

Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

Bat Activity Survey Report	
<b>For:</b>	Mr Wayne Bennett
<b>Site</b>	Pear Tree Farm, Church Street, Brierley, Barnsley, S72 9HT
<b>Report Date:</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2025
<b>Report Reference:</b>	SQ-2239



Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

<b>Client:</b>	Mr Wayne Bennett
<b>Site Name:</b>	Pear Tree Farm, Church Street, Brierley, Barnsley, S72 9HT
<b>Grid Reference:</b>	SE 40902 11236
<b>Report:</b>	Bat Activity Report
<b>Date of survey:</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2025
<b>Lead Ecologist:</b>	Sam Toon BSc(hons) <b>Natural England Bat Licence: 2018-35446-CLS-CLS</b>

<b>Issue:</b>	<b>Revision:</b>	<b>Stage:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Approved by:</b>
1	-	Draft for review	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2025	Sam Toon BSc(hons)	Natasha Estrada MRes, MCIEEM
2	n/a	FINAL	3 <sup>rd</sup> June 2025	Sam Toon BSc(hons)	Natasha Estrada MRes, MCIEEM



Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

This report has been prepared for exclusive use of the client, Mr Wayne Bennett. No part of this report may be reproduced or relied upon without written agreement from Estrada Ecology Ltd.

The contents of this report have been produced with due consideration of current best practice guidance, and in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct and guidelines, as outlined in Collins 2023.

This report should not be submitted as part of a planning application without any accompanying species-specific reports which may have been recommended herein.

Data within this report is valid for a maximum of eighteen months from the date of the survey. After this period, an updated site visit will be required to determine a new ecological baseline.

Whilst every effort has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this report and its contents, in view of potential ecological constraints to development or the presence or absence of species, it must only be viewed as a snapshot in time and, therefore, not be viewed as definitive. Due to external factors, such as seasonality, weather etc, having the potential to affect survey results, no liability can be assumed for omissions or changes that may, or may not occur, after the date this report was produced.

## Summary

Estrada Ecology Ltd was commissioned to conduct one bat activity survey on buildings within the curtilage of Pear Tree Farm, Church Street, Brierley, Barnsley, S72 9HT (hereafter referred to the site) which could be utilised by bats for roosting, and / or as a place of shelter.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was conducted by Estrada Ecology Ltd (*Report Ref: SQ-1996, 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024*). Two buildings on site recorded a low level of roost suitability when assessed by a licensed bat ecologist. Further survey effort was recommended in respect of bats to ascertain presence/ likely absence.

Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

## Findings and recommendations

### Bats and roosts

One dusk emergence activity survey, following BCT Survey Guidelines 2023, was undertaken following suitable weather conditions, as outlined herein.

During the survey, no bats of any species were recorded emerging from or entering the buildings. A very limited number of contacts solely from non-emerging common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) bat were recorded throughout the duration of the survey.

Based on field sign evidence, the buildings are deemed not to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter. As a result, no further surveys are recommended, and no formal mitigation is proposed.

### Hibernating bats

Crevice-dwelling bats, such as pipistrelle species, use structures for shelter and protection in winter when they hibernate. During hibernation, bats need roosts that are cool and remain at a constant temperature. They are difficult to detect in hibernation, in well-concealed crevices, and leave no obvious signs of their presence. The building was assessed for its potential to support features which bats could utilise for hibernation. The structure recorded very low to negligible potential for hibernacula use, due to the absence of crevices or cracks of a suitable depth and thermal mass which could support hibernating bats.

### Breeding birds

No evidence of breeding birds was recorded at the time of survey within or upon the building. No impacts are predicted on breeding birds at this juncture.

## Contents:

### Summary

- 1 Introduction and Site Description**
  - 2 Protected Species Legislation**
  - 3 Survey Objectives**
  - 4 Survey Methodology**
  - 5 Survey Findings**
  - 6 Survey and Site Assessment**
  - 7 Ecological Constraints**
  - 8 Interpretation and Evaluation**
  - 9 Assessment of Potential Impacts**
  - 10 Conclusions and Recommendations**
- References**



Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

## 1 Introduction and Site Description

- 1.1 Estrada Ecology Ltd was commissioned to conduct one dusk bat activity survey on Pear Tree Farm, Church Street, Brierley, Barnsley, S72 9HT. The survey site's central OS grid reference is SE 40902 11236.
- 1.2 The site is surrounded on the northwest, southwest, and southeast by residential developments and associated gardens. The northeastern aspect of the site is open to adjacent fields. Church Street forms the site's southwestern boundary.
- 1.3 The site is located at the northeastern side of the village of Brierley, South Yorkshire, and is approximately 7.8 km northeast from Barnsley town centre.
- 1.4 It is understood that the current development proposal includes the demolition of the existing buildings and the redevelopment of the remainder of the site, subject to the necessary consents.
- 1.5 Three buildings are present in the southwestern portion of the site. These include a bungalow (B1), a two-storey house (B2), and a farm building complex (B3). Buildings B2 and B3 were appraised as containing low roost suitability and further survey effort was recommended to ascertain presence/ likely absence of use by bats. The bungalow (B1) was assessed to offer negligible bat roost suitability.

**Figure 1:** The building in its wider setting (shown with red keyline).



Google Earth

## 2 Protected Species Legislation

- 2.1 All species of bat and their breeding sites or resting places (roosts) are fully protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- 2.2 The Regulations prohibit: the deliberate killing, injuring or taking of bats; the deliberate disturbance of any bat species, in such a way as to be significantly likely to affect:
  - their ability of to survive, hibernate, migrate, breed, or rear or nurture their young, or the local distribution or abundance of that species.

Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

- damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place (roost); and
- the possession or transport of bats or any other part thereof.

2.3 Bats are also protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through their inclusion in Schedule 5. Under the Act, they are protected from:

- intentional or reckless disturbance (at any level); obstruction of access to any place of shelter, breeding or rest; selling, bartering or exchange of these species, or parts of.

2.4 Seven British bat species are listed as Species of Principle Importance (SPI) under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. These are: barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*); Bechstein's (*Myotis bechsteinii*); noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*); soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*); brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*); greater horseshoe (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*); and lesser horseshoe (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*).

2.5 Under the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the presence of any protected species is a material planning consideration. The Framework states that impacts arising from development proposals must be avoided where possible, or mitigated / compensated for, and that opportunities for ecological enhancement should be sought.

2.6 Under certain circumstances, a licence may be granted by Natural England to permit activities that would otherwise constitute an offence. In relation to development, a scheme must have full planning permission before a licence application can be made.

### 3 Survey Objectives

3.1 The objective of these surveys was to establish if bats were using the site for roosting, or as a place of shelter; and, to identify to species level, determine the population size and nature of the roost within the buildings on site.

3.2 This report presents the findings of a bat activity survey undertaken in June 2025 and aims to:

- Outline any potential impacts of the proposed development on bats, as a result of the findings of the desk study and field surveys.
- Provide recommendations for mitigation and / or compensation measures to ensure any impacts on bat activity is avoided or minimised where applicable.
- Provide recommendations for enhancing the site for bat activity where possible; and
- Provide recommendations for mitigation and / or compensation measures to ensure any impacts on breeding bird species is avoided or minimised.

## 4 Survey Methodology

### 4.1 Desktop study

- 4.1.1 A biological data records search was commissioned from Barnsley Ecological Records Centre (BERC) for a 2 km radius from the central grid reference.
- 4.1.2 Further inspection, using colour 1: 25,000 OS base maps ([www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk](http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk)), MAGIC ([www.magic.defra.gov.uk](http://www.magic.defra.gov.uk)) and aerial photographs from Google Earth ([www.maps.google.co.uk](http://www.maps.google.co.uk)), was also undertaken to provide additional context and identify any features of potential importance for nature conservation in the wider countryside.
- 4.1.3 Consultation with MAGIC was undertaken to ascertain any European Protected Species Mitigation Licences granted within a 2 km radius from grid.

### 4.2 Initial inspection survey

- 4.2.1 An initial inspection survey of the site was undertaken in June 2024 and recorded Building B2 to contain one broken tile on the northwestern elevation. The feature was considered not to demonstrate any gaps or fissures suitable for use by bats, however, it could provide access to the roof internals by bat which could host suitable bat roosting provisions. Consequently, the building was assigned low roost suitability.

4.2.2 Building B3 recorded the northern rendered portion of the building to contain a slate tile roof which was noted to demonstrate minor lifting of tiles and multiple instances of missing or broken tiles which likely provide access to the interior of the building. Consequently, Building B3 was categorised as having low roost suitability.

4.2.3 The buildings were assessed by a licensed bat ecologist Sam Toon 2018-34456-CLS-CLS as part of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site undertaken in June 2024. Report reference: SQ-1996.

### 4.3 Bat activity surveys

4.3.1 One bat activity survey was undertaken on the evening of 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2025 using guidance from Collins, J., Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists, Good Practice Guidelines, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2023.

4.3.2 Prior to the start of the activity surveys an external examination, where accessible, was undertaken of all cavities, holes, cracks and fissures in timber and brickwork (where applicable), using an Explorer Premium Image Recording telescopic borescope, a Seek compact pro thermal camera and close-focusing binoculars. Features were examined for bat field signs to identify bats in situ, potential roost sites and access points and any signs of occupation such as scratch marks; droppings; smudge marks; discarded moth wings; and urine staining etc.

4.3.3 The number of surveys on the buildings is determined by their potential to support bats; any field sign evidence gathered during the initial inspection survey in June 2024, and any subsequent activity recorded during activity surveys.

4.3.4 The dusk emergence surveys commenced twenty minutes prior to sunset and continued up to two hours after sunset.

4.3.5 Echo Meter Touch 2 Pros were used to aid identification of the species along with Night fox Whisper Infrared cameras.

**Figure 2:** Location of surveyors ( ● ) over the survey period.



Google Earth

## 4.4 Timings

4.4.1 The activity surveys were conducted during suitable weather conditions as outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Environmental conditions throughout the survey period.

Date	Sunset / Sunrise	Start time	End time	Weather conditions
2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2025	21:05	21:26	22:40	Temp 15°C, Humidity 55%, No precipitation, wind speed 9mph NW

## 4.5 Personnel

4.5.1 The bat activity surveys were led by senior ecologist Sam Toon BSc (hons) who is a licensed bat ecologist (2018-35446-CLS- CLS) with over ten years' experience of undertaking bat activity surveys.

4.5.2 Sam was assisted by assistant ecologists John Davies BSc(hons) and Joanne Toller BSc(hons) both of whom are enrolled on a formal bat licence training programme with Ecology Training UK Ltd. Junior ecologists Emily Southern BSc(hons) and Aimee McManus BSc(hons) assisted to maximise survey effort.

## 5 Survey Findings

### 5.1 Desktop study

- 5.1.1 Over fifteen-hundred records were returned from Barnsley Ecological Records Centre for a 2 km radius from the central grid reference.
- 5.1.2 Six records which pertain to bats were returned, all dated 2018. These include three for common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), one unspecified *Pipistrellus* species, and three for brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*).
- 5.1.3 Consultation with MAGIC returned one European Protected Species Mitigation Licence within a 2 km radius from grid.

**Table 2:** Granted EPSM Licences within the Search Radius.

Licence Number	Date	Distance from Site	Species	Purpose
EPSM2012-4323	2012-2014	1163 meters southeast	Common Pipistrelle ( <i>Pipistrellus Pipistrellus</i> )	Destruction of a Resting Place

### 5.2 Initial inspection survey

- 5.2.1 Prior to the start of the activity survey, a visual inspection of the buildings was undertaken, where accessible by Sam Toon 2018-34456-CLS-CLS.
- 5.2.2 No new field sign evidence synonymous with bats to indicate use of any structure was recorded.

### 5.3 Bat activity surveys

- 5.3.1 During the activity survey, no bats of any species were recorded emerging from or re-entering any area of the buildings.
- 5.3.2 A very low level of bat contacts was recorded over the duration of the survey period limited to:

- 2 x Common pipistrelle foraging around the garden area between 22:00 and 22:01.
- 1 x C pip fly by at 22.06 heading south to north.
- 1 x C.pip 22.08 foraging within garden for approximately one minute before dispersing off site.

5.3.3 No further contacts from any other species of bat were recorded over the remainder of the survey period.

5.3.4 No evidence of breeding birds was recorded over the survey period, within or upon any structure within the site.

## 5.4 Commuting route assessment

5.4.1 Bats are known to utilise linear features as commuting lines to foraging grounds and between roosts. Under current proposals, no encroachment on habitat suitable for use by bats is predicted and thus no impacts.

5.4.2 No major commuting lines or foraging grounds were recorded during the survey period over the wider site.

5.4.3 Field sign evidence over the survey period infers the immediate area supports low level of bats/ bat activity.

## 6 Survey and Site Assessment

6.1 No bats of any species were recorded emerging from or re-entering any area of the buildings over the survey period.

6.2 Bat activity over the survey period was restricted to low numbers of non-emerging common pipistrelle bats.

6.3 No evidence of use of any structure by breeding birds was recorded at the time of survey.

6.4 Based on evidence collated over the dusk survey combined with an absence of bat activity and no emerging/ re-entering bats, the buildings were recorded as unlikely to support bats for roosting or as a place of shelter when assessed by an experienced bat ecologist (2018-134456-CLS-CLS).

Pear Tree Farm  
 Church Street  
 Brierley  
 Barnsley  
 S72 9HT

6.5 The buildings are considered to have very low to negligible potential for use by bats for hibernation, due to an absence of suitable crevices and cracks of a suitable depth capable of supporting a stable thermal mass which could support hibernating bats.

**7 Ecological Constraints**

7.1 Due to the variable properties of bat echolocation calls and the format of frequency division recordings, it is not always possible to identify a series of echolocation calls down to species level.

7.2 In most cases, it is usually possible to identify to genus level which is suitable to allow potential affects to be assessed, and appropriate mitigation designed.

**8 Interpretation and Evaluation**

8.1 The buildings are confirmed as being unlikely to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter.

8.2 No field sign evidence to suggest use of the buildings subject to survey by bats was recorded over the survey period and only sporadic bat activity was recorded throughout the duration of the survey period.

**9 Assessment of Potential Impacts**

**9.1 Impacts on bats and their roosts**

9.1.1 The results of the bat activity surveys confirm that the building is unlikely to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter.

9.1.2 The activity survey results recorded no evidence to suggest use of the survey site as a major commuting route or foraging ground. Under current proposals, no impacts on major foraging grounds or commuting lines are predicted.

Pear Tree Farm  
Church Street  
Brierley  
Barnsley  
S72 9HT

## 9.2 Impacts on breeding birds

- 9.2.1 At the time of survey, no evidence to indicate use of any building by breeding birds was recorded.
- 9.2.2 It is understood that works are due to commence outside the breeding bird season. However, should timings change and nests or activity to suggest birds are breeding or attempting to breed in any building be recorded, then all works should cease, and a suitably qualified ecologist consulted.
- 9.2.3 A suitable buffer zone, as advised by a suitably qualified ecologist, should be installed in order to protect the nest and prevent disturbance.

## 10 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.1 The result of the bat activity survey confirms the buildings are unlikely to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter. As a result, no formal mitigation is recommended however, the following precautionary caveat is applicable:

*As with all buildings, there is the residual possibility of single bats using a building post survey. The likelihood in this instance is deemed very low however, during the onset of works, should bats or field sign evidence of bats be recorded then all works should cease, and a suitably qualified ecologist consulted.*

- 10.2 It is deemed that a Protected Species Mitigation Licence (formerly European Protected Species Mitigation Licence) will not be required to facilitate the works.
- 10.3 No impacts on major foraging lines or commuting corridors are predicted via the proposals.

## References

Collins, J (2023). Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists, Good Practice Guidelines 4<sup>th</sup> Edition.

Stone, E., (2014) Bats and Lighting – Bats Conservation Trust.



**Appendix One:** Example of IR Footage over the survey period.

