

Bat Scoping Survey

Former Natwest Bank, St George's Road, Millom

13th March 2023

Report No. 0323/2

Report commissioned by;

Kamal Benissad
OPEN Ltd

On behalf of
Copeland Borough Council

Report prepared by;



Tamsin Douglas MSc MCIEEM
13 Rydal Road
Ulverston LA12 9BU
01229 582018

mail@southlakesecology.co.uk

Executive Summary

The former Natwest Bank in Millom has been unoccupied for several years, and there is now a proposal to refurbish the building (including a complete re-roof) and build a single storey extension on the north elevation to house a café.

This report was commissioned to accompany a planning application, and involved an inspection of the property and desktop searches to assess whether bats are using, or have used it for roosting purposes. An assessment is also made of the potential the buildings have to host bats or nesting birds, and whether this proposed development will have any negative impacts on individual bats, or the local bat population.

The building was inspected inside and outside for evidence of bat activity. There were minor restrictions – the roof void was not safe to access beyond the hatches, and snow was covering many of the shaded roof pitches – but these are not considered significant enough to affect the findings of this survey.

The building has stone and brick walls, which are rendered in places. Roofs are complex, but all are pitched and covered by slate except for the flat roof extension for the bank's safe. The basement and ground floor were previously part of the bank and the upper two floors were residential, but only the first floor appears to have been used within recent years. The second floor ceilings are in poor condition, and the roof void, timbers and felt can be seen easily from these rooms.

Roosting potential was identified around the wooden window frame of the upper floor window (rear elevation) and under slates on the rear and south elevations where slates have slipped, or where gaps are present along the rakes, and under slates on the outbuildings.

The building is assessed as having moderate scope to host bats. Surrounding habitat is quite urban, though with some parkland, and is assessed as of low quality for bats due to lack of sheltered habitat features linking to better quality feeding areas.

No evidence of bats was seen in the survey, and there are no records from the property in the data search.

As the property has moderate scope for use as a summer roost, **further survey work is required** to determine whether bats are likely to use the property, and the potential impacts of the project on the local bat population. Two surveys should be carried out in the active season (between May and September). These should be carried out before any works commence (the summer beforehand at the latest) to allow time to determine any mitigation and to apply for a license if required.

There was evidence of previous nesting attempts by corvids (probably jackdaw) and pigeons, and several dead birds in the upper floor of the property. All native birds are protected whilst in the process of nesting, and so some avoidance measures have been suggested to reduce the risk of delays to the project due to nesting birds.

To encourage a net gain to biodiversity following the project it is recommended that 3 swift boxes and at least 3 other bird boxes are erected on the building. Impacts on bats and any appropriate mitigation will be determined after the roost surveys.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Site Description	
1.2	Proposed Work	
1.3	Aims of survey	
2	Methods	6
2.1	Desktop data search	
2.2	Surveyor information	
2.3	Field survey	
2.3.1	Inspection	
2.3.2	Emergence surveys	
3	Results	8
3.1	Pre-survey data search	
3.1.1	Designated sites	
3.1.2	Protected species	
3.2	Field survey	
3.2.1	Habitat assessment	
3.2.2	Inspection	
3.3	Other species	
4	Assessment	12
4.1	Constraints on survey information	
4.2	Constraints on equipment used	
4.3	Potential impacts of development	
4.3.1	Designated sites	
4.3.2	Roosts	
4.3.3	Foraging and commuting habitat	
4.4	Legislation and policy guidance	
4.5	Other species	
5	Recommendations and mitigation	14
5.1	Further survey	
5.2	Avoidance and mitigation measures	
5.3	Mitigation licenses	
5.4	Other species	
5.5	Enhancement measures	
6	Summary	16
7	References	
	Appendices	18
i)	Photographs	

1 Introduction

1.1 *Site description*

The former Natwest Bank building is a large detached property in the town centre of Millom. It is located at SD 172 800, at approximately 10m AOD.

The property has been disused for several years, and is empty of furnishings. There are two separate parts to the building – the ground floor and basement with the bank infrastructure, and the first and second floors which were of domestic use. The building has a formal sandstone frontage and pitched slate roofs. There are two outbuildings on the southern elevation, and a small garden area to the north.

To the west of the property is an area of mature trees, a cemetery and community parks. Residential, community and commercial properties surround the property to the north and east. Millom is a small town and there are large ponds, intertidal habitats, agricultural land and nature reserves all within 2km of the building.

Figure 1 shows the location of the Natwest Bank building. Satellite imagery of the surrounding habitat and the area immediately surrounding the property is presented in figure 2. Photographs of the buildings are included in the appendices to this report.

1.2 *Proposed works*

The building requires significant internal refurbishments including a full re-roofing and replacement of doors and windows. There are also proposals to extend the ground floor to the north to create space for a café.

There are no set timescales for this project.

1.3 *Aims of survey*

This survey was commissioned to accompany a planning application to Copeland Borough Council.

The aim of the survey is to assess whether bats use, or have used, the former Natwest Bank; and if so how it has been used. From this data an assessment will be made as to whether any particular roost and/or the surrounding bat population would be affected by the proposed development. If they are likely to be affected then appropriate mitigation proposals will be included in this report.

The inspection survey and ensuing report follow guidance and structure provided by Bat Conservation Trust (Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, 2016).

The property was also appraised for its potential to host breeding birds (and any evidence noted).

Figure 1. Location Map



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right copied under licence (No. 100055725)

Figure 2. Aerial photograph showing surrounding habitat



Red circle indicates location.

(Imagery date 2018)

2 Methods

2.1 Desktop data search

A search of current literature (including the Bat Conservation Trust publication 'The Distribution Atlas of Bats in Britain and Ireland', Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre's Mammal Atlas and 'Mammals of the British Isles') was done, looking for bat records in the 10km gird square in which the property is situated.

An internet search was also carried out, noting any land with statutory designations within 5km of the former Natwest Bank. Reasons for any relevant land designations were researched to check whether bats were important features. A search was also carried out for local EPS (European Protected Species) licenses for disturbance to bats (this will give further indication of species present in the area). Searches for statutory designations, and relevant citations were done on a DEFRA website www.magic.defra.gov.uk.

A detailed search was commissioned from Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre, providing records of bats and their roosts within 2km of the property.

2.2 Surveyor information

The inspection was undertaken by Tamsin Douglas MCIEEM, experienced ecologist (holds Natural England Bat Class Licence – registration number 2015-10308-CLS-CLS).

2.3 Field survey

2.3.1 Daytime inspection

A daylight inspection of the building to identify possible roosting and nesting locations and access routes to these locations was carried out on 10th March 2023 between 10.30 and 12.30 by Tamsin Douglas.

The external and internal inspection was carried out, where necessary, using ladders, 10 x 42 binoculars, endoscope (Vscope VOxx-10WW), pole camera and a 1 million candlepower torch. The weather was cold with bright sun after overnight snow.

The building inspection involves a detailed internal and external daylight search for evidence of current or past use of the building by bats. Outside, particular attention is paid to the ground and ledges under any potential access points, weather boarding, hanging tiles, eaves, cracks and crevices in walls, and under tiles/slates. Internal inspections focus on areas around and below any potential roosting spots, ledges and lintels, behind crumbling render, and on and around roof timbers.

Evidence from a search which would indicate presence of bats includes-

- Roosting bats
- Corpses
- Droppings and urine staining on and around potential roosting areas (further evidence derived from amount and freshness of droppings)
- Droppings, staining and/or scratch marks at potential roost entrances
- Cleaner areas of woodwork, areas free of cobwebs suggesting bat activity such as crawling or flying
- Feeding detritus- such as moth wings

- Chattering or squeaking noise from roosting bats.

A general assessment is also made of the suitability of the surrounding habitat for bats, and connectivity to other areas of good quality foraging and commuting habitat.

Direct evidence of bats can be hard to detect and, as such, during the preliminary roost assessment the building is also appraised for its potential to host roosting bats. This potential is based on several factors:

- Presence of suitable internal or external features for roosting bats, and good access routes to these features
- Number of bats that these features could support
- Suitable conditions for roosting either in active season or for hibernation (humidity, temperature, exposure)
- Surrounding foraging and commuting habitat, connectivity to good habitat features
- Proximity to known roosts (especially for hibernation of species such as pipistrelles)

The need to undertake a roost emergence/ re-entry survey or hibernation survey (to provide further evidence as to whether bats use the building affected by these proposals) was determined by the results of this inspection.

2.3.2 Roost surveys

During the dusk or dawn roost survey, all suitable elevations of the property are observed for a standard period before and after sunrise or sunset. Surveys are carried out between May and September, when bats are most active. Surveyors watch all potential roosting locations to see if any bats emerge. Bat detectors (personal and static), digital recording devices and night-vision monoculars are used to aid detection and identification of any emerging bats.

A hibernation survey typically involves a detailed inspection of possible roosting sites using torch, mirror and endoscope, and can involve deploying static bat detectors. The survey is carried out in mid-winter, typically in January and February. The exact parameters of the survey depend on the nature of the site.

This scoping survey was carried out 'out of season', and as such roost surveys were not viable at the time. The need to undertake a roost emergence/ re-entry survey was determined by the results of this inspection, and will be detailed in the conclusions of this report.

3 Results

3.1 Desktop search

3.1.1 Designated sites

There is a large amount of designated land within 5km of the former Natwest Bank, and also within 2km of the property. The vast majority of this designated land is coastal/ inter-tidal.

A total of two SSSIs, one NNR (National Nature Reserve), one LNR (Local Nature Reserve), one SPA (Special Protection Area) and one SAC (Special Areas of Conservation) are found within 5km of the property. Although these may support bat populations, none of them detail bats in the supporting citations.

3.1.2 Protected species

Eight species of bat are currently known to breed in Cumbria, with a further two species that have been recorded within the county. All species of bat in the UK are fully protected under UK and European law.

Table 1. Status of bats in Cumbria

Species	Status in Cumbria
Whiskered bat <i>Myotis mystacinus</i>	Widespread, but uncommon. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Brandt's bat <i>M.brandtii</i>	Widespread, but uncommon. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Natterer's bat <i>M.nattereri</i>	Widespread. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Daubenton's bat <i>M.daubentonii</i>	Widespread. Strongly associated with still or slow moving water. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Noctule <i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	Widespread, but uncommon. Rarely associated with buildings. Breeding roosts recorded.
Leisler's bat <i>N.leisleri</i>	Rare. Only a confirmed bat detector record in Cumbria.
Common pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	Widespread. Roosts often associated with modern buildings, forages in a variety of habitats. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Soprano pipistrelle <i>P.pygmaeus</i>	Widespread. Only recently separated as a species from common pipistrelle, often associated with waterbodies, though forages in wide range of habitats. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.
Nathusius' pipistrelle <i>P.nathusii</i>	Rare. Recently added to Cumbria's list of bats. No confirmed breeding roosts recorded yet.
Brown long-eared bat <i>Plecotus auritus</i>	Widespread, but uncommon. Often associated with older buildings with good roof space. Maternity and hibernation roosts recorded.

The literature search provided records of summer roosts for 4 species of bats within the hectad SD18 (10km square) in which the former Natwest Bank is located. These are Whiskered/ Brandt's bat (very similar species difficult to separate), natterer's bat, pipistrelle species and brown long eared bat. The CBDC Mammal Atlas had recent (post-2000) confirmed records in SD18 for the species above, as well as; Daubenton's bat and noctule.

The internet search looking at nearby granted EPS (European Protected Species) licenses for bats produced no records within 5km. This is likely to be in part due to the low population density in this area (and large amount of coastal habitat) rather than a paucity of bats.

The detailed site search carried out by Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre gave 12 records of bats within 2km of the property. The only named species on the records was common pipistrelle (but there were some 'bat' records of undefined species). Records dated from 1998 to 2014, and included 4 records of roost sites. No records came from the property or its immediate surroundings (the closest valid record was 500m away).

Bats are generally an under-recorded group, and as such biological records such as those above can only be used as a guide to illustrate potential distributions in the area, and are not definitive.

3.2 *Field survey*

3.2.1 *Habitat assessment*

The property is in an urban setting, with residential areas (especially terraced houses with yards), commercial buildings and community areas nearby. Immediately west of the building are some mature deciduous trees and mown grassland leading to the church and cemetery, and some playing fields.

Beyond the urban area is agricultural land – primarily pasture with some cropland. There are small pockets of woodland and natural grasslands around Millom Ironworks LNR to the east, and Hodbarrow RSPB reserve to the south. Hodbarrow reserve also has several ponds and two large saline lagoons. Coastal habitats (saltmarsh and estuarine sands) have a strong influence within 2km of the property.

Bats can fly several kilometres to their feeding grounds, often following linear features such as hedgerows. Sheltered areas, particularly around water, tend to have greater amounts of invertebrate prey, and as such are sought out by foraging bats.

The habitat immediately to the west of the property offers some foraging opportunities for bats, but beyond this habitat is quite fragmented with few linking hedgerows, woodlands or watercourses leading to better feeding areas (such as at Hodbarrow). Overall the habitat quality is low for foraging and commuting bats due to this poor connectivity to good habitats, and the more disturbed urban setting (especially by artificial light).

3.2.2 *Roosting assessment*

Table 2: Factors affecting the probability of a building being used by bats in summer

Factors increasing probability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disused or little used; largely undisturbed Large roof void with unobstructed flying spaces Large dimension roof timbers with cracks, joints and holes Uneven roof covering with gaps, though not too draughty Entrances that bats can fly in through Hanging tiles or wood cladding, especially on south-facing walls Rural setting Close to woodland and/or water Pre-20th century or early 20th century construction Roof warmed by the sun
Factors decreasing probability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban setting or highly urbanised area with few feeding places Small or cluttered roof void (esp. for Plecotus) Heavily disturbed

	<p>Modern construction with few gaps around soffits or eaves (but be aware these may be used by pipistrelles in particular)</p> <p>Prefabricated with steel and sheet materials</p> <p>Active industrial premises</p> <p>Roof shaded from the sun</p>
--	---

(Taken from A. Mitchell-Jones, 2004)

Building construction

The building is from the late Victorian era, and is detached with a boundary stone wall and small area of grassland and trees (maturing ash and sycamore) to the north. There are four floors, including a basement.

The exterior of the building comprises sandstone walls, with some areas of brick walls to the rear (some of which are rendered). Above these walls are pitched slate roofs of varying orientation. On the front elevation are decorative gables and a long balcony on the first floor.

The external walls offer very limited roosting opportunities for bats, as the walls are well sealed at the eaves and there are few significant cracks or holes in the stonework or around the timber window frames. A notable exception to this is a significant gap surrounding the first floor window on the rear (west) elevation. The wooden fascia and soffits are in poor repair, but there are no gaps at the wall tops.

The roof slates are generally all in place and tightly fitted together (especially on the steeper pitches of the front elevations). Some missing slates were noted on the side (north) elevation in the structural report – but these could not be seen due to the covering of snow on the inspection date. There were gaps noted along the rakes on the rear and south elevations where the barge boards had rotted away.

The two outbuildings had some scope to host bats. The brick lean-to at the south-west corner of the landholding had gaps around roof slates and coping stones on the high boundary wall (forming the ridge of the building). The sandstone outbuilding (male toilets) also has some slipped slates around the roof.

Internally the first floor, ground floor and basement had no scope or opportunities for roosting bats. The upper floor has been unused for a considerable period of time, and there was loft insulation covering all of the floors. Many of the internal ceilings had partially collapsed around the dormers and eaves, and most rooms offered clear views into the roof void.

Under the roof slates the roofing felt was in good condition in most parts of the void, with few tears or sags. Daylight could be seen in places where slates were missing, and at the eaves – but the majority of the voids were fairly dark. The roof voids were of varying height, depending how far into them the second floor rooms extended. All had extensive cobwebs around roof timbers without any insulation around the timbers or floors, and the air was very dusty.

Suitability for bats

The building (including outbuildings) offers some scope for roosting bats – mostly around the roof areas (especially where slates are slipped/ missing and along the rakes). There is also some potential for bats to exploit the gaps around the upper floor window on the western elevation. None of these are high quality roosting areas, but they could be used by small to moderate numbers of bats at any time of the year – but more particularly in the active season (April- October).

Evidence of bats

No evidence of bats or bat activity was found during the inspection. No droppings were seen in or around the roof voids or upper floor bedrooms, and no bats seen in the voids or in suitable crevices within reach of inspection.

The floors of the roof voids were not safe to access (some were partially collapsed), and so these areas were assessed using a bright inspection torch and binoculars from the open hatches and from the gaps in the ceilings.

3.2.3 Summary of suitability of site for bats

Based on the evidence above, and using published guidance (summarised below) the former Natwest Bank in Millom is assessed as having low to moderate potential for roosting bats, and surrounding habitat has low suitability for commuting and foraging bats.

The property was assessed as having low potential to host hibernating bats, based on type and exposure of roosting features present, connectivity of habitat and proximity of known roosts.

As a result of this assessment at least one (preferably 2) summer roost surveys should be carried out to assess whether bats use (or show any interest in) the building.

Table 3: Summary of site suitability for bats.

Suitability	Roosting habitat-summer	Commuting/ foraging habitat
Negligible	No features found that are likely to be used	No features found that are likely to be used
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites, suitable for opportunistic use. Unlikely to be used by large numbers of bats or on a regular basis.	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of commuting or foraging bats, but isolated and not well connected to other suitable features.
Moderate	Structure with one or more potential roost sites, that could be used by bats – but unlikely to support roost of high conservation status.	Continuous habitat connected to wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging and/ or commuting.
High	Structure with one or more roost sites that are obviously suitable for larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis or for a longer period of time.	Continuous high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape and likely to be used regularly by foraging and/or commuting bats. Site near to and well connected to known bat roosts.

Table based on Table 4.1 of 'Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists', BCT 2016

3.3 Other species

There was significant evidence that the upper floor and roof area have been used by birds (pigeons and corvids) both as a roost site and to nest. There were piles of nesting material as well as broken eggs and several dead birds (some recent, some only skeletons).

4 Assessment

4.1 Constraints on survey information

This scoping visit was carried out in early March during cold weather conditions when bat activity is still unlikely (most still in hibernation or in torpor due to the cold snap). As such, sightings of bats were less likely. Recent heavy rains would also have washed away any external evidence of bats such as droppings.

Prior to the inspection there was overnight snow – which had not melted from many of the roof areas (especially north and east), and as such the external condition of some of the roofs could not be assessed. A recent (March 2022) building survey included photos of many of these roof areas, which helped in making conclusions for this report.

Close access was possible to the all the lower external walls and eaves. Torch and binoculars were used to assess the roof, eaves and upper walls.

The roof area was not considered safe to enter – many of the ceilings of the upper floor had partially collapsed. These areas were assessed from the loft hatches using torch and binoculars, and through gaps in the ceilings.

These constraints are not considered to affect the results of the inspection survey, but have been used to guide the need for any additional survey work at the building.

4.2 Constraints on equipment used

The conditions during the surveys were suitable for survey purposes and for the equipment used.

4.3 Potential impacts of the development

4.3.1 Designated sites

The proposed development will not have any negative impacts on nearby designated sites.

4.3.2 Roosts

No direct evidence of bats or bat activity was found during the inspection survey. The location and condition of the building means that it is classed as having low to moderate scope for small numbers of summer roosting bats. As such further survey work is required to ascertain whether the building and/ or outbuildings are used by bats, and whether these proposals will have any detrimental impacts on the local bat population.

4.3.3 Commuting and foraging habitat

The area surrounding the former Natwest Bank is a moderate foraging location for bats with poor quality connections to adjacent areas of higher quality habitat. The proposed development is highly unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the quality of the foraging habitat for bats.

4.4 *Legislation and Policy guidance*

Bats have declined in numbers dramatically across the UK and Western Europe in recent decades. Key factors linked to their decline are loss of roosting places due to building works and woodland destruction. Other factors implicated in their decline are changes in the countryside resulting in habitat loss and greater fragmentation of foraging habitats, and severing of commuting flightlines due to transport developments and hedgerow destruction.

As a consequence of these significant declines, bats and their roosts are protected under British and European law.

All bats are listed under Annexe IV of the EU Habitats Directive, and some under Annexe II. This law is transposed into English law into the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010).

Bats are also protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

As a result of the above legislation it is an offence to;

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat,
- Disturb a bat such that their survival, reproductive capacity, or the well being of the local population is affected
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a roosting bat, or block access to its roost.

If the proposed works were assessed as likely to commit an offence under the above legislation, then a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would need to be sought.

Further survey work is required to determine whether an offence is likely to be committed by the proposed development under the above legislation, and whether an EPS licence will need to be obtained or any specific mitigation carried out.

5 Recommendations and mitigation

5.1 Further survey

The property has been classed as having low to moderate scope to host bats, and further survey work is required to assess likely impacts of the proposed works on the local bat population.

Following best practice guidance, properties assessed as having moderate scope to host bats should have 2 summer (dusk or dawn) surveys carried out. These need to be carried out between May and September, and can be carried out this season – or at the latest in the summer before the works are due to commence (to allow time to organise licensing and mitigation if required).

The findings of this inspection report are valid provided that work commences within 12 months of the date of this report.

5.2 Avoidance and mitigation measures

5.2.1 Proposals for roost sites and potential roost sites

Any avoidance measures or mitigation for roost sites will be determined once the roost survey has been carried out.

5.2.2 Proposals for foraging and commuting habitat

No mitigation for foraging and commuting habitat is required for this development.

5.3 Mitigation licenses

Whether or not the project requires a mitigation license will be established following roost surveys.

5.4 Other species

The upper floor and roof area have been used in the past by corvids and pigeons to roost and nest. There is a small rookery in the nearby deciduous trees to the west, and birds may still try to access the roof area of the bank to nest. Rooks, jackdaw and pigeons are all widespread species, and are not of conservation concern, however all native UK species are protected whilst nesting under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). As such it is recommended that wherever possible birds are prevented from accessing the interior of the building to nest, and if the renovations are to start within the nesting season (end of March to mid-August) a nesting bird check should first be carried out.

5.5 Enhancement measures

Following local planning guidance, measures to encourage a net gain of biodiversity should be included for all new developments. Impacts of the proposals on bats have not yet been determined, but some mitigation for other wildlife can be included.

Given the height of the property, swift nest boxes would be appropriate on the north elevation (up near the eaves – they require a clear flight route into the box which should be at least 5m above the ground). Swifts nest in loose colonies, so three boxes should be erected to encourage them.

Three other bird nesting boxes for smaller species (such as a sparrow terrace, robin box or tit box) should be installed lower down on north or east elevations between 2 and 4m high on the external walls. All boxes should be installed in areas where they will not be exposed to predators such as cats.

Boxes can be bought or built from scratch. Full guidance can be found on the RSPB website <https://www.rspb.org.uk/fun-and-learning/for-families/family-wild-challenge/activities/build-a-birdbox/> and <https://www.rspb.org.uk/get-involved/activities/nature-on-your-doorstep/garden-activities/create-a-high-home-for-swifts/>

6 Summary

A desktop search and thorough daylight inspection were carried out to assess whether bats use, or have recently used the former Natwest Bank in Millom. An assessment was also made regarding the potential of this building to host bats and nesting birds, and whether the proposed development was likely to harm bats, or have an adverse impact on the local bat population.

The building is a large detached property in Millom town centre. It has four floors (including a basement) which were used for commercial and residential purposes, but the building has been empty for several years. The external walls are in reasonable condition with no significant gaps or cracks suitable for roosting bats. An exception to this is the upper floor window on the rear wall (west elevation), which has large gaps around it. Roofs are varied, but all are pitched and covered by slate. There are a few slipped/ missing slates, and gaps along the roof edge (mostly on the south and west elevations). There are two small outbuildings on the south elevation, and both of these have some missing and slipped slates.

The second floor of the building is in poor repair, with ceilings partially collapsed, giving clear views into the roof void in places. The roof timbers and roofing felt above are in better condition, but the upper floor of the building has been unused for a considerable period of time, with significant amounts of debris, cobweb and plaster/ mortar dust.

None of the potential roost sites around the roof areas and window frame are of high quality, and the habitat around the building offers limited scope for commuting and feeding bats.

No evidence of bat activity was found, and there are no records of bats from the property or its' surroundings.

There were no constraints on the survey conditions or equipment used that are considered to compromise the validity of the findings of this report.

As the property has moderate scope for use as a summer roost, further survey work is required to determine whether bats are likely to use the property, and the potential impacts of the project on the local bat population. Two surveys should be carried out in the active season (between May and September). These should be carried out before any works commence (the summer beforehand at the latest) to allow time to determine any mitigation and to apply for a license if required.

There was evidence of previous nesting attempts by corvids (probably jackdaw) and pigeons, and several dead birds in the upper floor of the property. All native birds are protected whilst in the process of nesting, and so some avoidance measures have been suggested to reduce the risk of delays to the project due to nesting birds.

7 References

Altringham, J.D. (2003) *British Bats* HarperCollins New Naturalist, London.

Bat Conservation Trust (2000) *Bat Atlas 2000- Distribution Atlas of Bats in Britain and Ireland*. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Bat Conservation Trust (2016) *Bat Surveys - Good Practice Guidelines* 3rd edition. Bat Conservation Trust, London

Gunnel K., Murphy B. and Williams C. (2013) *Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings*. RIBA Publishing, London

Korsten E. et al (2018) *Swarm and switch: on the trail of the hibernating common pipistrelle*. Bat News. No. 110 (Summer 2016). p. 8-10. Bat Conservation Trust. London

Middleton N (2019) *Assessing Sites for Hibernation Potential. A Practical Approach, including a Proposed Method & Supporting Notes*. Unpublished course notes.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. (2004) *The Bat Workers' Manual* 3rd edition JNCC, Peterborough.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004) *Bat Mitigation Guidelines* English Nature, Peterborough

Russ, J (2012) *British Bat Calls* Pelagic Publishing, Exeter

Bat Conservation Trust www.bats.org.uk

JNCC, Bat habitat management pages <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2465>

Details on the work done regarding issues with bats and non-bitumen roofing membranes www.batsandbrms.co.uk

Details on status of bats in Cumbria <http://www.cumberlandbatgroup.org.uk>

Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre, Cumbria Mammal Atlas <http://www.cbdc.org.uk/wildlife-in-cumbria/cumbria-mammal-atlas/>

Appendices

i) Photographs



Image 1. Front (East) elevation of property.

Note the steep pitch of the upper roof on this elevation.



Image 2. Side (north) elevation of the property, showing extension on ground floor to house the safe.



Image 3. Rear (west) elevation. No render over the brickwork.



Image 4.
Side (south) elevation, showing the decorative gables, and the rendered walls towards the rear of the building.



Image 5.
Two outbuildings on the south elevation. Detached lean-to against the boundary wall in foreground, and stone building to rear of image (male toilets).




Image 6.
Window on rear elevation where brickwork has bowed out creating gaps around the wooden frame suitable for roosting bats.




Image 7.
South-west corner of the building where the render has crumbled to reveal brickwork. No gaps at wall tops seen.



Image 8.
West elevation showing gaps along the rakes where the boards have rotted – potential for use by bats.



Image 9.
Second floor of property, showing poor condition of rooms on this floor, and clearly visible roof timbers.



Image 10.
Second floor room, showing crumbled mortar around eaves, and the roof insulation covering all the floorboards.



Image 11.
Interior of roof void at the rear of the building (looking west).
Empty void – no insulation or stored materials.



Image 12.
Second floor room at the front of the property with tear in roofing felt. Felt in quite good condition throughout the rest of the roof area.



Image 13.
Roof void seen through fallen ceiling, showing missing slate (clear daylight).



Image 14.
Inside void at the front of the property showing steep roof pitch over the top of other roof trusses.