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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report has been prepared by FPCR Environment and Design Ltd. on behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd (GDL) in support of an outline planning application for the residential development of land off Rampton Road, Cottenham. This application is a resubmission of application S/1818/15/OL which was refused by the Planning Committee on the 11th May 2016. It provides an ecological appraisal of the land at number 117 Rampton Road, Cottenham, proposed to become an access road to the Land off Rampton Road development.

1.2 The objective of the study was to make an initial investigation to determine the habitats and species present within a defined boundary, the house and garden of number 117 (hereafter referred to as the site) and to make an initial assessment of their ecological value and any potential ecological constraints to future residential development of the site. Additional objectives were to investigate the potential for roosting bats through an internal/external investigation and nocturnal surveys.

1.3 This report should be read in conjunction with the Land off Rampton Road, Cottenham Ecological Appraisal (May 2016) prepared by FPCR Environment and Design.

Site Context

1.4 The site is 1048m² and contains a residential property with a front and back garden which then extends on to open countryside dominated by arable farmland. Hardstanding and short grassland dominate the garden habitats with additional habitats limited to the boundaries of the site and include two ornamental plantings and trees.
2.0 METHODOLOGY

Field Survey

2.1 The site was surveyed on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} May 2015 following the Extended Phase I Habitat survey technique as recommended by Natural England\textsuperscript{1}. This involved a systematic walk over of the site by an experienced ecologist to classify the broad habitat types and to identify any habitats of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity as listed within Section 41 (S41) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Tree Assessment

2.2 The trees were classified into general bat roost potential groups based on the presence of features listed above. This assessment was completed by a licensed bat worker from FPCR.

2.3 Table 1 below classifies the potential categories as accurately as possible. This table is based upon Table 8.4 in Bat Surveys- Good Practice Guidelines\textsuperscript{2}. The table within the guidelines has been designed to inform assessments completed prior to the completion of arboricultural works. Consequently, the suggested survey methods have been refined to suit development works and considers the definition of a breeding site or resting place as described in the Habitat Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree category and description</th>
<th>Survey requirements prior to determination.</th>
<th>Recommended mitigation works and/or further surveys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed bat roost with field evidence of the presence of bats, e.g. live / dead bats, droppings, scratch marks, grease marks and / or urine staining.</td>
<td>Identified on a plan and in the field. Further assessment such as climb and inspect and/or dusk/dawn surveys should be undertaken, if the trees are affected by the development, to provide an assessment on the likely use of the roost, numbers and species of bat present.</td>
<td>Avoid disturbance where possible. Felling or other works that would affect the roost would require an EPS licence with like for like roost replacement as a minimum. Works may also be subject to timing constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees that have a high / moderate potential to support bat roosts.</td>
<td>Identified on a plan and in the field to assess the potential use of suitable cavities, based on the habitat preferences of bats. Where the tree(s) will be affected by the proposed development, further assessment such as climb and inspect and/or dusk/dawn surveys (up to 2/3 nocturnal surveys) should be undertaken (as appropriate), to ascertain presence/absence of roosting bats. Trees may be upgraded if presence of roosting confirmed after further surveys: Avoid disturbance where possible. In situations where disturbance cannot be avoided and where no evidence of occupation of suitable cavities has been confirmed during the initial surveys or nocturnal surveys (as appropriate), further precautionary survey work following the granting of planning permission and prior to works being completed is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} JNCC (2010) \textit{Handbook for Phase I habitat survey – a technique for environmental audit.}

\textsuperscript{2} Bat Conservation Trust (2012) \textit{Bat Surveys- Good Practice Guidelines.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree category and description</th>
<th>Survey requirements prior to determination.</th>
<th>Recommended mitigation works and/or further surveys.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 2b Trees with a low potential to support bat roosts.</td>
<td>Identified on a plan and in the field to assess the potential use of suitable cavities, based on the habitat preferences of bats. Where the tree(s) will be affected by the proposed development, further assessment such as climb and inspect and/or dusk/dawn surveys (one nocturnal survey) should be undertaken (as appropriate), to ascertain presence/absence of roosting bats. Trees may be upgraded if presence of roosting bats is confirmed or downgraded following further surveys if features present are not suitable for bats and / or no evidence of a breeding site or resting place * is found within features that can be assessed fully.</td>
<td>Trees where no bat roost confirmed after further surveys: Avoid disturbance where possible. In situations where disturbance cannot be avoided and where no evidence of occupation of suitable cavities has been confirmed during the initial surveys or nocturnal surveys (as appropriate), further precautionary survey work following the granting of planning permission and prior to works being completed is recommended to ensure features have not been occupied by bats. The additional precautionary survey work could comprise further nocturnal surveys during the active bat season immediately prior to felling or management works or the completion of additional aerial inspections. Use &quot;soft felling&quot; techniques, removing ivy cover by hand and avoid cutting through tree cavities is recommended once the presence of a roost has been discounted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3 Trees with no / negligible potential to support bat roosts.</td>
<td>Identified on a plan and in the field to assess the potential use of suitable cavities, based on the habitat preferences of bats.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) affords protection to breeding sites or resting places at all times. For an area to be classified as a breeding site or resting place, the Regulations require there to be a reasonably high probability that the species will return to the sites and / or place.
Confirmation of a breeding site or resting place in trees can be established through the completion of aerial inspection and / or nocturnal surveys (as appropriate). In situations where nocturnal surveys are completed and a breeding site or resting site is not confirmed, the survey effort is considered to be sufficient to reasonably discount the presence of roosting bats (for a period of time as defined in Natural England’s current Standing Advice). However, further precautionary works may be recommended if the trees is affected by works.

Where features of a tree are identified as providing potential to be used as a breeding site or resting place, evidence of current or previous use of the feature should be identified during an aerial inspection to necessitate the completion of further detailed nocturnal survey work prior to the granting of planning permission. In situations where no evidence of use is identified it is reasonable to conclude that a feature is not being used as a breeding site or resting place as defined by the Regulations but further precautionary measures maybe recommended if a tree is affected by development to ensure occupation has not occurred following completion of the survey. If the presence of a breeding site or resting place cannot be discounted from ground level or aerial inspections, nocturnal survey work to confirm the presence of a breeding site or resting place should be completed.

**Internal / External Building Assessment**

2.4 External aspects of the buildings were examined to determine the potential for bat roost sites and bat access features. Structural features were recorded and suitable access points such as small gaps in eaves/soffit boards, raised or missing ridge tiles, gaps through degraded mortar and gaps at gable ends were sought. Evidence of use by bats (including potential access points) was also sought and may include staining and the presence of bat droppings. Confirmation that access points were disused, may include the presence of heavy cob-webbing and general detritus around such points.

2.5 Internal inspections of buildings were also undertaken, including any roof voids or areas behind boarded windows to determine if there was any evidence of previous or present occupation by bats. Such evidence may comprise the presence of live or dead bats, droppings, urine staining, grease /scratch marks on timbers and the conspicuous absence of cobwebs.

2.6 The above mentioned surveys were conducted on the 22nd May 2015 by a licensed bat worker and an assistant from FPCR. Binoculars, ladders, torches and endoscopes were used to aid the surveys.

**Nocturnal Surveys**

**Buildings**

2.7 Nocturnal surveys were undertaken on building B1 to identify any bats exiting or entering possible roosting sites within the buildings. The surveys were undertaken between June and September 2015 when weather conditions were suitable, i.e. when the ambient air temperature exceeded 10˚C and when there was little/no wind or rain. This methodology takes into account the statutory guidance from English Nature (now Natural England)³ and further guidelines introduced by the Bat Conservation Trust⁴ and JNCC⁵. An additional fourth survey was undertaken in September, due to sub-optimal survey conditions (light rain shower) within the August nocturnal survey occasion.

---
⁴ Hundt (2012) *Bat Surveys - Good Practice Guidelines*
⁵ JNCC (1999) *Bat Workers Manual*
2.8 Surveyors were positioned at viewpoints where all aspects of the buildings could be observed. Bat Box Duet bat detectors were used during these surveys. Nocturnal surveys were undertaken between: approximately 15 minutes prior to sunset and up to 90 minutes following sunset and 2 hours prior to sunrise and 15 minutes afterwards.

Table 2: Survey Timings and Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Survey type</th>
<th>Area covered</th>
<th>Timing/ Weather conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/05/15</td>
<td>Phase 1 Habitat</td>
<td>All on site habitats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including assessment of trees for</td>
<td></td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bat roost potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/05/15</td>
<td>Internal/External Building Inspection</td>
<td>Building 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/08/15</td>
<td>Dusk Emergence Survey</td>
<td>Building 1</td>
<td>Dusk start time - 20:05, Sunset – 20:19, Finish 21:50, 15-16°C, light rain shower mid survey from 20:40 until 21:00. 100% cloud cover and a slight breeze.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 RESULTS

Habitats

3.1 The habitats on-site were dominated by hardstanding, buildings and amenity grassland forming the garden (Appendix A, Photograph 1 and 3).

3.2 All trees present were of early mature and comprised entirely, with exception to a silver birch Betula pendula in the front garden, of Leyland cypress X Cuprocyparis leylandii.

Tree Roost Assessment

3.3 At the time of survey, no trees on-site provided features that may be utilised by roosting bats.
Building Internal & External Inspection

3.4 Building B1 was a two storey brick built detached house with a pitched concrete pantile roof. A single storey brick garage with a flat felted roof and conservatory join onto the property (Appendix A, Photograph 2 and 3). Structural features of note included two chimney stacks, soffit boards, gables, fascia boards and lead flashing. The roof was in a good state of repair with few potential bat access points observed. Potential bat access points noted were limited to occasional small gaps under the soffits and lead flashing. The roof void (6m wide x 2.5 m high) had been insulated with wool at ceiling level and bituminous underfelt was present below the exterior roof tiles (Appendix A, Photograph 5). At the time of survey no evidence of a bat roost was observed internally or externally. However, given the presence of a small number of potential bat access points, the building was considered to offer low bat roost potential.

3.5 During the external building inspection it was noted that a blackbird *Turdus merula* nest and a house sparrow *Passer domesticus* nest were present in the soffit box lower ends.

3.6 Building B2 was a single storey wooden shed with a metal sheet roof (Appendix B, Photograph 4). No features of note or potential bat access were recorded. B2 was considered to provide negligible potential to support roosting bats.

Building Emergence Survey

Dusk Emergence Survey 22/06/15 (Figure 2a)

3.7 At the time of survey no bats were recorded emerging from building B1. Bat activity was limited to five contacts from common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* generally recorded within the garden area which included some foraging around the ornamental shrubs.

Dawn Re-entry Survey 23/06/15 (Figure 2a)

3.8 Low levels of bat activity were recorded during the survey, however a single common pipistrelle was observed returning to roost at 04:09. This bat was recorded entering a small gap between the soffit board and the wall at the chimney stack (Appendix A, Photograph 6). No further bats were recorded returning to roost.

Dusk Emergence Survey 21/07/15 (Figure 3)

3.9 Sustained levels of foraging activity was recorded from individual / small groups of common pipistrelle across the back gardens of the property and neighbouring houses from approx. 21:30 to 22:00 before activity became more sporadic. A noctule *Nyctalus noctula* was recorded commuting over the house at 22:14.

3.10 No bats were seen to emerge from the building during the survey. However, at 21:46 three common pipistrelle bats entered a small gap between the soffit box and brick wall of the chimney stack on the western aspect (Appendix A, Photograph 6) at approximately 21:46. The bats remained within the feature for approximately five minutes then all re-emerged at 21:51. Common pipistrelles were also recorded prospecting a gap behind the chimney on the eastern aspect, however the bats did not enter.
Dusk Emergence Survey 18/08/15 (Figure 4)

3.11 At the time of survey only two bats were recorded. A common pipistrelle was observed flying over the line of leylandii trees in the back garden at 21:15 and a common pipistrelle was recorded at 20:53 however was not sighted. No bats were recorded entering or exiting B1.

3.12 Light rain from 20:40 until 21:00 and although this was considered to be a partial constraint to the survey, bats were still recorded shortly after the rain shower ended.

Dusk Emergence Survey 02/09/15 (Figure 5)

3.13 Sporadic foraging activity was recorded from low numbers of individual common pipistrelle between 20:31 and 21:15. Activity was recorded within both the front and rear gardens associated with the house however as many of the bats recorded were not observed, it is likely they were foraging within the adjacent gardens off-site. One commuting common pipistrelle bat was recorded at 20:32, flying from east to west across the front garden. No bats were observed emerging or re-entering building B1.

4.0 DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Proposals for the site are for the demolition of the building to create an access road to the main development proposed off Rampton Road.

Legislation

4.2 All species of bats are listed on the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) making it illegal to deliberately disturb any such animal or damage / destroy a breeding site or roosting place of any such animal. Bats are also afforded full legal protection under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Under this legislation it is illegal to recklessly or intentionally kill, injure or take a species of bat or recklessly or intentionally damage or obstruct access to or destroy any place of shelter or protection or disturb any animal whilst they are occupying such a place of shelter or protection.

4.3 The presence of a bat roost is a material consideration in planning decisions as they are afforded full legal protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This legislation affords full protection to bat roosts whether the animals are present or not. The Habitats Directive prohibits the deterioration, destruction or disturbance of breeding sites or resting places of protected species. Where one of these actions is required a licence must be applied for. Natural England has the statutory responsibility under the regulations to deal with any licence applications but there is also a duty on planning authorities when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a development which could harm a European Protected Species to apply three tests contained in the Regulations. These state that the activity must be for imperative reasons of overriding public interest or for public health and safety, there must be no satisfactory alternative, and that the favourable conservation status of the species must be maintained.

Discussion

4.4 The habitats present are those commonly associated with residential dwellings such as ornamental planting, hardstanding and amenity grassland. This habitats were not botanically diverse and of negligible value to nature conservation. The ornamental planting and trees do
however provide foraging habitat to bats. Given the restricted size of these habitats within the
gardens, any loss would have a negligible impact upon local bat populations. The habitat creation
proposed within the main development, such as the wildflower meadow, woodland planting and
community orchard will compensate for the loss of these habitats by providing habitats of
increased value to the local wildlife.

4.5 Nesting birds were recorded in the soffit boxes of the house. All birds are protected whilst on the
nest. Any vegetation and the soffit boxes on B1 should therefore be removed outside of the bird
breeding season (March to Aug/Sept) if this is not possible, these features should be checked by
an experienced ecologist prior to any removal being undertaken. If active nests are found the
vegetation/soffit boxes would be left untouched and suitable buffered until all birds have fledged.

4.6 Two buildings were present within the site boundary. B1 was a two storey residential dwelling
and B2 a small wooden shed. The internal and external inspection of the buildings noted that B1
had potential bat access points in the form of gaps behind lead flashing and the soffit boxes. Building B2 did not offer any features suitable to support roosting bats and no further surveys
were recommended.

4.7 An internal investigation found no evidence of a bat roost within B1, however given the presence
of potential bat access points in to features which could not be inspected such as soffits, a
dusk/dawn emergence survey was recommended. This was conducted on the evening of the
22nd June and the morning of the 23rd June 2015 during suitable weather conditions.

4.8 During the dusk survey on 22nd June a small number of common pipistrelle was recorded
foraging over the residential gardens throughout the survey period, however no bats were
recorded emerging from B1. During the dawn survey on 23rd June 2015 a single common
pipistrelle returned to roost within B1 accessing via gap between the soffit and the brick wall on
the western aspect of the building.

4.9 As a roosting bat was recorded further dusk emergence surveys were undertaken to ascertain
the size / status of the roost. No bats were recorded during subsequent surveys which were
considered to have been using B1 as a day roost. However, during the dusk emergence survey
on 21st July 2015 three common pipistrelle bats entered the gap on the western aspect of B1
between the soffit and brick wall and re-emerged five minutes later. These bats had not been day
roosting within the building. The evidence suggests that a small, occasionally used common
pipistrelle roost exists within the property.

Outline Mitigation Strategy

4.10 The common pipistrelle roost was identified as an occasional small non-maternity roost, used by
non-breeding females/male bats. It is considered the survey effort was sufficient and survey
conditions were suitable to enable an accurate assessment of the size and status of roost sites
present within the site and complies with guidance outlined in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines6 and
Bat Surveys – Good Practice Guidelines7.

4.11 The presence of the confirmed roost is a statutory constraint to the proposed demolition and re-
development of this site and a European Protected Species (EPS) Licence from Natural England
will be necessary to legitimise the proposed works and appropriate mitigation / compensation will

---

7 Hundt (2012) Bat Surveys- Good Practice Guidelines
need to be provided on site. The Bat Mitigation Guidelines states that small, non-maternity roosts used by common species are of relatively low conservation significance. Following the implementation of appropriate mitigation design it is considered that the loss of these bat roosts will not have a negative impact on the favourable conservation status of common pipistrelle bats locally.

4.12 The full mitigation / compensation package to be provided will be detailed in full within the EPS Licence to be agreed with Natural England. Pending agreement with Natural England and as described in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines this mitigation will include the following elements:

- Measures to ensure the avoidance of deliberate killing, injury or disturbance of roosting bats,
- Roost creation to provide appropriate replacement roosting habitat, such that there will be no nett loss of roost sites,

4.13 The Bat Mitigation Guidelines states that there are few timing constraints relating to the demolition of the small, non-maternity roosts of common bat species that are present on site. However as a matter of best practice all roof stripping works should be undertaken outside of the main bat hibernation period. Appropriate working methods will be employed under licence during demolition works to the known bat roosts and will include one or more of the following:

- Toolbox talk by an ecologist for all site operatives to highlight the potential presence of bats within the site and all relevant working methods
- Dawn survey of the building prior to roof stripping should the weather be appropriate.
- Internal checks of roof voids prior to roof stripping works.
- Tiled roofs to be stripped by hand under the supervision of a licensed bat ecologist.

Works will apply to ridge tiles, roof tiles up to 1m down from the ridge, roof tiles up to 1m up from the eaves, roof tiles 1m in from the verge and all facias and soffits.

4.14 The mitigation measures for roost creation for common pipistrelle require opportunities for crevice dwelling bats, and will be achieved through the installation of ten bat boxes (details to be agreed with Natural England Licensing) such as five Schwegler 2F and five 2FN Schwegler Bat Box on trees within the site. These boxes will be installed prior to the demolition of B1, and will remain onsite for perpetuity. No artificial lighting is to be used adjacent the bat boxes.

4.15 It is considered that with the proposed mitigation outline above and to be agreed to by Natural England in full, the favourable conservation status of the species identified would not be negatively impacted upon, and with the provision of further roosting opportunities could result in a positive gain in biodiversity, this would therefore meet the requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4.16 At the time of the internal / external building assessment building B2 was considered to provide negligible potential to support roosting bats. Therefore, there is no statutory constraint to development from the presence of bats or a bat roost in B2 and further surveys are not required prior to demolition.
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APPENDIX B

Photographs

Photograph 1: The amenity grassland, looking south.

Photograph 2: B1 as viewed from Rampton Road.

Photograph 3: Buildings B1 and B2 as viewed from the main development site off Rampton Road.
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Photograph 4: Building B2, considered to have negligible bat roost potential.

Photograph 5: The roof void of B1, note the bituminous felt under the roof tiles.

Photograph 6: The location where the bat entered B1.
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Site Boundary

Observer

Bat Flight Direction

Bat Reference

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Behaviour/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21:37</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21:43</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21:45</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Foraging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21:49</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>21:54</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Foraging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ref. | Time | Species                  | Behaviour/Notes
--- | --- | ------------------------ | -----------------
A  | 21:26 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting
B  | 21:29 | Common pipistrelle       | Foraging
C  | 21:31 | Common pipistrelle       | Foraging
D  | 21:33 | Common pipistrelle +2   | Foraging
E  | 21:35 | Common pipistrelle       | Foraging
F  | 21:38 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting
G  | 21:40 | Common pipistrelle +2   | Foraging
H  | 21:41 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting
I  | 21:42 | Common pipistrelle +2   | Prospecting potential access point
J  | 21:44 | Common pipistrelle +3   | Entered gap near chimney
K  | 21:46 | Common pipistrelle +3   | Re-emerged from entry point
L  | 21:50 | Common pipistrelle       | Constant foraging
M  | 21:51 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting
N  | 21:54 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
O  | 21:58 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting - Heard not seen
P  | 22:00 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting - Heard not seen
Q  | 22:02 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting - Heard not seen
R  | 22:04 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
S  | 22:06 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting - Heard not seen
T  | 22:08 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
U  | 22:10 | Common pipistrelle       | Commuting - Heard not seen
V  | 22:12 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
W  | 22:14 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
X  | 22:16 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
Y  | 22:18 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen
Z  | 22:20 | Noctule                  | Commuting - Heard not seen

This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.

Ordnance Survey material is used with the permission of The Controller of HMSO, Crown copyright 100018896.
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### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Behaviour/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20:43</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>No visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21:15</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Foraging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

REPORT NO: E2118

DATE: 02.09.15

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive overview of the Dusk Emergence Survey conducted at the site on 02.09.15.

METHODS

The survey was conducted using a standardized protocol, which involved monitoring the emergence of bats from the site over a specific period.

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Behaviour/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20:31</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20:32</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>20:38</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>20:43</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>20:52</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No visual</td>
<td>20:54</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>20:57</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:05</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:08</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:11</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:13</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Forage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Visual</td>
<td>21:17</td>
<td>Common pipistrelle</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>