



**Updating Bat Emergence Survey  
Hoyle Ing Dyeworks,  
Linthwaite, Huddersfield**

Report reference: R-0893-03  
August 2014

---

Report Title:	Updating Bat Emergence Survey Hoyle Ing Dyeworks, Linthwaite, Huddersfield
Report Reference:	R-0893-03
Written by:	Karl Fisher BSc (Hons) Grad CIEEM Graduate Ecologist
Technical review:	Sam Kitching BSc (Hons) Grad CIEEM Ecologist
QA review:	Daniel Ross BSc (Hons) Assistant Ecologist
Approved for issue:	Peter Brooks BSc (Hons), MA, MCIEEM, CEnv Managing Director
Date:	29.08.14

---



Unit A, 1 Station Road, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 8BX  
Phone: **01943 884451**  
**01943 879129**  
Email: [admin@brooks-ecological.co.uk](mailto:admin@brooks-ecological.co.uk)  
[www.brooks-ecological.co.uk](http://www.brooks-ecological.co.uk)  
Registered in England Number 5351418



## Summary Statement

The updating emergence survey indicates the continued likely absence of roosting bats. Demolition can proceed with minimal risk of impacting on roosting bats following standard precautions.



## Introduction

1. Following Brooks Ecological's Bat Roost Potential Survey (R-0893-01), and the follow-up emergence survey (R-0893-02) carried out in 2011, works at the disused Hoyle Ing Dyeworks, Linthwaite, Huddersfield (SE 098 145) were delayed. A preliminary bat survey has since been commissioned to identify the current status of the site in relation to roosting bats.
2. Information relating to local and legal status is provided in previous reports R-0893-01 and R-0893-02, and is not repeated here. However these three reports should be read in conjunction for full context.

## Method

3. Brooks Ecological specialise in bat surveys ranging from individual buildings through to complex sites requiring numerous visits with large teams. In terms of the survey effort, number of personnel required and number of visits required to be able to properly evaluate the building(s) use by bats we refer to the Bat Conservation Trust, Survey Good Practice Guidelines (2012). However these guidelines are not prescriptive and we approach each site individually as required using our professional judgement and significant experience base.
4. In this case, a single visit with a team of 4 static surveyors and 1 mobile surveyor (see Figure 1), was deemed necessary to update the potential use of the site for roosting. The survey was carried out on the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2014 with surveyors positioned around the building to cover all aspects where bats could potentially emerge, and to establish activity levels around the site.
5. The surveyors, using heterodyne detectors, were in place at least half an hour before dusk and left once all species of bat would be expected to have left a roost and patterns of activity within the site had been appraised. Conditions and dates are summarised in table 1 below: Survey and assessment was directed by Peter Brooks BSc (Hons) MA, MCIEEM CEnv. Peter has over 15 years experience of carrying out bat surveys in a professional capacity and holds a Natural England license in respect of bats and is a Natural England Roost Warden.

**Table 1:** Survey summary

Date of Survey	Temperature	Weather	Invertebrate activity
31.07.14	17°C	Partly cloudy, light, occasional breeze. Dry	High

6. Survey and assessment was directed by Peter Brooks BSc (Hons) MA, MCIEEM CEnv. Peter has over 15 years experience of carrying out bat surveys in a professional capacity, he holds a Natural England license in respect of bats and is a Natural England Roost Warden.

## Results

### Survey – 31<sup>st</sup> July 2014

7. The first bat seen was a common pipistrelle at 21:27, 19 minutes after sunset. This bat was clearly seen to enter the site over trees to the southeast of the site. This bat foraged briefly, before leaving the site to the southwest.
8. The next bat, seen at 21:32, was another common pipistrelle. Arriving on site from the east, heading in a north-westerly direction along the edge of the site, passing close to the chimney. Another three bats followed this route at 21:35, 21:45 and 21:46, all common pipistrelles. These bats continued heading north west from the site, likely heading towards good foraging habitat associated with the River Colne and the Huddersfield Narrow Canal.
9. A single common pipistrelle was also seen to enter the site from the east at 21:40 and foraged to the south of the buildings.
10. No bats were seen to emerge from the surveyed building.

**Figure 1** Bat activity and surveyor locations on application site.



## Evaluation and recommendations

11. Following emergence survey work it is concluded that the building is very unlikely to support roosting bats and that further survey effort is not required in support of this conclusion.
12. The proposed works can therefore proceed with minimal risk of impacting on bats.

### *General advice*

13. Even where surveys have been carried out which demonstrate absence of roosting, site workers should always be aware that bats can move into buildings previously found not to support them. On this basis work should proceed with care and if a bat is found during the proposed demolition, works should stop immediately and a professional ecologist and/or the bat helpline (on 0845 1300 228 Bat Conservation Trust) should be contacted. The local office of Natural England should also be contacted to seek advice.

### *Enhancement*

14. The UK government's latest guidance on nature conservation in relation to development (NPPF) makes it clear that opportunities should be sought through their planning system to use development as an opportunity to enhance sites for wildlife where possible.
15. Given the site's proximity to high value bat foraging habitat (around Manchester Road), there is a good chance that dedicated bat roosting opportunities incorporated into the design of new buildings will be taken up by local bats. A wide range of roosting features are now available on the market, many of which are self maintaining and can be built directly into the fabric of new builds. Such features can appear invisible within the walls of the building, thus avoiding any future conflict with new homeowners. Suitable designs include NHBS supplies custom stone facing (NHBS code #193479), brick facing (#193477), timber facing (#193478) and a plain habitat bat box (#193482) which can be rendered with the rest of the building. These boxes can be exactly matched by sending bricks, stone or timber off to become part of the construction.
16. At least 4 new roosting opportunities should be incorporated into the scheme, with boxes positioned out of bright light, facing towards tree lines and in a range of orientations - in order that they provide a range of microclimates.
17. Modern building practices often fail to provide nesting opportunities for bird species, which have for many years been largely reliant on buildings in urban areas. It is therefore recommended that three bird boxes are incorporated in suitable new

builds, with boxes aimed at attracting a range of declining birds such as starling (NHBS code #197683 or similar), house martin (NHBS code #174802 or similar) and house sparrow (NHBS code #201458 or similar).

## References

Bat Conservation Trust (2012) Bat Surveys – Good Practice Guidelines

English Nature (2004) Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.

JNCC (2004) The Bat Workers Manual. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.

ODPM circular 06/05 (2005) Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within the Planning System  
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circularbiodiversity>

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010  
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made>