Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy

Wildlife and Bat Survey Meadowcroft, Lower Lark Hill, Cleckheaton BD19 6JJ

Prepared for: Mr A Fairbotham.

Licence No. 20100238 granted under section 16(3)(C) of The Wildlife And Countryside Act 1981 (amended 1990) and under section 44(2)(c) of The Conservation Regulations 1994

Rose Villa, Littlemoor Road, Pudsey, Yorks, LS28 8AN: tel/fax: 0113 2560426, mob: 07939 071109
batsurveys@btinternet.com

Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy

Contents:

Client: Mr A Fairbotham,
Location: Meadowcroft,
Lower Lark Hill,
Cleckheaton,
BD19 6JJ

Agent: Tim Bennett, Architect

Date of Survey: 6th February 2010

Introduction:

Bats amongst others are a European Protected Species (see app 3) and as such fall under the protection of The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended and the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 as amended August 2007. This legislation places certain requirements on Planning Authorities and developers to ensure the continued protection of the species.

Additionally PPS9 requires the Planning Authority to regard as a material consideration the presence of a protected species when considering a development proposal, which, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat.

Planning permission had been granted to demolish a barn/garage and rebuild as a dwelling but this has lapsed. The renewal of permission requires removal of part of a garden hedge and that a habitat and bat survey be undertaken prior to permission being renewed. Therefore a habitat survey with specific reference to European Protected Species, Bats, has been conducted on the grounds and building.
The survey was designed and conducted in accordance with Natural England and Bat Conservation Trust recommended guidelines.

Desk research undertaken has indicated no recorded bat use at the site specifically. However West Yorkshire Ecology database search, and our own database show bats recorded in the wider environs.

A site survey was undertaken on 6th February 2010. Weather conditions were considered satisfactory as the building and surroundings were free from snow and ice.
Two consultants undertook the site and surroundings walkover and external and internal detailed inspection of the building proposed for development.

Weather conditions and time of year are considered sub optimal for bats as they are in hibernation period. Therefore an external and internal inspection of the building proposed for development took place in daylight hours only. Zoom lens, high power light, torchlight, binoculars and ladders were used as necessary. A digital obedient endoscope was used as necessary.

Rose Villa, Littlemoor Road, Pudsey, Yorks, LS28 8AN: tel/fax: 0113 2560426, mob: 07939 071109
batsurveys@btinternet.com

Objectives

Conduct a habitat inspection survey of the site.
Determine the potential for use as a bat roost.
To determine if bats are, or have been present within the building.
To advise on mitigation, and further action if necessary.

Conclusions

The general wider area is consistent with bats (certain species) being present.
No other protected species would be expected on or near to site.

The section of hedge for removal is poor quality with low ecological value.
No old birds nests or remains of such were observed within the length of hedge to be removed or any further part of the hedge.

No disturbance in the recent past was evident which would indicate any potential evidence of use by bats had been disturbed or removed, within any part of the building due to be surveyed.

At time of survey no evidence internal or external was found to indicate bats had inhabited any part of the building at any time. It is considered that the building does not present itself as a likely summer roost site

No evidence was found to indicate that the building was used as a hibernaculum.

Removal of part of the hedge would not be detrimental to any potential flight path.

It is considered that whilst no evidence of bat use could be found, because of the nature of bats this does not preclude the use of this building (or others in the area) as a bat roost at some time in the future. The probability of use however is considered low.

It is considered that the proposed works are unlikely to be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species (bats) at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

The proposed works are unlikely in all probability to cause a net loss of habitat or disturbance to bat species in the local or wider area provided recommendations are adopted.

Rose Villa, Littlemoor Road, Pudsey, Yorks, LS28 8AN: tel/fax: 0113 2560426, mob: 07939 071109
batsurveys@btinternet.com

Recommendations

1: It is recommended that there should be no planning restrictions regarding development of the building identified in the text as being Barn, Meadowcroft, Lower Lark Hill, BD19 6JJ with regard to European Protected Species Bats or other wildlife providing the recommendations 2-8 below are adopted.

2: It is recommended that all contractors must be made aware of the possibility of the presence of bats and instructed to proceed with all due care especially when removing roofing materials, demolishing or pointing walls.
It is recommended that any contractor working on site is aware of any indicators of the potential presence of bats and that all due diligence is maintained by the contractors whilst works on the building is carried out.
Reason: Normal good practice and the pre-existing potential for bat use.

3: It is recommended that due diligence must be exercised during new build, (especially during the period May – October when bats are at their most active.) As bats are known to be in the close and wider environs all due care must be taken when building works are commenced. Bats by nature come and go, because bats are not there does not preclude their presence at a later date.
It is known during the process of new building, even prior to completion, Pipistrelle bats have on occasions taken up residence. Bats look for new sites with changes in weather conditions.
Reason: Normal good practice.

4: If any evidence of use by bats is found then all works must cease immediately and the ecological consultant or other appropriate licensed person must be contacted for further advice.
If bats are discovered then the ecological consultant or other appropriate licensed person and Natural England must be contacted.
Failure to do so could result in a fine of up to £5000 per bat and up to 6 months imprisonment.

5: It is recommended that 2 bat boxes be fixed to the building exterior at completion. One box should be southwest facing and one should be southeast facing. These features would serve to create potential new roosting facilities for bats where good value habitat already exists but no suitable roosting exist.
Reason: To assist in enhancing biodiversity.

6: Although no evidence of past bird nesting was found it is recommended that due care should be taken with respect to nesting birds.
If works are to be carried out between March to July, then the building should be carefully checked prior to commencement to ensure no nesting birds are present.

If nesting birds are found then any work, which may cause disturbance, must not commence until all birds have ceased nesting.
Reason: Normal good practice. It is an offence under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981 intentionally to take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built.

7: It is further recommended that the hedge should not be cut or removed during the period 1st March to 31st July in any year and that the hedge should only be removed or cut between 1st August and 28th February.
Reason: Normal good practice in not causing disturbance to nesting birds and avoidance of committing an offence under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981

8: It is recommended that the hedge around the new development shown on the plan consists in part of deciduous bushes or trees so that low level coverage is available for birds such as Wren and Robin and that autumn leaf fall is available for hibernating species such as Hedgehogs.
Reason: To compensate for loss of amenity in removing existing hedge and to assist in maintaining and enhancing biodiversity

Survey Review and Methodology

Prior to survey, a search using Google Earth and Magic, (Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside) was undertaken in order to ascertain the location of the site and therefore identify any features in the locality that may offer habitat value to bat or other species.

The M62 motorway skirts the site from SW to North, the closest point being about 400m distant. Between the M62 and site are other houses, gardens and several open fields. The wider area presents little in terms of interesting ecological features, being essentially urban. The whole area is classed as a nitrate vulnerable zone (an area of land draining into waters polluted by nitrates from agriculture) An area of countryside stewardship agreement about 600m west of site is to the north of the M62. A short distance to west is an area of past semi- improved grassland.
Oldfield Beck, the only close water source is culverted and disappears underground 200m to west. A small Great Crested Newt colony has been recorded 600m to the north being beyond the significant barrier created by the M62 motorway. No ponds are on site and as far as could be seen and in conversation with neighbours, no ponds noted in gardens close by. No trees listed on the National Inventory of Woodland and Trees are found in proximity to site although trees are found on and off site close by.
Consultation with Robert Masheder, Senior Ecologist at West Yorkshire Ecology showed no further information available regarding the location of site and surroundings other than that already determined.
Desk research undertaken using West Yorkshire Ecology database and our own database shows no record of bat use at the site specifically. The nearest recorded roost is of a single hibernating bat 5 years ago at a site 200m to the south -west in Mooorside Road. Other roosts (summer) are over 0.7km distant.

App1 maps the recorded observations and known bat roosts within +/- 2km radius details of which are shown in table 1.

Table 1: Bat records within +/- 2.0km of site

Species	Distance	Date	Comment	Location Name
Leisler	1.2km	Aug 2006	Grounded	Lincs Wold, Cleckheaton
Leisler	0.7km	Jul 2005/6/7	Roost	Whitcliffe Mount School
Pipistrelle 45	1.0km	Jul 2007	Roost	Scholes Lane, Cleckheaton
Unidentified	1.0km	2008	Roost	Whitcliffe Road, Cleckheaton
Unidentified	1.0km	Jul 2004	Grounded	The Maltings, Cleckheaton,
Unidentified	0.2km	Dec 2004	Roost	Moorside, Cleckheaton,
Unidentified	1.6km	Oct 2007	in building	Bradford Road, Cleckheaton
Pipistrelle 45	1.06km	Oct 2009	Field record	Prospect road Cleckheaton
Unidentified	0.7km	Jul 2003	Roost	Stone St, Cleckheaton,

Buildings and Surroundings

Access to site is directly off the A643, via a private road being Lower Lark Hill being tarmac surfaced in good order with no pavement (pedestrian footway) to either side.

A walkover of the surroundings was undertaken to assess the site for suitability of use by bats.

The barn is detached and stands opposite a gated driveway, which continues east to the house known as Meadowcroft. To the right side of the driveway entrance is a single garage constructed of wood with a corrugated roof. This is also subject to demolition.

Only three houses are found past site at the top of Lower Lark Hill where access to these terminates in a large turning and parking area. It is understood these houses and Meadowcroft were built in the mid 1970's. Further houses of similar ages and some older are seen beyond site, having access elsewhere. Trees, hedges and shrubs are to all sides of site with further trees found throughout other gardens close by. These serve to create good linear elements for navigating purposes and useful feeding and resting platforms for bats. No trees noted on site offered roosting possibility for bat use being mainly coniferous or lacking in trunk girth and height.

The barn for demolition, garage style in appearance is brick built with a stone roof. It stands within an acre of garden that surrounds the house known as Meadowcroft. No other access is available to site and no rights of way are known. The garden areas are given over mainly to well kept and cut lawn with occasional borders and pathways with steps to differing ground levels. Neatly clipped shrubs and ornamental conifer types are found throughout with heather and other lower planting.

An approximate one metre high fence surrounds the site. Planted alongside the fence are mainly coniferous types and further evergreens such as laurel affording privacy to site. Much thick ivy growth was to the lower part of the evergreens on the south boundary close to the entrance off Lower Lark Hill and both Wren and Robin were seen within this growth.

Boundary Hedge

The development of the site requires removal of approx 20m of a further hedge being alongside Lower Lark Hill. This we understand is to create separate access for Meadowcroft, and a service vehicle turning point.

The hedge approx 60m length in total was surveyed and is regarded as an overgrown, stretched to light, domestic hedge consisting of hawthorn with one small section of evergreen cypress. Occasional elderberry and single privet were also seen. The hedge is not a hedgerow under the meaning of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

The hedge is under-planted with a line of neatly clipped shrubs growing at a slightly lower level than that of the tarmac surface of Lower Lark Hill. Opposite side of the hill is a mature hedge of lesser height than that on site. However this hedge was

Rose Villa, Littlemoor Road, Pudsey, Yorks, LS28 8AN: tel/fax: 0113 2560426, mob: 07939 071109
batsurveys@btinternet.com

considered sufficient in height to offer a good linear element for navigating bats, being close by and parallel to the site hedge.

To the immediate right side of the access driveway is a mature copper beech being the only tree of notable size and age. Although offering good height and canopy spread for feeding and resting, no cracks or fissures were seen to offer roosting possibility for bats.

Birds
Noted on site during survey were Robin, Wren, Blackbird, Magpie and Feral Pigeon. No nests were observed in the hedge planned for removal.

Building Survey/ Bats- External.
The barn approximately 15 ft x 30ft is brick built with cement render to the surface and finished with a white texture coating. A double width `up and over` garage door is to the front, east facing apex wall. All render to the wall was intact with no gaps. Several gaps were noted to the stone roof edge where some cement pointing was missing. Ladder access showed no travel as only the surface area of pointing was missing. Moss was seen present to roof edge. A further gap at both the extreme left and right side of the wall at gutter height was seen. Ladder access showed the left side gap being only shallow with little travel available. The right side was found to be deeper and use of a digital obedient endoscope showed a travel of 1.5m along the top of the east wall. Careful observation showed loose, very sandy unstable rubble with cobwebs unbroken to the whole extent. Also noted were fragments of dry grass and other particles of vegetation. Not suitable for bat use. No evidence of bat use was seen in any area.
The south wall has a doorway to either end with two windows between. The windows were glazed and intact. It is understood all the doors are kept closed and locked when not being used. Also, all windows were non- opening type. No gaps were seen to the wall. Gutter was in place upon a shallow bargeboard. No gaps were seen beneath the bargeboard. The south facing roof was observed from ladder and found completely covered in a growth of very wet green moss .The ridge was also covered from end to end with moss. No gaps were seen in any area due to the dense coverage. This situation would preclude bat use had any gaps been available.
The west rear apex wall was observed and found with all render intact and no gaps. Beneath the apex was a window being half glazed to the upper part with horizontal wood panelling to the lower part. All was seen intact with no gaps.
The roof edge was seen moss covered, however two gaps were noted. Ladder access showed water soaked moss and a wet sandy substance immediately beneath the roof edge. A limited amount of travel was noted and use of endoscope was not needed. Wet cobwebs were also seen and these gaps were discounted. No evidence of bat use seen.

Building Survey/ Bats –Internal

Internal access was by way of the front double width doorway. The building found open to eaves was sub divided by a central brick wall built up to eaves height. This created two areas of similar size with access to the rear part through openings to the left and right of the central wall. Natural light from open front door and windows was available, however high beam light and torchlight were used where necessary.

Area 1

Front south facing was seen to have black older type roofing felt intact to the stone underside. Two main supporting roof beams were to either side from west to east. Two further beams non supporting, were below. The beams and walls had been whitewashed in the past and showed no signs commensurate with bat use. Ladder access showed no droppings or moth wings on the beams or the non- supporting ones beneath. No smooth cleaner areas or darkened spots were seen that would be expected if use by bats had taken place. Hanging cobwebs* were noted on the beams indicating no disturbance for some considerable time. The purlins were all noted free from signs of bat use. All walls were searched from roof edge down to floor level. Aged and dirty cobwebs were on the walls. Window ledges and surroundings were covered with a thick coating of dusty cobwebs. No evidence of moth wings seen beneath the beams or any other area. A garden table with sundry gardening tools on top was observed for signs of droppings, as was the concreted floor, none were found in any area. No gaps were seen in any area that would allow access from outside.

Area 2

This had a wooden mezzanine type floor overhead to almost ¾ width. Below at floor level was a wooden division attached to the east wall. Horses may have been kept here in the past. A single electric light was available with natural light from window. A ladder to the upper floor gave close views of all roof area. Roofing felt was intact All areas of the roof underside, beams and purlins were fingertip searched. They were uniform in dust coverage with no smooth area or signs of staining. The only gap found was at the top of the south apex wall, beneath the roof edge. Torchlight use was necessary and showed this gap did not offer any access from outside. It was found to be full of black gritty cobwebs and damp, sandy degraded mortar.

The upper floor area was searched. No evidence of bat use was found.

The walls were observed to ground level and all areas were seen free from use by bats. Cobwebs were very evident and the windows were thickly coated. The floor was in use as a store for gardening equipment and all surface areas were observed for signs of droppings, none were found. The only gaps seen with daylight through were noted at the top of the door in the south wall. These gaps were all covered with Narrow gauge wire netting and precluded bat access. No evidence of use by bats was found in any area.

The building was considered not suitable for use by bats.

*Bats are avid groomers and such as the presence of cobwebs would serve to inhibit their flight capability

Single Garage

To the right side of the driveway entrance and beneath the mature copper beech tree is a single garage. This was constructed of overlapping wood panels fixed vertically to sides and rear. The front had closed double doors also of wood, with horizontal fixed panels to the upper part. The front and rear had a wooden fascia board to the roof edge. No gaps were found beneath, cobwebs were present. The roof had a wooden overhang to both sides with guttering in place. Cobwebs were present beneath the overhanging roof. No gaps were found in any part of the woodwork beneath the overhangs. No gaps were found in any part of the garage walls.

The corrugated apex roof was covered in green moss to both sides and this continued to gutter edge. The overhanging copper beech tree served to create a wholly cluttered environment. The garage was considered unsuitable for bat use. No evidence was found to indicate use by bats had taken place.

At no time during survey was any evidence found to suggest use by bats had taken place at any time at the property known and identified in text as Barn, Meadowcroft, Lower Lark Hill, Bd19 6JJ

Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy
Appendix 1
Wider Environment

Showing site and bat roosts/observations – 2km radius

Yellow: Site, Meadowcroft, Lower Lark Hill.
Motorway M62 seen to left of site
Blue: Recorded field observation
Red : Recorded Roost

Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy

Appendix 2

Buildings

1: East Facing Area 2

2: South East Corner

3: North And West Facing Walls

4: No Gaps Under Bargeboard

5: Moss Covered Roof

6: Moss, Gaps And Cobwebs

Appendix 2 cont

7: Cobwebs, Wet Sand At Roof Edge

8: Wooden Garage To Be Demolished

9: Area 1 Beams And Cobwebs

10: Area 2 Cobwebs

11: To South West

12: To West

Appendix 2 Cont

13: Garden Looking North

14 Southern Hedge With Ivy

15: Hedge To Be Removed (on left)

16: Hedge To Be Removed On Right

Appendix 3
Bats and the Law

All species of bat and their breeding sites or resting places (roosts) are protected under Regulation 39 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 as amended 2007 and Section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981as amended. All bats in the UK are listed as 'European protected species'

It is an offence not only to intentionally or *recklessly* kill, injure or handle any bat but also intentionally or *recklessly* to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place that bats use for shelter or protection, ***whether they are present or not***,
In this context 'damage means make worse for the bat' and so would include such operations, as, for instance,
The blocking of accesses and exits by whatever means, or demolition of all or part of a building or structure, or replacement of one material by another which was inappropriate
Or treatment with the toxic chemicals found in wood preservatives
Or in the case of winter hibernacula changes causing alterations in temperature or airflow.

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act it is an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection. Disturbance could include physical presence, loud noises, bright lights or even vibration. Works associated with development or building work are likely to lead to an increase in human presence at the site, extra noise and changes in the site layout and local environment.
All these may have a detrimental effect on the bats, which seek particular environmental conditions, such as a low incidence of direct human disturbance, particular temperature and humidity regimes and a stable internal and external layout so they can continue to follow established flight-paths.

Penalties for causing such an offence or disturbing bats are fines up to £5000 per bat and up to 6 months imprisonment.

An offence would be committed if for instance a developer did not exercise sufficient due diligence before a project was commenced by not having an appropriate survey, particularly in a bat friendly area, and bats were later found to be present and the roost disturbed or destroyed. This action would be regarded as reckless and penalties mentioned above could be applicable. The offences could also be regarded as corporate leading to not only the individual(s) causing the disturbance but also directors being liable

Appendix 4

'Developments have the potential to destroy or degrade the habitats of bats. The planning system therefore has an important role to play in the conservation of this protected species.' *

* ISBN 1 85716 781 3- Bat Mitigation Guidelines – A J Mitchell –Jones - Natural England

Extract from

Planning Policy Statement 9 Circular 06/2005 ODPM

PART IV Conservation of Species Protected by Law

98. The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. ~~ They should consider attaching appropriate planning conditions or entering into planning obligations under which the developer would take steps to secure the long-term protection of the species. They should also advise developers that they must comply with any statutory species' protection provisions affecting the site concerned. ~~

99. It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. ~~~
. Where this is the case, the survey should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place, through conditions and/or planning obligations, before the permission is granted. In appropriate circumstances the permission may also impose a condition preventing the development from proceeding without the prior acquisition of a licence~~

103. The Habitats Regulations implement the requirements of the Habitats Directive for species listed in Annexe IV of the Directive (European protected species). Stricter provisions than those contained in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 apply for these species and regulation 3(4) of the Habitats Regulations places a duty on local planning authorities, in the exercise of their functions, to have regard to the requirements of the Directive so far as they might be affected by those functions. All European protected species are also separately protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

116. When dealing with cases where a European protected species may be affected, a planning authority is a competent authority within the meaning of regulation 6 of the Habitats Regulations, and therefore has a statutory duty under regulation 3(4) to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the exercise of its functions. So the Directive's provisions are clearly relevant in reaching planning decisions, and these should be made in a manner which takes them fully into account. ~~ ~~~Planning authorities should give due weight to the presence of a European protected species on a development site to reflect these requirements, in reaching planning decisions, and this may potentially justify a refusal of planning permission.

Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy
Appendix 5
Selected Extracts from
The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.)Regulations 1994
As amended by Statutory Instrument 2007 No. 1843
The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007

Protection of wild animals

39.—(1) A person commits an offence if he—
(a) deliberately captures, injures or kills any wild animal of a European protected species;
(b) deliberately disturbs wild animals of any such species in such a way as to be likely significantly to affect—
(i) the ability of any significant group of animals of that species to survive, breed, or rear or nurture their young; or
(ii) the local distribution or abundance of that species;
(c) deliberately takes or destroys the eggs of such an animal; or
(d) damages or destroys a breeding site or resting place of such an animal.

(2) It is an offence for any person—
(a) to have in his possession or control;
(b) to transport;
(c) to sell or exchange; or
(d) to offer for sale or exchange,
anything to which this paragraph applies. ~~~~~

Grant of licences for certain purposes

44.—(1) Regulations 39, 41 and 43 do not apply to anything done for any of the following purposes under and in accordance with the terms of a Licence granted by the appropriate authority.
(2) The purposes referred to in paragraph (1) are-
(a) Scientific or educational purposes;
(b) Ringing or marking, or examining any ring or mark on, wild animals;
(c) Conserving wild animals or wild plants or introducing them to particular areas;
(d) Protecting any zoological or botanical collection;
(e) Preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;
(f) Preventing the spread of disease; or
(g) Preventing serious damage to livestock, foodstuffs for livestock, crops, vegetables, fruit, growing timber or any other form of property or to fisheries.

(2A) Subject to paragraph (2B), the appropriate authority may grant a licence to permit the taking or the possession or control of certain specimens of any of the species or subspecies listed in Annex II(b) (other than any bryophyte) or Annex IV to the Habitats Directive notwithstanding that the licence is for a purpose not falling within paragraph (2).

(2B) The appropriate authority may only grant a licence under paragraph (2A) if it is satisfied that the grant of the licence would be consistent with the restrictions in Article 16(1)(e) of the Habitats Directive (namely "under strictly supervised conditions, on a selective basis and to a limited extent" and "in limited numbers").

(2C) Regulations 39, 41 and 43 do not apply to anything done under and in accordance with the terms of a licence granted by the appropriate authority under paragraph (2A).

(3) The appropriate authority shall not grant a Licence under this regulation unless they are satisfied-
(a) That there is no satisfactory alternative, and
(b) That the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range. ~~~~~~

Rose Villa, Littlemoor Road, Pudsey, Yorks, LS28 8AN: tel/fax: 0113 2560426, mob: 07939 071109
batsurveys@btinternet.com

Appendix 6: Consultants

Lucille Fairbank:
A consultant with over 20 years experience of specialisation in bat species. Lucille undertook her early training with NCC (now Natural England) and further training under the personal guidance of Peter Lina, Bat Conservation Officer for the Netherlands.

She has held licences to disturb bats for both scientific and conservation purposes, which has allowed her to handle and work with bats, for over 20 years.

She is a founder member of the Bat Conservation Trust; the only organisation in the UK solely dedicated to the conservation of bats and their habitats. She was also a founder member of Bradford Bat Group, which evolved to become West Yorkshire Bat Group.

Besides operating a wildlife consultancy specialising in bats and offering advice on conservation and habitat enhancement she also offers her expertise on a voluntary basis to Natural England as a Bat Warden. Lucille has worked with and been involved in the training of the West Yorkshire Police Wildlife Liaison Officer with particular reference to bats.
She has been instrumental in amicably and successfully resolving many situations where humans have been in conflict with bats.

She is well versed in Barn Owl ecology, having advised on several successful mitigations. She holds a Natural England Barn Owl Licence and is one of a very limited number of consultants in the North holding a Barn Owl Trust certificate.

Stephen A Fairbank, M.A., B.Sc.
An associate consultant who has over 15 years experience with the species and has been involved in survey work for over 10 years.

Stephen's particular interest is in the use of technology in data collection and statistical analysis. He has considerable knowledge, research experience and mathematical modelling skills in the effects of wind turbines on bats as well as system analysis and procedural processes with respect to bat mitigation guidelines.

He also offers his services as a Natural England volunteer bat worker.

He holds a Natural England Barn Owl Licence, has advised on several successful mitigation and enhancement plans and holds the Barn Owl Trust Ecology Certificate.

Lucille Fairbank
Wildlife Survey and Consultancy

Appendix 7

Examples of Bats found within the Local Environs.

Adult female Pipistrelle

Infant –Pipistrelle, 7 Days old

Adult male Whiskered bat

Adult female –Pipistrelle