

Bat Activity Survey Report	
For:	JR Planning
Site	Slate Pitts Farm, Chain Road, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5TY
Report Date:	28 th September 2026
Report Reference:	SQ-4516



Client:	JR Planning
Site Name:	Slate Pitts Farm, Chain Road, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5TY
Grid Reference:	SE 07657 12565
Report:	Bat Activity Report
Date of Activity Survey	2 nd July, 29 th July, 26 th August 2026

Issue:	Revision:	Stage:	Date:	Prepared by:	Approved by:
0	-	Draft for review	22 nd September 2026	Niamh McHale BSc (Hons), Estrada Ecology Ltd	Rebecca O'Neill BSc (Hons), Estrada Ecology Ltd
1	V1	FINAL	28 th September 2026	John Davies BSc (Hons), Estrada Ecology Ltd	Natasha Estrada BSc (Hons), MRes, MCIEEM, Estrada Ecology Ltd



Slate Pitts Farm
Chain Road
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5TY

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

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

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

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

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

Summary

Estrada Ecology Ltd was commissioned to conduct bat activity surveys on buildings located within the curtilage of Slate Pitts Farm, Chain Road, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5TY to assess the buildings for the presence / likely absence of roosting bats.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was undertaken in April 2026 (*Estrada Ecology Ltd, SQ-3898, May 2026*) which recorded one building, the farmhouse, to contain moderate suitability for roosting bats.

Consequently, three bat activity surveys were recommended to ascertain presence/ likely absence/ roost characteristics.



Slate Pitts Farm
Chain Road
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5TY

Findings and recommendations

Bats and roosts

Dusk activity surveys were undertaken following BCT Survey Guidelines (2023 as amended), within suitable weather conditions, as outlined herein.

No bats of any species were recorded emerging from any of the structures subject to survey over the duration of the survey period. For the purposes of assessment, the farmhouse building is deemed not to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter. At this juncture, no impacts in respect of bats are predicted on this structure.

Several Common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) contacts with two visual sightings, non-emerging, were recorded over the duration of the second survey, with the first contact at 21:02, and a low number of further contacts throughout the duration of the survey.

For the purposes of assessment, the farmhouse has been categorised as not being used as a roost in any capacity. No formal mitigation will be required to facilitate the proposed works on the building. No major foraging grounds or commuting lines were recorded throughout the surveys.

Hibernating bats

The site was assessed for features capable of supporting hibernating crevice-dwelling bats, which require stable, cool roosting conditions and may leave little or no detectable evidence. The structures were considered to have very low to negligible hibernation potential owing to the absence of suitably deep crevices and sufficient thermal mass.

Breeding birds

No evidence of breeding birds was recorded using any of the structures subject to survey over the survey period.

Contents:

Summary

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

Slate Pitts Farm
Chain Road
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5TY

1 Introduction and Site Description

- 1.1 Estrada Ecology Ltd was commissioned to conduct bat activity surveys on buildings located within the curtilage of Slate Pitts Farm, Chain Road, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5TY to inform the proposed redevelopment of the site.
- 1.2 A previous Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site was undertaken by Estrada Ecology Ltd (*Report Ref: SQ-3898; May 2026*) which recorded the farmhouse building to contain moderate roost suitability. The farmhouse building contains numerous small features such as missing mortar, lifted tiles and cracked stones. Overall, the building recorded no field sign evidence synonymous with bats but moderate roost suitability. Further survey effort was recommended to ascertain presence/ likely absence and roost characteristics.
- 1.3 The site under discussion is a farm and associated land, north of Chain Road, approximately 1.3 km south of the town of Slaithwaite. The site consists of the main farmhouse building as well as several other smaller storage buildings and areas of developed land and bare ground, which are currently used for storage. Other habitats on site include vegetated garden, modified grassland, a non-native ornamental hedgerow and a line of trees. The survey site's central OS grid reference is SE 07657 12565.
- 1.4 The wider site is mainly agricultural upland areas characterised by mostly agricultural fields, stone walls and scattered farms and villages. The site is approximately 1.3 km from the small town of Slaithwaite. Small pockets of woodland and two large reservoirs can also be found within 1 km of the site. The nearest urban centre is Huddersfield, 7.7 km northeast.



Figure 1: The site within its immediate setting.



2 Protected Species Legislation

- 2.1 All species of bat and their breeding sites or resting places (roosts) are fully protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.
- 2.2 The Regulations prohibit: the deliberate killing, injuring, or taking of bats; the deliberate disturbance of any bat species, in such a way as to be significantly likely to affect:
- Their ability of to survive, hibernate, migrate, breed, or rear or nurture their young, or the local distribution or abundance of that species.
 - Damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place (roost); and
 - The possession or transport of bats or any other part thereof.
- 2.3 Bats are also protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through their inclusion in Schedule 5. Under the Act, they are protected from:

Slate Pitts Farm
Chain Road
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5TY

- Intentional or reckless disturbance (at any level); obstruction of access to any place of shelter, breeding, or rest; selling, bartering or exchange of these species, or parts of.
- 2.4 Seven British bat species are listed as Species of Principle Importance (SPI) under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. These are: barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*); Bechstein's (*Myotis bechsteinii*); noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*); soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*); brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*); greater horseshoe (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*); and lesser horseshoe (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*).
- 2.5 Under the National Planning Policy Framework (2026), the presence of any protected species is a material planning consideration. The Framework states that impacts arising from development proposals must be avoided where possible, or mitigated / compensated for, and that opportunities for ecological enhancement should be sought.
- 2.6 Under certain circumstances, a licence may be granted by Natural England to permit activities that would otherwise constitute an offence. In relation to development, a scheme must have full planning permission before a licence application can be made.

3 Survey Objectives

- 3.1 The objective of the survey was to establish if bats were using the site for roosting, or as a place of shelter; and, where present, to identify to species level, determine the population size and nature of the roost within the property on site.
- 3.2 This report presents the findings of bat activity surveys undertaken in July and August 2026 and aims to:
- Outline any potential impacts of the proposed development on bats, as a result of the findings of the desk study and field surveys.
 - Provide recommendations for mitigation and / or compensation measures to ensure any impacts on bat activity is avoided or minimised where applicable.
 - Provide recommendations for enhancing the site for bat activity where possible; and
 - Provide recommendations for mitigation and / or compensation measures to ensure any impacts on breeding bird species is avoided or minimised.

4 Survey Methodology

4.1 Desktop study

- 4.1.1 A biological records search was commissioned from West Yorkshire Ecology Service for a 2 km radius from grid.
- 4.1.2 MAGIC Maps online web application was consulted to inform on granted European Protected Species Applications licences within the 2 km search radius from the site.
- 4.1.3 Further inspection, using colour 1: 25,000 OS base maps (www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk), MAGIC (www.magic.defra.gov.uk) and aerial photographs from Google Earth (www.maps.google.co.uk), was also undertaken to provide additional context and identify any features of potential importance for nature conservation in the wider countryside.
- 4.1.4 Previous survey reports of the site where accessible, were consulted for add context, namely the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (*Estrada Ecology Ltd; Report reference SQ-3898, May 2026*).

4.2 Initial inspection survey

- 4.2.1 The Preliminary Ecology Appraisal undertaken by Estrada Ecology Ltd in April 2026 recorded that the main farmhouse had no feeding remains synonymous with bats however, multiple small features exist that could be utilised by roosting bats including missing mortar, lifted tiles and cracked stones.
- 4.2.2 In advance of each activity survey, the buildings were inspected externally for any new field sign evidence of bats. No material changes to the buildings and ecological functionality for use by bats was recorded over the survey period and no additional field signs recorded.

4.3 Bat activity surveys

- 4.3.1 Bat activity surveys were undertaken on evenings within July and August 2026 (Table 1) using guidance from Collins, J., Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists, Good Practice Guidelines, 4th Edition (2023 as amended).

- 4.3.2 The number of surveys undertaken on the buildings is determined by their potential to support bats, any field sign evidence gathered during the initial inspection survey in April 2026, and any subsequent activity recorded during the activity surveys.
- 4.3.3 The dusk emergence surveys commenced twenty minutes prior to sunset and continued up to two hours after sunset, as per recommendations (Collins, 2023).
- 4.3.4 Echo Meter Touch 2 Pros were used during the survey to identify bat contacts. The survey results were aided by the use of Night Fox Whisker IR Cameras.
- 4.3.5 The surveys were led by suitably experienced surveyors following guidance outlined within Collins 2023.

4.4 Timings

- 4.4.1 The activity survey was conducted during suitable weather conditions as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Environmental conditions throughout the survey period.

Date	Sunset	Start time	End time	Weather conditions
2 nd July 2026	21:39	21:15	22:55	14°C, 18 mph W winds, 73% humidity, party cloudy
29 th July 2026	21:09	20:45	22:15	19°C, 10 mph W windspeed, 76% humidity, partly cloudy
26 th August 2026	20:13	19:48	21:08	19°C, 9 mph E windspeed, 75% humidity, light rain

4.5 Personnel

- 4.5.1 The surveys were led by senior ecologist Joanne Toller BSc(hons) who has multiple seasons experience undertaking bat activity surveys and who is nearing completion of formal bat licence training with Ecology Training UK Ltd.

- 4.5.2 Assisting the team were ecologists including John Davies BSc (Hons), Rebecca O'Neill BSc (Hons), Megan Parr, Daniel Kight-Woodall BSc (Hons) MSc and Jack Towler BSc (Hons). All surveyors are suitably experienced in undertaking bat activity surveys.
- 4.5.3 IR footage was analysed post survey by experienced bat ecologist Natasha Estrada MRes, MCIEEM, Natural England Bat Licence: 2025-85541-CL18-BAT. Natasha has held a bat licence for approximately twenty years and has been the named ecologist on multiple mitigation licences in respect of bats.

5 Survey Findings

5.1 Desktop Study

- 5.1.1 West Yorkshire Ecology returned 619 records, 102 pertaining to bats for a 2 km radius from the central grid reference including:
- Forty-eight records of common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*),
 - Five records of soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*),
 - One further bat of the *Pipistrellus* genus,
 - Three Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentoniid*),
 - Two whiskered bats (*Myotis mystacinus*),
 - Three Natterer's bats (*Myotis nattereri*),
 - Eight further bats from the *Myotis* genus,
 - Ten records of noctule bats (*Nyctalus noctula*),
 - Four records of Leisler's bats (*Nyctalus leisleri*),
 - Two further bats from the *Nyctalus* genus
 - Six records of brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*).
- 5.1.2 Consultation with MAGIC returned no European Protected Species Mitigation Licenses within a 1 km radius from grid. The closest licence to central grid reference pertains to bats and is located approximately 2.5 kms southwest.

5.2 Initial Inspection Survey

- 5.2.1 Prior to the onset of each bat activity survey, an external assessment was undertaken where applicable to ascertain any new field signs synonymous with bats. Internal access to the farmhouse building was not possible given its tenanted nature but externally, no fresh field sign evidence was recorded throughout the duration of the survey period.
- 5.2.2 No active signs of breeding birds were recorded throughout the survey period within any building subject to survey.

5.3 Bat Activity Surveys

- 5.3.1 The first activity survey, undertaken on 2nd July 2026, was discontinued shortly after the surveyors arrived on site because circumstances prevented the survey from proceeding safely. Consequently, camera and infrared footage were not obtained, and the survey did not constitute a completed activity survey. During the approximately 10-minute period in which the survey team was able to take up position, no bats were observed and no bat calls were detected from any of the structures subject to survey. Owing to the curtailed survey period, these observations are limited and should not be interpreted as evidence of likely absence.
- 5.3.3 During the second activity on the 29th of July, no bats of any species were recorded emerging from or re-entering any of the structures subject to survey over the survey period. Analysis of IR footage post survey recorded no bats emerging or re-entering any of the building subject to survey.
- 5.3.4 Non-emerging bat activity within the site was isolated to solely several common pipistrelle bats entering the site between 21:02 and 22:06 from land outside the northern boundary, flying over the site and foraging around the immediate surroundings. No contacts from any other species of bat was recorded over the survey period.
- 5.3.5 The final dusk activity survey undertaken on the 26th of August had limited visibility on previously identified features due to a large bus restricting access to survey locations and visuals of the roof on the southern aspect of the building. The visible features recorded no bats of any species emerging from or re-entering any aspect of the building. Analysis of the IR footage post survey corroborated the field

Slate Pitts Farm
Chain Road
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5TY

survey in that no bats of any species were recorded emerging from or re-entering the farmhouse.

- 5.3.6 Bat activity over the survey period was broadly consistent with that over the previous surveys with low numbers of common pipistrelle bats passing over the site east to west and low numbers of common pipistrelle bats foraging within land outside the northern and western site boundary. Across the survey, there was no evidence suggesting that any bats were present or emerging from areas of the building which had no direct visual for this survey.
- 5.3.7 No evidence of breeding birds was recorded over the survey period within any of the buildings subject to survey.
- 5.3.8 The surveyors positioning can be seen in figure 2 and their camera vantage points can be found in appendix 1.



Figure 2: Location of surveyors and IR cameras over the survey period.



Google Earth 2026

5.4 Commuting Route Assessment

- 5.4.1 Bats are known to utilise linear features as commuting lines to foraging grounds and between roosts. No major commuting lines or foraging grounds were recorded during the survey periods over the wider site.
- 5.4.2 Field sign evidence over the survey period infers the immediate area supports lower level of bats / bat activity.

6 Survey and Site Assessment

- 6.1 No bats were recorded emerging from or re-entering any aspect of the buildings or wall subject to survey over the duration of the activity survey period.
- 6.2 Under current works proposals the farmhouse is deemed to be impacted. However, for the purposes of assessment, the farmhouse is deemed unlikely to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter. Consequently, no further survey effort is recommended and no formal mitigation proposed.
- 6.3 No bats of any species were recorded emerging from or re-entering any aspect of the farmhouse building. No field sign evidence synonymous with bat feeding activity was recorded during the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal survey.
- 6.4 The surveys were undertaken throughout the main bat activity season. No evidence to suggest use of the site as a maternity roost or large bachelor roost was recorded.
- 6.5 No evidence of breeding or roosting barn owl was recorded over the survey period. No evidence of active breeding birds was recorded within any of the buildings on site.

7 Ecological Constraints

- 7.1 Due to the variable properties of bat echolocation calls and the format of frequency division recordings, it is not always possible to identify a series of echolocation calls down to species level.
- 7.2 In most cases, it is usually possible to identify to genus level which is suitable to allow potential affects to be assessed, and appropriate mitigation designed.



- 7.3 On the first full survey on the 29th of July, surveyors were positioned to obtain a full visual of potential roost features. No equipment failed over the survey period. The final survey was limited to visuals on the north, east, and western elevations of the building due to a large bus and lorry trailer parked in front of the building, blocking visual of the southern elevation and access into the garden to the southwest of the building. This is not deemed a major limitation as other aspects were visible at the time of survey and all bat contacts that night were cross-referenced between surveyors and IR used, and no contacts were recorded as being close to or potentially emerging from the southern elevation that survey.

8 Interpretation and Evaluation

- 8.1 The farmhouse and surrounding structures were deemed unlikely to be used by bats for roosting or as a place of shelter. No further survey effort or formal mitigation is required at this juncture.
- 8.2 The farmhouse building recorded no emerging bats and no field sign evidence synonymous with bat feeding activity.
- 8.3 No major foraging grounds or commuting lines were recorded over the survey period. It would be expected that surveys undertaken during the period of June and August 2026 would reveal a greater level of activity, if the site were to be used regularly by a larger number of bats. Survey results were broadly consistent over the three surveys undertaken.
- 8.4 No evidence of active breeding birds was recorded within any building over the survey period. No evidence to indicate use by barn owl (in any capacity) in any building was recorded over the survey period.

9 Assessment of Potential Impacts

9.1 Impacts on bats and their roosts

- 9.1.1 The results of the bat activity surveys confirm that the farmhouse is not utilised by any bats for feedings or maternity roosts at the time of the survey.

- 9.1.2 The activity survey results recorded no evidence to suggest use of the survey site as a major commuting route or foraging ground.
- 9.1.3 Formal mitigation in respect of bats will not be required to facilitate the proposed works within the farmhouse building.

9.2 Impacts on breeding birds

- 9.2.1 No evidence of active use by breeding birds was recorded over the survey period within any building. However, this must be viewed as a snapshot in time and not definitive, as birds could be breeding at other times of the year.

10 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 10.1 The result of the bat activity surveys identified no evidence of use of the farmhouse by bats. No further survey effort or formal mitigation is proposed other than the following standard best practice. Should during the onset of works any bats or field sign evidence synonymous with bats be recorded, all works should cease, and a suitably qualified ecologist consulted.
- 10.3 No impacts on major foraging lines or commuting corridors are predicted via the proposals.
- 10.4 It is recommended that any clearance works on the buildings, as well as any vegetation around the rest of the site, is conducted outside the breeding bird season (March to September inclusive). If this is not feasible, it is recommended that a breeding bird survey is conducted on the suitable habitats proposed to be removed prior to works. If birds are recorded nesting, attempting to create a nest, breeding, or attempting to breed, then all works should cease, and a suitably qualified ecologist consulted.
- 10.5 A suitable buffer zone, as advised by a suitably qualified ecologist, should be installed in order to protect the nest to prevent disturbance.
- 10.6 Only when breeding activity has deemed to have ceased and any young fledged, as assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist can works commence.

References

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



EstradaEcology itd

Units 8 & 9 Flexspace Dinnington
Nobel Way
Dinnington
Sheffield S25 3QB

Tel: 01909 807177
Web: www.estradaecology.co.uk
Email: enquiries@estradaecology.co.uk

Appendix One: Example of IR footage and surveyors field view over the survey period.



EstradaEcology itd

Units 8 & 9 Flexspace Dinnington
Nobel Way
Dinnington
Sheffield S25 3QB

Tel: 01909 807177
Web: www.estradaecology.co.uk
Email: enquiries@estradaecology.co.uk

Company Reg. No: 06305254
VAT No: 217401149







