

Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Survey

Survey Site

**119 High Street, Steyning
BN443RE**

Client

Patrick Middleton

Report Date

06/07/2026

Project

This report is prepared to inform a planning application for the proposal described as a conversion of the existing ground floor shop and bakery and 4-bed self-contained residential on first floor to 4 x 2-bed flats. The only physical change to the external building envelope is the addition of 2 roof dormers to the High Street and one to the side street.

This report is supplementary to the Preliminary Roost Assessment report completed by Arbtech Consulting Ltd (2026).

BERS survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Appendices of this report.

Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons)

Assistant Ecologist

charlottehall@arbtech.co.uk

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Site Context and Background	2
Proposed Works	3
Surveyors and Equipment	4
Surveyor Positions	5
Survey Visit Details	6
Limitations	6
Summary Findings	7
Requirements & Enhancements	8
Version Control and Copyright	9
Appendices	10

Survey Author & Designer

Survey design and oversight were provided by Consultant Ecologist Anna Dolby BSc (Hons), (Accredited on Craig Williams’s Natural England Bat License No. 2018-33540-CLS-CLS) at BCT Level 2 competence.

Executive Summary

This report is an addendum to and must be read in conjunction with the Preliminary Roost Assessment completed by Arbtech Consulting Limited (2026) for the same site address. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the consultant for advice.

The surveys undertaken to date have indicated that there is a sufficiently low risk of bat roosts being present on site, and works can proceed without any further survey or licence requirements.

Table 1: Requirements arising as a result of this survey.

Requirement	Details
Wildlife Sensitive Lighting Strategy	A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during and post-development.

Report Validity

This report is valid for up to 18 months for the purposes of planning/LBC applications. For the purposes of bat licensing, the report is considered 'up to date' and suitable for licence application until the start of the following bat activity season. After those timeframes, some level of updated surveys will be required. The level of survey effort will depend on the specific circumstances of the site.

Site Context and Background

Background

A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was completed by Arbtech Consulting Ltd on 18 March 2026. The survey assessed one building onsite (B1). The site is located at National Grid Reference TQ 17365 11486 and comprises approximately 0.038ha of one building and surrounding hardstanding within the urban area of Steyning. Although the site itself has limited ecological connectivity due to its urban setting, the wider landscape includes grassland, arable fields, hedgerows and pockets of woodland, with the nearest Priority Habitat comprising deciduous woodland approximately 150m west of the site. The site also lies approximately 55m east of the South Downs National Park and within the impact risk zone for Chanctonbury Hill SSSI, although the proposed development is not considered a high-risk development for this designation.

As a result of an internal and external inspection, B1 was assessed as having moderate habitat value for roosting bats due to the presence of several suitable roosting features, including gaps beneath multiple roof tiles and a gap between the soffit and wall, which could support crevice-dwelling bats. Consequently, two bat emergence/re-entry surveys were required to assess the presence or likely absence of roosting bats within B1. No bat droppings or other evidence of bat use were recorded, and no DNA analysis was undertaken.

Context

Number of buildings on site

1

Number of buildings surveyed

1

Site Inspection

An updated loft inspection was undertaken by Charlotte Hall (BSc) on 30/06/26 as part of the BERS survey. The inspection identified no evidence of bats. No changes were noted since the previous inspection, with no alterations to the structure, access points, or suitability for roosting bats identified. The conclusions of the original Preliminary Roost Assessment by Arbtech Consulting Ltd on 18/03/26 are therefore considered to remain valid.



Figure 1a: Internal void of B1

Proposed Works

Proposed Development

Current use of building(s)

B1 is currently a residential property on the first floor, and the ground floor was a former bakery however is now out of use.

Proposed use of building(s)

Conversion of existing ground floor shop and bakery and 4-bed self-contained residential on first floor to 4 x 2-bed flats

Structural changes to building(s)

Addition of 2 roof dormers to the High Street and one to the side street.

Cosmetic/repair work

B1: N/A.

Type of permission required

Full planning application

Proposed Plan

PROPOSED ELEVATIONS



Figure 2: The proposed plans

Surveyors and Equipment

Surveyors

Table 2: Details of the surveyors involved in each of the surveys

Name	BERS Experience	Bat Licence	BCT Competency
Archie Simmons	1 years	N/A	Level 1
Abigail Louise Dodge	6 years	N/A	Level 1
Charlotte Hall	1 years	N/A	Level 2
Sophie Gullan	4 years	N/A	Level 2

Equipment

Table 3: Details of the equipment used in each of the visits

Category	Equipment	Count	
		Visit 1	Visit 2
Night Vision Aid	Nightfox Whisker	4	4
Additional illumination	Nightfox Arc IR Floodlight	2	2
Bat detector	Wildlife Acoustics Echo Meter Touch 2	2	2
Two-way radio	BAOFENG FV-880E two-way radio (or similar)	3	3
Additional illumination	Nightfox XB5 PRO	3	2
Bat detector	Anabat scout	1	1
Bat detector	Magenta Electronics Bat 4	1	1
Bat detector	Titley Chorus Static Bat Detector	1	1

Surveyor Positions

Positions

Details of each surveyor position for each visit

A diagram of the positions on site can be found in Appendix 1 along with the position images.

Table 4: The surveyor positions and the surveyors associated with them on each visit. The initials LS indicate the lead surveyor for the site visit

Position	Elevation	Visit 1	Visit 2
B1-1	South-West	Charlotte Hall (LS)	Charlotte Hall (LS)
B1-2	South-East	Archie Simmons	Sophie Gullan
B1-3	North	Abigail Louise Dodge	Abigail Louise Dodge
B1-4	North-West (semi-manned)	Charlotte Hall (LS)	Charlotte Hall (LS)

Survey Visit Details and Limitations

Visit 1			Visit 2		
07/06/2026			30/06/2026		
Start time	Sunset	End time	Start time	Sunset	End time
20:55	21:10	22:40	21:03	21:18	22:48
Start Conditions			Start Conditions		
Temperature(°C): 15.8			Temperature(°C): 18.8		
Relative humidity (%): 81.0			Relative humidity (%): 70.0		
Wind (km/h): 0.1			Wind (km/h): 5.2		
End Conditions			End Conditions		
Temperature(°C): 13.6			Temperature(°C): 16.7		
Relative humidity (%): 82.0			Relative humidity (%): 82.0		
Wind (km/h): 1.2			Wind (km/h): 1.4		
Rain			Rain		
None			None		
Buildings surveyed			Buildings surveyed		
1			1		
Trees surveyed			Trees surveyed		
N/A			N/A		

Limitations

There are no limitations associated with this survey.

Summary Findings

Findings & Impacts

Summary of all observations and impacts

Emergences

No emergences were observed during any visit.

Roosts

No roosts were observed during any visit.

Key Foraging Areas

No foraging locations were observed during any visit.

Key Commuting Paths

Commuting activity was observed along the southeast to north along the frontage of the eastern facing elevation. No corresponding echolocation associated with this pass. There was also commuting activity of a Common pipistrelle circling around the roof of B1.

Impacts on Foraging / Commuting Bats

Increased artificial lighting from the proposed site could negatively affect commuting bats by causing disturbance to established flight routes and altering commuting behaviour. However, these impacts are expected to be localised, as extensive suitable commuting and foraging habitat is available within the surrounding landscape.

Hibernation suitability

The site offers limited potential hibernation features for bats, including the multiple gaps associated with defects in the roof and minor defects within the PVC eaves and soffits. These features are considered highly exposed, allowing significant ingress of natural light and airflow, which would prevent the development of the stable, cool and undisturbed conditions required for hibernation. As a result, they are considered unsuitable for supporting hibernating bats. No evidence of bat use was recorded during the surveys, and no further hibernation surveys are required.

Requirements & Enhancements

Requirements & Enhancements

Requirements

Bat Licence

A licence is not required for the works on this site.

Mitigation

The surveys undertaken to date have indicated that there is a sufficiently low risk of bat roosts being present on site, and works can proceed without any further survey or licence requirements. In the unlikely event bats are found, work must stop and a suitably qualified ecologist will be contacted for further advice.

Wildlife Sensitive Lighting Strategy

Foraging and commuting bats could be impacted by additional lighting on site which can affect resources for the local population. Only common and widespread species were identified on site, therefore no impacts at population level are anticipated. Impacts are at site level only.

A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during and post-development, and this should be designed in accordance with Guidance Note GN08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night (Institution of Lighting Professionals, 2023). Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/08/bats-and-artificial-lighting-at-night-ilp-guidance-note-update-released>

Enhancements

The creation of additional habitat for bats is recommended in line with the local authorities' duty to request enhancements under the NPPF (2024).

Bat Boxes

The installation of two bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be integrated within the new build extension. Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level (at the eaves of buildings), facing in a south or south-westerly direction, with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from and unlit by artificial light, and not above any windows. The bat boxes will be a specification suitable for crevice dwelling species.

Version Control and Copyright


Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version Control

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons), Assistant Ecologist	06/07/2026
Review	0.2	Anna Dolby, BSc (Hons), Consultant Ecologist	07/07/2026
Final	1.0	Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons), Assistant Ecologist	10/07/2026
Review	1.1	Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons), Assistant Ecologist	14/07/2026
Final	2.0	Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons), Assistant Ecologist	14/07/2026

Appendix 1: BERS plan



Appendix 2: Additional Site Inspection Images



Internal void of B1



Internal void of B1

Appendix 3: Surveyor Photos



V1 B1-1 surveyor photo



V2 B1-1 surveyor photo



V1 B1-2 surveyor photo



V1 B1-1 darkest point image



V2 B1-1 darkest point image



V1 B1-2 darkest point image



V2 B1-2 surveyor photo



V1 B1-3 surveyor photo



V2 B1-3 surveyor photo



V2 B1-2 darkest point image



V1 B1-3 darkest point image



V2 B1-3 darkest point image



V1 B1-4 surveyor photo



V2 B1-4 surveyor photo



V1 B1-4 darkest point image



V2 B1-4 darkest point image

Appendix 4: Summary of Call Data

Species	Visit 1	Visit 2	Total
Common noctule	1	20	21
Soprano pipistrelle	15	2	17
Common pipistrelle	12	-	12
Pipistrelle sp.	1	-	1

Appendix 5: Raw Survey Data Log

Pos - Position **Spp** - Species **Act** - Activity **Emer** - Emergence **Fora** - Foraging **Comm** - Commuting **PSR** - Post-survey result **Re-ent** - Re-entry **CPIP** - Common pipistrelle **SPIP** - Soprano pipistrelle **PIPSP** - Pipistrelle sp. **BLE** - Brown long-eared bat **PLECSP** - Plecotus sp. **NOC** - Common noctule **DAUB** - Daubenton's bat **NAT** - Natterer's bat **WHI** - Whiskered bat **WHI/BRAN** - Whiskered/Brandt's bat **MYOSP** - Myotis sp. **SERO** - Serotine **NYCSP** - Nyctalus sp. **LEI** - Leisler's noctule **NPIP** - Nathusius pipistrelle **LHO** - Lesser horseshoe bat **BARB** - Barbastelle **GHO** - Greater horseshoe bat **GLE** - Grey long-eared bat **ALCA** - Alcahoo **BECK** - Bechstein's bat **GME** - Greater mouse-eared bat

Visit 1

Time	Pos	Spp	Act	Notes	PSR
21:45	B1-3	CPIP	Call	A pass initially heard not seen, but movement was seen along the skyline above the dormer window ridgeline at the southern end of the south facing elevation, in an east to west direction. The view was heavily obscured by the street light less than 1 foot away from the building's frontage.	
21:45	B1-1	CPIP	Call		
21:46	B1-1	CPIP	Comm	Common pipistrelle circling around roof	
21:49	B1-3	SPIP	Call	Brief echolocation buzz heard not seen.	
21:52	B1-1	SPIP	Call	Heard but not seen , faint	
21:53	B1-2	SPIP	Call	faint call	
21:56	B1-4	CPIP	Call		PSR
21:57	B1-1	CPIP	Call	Heard but not seen	
22:05	B1-3	PIPSP	Call	Derived from commuting observations	PSR
22:05	B1-3	PIPSP	Comm	Passing from southeast to north along the frontage of the eastern facing elevation. No corresponding echolocation associated with this pass.	PSR
22:12	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:12	B1-1	CPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:12	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:12	B1-4	SPIP	Call		PSR
22:13	B1-3	SPIP	Call	Pass heard not seen.	

Visit 1 - ctd

Time	Pos	Spp	Act	Notes	PSR
22:13	B1-4	SPIP	Call		PSR
22:15	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:17	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:18	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:19	B1-3	SPIP	Call	Pass heard not seen.	
22:19	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:19	B1-4	SPIP	Call		PSR
22:22	B1-2	CPIP	Call	very faint	
22:22	B1-3	NOC	Call	Very brief pass heard not seen.	
22:22	B1-1	CPIP	Call	heard but not seen very faint	
22:22	B1-4	CPIP	Call		PSR
22:23	B1-1	CPIP	Call	heard but not seen very faint	
22:24	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen very faint	
22:24	B1-1	CPIP	Call	heard but not seen very faint	
22:33	B1-3	CPIP	Call	Very faint and brief echolocation heard not seen.	
22:34	B1-2	CPIP	Call	brief and very faint	

Visit 2

Time	Pos	Spp	Act	Notes	PSR
20:47	B1-4	NOC	Call		PSR
21:40	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
21:41	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
21:43	B1-3	NOC	Call	briefly heard not seen	
21:46	B1-2	NOC	Call		
22:15	B1-2	NOC	Call	Derived from foraging observations	
22:15	B1-3	NOC	Call	foraging hears not seen until 22:17.	
22:15	B1-2	NOC	Fora	Noctule foraging at 22:15 for a few minutes, not seen however	
22:16	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:18	B1-3	NOC	Call	foraging hears not seen until 22:20.	
22:18	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:22	B1-3	NOC	Call	foraging hears not seen until 22:25.	
22:23	B1-2	NOC	Call		
22:23	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:24	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:25	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:30	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:31	B1-1	SPIP	Call	heard but not seen	
22:37	B1-3	NOC	Call	briefly hears not seen .	
22:37	B1-1	NOC	Call	heard but not seen	
22:41	B1-3	NOC	Call	foraging hears not seen .	
22:44	B1-2	NOC	Call		
22:44	B1-3	NOC	Call	briefly hears not seen .	

Appendix 6: General Methodology

BAT EMERGENCE AND RE-ENTRY SURVEY METHODOLOGY — GENERAL

1. Survey Aims and Approach

Dusk bat emergence surveys (and, where justified, dawn re-entry surveys) were undertaken to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats and, where present, to characterise roosts by species, numbers, access points, roost type and how bats use the site. Survey design follows an iterative approach: results and audit data are reviewed after each visit so that subsequent survey effort, positioning, equipment deployment and objectives can be refined as needed (BCT 7.2.17; 10.1.1).

2. Guidance and Standards

All surveys were designed and delivered with reference to Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists — Good Practice Guidelines (4th ed.) (Collins, 2023), the CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (2nd ed.) (CIEEM, 2017a), and other relevant guidance including Natural England standing advice for bats (updated April 2025) and BS 42020:2013. Where departures from published good practice were made, the report identifies what changed, why, how survey robustness was maintained, and the competence of the ecologist(s) making that judgement (BCT 1.1.4–1.1.5; 2.2.32–2.2.33).

3. Competence and Roles

Survey design and oversight were provided by Consultant Ecologist Anna Dolby BSc (Hons), (Accredited on Craig Williams's Natural England Bat License No. 2018-33540-CLS-CLS) at BCT Level 2 competence. On-site survey work was led by Charlotte Hall, BSc (Hons) at BCT Level 2 competence, supported by 3 additional Bat Surveyor(s) and/or Assistant(s). Bat Surveyors (minimum BCT Level 1, trained to internal standard) worked under the supervision of the Project Surveyor and were responsible for data collection at their manned positions, including real-time species identification and operating IR camera/acoustic equipment. Assistants worked under the supervision of the Project Surveyor and were responsible for securing IR camera/acoustic equipment. Training records and competency sign-offs are maintained in line with CIEEM Code of Professional Conduct. Full surveyor details are provided in Table 2.

4. Survey Timing, Effort and Seasonal Windows

Survey effort was set in line with BCT Tables 7.1 and 7.2 and reviewed as results emerged. Dusk emergence surveys commenced with surveyors and equipment in place 15 minutes before sunset and continued for 1.5–2 hours after sunset (BCT 7.2.31). Survey visits were spaced a minimum of three weeks apart and timed within the core May–August survey window wherever feasible. Where September surveys were required, the report details the justification, how robustness was maintained, and any residual uncertainty.

Survey dates, start/end times, and sunset/sunrise times are provided in the survey visit details section of the report.

5. Weather Conditions

Surveys were undertaken only when conditions were likely to support typical bat emergence and flight behaviour. Conditions were assessed using forecasts and confirmed on arrival. Minimum thresholds: temperature $>7^{\circ}\text{C}$ at survey start; wind $\leq$ Beaufort Scale 3 (~ 5 m/s); no persistent heavy rain. Where suboptimal but permissible conditions occurred (e.g. intermittent light drizzle), these are recorded and interpretation reflects this. Weather data recorded during each survey are provided in the survey visit details section of the report.

6. Survey Area and Position Design

The survey area comprised 1 building, selected on the basis of the PRA findings and/or tree assessment results. Justification for the extent of survey coverage is provided in the Site Context and Background section.

The arrangement of surveyors and equipment was informed by the Preliminary Roost Assessment (structures) and/or tree assessment (PRFs/GLTA) so that identified roosting features and likely access points were the focus of coverage, while recognising that bats may emerge from unexpected locations (BCT 7.2.12). Where NVAs were deployed, a still image or screenshot was captured from the darkest point of the survey from each NVA to demonstrate field of view and adequacy of illumination; these are provided in 3 (BCT 7.2.10). Surveyor and equipment positions for each survey visit are shown on Appendix 1.

7. Equipment Standards

All electronic survey equipment (detectors, recorders and NVAs) was tested prior to deployment (function check, storage capacity, battery health, time synchronisation) and calibrated/tested in line with manufacturer guidance, typically at least annually, with evidence retained and available on request (BCT 2.5.14). Microphone sensitivity was verified prior to the survey season, as sensitivity can decline over time (BCT 2.5.16). Equipment was selected as suitable for the target species and site conditions (BCT 2.5.13; 2.5.17). Detector settings and deployment metadata were documented consistently, including gain/sensitivity, trigger parameters, recording format, sample rate, firmware/app version, time settings and any filters applied (BCT 2.5.15; 2.5.20). Equipment details and settings are provided in Table 3.

8. Data Capture and Acoustic Analysis

All results were recorded using a standardised digital survey form, including surveyor positions, start/end times, weather at intervals, equipment identifiers, detector settings, observed emergences/returns, bat passes, flight direction, behaviour notes and confidence/uncertainty notes (BCT 7.2.19). Raw audio/video recordings and metadata were retained as an auditable record. Negative survey results were also recorded (BCT 2.5.19).

A bat pass was defined as a sequence of two or more echolocation pulses produced by an individual bat, with a new pass recorded when a gap of one second or more occurred between successive calls. Where sustained activity was recorded (e.g. circling bats), this was noted as sustained activity rather than counted as individual passes.

At manned positions, species identification was carried out in real-time by the ecologist using a heterodyne detector for live listening and an Echo Meter Touch

(built-in MEMS microphone) for full-spectrum recording. All recordings were retained as an auditable record. Post-survey acoustic review was undertaken only where specific calls could not be confidently identified on site; these were reviewed using Wildlife Acoustics Kaleidoscope Pro with reference to Russ (2012) *British Bat Calls: A Guide to Species Identification*.

Where semi-manned positions were deployed (Titley Chorus with ultrasonic microphone), recordings were processed through Titley Scientific Anabat Insight (BatClassify UK plug-in) to provide automated species identification. Auto-ID outputs were subject to targeted manual verification by an experienced ecologist using Kaleidoscope Pro. Manual verification was applied to: uncertain or low-confidence classifications; any classifications of conservation-significant, locally uncommon or Annex II species regardless of confidence score (BCT 10.2.19); and any records detected at unusual times. Manual verification involved visual inspection of spectrograms and examination of call parameters including peak frequency (kHz), start and end frequency (kHz), call duration (ms), inter-pulse interval (ms), bandwidth (kHz), and call shape/structure (e.g. FM, FM-QCF, QCF). Where calls could not be confidently assigned to species level (e.g. *Myotis* species group), they were recorded at the most reliable taxonomic level.

It is acknowledged that automated classification software is not infallible; false positives and false negatives may occur. Different species can produce similar calls, and recording quality, environmental conditions and bat behaviour can affect call characteristics. Some species groups (e.g. *Myotis* spp., *Nyctalus/Eptesicus*) cannot be reliably separated by echolocation alone (Russ, 2012). Where auto-ID was used, the system and version, validation steps, thresholds and manual verification criteria are documented in Appendix 5 (BCT 10.2.21).

Acoustic data were reviewed promptly after each survey to inform subsequent survey design (BCT 2.2.16; 10.1.1).

9. Health and Safety

A site-specific risk assessment was prepared addressing both site and generic survey hazards (night working, slips/trips, lone working, antisocial behaviour risk). The risk assessment was reviewed on arrival at each visit, and new hazards identified on site were recorded for subsequent visits (BCT 2.7.3).

10. Report Quality Assurance

This report has been written by, or reviewed by, a senior member of staff to confirm technical adequacy, clarity and that recommendations are justified (BCT 11.4.1). Survey effort has been checked as part of project quality assurance (BCT 7.2.13).

11. Limitations and Survey Validity

Survey data in this report were collected during the 2026 survey season. In accordance with CIEEM (2019) Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys, survey data are generally considered valid for up to 12 months / state period from the date of the last survey visit. Where this report is relied upon beyond that period, an update assessment may be required.

References

References relevant to this methodology.

- BCT (2023, amended 27.03.2024) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists — Good Practice Guidelines (4th ed.). Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- BCT / Fawcett-Williams, J. (2021) Thermal Imaging: Bat Survey Guidelines. Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- CIEEM (2017a) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (2nd ed.). CIEEM, Winchester.
- CIEEM (2019) Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys. CIEEM, Winchester.
- BSI (2013) BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity — Code of practice for planning and development. British Standards Institution, London.
- Natural England (2025) Bats: advice for making planning decisions. Updated April 2025.
- Russ, J. (2012) British Bat Calls: A Guide to Species Identification. Pelagic Publishing, Exeter.

Appendix 7: Survey Methodology

BAT EMERGENCE SURVEY METHODOLOGY — HYBRID NVA/ECOLOGIST SURVEY

1. Survey Method

This survey used a hybrid approach combining manned positions (ecologist with NVA, live detector and recording) and semi-manned automatic recording positions (NVA with dedicated static audio detector). Semi-manned positions were deployed to maintain coverage of roosting features while reducing the number of human positions required, consistent with BCT guidance that NVAs can reduce the number of surveyors where appropriately deployed with a detector soundtrack and evidence of efficacy (BCT 7.2.8; 7.2.11).

2. Position Design

The arrangement of manned and semi-manned positions was determined from the PRA and/or tree PRF assessment, with coverage designed so that all elevations and identified roosting features were monitored (BCT 7.2.12). Survey design and oversight were provided by Consultant Ecologist Anna Dolby BSc (Hons), (Accredited on Craig Williams's Natural England Bat License No. 2018-33540-CLS-CLS) at BCT Level 2 competence. at BCT Level 3 competence (BCT 7.2.6). Manned positions were staffed with either Project Surveyors or Bat Surveyors, who were responsible for data collection, including real-time species identification and recording all bat activity, including peripheral activity across the wider site (BCT 7.2.13). Semi-manned positions were monitored by either the Project Surveyor or Bat Surveyors, which were allocated by the Project Surveyor. Where required, additional assistants were present to monitor semi-manned positions to provide additional equipment security. Surveyor and equipment positions are shown on Appendix 1.

3. Equipment

Manned positions: IR camera (Nightfox Whisker) with tripod; true IR illumination source (Nightfox XB5 Pro 850 nm); tablet for digital data capture; full-spectrum detector (Echo Meter Touch, built-in MEMS microphone) with recording enabled, supplemented by heterodyne detector for real-time species identification; radio communication; red-light head torch; weather meter/anemometer.

Semi-manned positions: IR camera with true IR illumination source; full-spectrum static bat detector/recorder (Titley Chorus with ultrasonic microphone, unique identifier) deployed on a tripod at approximately 1.5–2 m above ground level, with the microphone oriented horizontally and directed towards the building features under observation — height and orientation were adjusted on site as necessary to maximise acoustic coverage of identified roosting features; tripod/clamp system for stable alignment and security.

Staffing and equipment deployment were designed to ensure survey effort was not diluted across the site, with sufficient coverage of all relevant elevations and features (BCT 7.2.15).

All equipment was tested and calibrated in line with manufacturer guidance, with evidence retained and available on request (BCT 2.5.14). Detector settings

(gain/sensitivity, trigger parameters, recording format, sample rate, firmware version, time settings) were documented (BCT 2.5.15; 2.5.20). Equipment details and settings are provided in Table 3, along with any deviations from this kit list.

4. Survey Operation

All equipment was deployed and operational before the 15-minute pre-sunset survey start. Each NVA was checked for focus, field of view and adequacy of true IR illumination (BCT 7.2.10). NVAs and audio recorders were turned on before the survey window and remained running until after completion (BCT 7.2.11). During the survey, each surveyor monitored their allocated NVAs and carried out operational checks (recording status, IR illumination timing, lamp alignment). Surveyors maintained constant radio contact. A still image was captured from the darkest point of the survey from each NVA to demonstrate field of view and illumination adequacy; these are provided in Appendix 3 (BCT 7.2.10).

5. Post-Survey Review

NVA footage was reviewed promptly (typically the following day) while the survey remained fresh in surveyors' minds (BCT 7.2.16). Acoustic files were processed promptly to inform subsequent survey design (BCT 2.2.16; 10.1.1). Results from each visit were used to refine positioning, equipment deployment and objectives for subsequent visits where required (BCT 7.2.17). Where overlap between independent observer and NVA detections was noted, this was recorded to support internal quality assurance (BCT 7.2.14). Where bats were observed emerging, survey interpretation recognised that the roosting location may differ from the emergence point, and follow-up survey design was adjusted accordingly (BCT 7.2.17).

6. Justification for Method

This hybrid approach was selected as appropriate for the site based on low site complexity and a few features suitable for roosting bats. The method maintains full auditable NVA and acoustic coverage of all identified roosting features while providing direct ecologist observation at key positions.

7. Limitations

All limitations are listed, along with their impact level, in the Limitations section of the main report.