



Angus Energy Ltd

Bat Survey Report

Lower Stumble Exploration Site, Balcombe

858544

SEPTEMBER 2019

RSK



RSK GENERAL NOTES

Project No.: 858544

Title: Lower Stumble Exploration Site, Balcombe - Bat Survey Report

Client: Angus Energy Ltd

Date: September 2019

Office: Tonbridge

Status: Final

This report has been prepared by a professional ecologist and reviewed by a principal consultant. Both are members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). Names have been omitted from this report for confidentiality reasons but can be provided on request.

RSK has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and RSK. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by RSK for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of RSK and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of RSK.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report provides details of bat surveys carried out in connection with the planned works at the 2z borehole hydrocarbon exploration site south of the village of Balcombe.
2. The site comprises an area of hard-standing (previously used as a drilling platform) with an associated access road (hereon referred to as the “works footprint”). The works footprint is surrounded by suitable bat roosting and foraging habitat including coniferous plantation woodland, broadleaved woodland and rough grassland.
3. Bat activity and static bat detector surveys were carried out in August 2019 and compared to data collected for the site in 2017 and 2018.
4. At least six species of bat were recorded using the site. The highest levels of bat activity recorded during the transect survey were associated with the woodland edge habitat and the grassland paths bordering and dissecting the wooded areas.
5. Measures have been included to help minimise effects to local bat populations from the proposed development. These include measures to minimise light spill and also recommendations on the timing of the works. Monitoring surveys should also be undertaken to determine if the works are causing an adverse effect on bat populations.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of report.....	1
1.2 Ecological context.....	1
2 METHODS.....	2
2.1 Personnel	2
2.2 Habitats	2
2.3 Transect Surveys.....	2
2.4 Static Surveys.....	3
2.5 Survey constraints	4
3 RESULTS	5
3.1 Transect Surveys.....	5
3.2 Static Surveys.....	5
4 EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	7
4.1 Habitats	7
4.2 Potential Impacts of Development.....	7
4.2.1 Habitat loss.....	7
4.2.2 Lighting	7
4.3 Mitigation	8
4.3.1 Timing of works	8
4.3.2 Lighting	8
4.3.3 Monitoring Surveys.....	9
4.3.4 Enclosed Flare.....	9
5 REFERENCES	10
6 FIGURES.....	11
7 APPENDIX 1 – BAT LEGISLATION.....	15

TABLES

Table 1: Survey dates and timings for each transect surveys.	3
Table 2: Weather conditions recorded at the beginning and end of each transect survey.....	3
Table 3. Total number of bat passes recorded during the transect survey	5
Table 4. Summary of results from the seasonal static surveys	6

FIGURES

Figure 1. Site Location	12
Figure 2. Bat transect route and SM2 location.....	13
Figure 3. Transect results map, August 2019	14

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of report

This report contains details of bat surveys and static bat detector surveys carried out in 2019 for the proposed works at the Balcombe-2z borehole exploration site south of the village of Balcombe (centred at National Grid reference TQ 31007 29251). The 2019 data has been compared with data collected in 2018 and 2017 to determine if there have been any changes to bat species using the site. *Figure 1* shows the site location and boundary.

Planning permission was granted in 2014 for flow testing and monitoring of an existing borehole drilled in 2013. This permission expired in May 2017 without the works being completed. Following this, a temporary permission for the same scope of works is was submitted to WSCC. The well is currently suspended following the demobilisation of equipment after the autumn 2018 well test carried out by angus Energy, to determine if the Balcombe-2z horizontal well was capable of producing movable oil at commercial rates.

Angus Energy are now seeking new planning permission to reopen the site to continue exploration well testing and operations. Works proposed will include:

- Stage 1 – Pumping remaining drill fluids (minimal well test package and tanks) over an estimated 4 weeks.
- Stage 2 – Extend well test (full well test package and tanks) should oil be seen to flow during stage 1. This stage is estimated to take 3 years but is subject to Oil and Gas Authority permission for a test of this length.

1.2 Ecological context

The site lies to the south of Balcombe; a village in West Sussex. It comprises an area of hard-standing (previously used as a drilling platform) with an associated access road (hereon referred to as the “works footprint”). The area immediately surrounding the works footprint comprises planted broadleaved and coniferous trees, scrub, grassland and hedgerows and was surveyed as part of this assessment. There are patches of ancient woodland (which form part of Lower Stumble Wood and Lower Beanham Wood) to the north and south of the survey area, a railway line to the east, and London Road the B0236 to the west.

Although the works footprint solely comprises hard-standing with some encroaching ruderal vegetation, it is surrounded by habitat which is suitable for a number of protected species including bats, birds and Badgers.

2 METHODS

2.1 Personnel

Bat activity surveys were by led and assisted by RSK consultant ecologists. The lead ecologist is experienced in surveys of this type and has 3 years' experience in ecological consultancy.

2.2 Habitats

Habitats were assessed for their suitability for foraging and commuting bats during a preliminary ecological appraisal undertaken by RSK in August 2019. Areas of particular interest vary between bat species, but generally include sheltered areas and habitats with good numbers of insects such as woodland edges, hedgerows, watercourses and species-rich or rough grassland. Both Noctule bats (*Nyctalus noctula*) (Mackie and Racey, 2017) and Common Pipistrelles (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) (Davidson-Watts and Jones, 2006) preferentially select deciduous woodland habitats and edges for foraging.

Habitats of particular interest to foraging and commuting bats that are present on the site are:

- woodland and scrub edges;
- lines of trees; and
- grass footpaths surrounding the site.

2.3 Transect Surveys

Bat surveys followed methodology outlined in published guidelines (Collins, 2016) to identify any areas of high commuting and/or foraging activity and also to confirm the species involved (large roosts can sometimes also be identified from patterns of activity). One dusk activity survey was undertaken in August 2019, to update previous surveys undertaken in 2017 and 2018. One survey undertaken in the summer months when bats are most active was considered adequate to update the information gathered in previous years.

The transect consisted of a two hour-long dusk survey across the site. It included walking sections of a pre-defined transect (continuously recording any signs of bat activity) and stopping for five minutes at pre-determined locations before continuing along the transect route. Monitoring locations were chosen to include areas with high quality habitat where bats were likely to be encountered if present (*Figure 2*).

The transect route was walked in suitable weather (above 10°C with little or no rain and no strong winds) using a Baton XD bat detector. Targeted and continuous recordings of bat calls were made during the survey in time expansion and frequency division formats. Bat passes were marked on a map so that statistics on passes and numbers of bats could later be calculated.

Table 1 details the dates and survey times for the activity survey completed. Weather conditions recorded at the beginning and end of each survey were also recorded. These are provided in Table 2.

Table 1: Survey dates and timings for each transect surveys.

Date	Survey Type	Sunset Time	Start Time	End Time
28.08.2019	Dusk	19:55	19:55	22:00

Table 2: Weather conditions recorded at the beginning and end of each transect survey.

Date	Air Temperature (°C)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind Speed (Beaufort)	Precipitation
28.08.2019	18°C	2	2	Very light rain around 21:15

The transect survey consisted of five walking sections and five-minute monitoring stops. Levels of bat activity were quantified by the number of bat passes recorded during each walking section or monitoring stop. A single pass by a bat was defined by a gap of one second or more between the end of one call and beginning of the next bat call. Species were identified either in the field or through the analysis of recordings using BatExplorer® and Kaleidoscope® software programs.

2.4 Static Surveys

A Wildlife Acoustics Song Meter 2 Bat+ (SM2) detector was installed within the drilling platform to monitor activity in the vicinity of the works footprint (see Figure 2). The SM2s provided complementary data collected over a minimum of five consecutive nights in accordance with Collins (2016) guidelines.

The SM2 was deployed in August 2019 for five consecutive nights to augment the data collected. Survey dates were selected when the predicted weather forecast indicated suitable weather conditions for foraging and commuting bats (i.e. air temperature above 10°C, the absence of strong winds and no precipitation). Surveys were designed to provide information on the level of bat activity and composition of bat species using the site, the relative importance of features and locations and how patterns of bat activity may change throughout the year.

The units were set up to continuously record from 30 minutes before sunset until 30 minutes after sunrise. Microphones were mounted on extension cables at least 3 m off the ground. All recordings were stored on memory cards and analysed using the Kaleidoscope Pro® software program. All automated identifications, noise and no ID files from the software were double checked by an experienced ecologist for quality assurance purposes. Echolocation calls were identified down to species or genus level

depending on the type of bat encountered (*i.e.* it is not possible to reliably identify species belonging to the genus *Myotis* and *Plecotus* and *Nyctalus* species) and the quality of the recording.

The level of bat activity was quantified by the number of files (passes) and pulses (individual echolocation pulses within a call) recorded for each recorded species for each night and monitoring period. The Kaleidoscope analysis software produced a single file for each pass made by an echolocating bat. The number of pulses within each file also gives a quantifiable measure for the approximation of the level of foraging and commuting activity.

2.5 Survey constraints

During transect surveys, bats and their direction of flight were easiest to observe during the period just after sunset when light levels were still high. As the light fades, visual observation often becomes less reliable and “heard not seen” records are more frequently made. When this occurred, only the location of the bat pass could be recorded and not the direction of flight.

The SM2 microphone failed after two nights due to heavy rainfall. However, after analysing these recordings and comparing the data gathered during the transect survey and static detector with the data collected in 2018 and 2017, it appears that the data fits previous trend showing limited changes, therefore suitable recommendations can be made in this report.

3 RESULTS

The following sections provide the findings of bat surveys completed in August 2019. The current data is also compared to data collected in the 2018 and 2017 bat activity surveys.

3.1 Transect Surveys

Table 3 shows the total number of bat passes recorded for the transect completed in August 2019. At least three different species of bat were recorded during the surveys in August 2019, these were - *Myotis* species, Soprano Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) and Common Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*).

Table 3. Total number of bat passes recorded during the transect survey

Pipistrellus pipistrellus	Pipistrellus pygmaeus	Myotis species	Total
16	5	9	30

The highest levels of bat activity were recorded along the woodland boundaries, particularly to the north and north-east of the works footprint where there are rough grassland paths forming linear clearings suitable for bats to forage along.

Both commuting and foraging activity was recorded during the surveys; with Pipistrelle and *Myotis* bat species being regularly noted flying along the north and north-west of the transect route. This made it clear that these species regularly used these paths bordering the adjacent woodland as both commuting and foraging habitat.

The transect survey results and stops are illustrated in *Figure 3*.

When comparing this data to that collected in 2017 and 2018 it shows that *Myotis* species, Soprano Pipistrelle, Common Pipistrelle and Serotine (*Eptesicus serotinus*) were present on site in 2017 and 2018.

Overall, the results show that, except for one Serotine bat pass recorded in 2017 and three recorded in 2018, there has been no significant change in bat species using the site since 2017.

3.2 Static Surveys

A summary of the results from the survey completed in August 2019 is presented in *Table 5*. Throughout the survey period, a total of six bat species were recorded; Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Nathusius Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus nathusii*), Brown Long-eared Bat (*Plecotus auratus*), Noctule (*Nyctalus noctule*), and *Myotis* species. Common Pipistrelle was the most frequently recorded species, closely followed by Soprano Pipistrelle. This was followed by Brown Long-eared Bat, *Myotis* species, Noctule and then Soprano Pipistrelle.

Table 4. Summary of results from the seasonal static surveys

Pipistrellus pipistrellus	Pipistrellus pygmaeus	Pipistrellus nathusii	Plecotus auritus	Myotis species	Nyctalus noctula	Total
28	24	1	10	2	2	67

During the 2018 surveys, seven species of bats were recorded over a period of 7 nights. The most frequently recorded species were Common Pipistrelle (113), followed by *Myotis* species (28), Barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*) (22), Leisler's bat (*Nyctalus leisleri*) (19) and Soprano Pipistrelle (16). Small numbers of Nathusius Pipistrelle (3) and Serotine bat (1) passes were also recorded, therefore, a total of 202 bat passes were recorded across the site.

Whereas, the 2017 surveys recorded only four species of bats - Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Noctule and *Myotis* species over seven nights, recording a total of 0 species in May 2017, 76 in June 2017, and only 2 in September 2017.

When comparing the data collected during the transect and static monitoring surveys since 2017, recordings show that the site is commonly used by Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle and *Myotis* species; frequently used by Barbastelle, Leisler's bat and Brown Long-eared Bat; and occasionally used by Nathusius Pipistrelle, Noctule and Serotine bats.

4 EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Habitats

Habitats within the immediate surroundings of the works footprint were found to provide suitable foraging and commuting opportunities for bats during the activity and static surveys which recorded at least six bat species using the site during the 2019 survey but eight different species since 2017.

Optimum habitat occurs all around the boundary of the works area and comprises woodland and scrub edge habitat with linear grass clearings (foot paths). The woodland that the works footprint is situated within is connected to further suitable habitat off site with large blocks of woodland to the north and south of the works footprint and to the west on the other side of London Road B0236. In addition, there is good connectivity to the Ardingly reservoir to the east via woodland and hedgerows. The reservoir represents optimal foraging habitat for any *Myotis* species in the area such as Daubenton's Bat (*Myotis daubentonii*).

During the transect surveys, peak bat foraging and commuting activity was recorded in connection with the woodland edges and rough grassland paths that bordered and dissected wooded areas.

4.2 Potential Impacts of Development

4.2.1 Habitat loss

The works footprint is comprised entirely of crushed concrete hard-standing with some minor colonisation by scattered early successional herbaceous plants and therefore the habitat within the works footprint is of very limited value for bat species.

The highest quality habitat (e.g. woodland edges and rough grassland paths surrounding the works footprint) will not be physically affected by the planned works. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the habitat lost will be detrimental to the local bat population, especially given the amount of adjacent higher quality foraging and commuting habitat that will not be affected (e.g. woodland edges).

4.2.2 Lighting

All species of bat are nocturnal and artificial lighting of areas in which bats are active is likely to disturb their normal activities. For example, light falling on a roost exit point will at least delay bats from emerging. This shortens the amount of time available to them for foraging. As the main peak of nocturnal insect abundance occurs at and soon after dusk, a delay in emergence could mean that this vital time for feeding is missed. At worst, bats may abandon the roost all together which could have a significant effect on the future success of the colony (Van Langevelde, F et al., 2011). This is likely to be deemed as a breach of the national and European legislation that protects bats and their roosts from disturbance.

In addition to causing disturbance to a roost, artificial lighting can also affect the feeding behaviour of bats and their commuting routes via the attraction of insects to lights with

short wavelengths (UV and blue light), and via the illumination of important foraging and commuting habitats.

Illumination of foraging areas can prevent or reduce foraging activity, causing bats to pass quickly through the lit area or avoid it completely. Lighting can disrupt the composition and abundance of insect prey and can effectively cause a loss of foraging areas for some bat species. This can have negative effects on bat communities by potentially causing competitive exclusion of less tolerant species (e.g. Long-eared Bat and *Myotis* species.) as more light tolerant species (e.g. *Pipistrellus* sp.) may out-compete them for insect prey. *Myotis* species were frequently recorded during the bat surveys on this site.

Some bat species actively forage at lights due to the higher numbers of insects (particularly moths) attracted to street lights, in particular low wavelength light (Eisenbeis 2006; van Langevelde *et al.* 2011). Fast flying bat species adapted to forage in open areas (particularly *Eptesicus*, *Pipistrellus* and *Nyctalus* species) may benefit from the increased foraging opportunities provided at lamps which attract high densities of insects. However, bats foraging at street lights may be subject to increased mortality risk because juveniles may be at higher risk of predation due to their slower and less agile flight (Racey & Swift, 1985). In addition, the insect prey of bats may be attracted away from dark areas, potentially reducing prey availability for species that do not forage in lit areas.

Although total absence of light is best for bats this may not always be possible due to the necessity for 24 hour operations during exploration works which is likely to last for around 4 weeks. It is not currently known whether the works will be taking place during the active season for bats (generally considered to be between May and October). Therefore, there is potential for disturbance to occur if works are scheduled within that period of time. Mitigation in accordance with condition 10 of planning approval WSCC/040/17/BA to detail a lighting strategy has been suggested in the instance that works are carried out between May and October.

4.3 Mitigation

4.3.1 Timing of works

The works should be undertaken outside the most disturbing works to bats (*i.e.* works which require night time lighting) outside the active season for bats (November to April). However, where this is not possible the following mitigation measures will be put in place and detailed within a lighting plan for the works.

4.3.2 Lighting

The lighting plan (in accordance with condition 10: Site lighting strategy) will seek to keep areas where high bat activity was recorded (*i.e.* surrounding woodland boundaries) as dark as possible.

Stage 1 will take a 4 week period and during this time Angus Energy plan to work between the hours of 07:30 and 22:00 which will require lighting in the evening and therefore has the potential to disturb bats depending on the timing of works. If the planned works take place during the active bat season it may be appropriate to change

these standard working hours to reduce / remove the necessity for lighting. The precise details of any changes to the standard working hours to minimise impacts on bats will depend on when the work is planned and the sunset time during that period.

During the flow testing operations, the site will be operational over 24 hours and may require some minor night time lighting of the working areas; however, minimal human activity is expected during this time so lighting requirements are likely to be very temporary and brief and impacts upon bats would be negligible. To minimise the potential disturbance to bats during these periods of 24 hour working all operational areas of the drilling platform will be lit with task-based lighting e.g. SMC TL90 lighting towers, which will be inward facing to avoid light spill to areas outside of the works footprint and therefore minimising the potential for negative impacts to bats. Lighting cowls should be utilised to further reduce light spillage to areas outside of the works footprint. This is particularly important for bat species that are less tolerant of artificial light such as *Myotis* species which were frequently encountered during the site surveys so are known to use the habitats surrounding the works footprint.

4.3.3 Monitoring Surveys

The site is surrounded by habitat suitable for commuting and foraging bats. There is potential for disturbance to bats if the works are left unmitigated. Therefore, depending on the time of year when works are scheduled to take place, an appropriate a monitoring strategy will be devised. During winter months bat activity would be low therefore monitoring would not be appropriate.

However, if the works are scheduled during the summer months (April to October inclusive) then an appropriate monitoring plan should be devised to determine if the development is having adverse impacts on local bat populations, in accordance with condition 17 of planning approval WSCC/040/17/BA. These monitoring surveys will be undertaken in accordance with best practice guidelines, one per season in the bat active months (April to October inclusive). One survey will be undertaken in spring, One in summer and one in Autumn. If, through the results of these surveys, it is thought that there is an adverse effect to local bat populations arising as a result of the development, then it will be reported to the relevant site operators and the Minerals Planning Authority. Mitigation works would need to be implemented immediately to reduce these impacts where applicable.

4.3.4 Enclosed Flare

An enclosed flare with a maximum height of 13.7 m will be located on the site as this is an essential part of the testing equipment and is necessary to burn off any associated gas produced during the seven-day flow testing period.

The flare will be situated within the stone drilling platform fenced compound which offers negligible potential for foraging and commuting bats which will likely utilise the habitats surrounding the works footprint. Additionally, this area will also be lit during the testing phase which will further dissuade bats from entering the working footprint. This combination of factors will limit the potential for bats to be disturbed by the light produced by the flare. The potential impact of the flare on bat species in the area is therefore deemed to be negligible.

5 REFERENCES



- ABR Ecology (2018). *Lower Stumble Exploration Site, Balcombe – Bat Activity Report*. ABR Ecology Ltd.
- Collins, J. (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practise Guidelines (3rd edn)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Davidson-Watts, I. & Jones, G., (2006). Differences in foraging behaviour between *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* (Schreber, 1774) and *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* (Leach, 1825). *Journal of Zoology*, 268 (1), pp.55-62.
- Eisenbeis, G. (2006) *Artificial night lighting and insects: attraction of insects to streetlamps in a rural setting in Germany. In Ecological consequences of artificial night lighting* (eds Rich, C. & Longcore, T.), pp. 281-304. Island Press, Washington.
- Mackie, I.J. & Racey, P.A., (2007). Habitat use varies with reproductive state in Noctule bats (*Nyctalus noctula*): implications for conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 140(1), pp.70-77.
- Racey, P.A. & Swift, S.M. (1985) *Feeding ecology of Pipistrellus pipistrellus (Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae) during pregnancy and lactation. I. Foraging Behaviour*. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 54, 205-215.
- RSK, (2019). 858544 – *Lower Stumble Exploration Site, Balcombe – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report*. RSK Environment Ltd.
- RSK, (2017). 857001 – *Lower Stumble Exploration Site, Balcombe – Bat Survey Report*. RSK Environment Ltd.
- Russ, J.M., Briffa, M. & Montgomery, W.I., (2003). *Seasonal patterns in activity and habitat use by bats (Pipistrellus spp. and Nyctalus leisleri) in Northern Ireland, determined using a driven transect*. *Journal of Zoology*, 259 (3), pp.289-299.
- Stone, E.L. (ed.) (2013) *Bats and Lighting: Overview of Current Evidence and Mitigation*. Bats and Lighting Research Project, University of Bristol.
- van Langevelde, F., Ettema, J.A., Donners, M., WallisDeVries, M.F. & Groenendijk, D. (2011) *Effect of spectral composition of artificial light on the attraction of moths*. *Biological Conservation*, 144, 2274-2281.

6 FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site location plan

Figure 2 – Bat transect route and SM2 location

Figure 3 – Transect results map, August 2019



Site boundary

Survey Area

00	11.09.19	858544
Rev	Date	Description
Balcombe		

Figure 1

Site Location Plan

0

300

Metres

Scale = 1:10,000 @ A3

N

W

E

S

REV 00



Site boundary

Survey area

Transect route and stop points

Static bat detector location

00	11.09.19	858544
Rev	Date	Description
Balcombe		

Figure 2
Bat Transect Route and SM2 Location

030

metres

Scale = 1:1,000 @ A3

N

W

E

S

REV 00

Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database right 2019

bing © 2019 Microsoft Corporation © 2019 DigitalGlobe © CNES (2019) Distribution Airbus DS

File Name : U:\Ecology\857000s\857001 - Cuadrilla Balcombe PEA\07 - GIS



Site boundary

Survey area

Transect route and stop points

Common Pipistrelle Bat

Soprano Pipistrelle Bat

Myotis Bat Species

00	11.09.19	858544
Rev	Date	Description
Balcombe		

Figure 3

Transect Results

August 2019

0

30

metres

Scale = 1:1,000 @ A3

N

E

S

W

REV 00

7 APPENDIX 1 – BAT LEGISLATION

All species of British bat are protected by The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) extended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This legislation makes it an offence to:

- intentionally kill, injure or take a bat;
- possess or control a bat;
- intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to a bat roost; and
- intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat whilst it occupies a bat roost.
- Bats are also European Protected Species listed on The Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended). This legislation makes it an offence to:
 - deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat;
 - deliberately disturb a bat (in such a way as to be likely to significantly affect: (i) the ability of a significant group of bats to survive, breed or rear/nurture their young; or (ii) the local distribution or abundance of the species concerned);
 - damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat; and
 - possess, control, transport, sell, exchange a bat, or offer a bat for sale or exchange.

All bat roosting sites receive legal protection even when bats are not present.

Where it is necessary to carry out an action that could result in an offence under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) it is possible to apply for a European Protected Species (EPS) licence from Natural England. Licences are only issued where Natural England are satisfied that there is no satisfactory alternative, works are for overriding reasons of public interest and that the favourable conservation status of bat populations will not be detrimentally affected.