



Victoria Cottage Hospital

Bat Survey Report



NHS Property Services

July 2019

The Pavilion, 1st Floor, Botleigh Grange Office Campus, Hedge End, Southampton, Hampshire, SO30 2AF

Tel: 0123 456 789

Email: ecology@wyg.com



Document Control

Project: Victoria Cottage Hospital
 Client: NHS Property Services
 Job Number: A110328
 File Origin: N:\Projects\Projects A110000 on\A110328 Victoria Cottage Hospital\REPORTS

Issue 1	ISSUE DATE	FINAL
Prepared by:		Lynn Spencer ACIEEM Project Ecologist
Checked By:		Jonathan Jackson CEnv MCIEEM Principal Ecologist
Verified By:		David West CEnv MCIEEM Associate Ecologist

Rev:	Date:	Updated by:	Verified by:	Description of changes:

WYG Environment Planning Transport Ltd. accept no responsibility or liability for the use which is made of this document other than by the Client for the purpose for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.



Contents

Executive Summary	1
Glossary	2
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Site Location	3
1.3 Development Proposals	3
1.4 Existing Site Information	3
1.5 Purpose of the Surveys	3
2.0 Methodology	4
2.1 Field Surveys	4
2.2 Valuing On-Site Bat Population	4
2.3 Limitations	5
3.0 Planning Policy & Legislation	6
3.1 Revised National Planning Policy Framework	6
3.2 Legislation	7
4.0 Results	8
4.1 Timings and Weather Conditions for Nocturnal Bat Surveys	8
4.2 Bat Emergence / Return of Buildings	8
5.0 Recommendations and Mitigation	10
5.1 Effects on Roosting Bats	10
5.2 Mitigation of Effects on Roosting Bats	10
5.3 Other Effects and Mitigation Measures	12
5.4 Enhancement	12
5.5 Recommendations for Further Work	13
6.0 References	14

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Site Location Plan

Figure 2 – Dusk Emergence Survey 1 Results

Figure 3 – Dawn Return Survey Results

Appendix A – Report Conditions



Executive Summary

Contents	Summary
Site Location	The site is located within the village of Emsworth, (Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference SU 74894 05934). The survey area comprises a vacant late-Victorian building with a number of more recent single-story extensions. Areas of hardstanding are present around the building and an area of garden with a summer house, shed and associated flower beds, trees and lawn.
Proposals	The development proposals for the site are not known.
Existing Site Information	An Ecological Appraisal (WYG, 2018) identified a number of areas of loose and broken tiles that offer potential roosting locations for bats and, as a result of this, the building was assessed as having <i>high suitability</i> for roosting bats.
Scope of this Survey(s)	Three dusk emergence and dawn return surveys were completed to establish the presence or likely absence of bat roosts within the building.
Results	During the surveys the building was found to support a bat roost comprising one soprano pipistrelle. This was located on the western aspect of the main building. One soprano pipistrelle was recorded emerging from the building during the first dusk emergence survey one soprano pipistrelle was recorded returning to the building during the dawn return survey.
Recommendations	The proposals are likely to affect a bat roost (directly or indirectly) and so a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) must be obtained from Natural England (NE) to allow work to proceed. The EPSML will contain a method statement detailing how bats themselves will be protected during works and how the loss of a roost will be compensated for. Measures to enhance the site for bats in relation to planting and a sensitive lighting strategy have been presented.



Glossary

BCT	Bat Conservation Trust
BRM	Breathable roof membranes
CEnv	Chartered Environmentalist
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management
EPSML	European Protected Species Mitigation Licence
Habitat Regulations	Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017
MCIEEM	Member of Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management
NE	Natural England
NERC Act	Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

WYG was commissioned by NHS Property Services to undertake bat emergence surveys on the site known as Victoria Cottage Hospital. The location of the site is shown on Figure 1.

This report has been prepared by Project Ecologist Lynn Spencer ACIEEM. The conditions pertinent to the report have been provided in Appendix A.

1.2 Site Location

The site is located within the village of Emsworth in Hampshire and is centred at Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference SU 74894 05934. The surveyed building within the site is shown on Figure 1 and comprises a vacant late-Victorian building with a number of more recent single-story extensions. Areas of hardstanding are present around the building and an area of garden with a summer house, shed and associated flower beds, trees and lawn.

1.3 Development Proposals

No proposals were available at the time of writing, but we have assumed that the bat roost that the building was found to support will be lost.

1.4 Existing Site Information

WYG undertook an Ecological Appraisal of the site in October 2018 (WYG, 2018) which identified that the building had high suitability to support roosting bats, in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust Guideline classifications (Collins, 2016).

It was therefore recommended that three surveys comprising two dusk emergence and one dawn return survey were undertaken, with at least two of the surveys to be undertaken between May and August. This survey effort and timing was recommended to be in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines (Collins, 2016).

1.5 Purpose of the Surveys

The purpose of the surveys was to:

- Identify if the building supports roosting bats;
- Classify the value of any roost found;
- Identify any ecological constraints related to bats that could affect the development proposals; and
- Summarise the potential for mitigation and enhance for the site for bats.



2.0 Methodology

2.1 Field Surveys

The building was surveyed three times which complies with BCT guidelines (Collins, 2016) for a building with high suitability. These dates were:

- Dusk emergence survey 1 on 9th May 2019
- Dusk emergence survey 2 on 28th May 2019
- Dawn return survey on 28th June 2019

Five surveyors were positioned around the building during each survey so that all potential bat access points or roosting features could be observed. Positions of surveyors around the building are shown on Figures 2 and 3. Surveyors used an Elekon Batlogger (full spectrum) to record bat calls as well as watching for emerging or returning bats.

The dusk emergence surveys commenced 30 minutes before sunset and lasted for 90 minutes after sunset. The dawn return survey commenced 90 minutes before sunrise and ended 15 minutes after sunrise.

2.2 Valuing On-Site Bat Population

The assessment of the value of the bat population on site is based on the article in the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (IEEM) In Practice magazine – *Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment*, No. 70, December 2010 (Wray *et al.* 2010). Where bats (species and number) are found using certain habitats (to roost, commute or forage) their population is assigned a relative ecological value. The value to the species is partly based upon how well used a habitat is and upon how rare the bat species is. Once the value of the bat population has been calculated, robust mitigation for any impact on the bats can be determined.

British bat species have been subdivided into groups, dependant on how common they are (common, rarer and rarest). These have been further subdivided based upon the location surveyed. Table 1 presents the rarity categorisation of bats in England. The tables in the following sections have been adapted from *Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment* (Wray *et al.* 2010).

Table 1: Categorising bats by distribution and rarity in England

Rarest	Rarer	Common
Greater horseshoe Bechstein's Alcathoe Greater mouse-eared Barbastelle Grey long-eared	Lesser horseshoe Whiskered Brandt's Daubenton's Natterer's Leisler's Noctule Nathusius' pipistrelle Serotine	Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle Brown long-eared



The value assigned for rarity is combined with the type of roost found to give a value for bats as an ecological receptor, as detailed in Table 2.

Table 2 Valuing Bat Roosts

Geographic Frame of Reference	Roost Types
District, Local or Parish	Feeding perches (common species) Individual bats (common species) Small number of non-breeding bats (common species) Mating sites (common species)
County	Maternity sites (common species) Small number of hibernating bats (common and rarer species) Feeding perches (rarer / rarest species) Individual bats (rarer / rarest species) Small numbers of non-breeding bats (rarer / rarest species)
Regional	Mating sites (rarer / rarest species) including well-used swarming sites Maternity sites (rarer species) Hibernation sites (rarest species) Significant hibernation sites for rarer/rarest species or all species assemblages
National / UK	Maternity sites (rarest species) Sites meeting Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) guidelines
International	Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) sites

2.3 Limitations

The details of this report will remain valid for a period of **two years** from the date of the survey, after which the validity of this assessment should be reviewed to determine whether further updates are necessary. Note that the recommendations within this report should be reviewed (and reassessed if necessary) should there be any changes to the red line boundary or development proposals which this report was based on.



3.0 Planning Policy & Legislation

3.1 Revised National Planning Policy Framework

The revised NPPF was issued on 19th February 2019 (Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, 2019) and currently supplements government Circular 06/2005, *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System* (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), 2005).

Circular 06/2005 states that the presence of protected species is a material consideration in the planning process. Paragraph 107 of the NPPF also states that:

"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)*
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland*
- c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate*
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures*
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and*
- f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate."*

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;*
- b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;*
- c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and*



- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity."*

3.2 Legislation

British bat species are listed in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HMSO, 1981) and under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (HMSO, 2017) as European protected species. Furthermore, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (Schedule 12, Paragraph 5) (HMSO, 2000) has amended Section 9 of the 1981 Act.

This makes it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill any bat;
- Deliberately disturb bats, in particular where it is likely to:
 - Impair their ability to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young;
 - Impair their ability to hibernate or migrate; or
 - Affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of bats.
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct the access to the place of shelter or protection; and
- Damage or destroy a bats breeding site or resting place.

The effects of development proposals should be considered when assessing the impact of the maintenance of favorable conservation status of local bat populations, especially those mentioned under Section 41 of the NERC Act (HMSO, 2006). The presence of these species is a material consideration in determining a planning application and it is therefore appropriate for the LPA to ensure that these species are not adversely affected by development.



4.0 Results

4.1 Timings and Weather Conditions for Nocturnal Bat Surveys

Table 3 shows the survey dates, times and weather conditions recorded during each of the surveys.

Table 3 Survey Dates and Weather Conditions

Date	Dusk/Dawn Time	Survey Times	Survey Start Weather Conditions	Survey End Weather Conditions
Survey 1 09/05/19 Dusk emergence	20:35	20:05 to 22:05	Temperature: 14°C Cloud cover: 40% Precipitation: None Wind: 3	Temperature: 10°C Cloud cover: 30% Precipitation: None Wind: 1
Survey 2 28/05/19 Dusk emergence	20:35	20:05 to 22:05	Temperature: 14.8°C Cloud cover: 30% Precipitation: None Wind: 0	Temperature: 13.7°C Cloud cover: 100% Precipitation: None Wind: 0
Survey 3 28/06/19 Dawn return	04:52	03:22 to 05:07	Temperature: 16°C Cloud cover: 0% Precipitation: None Wind: 2	Temperature: 14°C Cloud cover: 0% Precipitation: None Wind: 0

4.2 Bat Emergence / Return of Buildings

4.2.1 Survey 1 Dusk emergence – 09/05/19

One soprano pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the building. The bat was observed emerging from a western elevation from a crevice behind a missing tile. The location of the feature / access point is shown on Figure 2 and Plate 1. The bat emerged 36 minutes after sunset at 21:11. No other emergences by bats were recorded.

During the surveys, small numbers of common and soprano pipistrelles were recorded foraging and occasionally commuting around the building.

Plate 1: Location of bat roost



4.2.2 Survey 2 Dusk emergence – 28/05/19

No bats were recorded emerging from the building.

During the surveys, small numbers of common and soprano pipistrelles were recorded foraging and occasionally commuting around the building.

4.2.3 Survey 3 Dawn Return – 28/06/19

One pipistrelle was recorded flying towards the building from the west in the direction and vicinity of the feature that was found to support a soprano pipistrelle during Survey 1. This is shown in Figure 3. This did not reappear and was not observed by any of the other surveyors and so is believed to have re-entered the building. This was at 03:57, 55 minutes before sunrise.

During the surveys, small numbers of common and soprano pipistrelles were recorded foraging and occasionally commuting around the building.



5.0 Recommendations and Mitigation

5.1 Effects on Roosting Bats

The surveys found that the building supports single soprano pipistrelle. Based on the small size of the roost (supporting only a single individual during the maternity period) it is considered that it is most likely a day roost. Based on the Wray *et al.* (2010) method, the roost considered to be of district, local or parish value (low numbers of a common species).

Any works to the building which result in direct (such as removal) or indirect (such as obstructing access) effects to the roost could result in a breach of the legislation that bats are afforded. This is because in absence of mitigation, bats could be injured, killed or disturbed, and bat roosts (even when not occupied) are afforded legal protection. Therefore, if the proposals will affect the roost, then a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence will need to be obtained from Natural England.

The licence application will need to include proposals to mitigate any adverse effects identified as a result of the proposed works. This could include the provision of alternative roosting opportunities nearby to mitigate for the loss of the day roost and best practice working methods to minimise impacts on roosting bats. An application for an EPSML can only be submitted once full planning permission is received and all planning conditions relevant to wildlife have been discharged.

All survey, mitigation and development information must be included in the licence application to be submitted to NE for determination. A licence can only be granted:

"... for the purpose of 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, to allow people to carry out activities which would otherwise be illegal".

Please note NE take a minimum of 30 working days to determine a licence application. Once the licence has been obtained, it will allow the demolition of the building to proceed which would otherwise be classed as an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HMSO, 1981) and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (HMSO, 2017).

5.2 Mitigation of Effects on Roosting Bats

5.2.1 The Derogation of EPS Licensing

The species protection provisions of the Habitats Directive, as implemented by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (HMSO, 2017), contain three "derogation tests" which must be applied by the LPA prior to granting planning permission and again by Natural England when deciding whether to grant a licence to a person carrying out an activity which would harm a European Protected Species (such as bats). For development activities the licence is normally obtained after planning permission has been obtained. The three tests are that:

- the activity to be licenced must be for the purpose of preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest;
- there must be no satisfactory alternative; and
- the favourable conservation status of the species must be maintained.



Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest

In order to meet the purpose of preserving public interest it would be expected that a clear benefit to the general public is demonstrated. This criterion will be argued by the planning consultant in their supporting documents.

No Satisfactory Alternative

In order to qualify under this criterion, it will be necessary to provide a strong and robust argument that any other solution to the identified need is not satisfactory. It will be necessary to demonstrate the lack of alternative development sites and lack of alternative design. This argument should be proportionate to the impact (the loss of a low conservation significance roost for individual soprano pipistrelle) (Mitchell-Jones, 2004).

Favourable Conservation Status

A derogation of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (i.e. action permitted under an EPSML that would otherwise be unlawful) must not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

Without mitigation, we have assumed that the development will result in the permanent loss of a day roost in the building for a soprano pipistrelle. The loss of such roosts is unlikely to be significant to the favourable conservation status of these species. However, small roosts are still important (which is why they are protected as much as larger roosts) to bat conservation and population dynamics. Therefore, mitigating features have been recommended to reduce the risk of contributing to wider scale cumulative impacts to conservation status.

With the provision of mitigation (as outlined in the following sections), it is anticipated that the bat populations (currently estimated to be individuals) would remain constant following completion of the mitigation works. Although the short-term mitigation (i.e. installation of bat boxes) is unlikely to provide a significantly positive enhancement to enable an increase in the favourable conservation status of bat species in the area, it is considered to be sufficient to maintain the existing favourable status of bats in the immediate vicinity.

5.2.2 Protection Measures for Bats during Roost Demolition

Prior to the commencement of works, a toolbox talk would be given to contractors to disseminate the method statement. This talk will include information on the bats roosting on site, bat signs and what to do if bats are found during works.

The buildings are considered to have negligible potential to support hibernating bats and therefore the building can be demolished throughout the year once the EPSML has been granted. Although it is recommended that works are to be undertaken during spring or autumn. Works conducted during these time periods are not expected to have as great of an adverse effect on the survival of any bats potentially located within the building. Removal of potential roosting features will take place by hand or with hand tools under the supervision of a suitably experienced and licenced ecologist. Once all features with the potential to support roosting bats have been removed, the remaining demolition will take place.

Any bats found during works, if active (i.e. not torpid) and in temperatures are above 5°C, will be given a health check and relocated to a bat box put up on a retained building or tree on site. The bat



box would be retained in perpetuity once the construction phase of any proposal is completed. If an injured bat is found it they will be taken to the nearest bat hospital. Should a torpid bat be encountered it would be taken to an appropriate bat carer until a period of suitable weather conditions to be released on site.

5.2.3 Compensation for Roost Loss

The bat day roost present which would be lost would need to be compensated for by the inclusion of two integral bat tubes (Schwegler 1FR or similar) within the fabric of one of the new buildings on site in addition to the bat box on a retained building or tree.

5.2.4 Habitat Replacement

It is recommended that where possible existing boundaries and boundary habitats are retained to provide linear features for commuting and foraging bats.

It is recommended that a diverse collection of native planting is incorporated into the landscaping design within the proposed development site. Structurally diverse vegetation and inclusion of native evening-blooming plants will attract insects which in turn will help to enhance the site for foraging bats.

5.3 Other Effects and Mitigation Measures

5.3.1 Lighting

Artificial lighting can have an adverse effect on bats and measures are recommended to avoid or reduce this impact. It is recommended that lighting on the development site comprise LED lamps, with a low colour correlated temperature – preferably below 3500K (warm white). Lighting should be directed groundward to avoid upward light spillage, with hoods / shields as necessary. Light spill on boundary features to be used by commuting bats should be a maximum of 1lux (ILP, 2018).

5.3.2 Breathable Roof Membranes

In new buildings, best practice should be considered and the use of breathable roof membranes BRM avoided. Instead, Type 1F bitumen and hessian under-felt should be considered as an alternative. Ongoing research has confirmed that no BRM are bat-friendly and all pose a risk to bats. As the membranes wear over time the fibres in the membrane become loose. Bats become entangled in the fibres and, unable to escape, dehydrate, and starve to death.

As well as posing a risk to bats, BRMs are also degraded by bats and the efficiency of the membrane is impaired (i.e. the use of BRMs in situations where bats are present is detrimental to the efficient functioning of the BRM as well as to bats. Further detail is provided in Waring *et al.* (2013).

5.4 Enhancement

Whilst enhancement is not a legal requirement, it is encouraged on site as it helps to meet the government objectives for planning to protect and enhance biodiversity, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

It is recommended that a diverse collection of native planting is incorporated into the landscaping design within the proposed development site. Structurally diverse vegetation and inclusion of native



evening-blooming plants will attract insects which in turn will help to enhance the site for foraging bats (Bat Conservation Trust, 2015). Planting of 'bat-friendly' plants have the potential to enhance the site for bats.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Work

If the proposed development does not proceed within the next two years (i.e. May 2021) it is recommended that a review of the site conditions is undertaken to determine whether updated surveys are necessary. This will help to establish if bat activity and roost status have changed in the interim period and to inform future mitigation measures, if necessary. Please note that surveys to support an EPSML application must be completed within 12 months of the application.



6.0 References

- Bat Conservation Trust, (2015), *Encouraging bats: A guide for bat-friendly gardening and living*, [online] Available at http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/encouraging_bats.html, Accessed July 2019.
- Collins, J. (ed.), (2016), *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines*, 3rd ed. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- HMSO, (1981), *Wildlife and Countryside Act*, [online] Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69>, Accessed July 2019.
- HMSO, (2006), *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act*, [online] Available at <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/contents>, Accessed July 2019.
- HMSO, (2017), *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations*, [online] Available at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/1012/contents/made>, Accessed July 2019.
- ILP, (2018), Guidance note 8 *Bats and artificial lighting in the UK*, [online] Available at <https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/>, Accessed July 2019.
- Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, (2019), *National Planning Policy Framework*, [online] Available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/728643/Revised_NPPF_2018.pdf, Accessed July 2019.
- Mitchell-Jones, A.J., (2004), *Bat mitigation guidelines*, Version January 2004, English Nature: Peterborough.
- Waring, S. D., Essah, E. A., Gunnell, K., Bonser, R. H. C., (2013), Double jeopardy: The potential for problems when bats interact with breathable roofing membranes in the United Kingdom, *Architecture and environment*, 1(1):1-13.
- Wray, S., Wells, D., Long, E. and Mitchell-Jones, T., (2010), Valuing bats in ecological impact assessment, *In Practice*, No 70, pp 22-25.
- WYG, (2018), *Ecological Appraisal*, Report on behalf of NHS Property Services, Project No. A110328.



FIGURES



Rev	Date	Notes
A	17/10/18	Initial map production

Legend

Site boundary

0 50 100 200 Metres



Site Location Plan

**Victoria Cottage Hospital
NHS Property Services**

Scale at A3: 1:5,000	Project No: A110328	Drawing No: Figure 1	Revision: A
Drawn by: Ben Blowers	Drawn date: 17/10/2018	Approved by: John Simper	

Contains Ordnance Survey Data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. © Northern Ireland Environment Agency.
Open Government Data reproduced contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0
Other Credits: Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2018

03/05/2025 Southwark\A110328_Victoria Cottage Hospital NHS Property Services_Site Location Plan_171018.mxd



Rev	Date	Notes
A	22/07/19	Initial map production

Legend

- Site boundary
- Common pipistrelle
- Emergence
- Surveyor position

0 2.5 5 10 Metres



Dusk Emergence Survey 1

Victoria Cottage Hospital
NHS Property Services

Scale at A3: 1:250	Project No: A110328	Drawing No: Figure 2	Revision: A
Drawn by: Maddie Errington	Drawn date: 22/07/2019	Approved by: Jonathan Jackson	

Contains Ordnance Survey Data © Crown copyright and database right 2019. © Natural England © Northern Ireland Environment Agency.
Open Government Data reproduced contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v2.0
Other Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Rev	Date	Notes
A	22/07/19	Initial map production

Legend

- Site boundary
- Common pipistrelle
- Re-entry
- S Surveyor position

0 2.5 5 10 Metres



Dawn Re-entry Survey

Victoria Cottage Hospital
NHS Property Services

Scale at A3: 1:250	Project No: A110328	Drawing No: Figure 3	Revision: A
Drawn by: Maddie Errington	Drawn date: 22/07/2019	Approved by: Jonathan Jackson	

Contains Ordnance Survey Data © Crown copyright and database right 2019. © Natural England © Northern Ireland Environment Agency.
Open Government Data reproduced contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v2.0
Other Credits: Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community



Appendix A – Report Conditions



REPORT CONDITIONS

This Report has been prepared using reasonable skill and care for the sole benefit of NHS Property Services ("the Client") for the proposed uses stated in the report by WYG Environment Planning Transport Limited ("WYG"). WYG exclude all liability for any other uses and to any other party. The report must not be relied on or reproduced in whole or in part by any other party without the copyright holder's permission.

No liability is accepted or warranty given for; unconfirmed data, third party documents and information supplied to WYG or for the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report. WYG does not purport to provide specialist legal, tax or accounting advice.

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections'. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. No investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather-related conditions. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions. The "shelf life" of the Report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client's instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

The whole of the report must be read as other sections of the report may contain information which puts into context the findings in any executive summary.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. WYG accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.



ecology@wyg.com

**WYG Environment Planning Transport
Limited.**

Registered in England & Wales Number:
3050297

Registered Office: Arndale Court, Headingley,
Leeds, LS6 2UJ



creative minds safe hands