Light Valley Solar

Environmental Statement Volume 3

Appendix 6.4: Bat Report

Document Reference: EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.06.04

November 2026

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN0110012
APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Light Valley Solar

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Light Valley Solar

DCO Submission

Appendix 6.4: Bat Report

Regulation Reference	APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Case Reference	EN0110012
Application Document Reference	EN0110012/APP/ LVS/06.03.06.04
Author	Light Valley Solar Limited

Version	Date	Status of Version
1.0	February 2026	DCO Submission
2.0	September 2026	DCO Deadline 2 Submission
3.0	November 2026	DCO Deadline 4 Submission

Contents

1 Introduction and context 1
1.1 Site background 1
1.2 Quality control 2
2 Methodology 3
2.2 Desk study 3
2.3 Daytime bat walkover survey 3
2.4 Nighttime bat walkover 4
2.5 Automated static detector deployment 8
2.6 GLTA 13
2.7 Emergence Surveys 15
3 Results 20~~19~~
3.1 Desk study 20~~19~~
3.2 Daytime bat walkover 20~~19~~
3.3 Nighttime bat walkover 22~~21~~
3.4 Automated static detector deployment 30~~29~~
3.5 GLTA 41~~40~~
3.6 Emergence Surveys 59~~50~~
4 Conclusion 60~~51~~
References 63~~53~~

List of tables

Table 2-1 Flight Path and Foraging Habitats Assessment Criteria- Adapted from Collins, 2023 (Ref 4) 4
Table 2-2 NBW - Weather Conditions and Details 6
Table 2-3 Static Detector Months Deployed for Sites 1-4* 9
Table 2-4 Static Detector Seasons Deployed for Sites 6-8* 10
Table 2-5 Static Survey Metadata 10
Table 2-6 Assessment of Tree Suitability Criteria - adapted from Collings, 2023 15~~14~~
Table 3-1 NBW Species Count Per Transect 22~~21~~
Table 3-2 Percentage of Each Bat Species Recorded During NBWs 25~~24~~
Table 3-3 Location 1- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 30~~29~~
Table 3-4 Location 2- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 30~~29~~
Table 3-5 Location 3- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits) 31~~30~~
Table 3-6 Location 4 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 31~~30~~
Table 3-7 Location 5 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 31~~30~~
Table 3-8 Location 6 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 32~~31~~
Table 3-9 Location 7 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 33~~32~~
Table 3-10 Location 8 – percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 34~~33~~
Table 3-11 Location 9 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 35~~34~~
Table 3-12 Location 10 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 35~~34~~
Table 3-13 Location 11 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 35~~34~~
Table 3-14 Location 12 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 36~~35~~

Table 3-15 Location 13 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits) 36~~35~~
Table 3-16 Location 14 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits) 36~~35~~
Table 3-17 Location 15 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 38~~37~~
Table 3-18 Location 16 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 38~~37~~
Table 3-19 Location 17 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 38~~37~~
Table 3-20 Location 18 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 38~~37~~
Table 3-21 Location 19 – percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 39~~38~~
Table 3-22 Location 20 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 40~~39~~
Table 3-23 Location 21 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 40~~39~~
Table 3-24 Location 22 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys 41~~40~~
Table 3-25 Description of PRF-M and PRF-I tress following GLTA 43~~42~~

1 Introduction and context

1.1 Site background

1.1.1 This bat survey report has been produced by Tyler Grange Limited on behalf of Light Valley Solar Limited ('the Applicant') and relates to the Proposed Development of solar photovoltaic (PV) modules, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated infrastructure.

1.1.2 The Proposed Development's boundary, herein referred to as the Order Limits, is made up of four broad areas, the Solar Development Sites (900 ha), Cable Route Corridor (328.5 ha), Highways Improvements Areas (17.1 ha), and Solar Development Site 8 Access (24.1 ha). Underground electric cables laid within the Cable Route Corridor will connect the Solar Development Sites and the existing Monk Fryston Substation, where the Proposed Development will connect to the National Grid. The Highways Improvement Areas are sections of the highway network that will contain localised improvements to allow movement of construction vehicles on narrower sections of the local highway network, such as improvements to the road edge, traffic management, and provision of temporary passing places or visibility splays. The Solar Development Site 8 Access area will provide optionality to access Solar Development Site 8 from the north. The entirety of the Order Limits is within the administrative area of North Yorkshire Council and falls within what was Selby district.

1.1.3 The Solar Development Sites are split across a total of seven separate land parcels (Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8) as presented in Figure 2.1: Illustrative Site Layout Plans (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.01**] and in the Outline Environmental Masterplan [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/02.12**]. The Solar Development Sites comprise parcels of agricultural fields bound by hedgerows, ditches, and some mature trees, with small areas of woodland, grassland and scrub. The Cable Route Corridor is similarly comprised of agricultural fields and associated boundary features and passes through the River Ouse and Selby Dam. The Highways Improvements Areas, and Solar Development Site 8 Access largely comprise hardstanding roads and adjacent habitats, with Solar Development Site 8 Access also including a crossing over Selby Dam.

1.1.4 Within the report, the Cable Route Corridor (CRC), Highways Improvements Areas, and Solar Development Site 8 Access are collectively referred to as "Order Limits Outside of the Solar Development Sites".

1.1.5 Solar Development Sites 1-4 have been subject to a Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW), Nighttime Bat Walkover (NBW) and automated static detector deployment in 2024, and Solar Development Sites 6-8 were subject to the same surveys in 2025, the results of which are presented within this report.

1.1.6 As set out in Chapter 2: The Proposed Development (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.01.02**] and the Design Parameters and Commitments Document [**E110012/APP/LVS/05.06**], the Order Limits Outside of the Solar

Development Sites have been sited to avoid important bat commuting and foraging features such as ponds, woodlands and trees, and will utilise existing road and crossing points in hedgerows and ditches where practicable. Furthermore, the habitat surveys completed for the Order Limits Outside of the Solar Development Sites (Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.06.01**]) confirm the majority of the area comprises arable fields or hardstanding roads, which provide sub-optimal commuting and foraging habitat for bats. Additionally, the works within the Order Limits Outside of the Solar Development Sites will be small scale and temporary, with any vegetation removal reinstated within two years of the start of works. For these reasons, impacts to commuting and foraging bats within the Order Limits Outside of the Solar Development Sites are anticipated to be very low/negligible and therefore, NBWs and static detector deployment have not been completed for the Order Limits Outside of the Solar Development Sites. This approach was agreed with North Yorkshire Council (see Table 6-8 within Chapter 6: Biodiversity (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APS/LVS/06.01.06**]).

1.1.7 No buildings are located within the Order Limits that could support roosting bats, and the Design Principles have aimed to retain and buffer all trees within the Order Limits where practicable. However, as detailed in the Arboriculture Impact Assessment (Appendix 16.2 (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**]), a number of scattered trees, some lengths of treelines and two/three trees within a woodland copse require removal to facilitate the Proposed Development. These trees were subject to a Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) in January 2026, and where required, nocturnal emergence surveys in May to July 2026, the results of which are presented within this report.

1.1.8 A Change Application was submitted during Examination, resulting in 11 additional trees and two treelines potentially requiring removal/pruning to facilitate the Proposed Development. A GLTA of these additional trees was completed in September and October 2026, the results of which are presented within this report. However, due to seasonal constraints, any required further bats surveys on these additional trees could not be completed before the end of the Examination period. The further bat surveys will be undertaken in a suitable surveying season prior to the start of works to confirm whether bats use the PRFs within these trees to roost.

1.2 Quality control

1.2.1 All ecologists at Tyler Grange Group Limited are members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) or are working towards membership, and act under the direction of members and abide by the Institute's Code of Professional Conduct (Ref 1).

2 Methodology

2.1.1 The surveys followed standard methodologies set out in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Ref 2) the Bat Workers Manual (Ref 3) and Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists- Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition (Ref 4) and comprised:

1) DBW– Walkover of the Solar Development Sites to assess potential for bat activity including foraging areas and potential commuting routes;
2) NBW – to assess the species assemblage present at the Solar Development Sites and to identify significant commuting routes and foraging locations;
3) Automated static detector deployment – to supplement the NBWs by leaving static bat detectors within the Solar Development Sites to record for five consecutive nights per month or season; and
4) Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) – Ground level inspection of trees within the Order Limits (to be removed/pruned to facilitate the Proposed Development) in an aim to assess the potential of these trees to support roosting bats.
5) Bat emergence surveys of PRF-M trees (having roosting suitability for multiple bats) that may be removed to facilitate the Proposed Development – Completion of emergence surveys to identify any current bat roosts within these trees.

2.2 Desk study

2.2.1 In March 2025, desk study data was received from North and East Yorkshire Ecological Data Centre (NEYEDC) for protected species groups, including bats, for up to 2 km from the Order Limits for the past 10 years.

2.3 Daytime bat walkover survey

2.3.1 Initially in 2024, Solar Development Sites 1-4 were assessed precautionarily for their suitability for commuting and foraging bats using desk study records and aerial imagery, to not miss the start of the bat surveying season. A DBW was then undertaken alongside the UK Habitats surveys completed in 2024 to confirm the initial assessment. Please refer to the Habitats Report (Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.06.01**]) for details of the habitat surveys including dates and surveyor qualifications. The DBW assessed habitats within Solar Development Sites 1-4 for the likelihood of use by foraging and commuting bats as detailed in Table 2-1 below.

2.3.2 A DBW was also completed for Solar Development Sites 6-8 during the UK Habitat surveys in May 2025. Please refer to the Habitats Report (Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.06.01]**) for details of the habitat surveys including dates and surveyor qualifications.

Table 2-1 Flight Path and Foraging Habitats Assessment Criteria- Adapted from Collins, 2023 (Ref 4)

Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight-lines or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flight-paths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.
Low	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight-paths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flight-paths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flight-paths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

Limitations of daytime bat walkover

2.3.3 No limitations were experienced during the DBWs.

2.4 Nighttime bat walkover

2.4.1 In 2024, Solar Development Sites 1-4 were assessed as providing moderate suitability for commuting and foraging bats, on a precautionarily basis, using desk study records and aerial imagery, as not to miss the start of the bat surveying season (DBW later confirmed Solar Development Site 1 retained the assessment of moderate, however Solar Development Site 2-4 were reduced to low suitability for commuting and foraging bats. See Section 3.2 below for reasoning). In 2025, Solar Development Sites 6-8 were assessed providing low suitability for commuting and foraging bats following the DBW.

2.4.2 As such, NBWs were completed at Solar Development Sites 1-4 based on habitats of moderate suitability for bats between April and October 2024, and Solar Development Sites 6-8 based on habitats of low suitability for bats between April and October 2025. All sites required one survey visit per season (spring-April/May, summer-June to August, and autumn-September/October), as per best practice guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3, and Ref 4).

2.4.3 The surveys aimed to record the bat species present and to determine the importance of any habitat features for foraging and/or commuting bats. Nine transects were required once per season (spring, summer and autumn) to survey Solar Development Sites 1-4 and 6-8, namely Transect 1, Transect 2 and Transect 3 (Solar Development Site 1), Transect 4 (Solar Development Site 2 and 3 combined), Transects 5, Transect 6 and Transect 7 (Solar Development Site 4), Transect 8 (Solar Development Site 6), and Transect 9 (Solar Development Site 7 and 8 combined). The NBW transects are shown on Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09**].

2.4.4 Due to refinement of the Order Limits through the design development process, Transect 7 within Solar Development Site 4, and a small length of Transect 1 within Solar Development Site 1 are now outside of the Order Limits, however the results from these transects are still included within this report for context.

2.4.5 The survey visits commenced at sunset, with a 30-minute vantage point survey undertaken before the transect route commenced, as per guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4). The transects were walked slowly, at a steady pace and the survey continued for between two and three hours after sunset, covering the period of peak activity for bats. The dusk NBWs used a combination of visual observation and echolocation detection techniques to identify any bat activity.

2.4.6 NBW metadata is included in Table 2 below, ordered by survey date (2025 surveys shown in grey for clarity). Weather conditions for the surveys were recorded as per the BCT guidance (Ref 4) including the air temperature, wind speed and precipitation at sunset, with sunset times recorded for each survey.

2.4.7 Echometer touch pro detectors, in combination with tablets, were used to record calls for later analysis. The static detectors were programmed to record from 30 minutes before sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise. Echolocation calls were later analysed utilising British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Acoustic Pipeline before being assessed using BatExplorer software. Analysts of the sound files had all completed the Certificate of Bat Acoustics Analysis (COBAA) assessment course.

Table 2-2 NBW - Weather Conditions and Details

Survey Date	Transect Reference	Survey Timings	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation	Wind (Beaufort Scale)
24 April 2024	Transect 5, 6 and 7 (Solar Development Site 4)	Start/Sunset: 20:24 Ends: 22:54	9	Dry	1
29 April 2024	Transect 1 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 20:32 Ends: 22:23	13.5	Dry	6
30 April 2024	Transect 2 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 20:34 Ends: 22:46	16	Dry	4
01 May 2024	Transect 3 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 20:36 Ends: 22:50	18	Dry	0
2 May 2024	Transect 4 (Solar Development Site 2 and 3)	Start/Sunset: 20:38 Ends: 23:30	12	Dry	2
25 June 2024	Transect 5, 6 and 7 (Solar Development Site 4)	Start/Sunset: 21:40 Ends: 00:17	20	Dry	0
8 July 2024	Transect 4 (Solar Development Site 2 and 3)	Start/Sunset: 21:34 Ends: 00:30	16	Light rain in last five minutes of survey	1
16 July 2024	Transect 1 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 21:25 Ends: 23:10	18	Dry	3
17 July 2024	Transect 3 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 21:24 Ends: 23:28	22	Dry	2
18 July 2024	Transect 2 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 21:23 Ends: 23:10	21	Dry	2

Survey Date	Transect Reference	Survey Timings	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation	Wind (Beaufort Scale)
10 September 2024	Transect 5, 6 and 7 (Solar Development Site 4)	Start/Sunset: 19:32 Ends: 22:02	12	Dry	4
24 September 2024	Transect 4 (Solar Development Site 2 and 3)	Start/Sunset: 18:57 Ends: 21:57	12	Dry	3
10 October 2024	Transect 1 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 18:15 End: 20:10	6	Dry	2
11 October 2024	Transect 2 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 18:10 End: 20:06	8	Dry	2
14 October 2024	Transect 3 (Solar Development Site 1)	Start/Sunset: 18:08 End: 20:15	10	Dry	2
20 May 2025	Transect 8 (Solar Development Site 6)	Start/Sunset: 21:10 End: 23:48	15	Dry	1
21 May 2025	Transect 9 (Solar Development Sites 7 and 8)	Start/Sunset: 21:10 End: 23:28	10.5	Dry	1
16 July 2025	Transect 8 (Solar Development Site 6)	Start/Sunset: 21:26 End: 23:50	19	Dry	2
18 July 2025	Transect 9 (Solar Development Sites 7 and 8)	Start/Sunset: 21:23 End: 23:27	20	Dry	1
8 September 2025	Transect 9 (Solar Development Sites 7 and 8)	Start/Sunset: 19:37 End: 21:46	13.5	Dry	1
9 September 2025	Transect 8	Start/Sunset: 19:34	18	Dry	3

Survey Date	Transect Reference	Survey Timings	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation	Wind (Beaufort Scale)
	(Solar Development Site 6)	End: 21:50			

Limitations of nighttime bat walkover

2.4.8 Light rain at the end of the Transect 4 (Solar Development Site 2 and 3) summer survey could have reduced bat activity. However, as this was only the last five minutes of the survey, and the weather conditions were optimal for the first 2.55 hours, this is not considered to be a major limitation to assessment.

2.4.9 Dense arable crop caused a slight detour from the pre-determined route for Transect 8 (Solar Development Site 6) during the spring survey. The detour passed through a short section of field that fell outside of the Order Limits. However, as this slightly amended route was only taken during the spring survey, it is not considered to be a significant limitation to assessment.

2.4.10 Bat surveys are subject to numerous variables. The echolocation calls of species such as brown long-eared bats *Plecotus auritus* are of low amplitude and may not always be picked up on bat detectors. Survey results also represent a sample of bat activity during the surveys, and it is possible that bats may use the Solar Development Sites at other times, however the surveys completed provide sufficient coverage as per best practice guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4).

2.5 Automated static detector deployment

2.5.1 Static detector surveys of Solar Development Sites 1-4 were completed based on habitats of moderate suitability for bats (on a precautionary basis), whereby static detectors were deployed each month between April and October 2024, as per best practice guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4). These surveys were designed to record bat species over an extended period and to determine whether any habitat features are of importance to bats.

2.5.2 During each static survey, six static detectors were deployed in Solar Development Site 1 (Location 1, L1, to Location 6, L6), one static detector was deployed in Solar Development Site 2 (Location 7, L7), one static detector was deployed in Solar Development Site 3 (Location 8, L8) and six static detectors were deployed in Solar Development Site 4 (Location 9, L9 to Location 14, L14).

2.5.3 Due to refinement of the Order Limits through the design development process, Location 3 within Solar Development Site 1, and Locations 13 and 14 within Solar Development Site 4 are now outside of the Order Limits, however the results from these locations are still included within this report for context.

2.5.4 Static detector surveys of Solar Development Sites 6-8 were completed based on habitats of low suitability for bats, whereby static detectors were deployed in

2025, once each season (spring-April/May, summer-June to August, and autumn-September/October), as per best practice guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4).

2.5.5 During each static survey, five static detectors were deployed in Solar Development Site 6 (Location 15, L15, to Location 19, L19), one static detector was deployed in Solar Development Site 7 (Location 20, L20), and two static detectors were deployed in Solar Development Site 8 (Location 21, L21 and Location 22, L22).

2.5.6 See Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09]** for the locations of the 22 static detectors. The detectors were left in situ for a minimum of five nights of suitable weather conditions as per guidance (Ref 4).

2.5.7 Table 2-3 (Sites 1-4) and Table 4 (Sites 6-8) below shows the months which static detectors were deployed across each location, where green = successful deployment, X = failed deployment, and amber = did not record for full five nights (actual number of recorded nights detailed).

Table 2-3 Static Detector Months Deployed for Sites 1-4*

		Month						
Site	Location	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct
1	L1							
1	L2		X			X		
1	L3			2 nights	3 nights	4 nights		
1	L4						4 nights	
1	L5							
1	L6					X		
2	L7							
3	L8				1 night	2 nights		
4	L9		1 night	2 nights		X		X
4	L10			X		X	3 nights	
4	L11							
4	L12	X	3 nights			X	4 nights	
4	L13			4 nights				
4	L14	X						X

*Green = successful deployment, X = failed deployment, Amber = did not record for full five nights (actual number of recorded nights detailed)

Table 2-4 Static Detector Seasons Deployed for Sites 6-8*

Site	Location	Season		
		Spring	Summer	Autumn
6	L15			
6	L16			X
6	L17			
6	L18			
6	L19			
7	L20			
8	L21			
8	L22			

*Green = successful deployment, X = failed deployment

2.5.8 The detectors were programmed to record from 30 minutes before sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise. Echolocation calls were later analysed utilising British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) automatic assessment of bat calls.

2.5.9 Weather conditions during the static detector surveys are provided in Table 5, including the air temperature, wind speed and precipitation at sunset, taken from the nearest weather station (York (Ref 5)). Table 2-5 includes sunset and sunrise times for each static detector survey (2025 surveys shown in grey for clarity).

2.5.10 Two of the static detectors located within Solar Development Site 6 (L16 and L17), and one static detector located within Solar Development Site 8 (L22), failed during the first autumn deployment (17 - 21 September 2025). As such, static detectors were redeployed in these locations on a second occasion in autumn (30 September 2025 to 4 October 2025). L16 failed again on this second deployment, which is discussed below in the limitations.

Table 2-5 Static Survey Metadata

Survey Date	Sunset Time	Sunrise Time	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation at Sunset	Wind
9 April 2024	19:55	06:16	10	Dry	Fresh breeze
10 April 2024	19:57	06:14	14	Dry	Fresh breeze
11 April 2024	19:59	06:12	15	Light rain	Gentle breeze

Survey Date	Sunset Time	Sunrise Time	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation at Sunset	Wind
12 April 2024	20:01	06:09	13	Dry	Light air
13 April 2024	20:03	06:07	11	Dry	Gentle breeze
8 May 2024	20:49	05:13	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
9 May 2024	20:51	05:11	15	Dry	Light breeze
10 May 2024	20:52	05:09	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
11 May 2024	50:54	05:07	11	Dry	Gentle breeze
12 May 2024	20:56	05:06	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
3 June 2024	21:28	04:37	16	Dry	Gentle breeze
4 June 2024	21:29	04:36	10	Dry	Moderate breeze
5 June 2024	21:30	04:35	10	Dry	Gentle breeze
6 June 2024	21:31	04:35	11	Dry	Gentle breeze
7 June 2024	21:32	04:34	12	Dry	Gentle breeze
1 July 2024	21:38	04:37	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
2 July 2024	21:38	04:38	13	Dry	Light breeze
3 July 2024	21:37	04:38	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
4 July 2024	21:37	04:39	14	Dry	Moderate breeze
5 July 2024	21:36	04:50	13	Dry	Light air
6 August 2024	20:51	05:27	17	Dry	Light breeze
7 August 2024	20:49	05:28	17	Dry	Gentle breeze
8 August 2024	20:47	05:30	19	Light rain	Moderate breeze
9 August 2024	20:45	05:32	18	Dry	Moderate breeze
10 August 2024	20:43	05:34	17	Dry	Light breeze
11 August 2024	20:41	05:36	16	Dry	Gentle breeze
4 Sept 2024	19:46	06:18	12	Rain	Gentle breeze
5 Sept 2024	19:44	06:20	15	Drizzle	Fresh breeze
6 Sept 2024	19:41	06:22	17	Dry	Gentle breeze
7 Sept 2024	19:39	06:24	17	Dry	Gentle breeze
8 Sept 2024	19:36	06:25	16	Dry	Gentle breeze
2 October 2024	18:37	07:08	10	Dry	Gentle breeze
3 October 2024	18:34	07:10	10	Dry	Light breeze
4 October 2024	18:32	07:12	10	Dry	Gentle breeze
5 October 2024	18:29	07:14	12	Dry	Gentle breeze
6 October 2024	18:27	07:16	12	Light rain	Light breeze
15 May 2025	21:00	05:01	11	Dry	Gentle breeze
16 May 2025	21:02	04:59	10	Dry	Gentle breeze

Survey Date	Sunset Time	Sunrise Time	Weather Conditions		
			Air Temperature at Sunset (˚C)	Precipitation at Sunset	Wind
17 May 2025	21:04	04:58	10	Dry	Moderate breeze
18 May 2025	21:05	04:56	10	Dry	Gentle breeze
19 May 2025	21:07	04:55	11	Dry	Gentle breeze
20 May 2025	21:09	04:53	15	Dry	Light breeze
23 July 2025	21:17	05:03	16	Dry	Light breeze
24 July 2025	21:15	05:05	19	Dry	Gentle breeze
25 July 2025	21:13	05:06	18	Dry	Gentle breeze
26 July 2025	21:12	05:08	17	Dry	Moderate breeze
27 July 2025	21:10	05:09	17	Dry	Gentle breeze
17 September 2025	19:14	06:41	17	Dry	Gentle breeze
18 September 2025	19:12	06:43	20	Dry	Moderate breeze
19 September 2025	19:09	06:44	19	Dry	Gentle breeze
20 September 2025	19:07	06:46	11	Rain	Moderate breeze
21 September 2025	19:05	06:48	10	Dry	Light breeze
30 September 2025 (L16, L17, and L22 only)	18:42	07:04	13	Dry	Gentle breeze
1 October 2025 (L16, L17, and L22 only)	18:40	07:06	15	Dry	Gentle breeze
2 October 2025 (L16, L17, and L22 only)	18:37	07:08	14	Dry	Moderate breeze
3 October 2025 (L16, L17, and L22 only)	18:35	07:10	17	Light rain	Moderate breeze
4 October 2025 (L16, L17, and L22 only)	18:32	07:11	12	Light rain	Moderate breeze

Limitations of automatic static detector

2.5.11 Bat calls cannot always be identified to species level, either due to distant contacts or the similarity between some types of bats. Where this occurs, it is recorded as 'unidentified bat species' (Unid) or will show which bat species it is likely to be (e.g. *Pipistrelle sp*. / *Myotis sp*.).

2.5.12 As shown in Table 2-3, 11 of the 98 static deployments in 2024 failed to record any data. However, no location had more than two failures over the seven monthly deployments. In addition to this, on some occasions, the static detectors did not record for the full five nights, also shown in Table 2-3 (however in some instances six nights were analysed on successful deployments, which is above the requirement in guidance). Although this is a limitation, it is considered that the large number of successful static deployments provides a representative picture of the bat activity across the Solar Development Sites, with a large data set gathered throughout the various seasons. Also, the commitment to monthly static deployments was decided prior to the DBWs due to the time of year, with surveys completed based on habitats of moderate condition, on a precautionary basis. However, following the completion of the DBWs, Solar Development Sites 2, 3 and 4 were later downgraded to low suitability for commuting and foraging bats, and as per guidance, seasonal static deployment would be sufficient to accurately assess bat activity in this case (which was achieved as a minimum). Therefore, the conclusions of the surveys are deemed to be valid.

2.5.13 During the 2025 deployment, as shown in Table 2-4, two of the static detectors located within Solar Development Site 6, and one static detector located within Solar Development Site 8, failed during the first autumn deployment. As such, static detectors were redeployed in these locations on a second occasion in autumn. During this second autumn deployment, L16 (within Solar Development Site 6) was the only static to fail again, and it is suspected that the detector at L16 had been tampered with during both autumn deployments, due to damage noted on the detectors. As such, a detector was not deployed in this location again. However, this is not thought to pose a limitation to assessment due to the large data set gathered throughout the various seasons within Solar Development Site 6.

2.5.14 The weather was largely optimal during all static detector surveys, and a high level of confidence is placed on the results.

2.6 GLTA

2.6.1 The GLTA was undertaken on the ~~6~~following dates in 2026:

- 6th January~~, 8~~
- 8th January~~, and 13~~
- 13th January ~~2026~~
- 29th September
- 2nd October
- 6th October

- 8th October

~~2.6.1~~2.6.2 The GLTA was completed by an experienced and suitably qualified ecologist. The GTLA was conducted on trees within the Order Limits proposed for complete removal, or pruning, to facilitate the Proposed Development. The trees to be removed/pruned have been taken from Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**]. The results of the GLTA surveys are illustrated on Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09**].

~~2.6.2~~2.6.3 The GLTA was based on best practice published guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4), and comprised an inspection of the tree from ground level to identify Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) that bats may exploit. These PRFs include:

1) Woodpecker holes;
2) Rot Holes;
3) Hazard beams;
4) Other vertical or horizontal cracks and splits (such as frost-cracks) in stems or branches
5) Partially detached platy bark;
6) Knot holes arising from naturally shed branches, or branches previously pruned back to the branch collar;
7) Man-made holes (e.g. cavities that have developed from flush cuts) or cavities created by branches tearing out from the parent stems;
8) Cankers (caused by localised bark death) in which cavities have developed;
9) Other hollows or cavities, including butt-rots;
10) Double-leaders forming compression forks with included bark and potential cavities;
11) Gaps between overlapping stems or branches;
12) Partially detached ivy with stem diameters in excess of 50 mm; and
13) Bird, bat or dormouse boxes.

~~2.6.3~~2.6.4 Signs of a bat roost, as identified by the BCT, besides the actual presence of bats themselves, were also searched for during the GLTA. These signs include:

1) Bat droppings in, around or below a PRF;
2) Odour emanating from a PRF;
3) Audible squeaking at dusk or in warm weather; and
4) Staining below the PRF.

~~2.6.4~~2.6.5 The potential of trees to support roosting bats was then assessed using the criteria shown in Table 2-6 below.

Table 2-6 Assessment of Tree Suitability Criteria - adapted from Collings, 2023

Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitat
None	Either there are no PRFs in the tree or highly unlikely to be any.
FAR	Further assessment required to establish if PRFs are present in the tree.
PRF-I	A tree with at least one PRF present.
PRF-M	A tree that is suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony.

2.7 Emergence Surveys

2.7.1 [redacted]

2.7.2 As such, in accordance with best practice guidance (Ref 2, Ref 3 and Ref 4), this triggers a requirement for three nocturnal bat emergence surveys on each tree, to establish the presence or likely absence of roosting bats with the tree.

2.7.3 In line with best practice guidance, three dusk emergence surveys were undertaken on each tree between May and August 2026, spaced a minimum of three weeks apart. The emergence surveys commenced 15 minutes before sunset and concluded 1.5 hours after sunset. Survey metadata for all six surveys is detailed in Table 2-7 below.

2.7.4 Surveyors were positioned on either side of the tree to provide adequate coverage of all Potential Roosting Features during the survey. Surveyors used a combination of visual observation, echolocation devices, thermal cameras and night vision aid (NVA) cameras with infra-red torches and floods to identify any bats emerging from the trees, assisted by two-way radios in order to correlate bat movements between surveyors.

2.7.5 Survey equipment used comprised Anabat walkabout, Pixfra A613 thermal imaging monocular, and Pulsar 2 XP50 Pro. BatExplorer and Analook software were used to analyse sonograms of any calls recorded in the field.

2.7.6 The infra-red camera footage recorded was thoroughly reviewed following surveys to confirm whether any bats emerged from the trees. Start and end screenshots of the NVA footage from each surveyor vantage point on each survey are shown in Table 2-8 below.

2.7.7 A Change Application was submitted during Examination, resulting in a small number of additional trees potentially requiring removal to facilitate the Proposed Development. A GLTA of these additional trees was completed in September and October 2026, the results of which are presented within Section 3.5 of this report.




However, due to seasonal constraints, any required further bats surveys (i.e. emergence surveys) on these additional trees could not be completed before the end of the Examination period. The further bat surveys will be undertaken in a suitable surveying season prior to the start of works to confirm whether bats use the PRFs within these trees to roost.

Table 2-7 Nocturnal Emergence Survey Metadata

Survey Reference	Tree Reference	Date	Weather at Start	Weather at End	Survey Timings	Number of Surveyors
V01	T505	20/05/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 15.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 8	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 14.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 2-3 Cloud Cover: 5	Start Time: 20:53 Sunset: 21:08 End Time: 22:38	2
V01	T1961	21/05/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 15.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1 Cloud Cover: 5	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 14 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1 Cloud Cover: 7	Start Time: 20:55 Sunset: 21:10 End Time: 22:40	2
V02	T1961	17/06/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 17 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1 Cloud Cover: 4	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 13 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 2	Start Time: 21:23 Sunset: 21:38 End Time: 23:08	2
V02	T505	18/06/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 20 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 2	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 18 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1 Cloud Cover: 1	Start Time: 21:23 Sunset: 21:38 End Time: 23:08	2
V03	T1961	08/07/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 22.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 0	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 17 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 0	Start Time: 21:19 Sunset: 21:34 End Time: 23:04	2
V03	T505	09/07/2026	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 23.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover:2	Precipitation: 0 Temp ºC: 18.5 Wind Speed Beaufort: 1-2 Cloud Cover: 1	Start Time: 21:18 Sunset: 21:33 End Time: 23:03	2

Table 2-8 NVA Start and End Photographs from Emergence Surveys

Tree Reference	Survey Reference	Surveyor Reference	NVA Start Photo	NVA End Photo
[redacted]				

Tree Reference	Survey Reference	Surveyor Reference	NVA Start Photo	NVA End Photo
T505	V02	L02		
[redacted]				
T505	V03	L01		
[redacted]				

Tree Reference	Survey Reference	Surveyor Reference	NVA Start Photo	NVA End Photo
T1961	V03	L01		

[redacted]

3 Results

3.1 Desk study

3.1.1 Species of bat returned in the data search included brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, Leisler's bat *Nyctalus leisleri*, myotis species *Myotis sp*., Nathusius's pipistrelle *Pipistrellus nathusii*, Natterer's bat *Myotis nattereri*, noctule *Nyctalus noctula*, soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, pipistrelle species *Pipistellus sp*. and whiskered bat *Myotis mystacinus*. No records of bats were returned within the Order Limits.

[redacted]

3.2 Daytime bat walkover

3.2.1 Initially, Solar Development Sites 1-4 were assessed as providing moderate suitability for commuting and foraging bats, on a precautionarily basis, using desk study records and aerial imagery, as not to miss the start of the bat surveying season. A DBW was then undertaken alongside the UK Habitats surveys completed in April-September 2024 to confirm the initial desk-based assessment.

3.2.2 The DBW found that Solar Development Sites 2-4 had few linear features of use to commuting and foraging bats, which were largely located at the boundaries of the Solar Development Sites. Solar Development Site 4 was however dissected by a number of wet ditches, which may form commuting and foraging features for bats. However, these ditches were surrounded by intensively managed cropland (which also formed the majority of the habitats present within all the Solar Development Sites), anticipated to provide lower invertebrate pray levels for foraging bats. As such, Solar Development Sites 2-4 were re-assessed as providing low suitability for commuting and foraging bats following the DBWs. As the DBWs were completed throughout the summer period, when monthly static deployments had already commenced, monthly static detector surveys were continued (as per the initial desk-based assessment of moderate suitability).

3.2.3 Solar Development Site 1 however was found to have a higher number of smaller fields, most of which were bound by hedgerows and ditches. There was also a number of woodland copses located adjacent Solar Development Site 1, as well as five ponds. The initial desk-based assessment of moderate suitability for commuting and foraging bats was therefore retained for Solar Development Site 1 following the DBW, and the static detector deployment surveys were completed in accordance with best practice guidelines for moderate suitability habitat.

3.2.4 DBWs for Solar Development Sites 6-8 were completed during the UK Habitat surveys in May 2025. It was found that Solar Development Sites 6-8 had few linear features of use to commuting and foraging bats, which were largely located at the Solar Development Site boundaries, with the majority of the Solar Development Sites comprising intensively managed cropland, anticipated to provide low invertebrate pray levels for foraging bats. As such, Solar Development Sites 6-8 were assessed as providing low suitability for commuting and foraging bats.

3.3 Nighttime bat walkover

3.3.1 Table 3-1 and Table 3-2 below provides a summary of the number of passes, and their associated percentage, of each bat species recorded during the seasonal NBWs completed for Transects 1 to 7 within Solar Development Sites 1-4 in 2024, and Transects 8 and 9 within Solar Development Site 6-8 in 2025 (table ordered by date of survey).

Table 3-1 NBW Species Count Per Transect

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Species Count Per Transect*							Total
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown	
5	Solar Development Site 4	24/04/2024	6	4	-	-	-	-	-	**10**
6		24/04/2024	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	**2**
7		24/04/2024	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	**3**
1	Solar Development Site 1	29/04/2024	59	-	-	1	-	-	-	**60**
2		30/04/2024	89	-	-	3	-	-	-	**92**
3		01/05/2024	167	-	-	2	-	1	-	**170**
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	02/05/2024	5	2	-	-	1	-	-	**8**
5	Solar Development Site 4	25/06/2024	8	4	-	1	5	-	-	**18**
6		25/06/2024	12	2	-	-	3	-	1	**18**
7		25/06/2024	2	-	-	1	1	-	1	**5**

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Species Count Per Transect*							Total
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown	
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	08/07/2024	5	1	1	-	-	-	1	**8**
1	Solar Development Site 1	16/07/2024	157	-	-	7	-	-	-	**164**
3		17/07/2024	73	-	-	-	-	3	-	**76**
2		18/07/2024	39	-	-	1	-	-	-	**40**
5	Solar Development Site 4	10/09/2024	6	2	-	2	1	-	-	**11**
6		10/09/2024	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
7		10/09/2024	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	**3**
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	24/09/2024	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	**8**
1	Solar Development Site 1	10/10/2024	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**0**
2		11/10/2024	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	**2**
3		14/10/2024	31	-	-	4	-	1	-	**36**
8	Solar Development Site 6	20/05/2025	9	3	-	1	3	-	-	**16**

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Species Count Per Transect*							Total
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown	
9	Solar Development Site 7	21/05/2025	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	**4**
9	Solar Development Site 8	21/05/2025	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
8	Solar Development Site 6	16/07/2025	13	2	-	-	3	-	-	**18**
9	Solar Development Site 7	18/07/2025	2	2	-	-	1	-	-	**5**
9	Solar Development Site 8	18/07/2025	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	**3**
9	Solar Development Site 7	08/09/2025	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	**2**
9	Solar Development Site 8	08/09/2025	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**4**
8	Solar Development Site 6	09/09/2025	5	2	-	1	-	-	-	**8**

* Ppi - Common pipistrelle, Ppy – Soprano pipistrelle, Pna – Nathusius' pipistrelle, My – *Myotis sp.*, Noct – Noctule, Nyct – *Nyctalus sp.,* unknown-unidentifiable bat species due to poor quality/distant recording

Table 3-2 Percentage of Each Bat Species Recorded During NBWs

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Percentage of Bats Species Recorded						
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown
5	Solar Development Site 4	24/04/2024	60	40	-	-	-	-	-
6		24/04/2024	-	100	-	-	-	-	-
7		24/04/2024	33.3	33.3	-	33.3	-	-	-
1	Solar Development Site 1	29/04/2024	98.3	-	-	1.7	-	-	-
2		30/04/2024	96.7	-	-	3.3	-	-	-
3		01/05/2024	98.2	-	-	1.2	-	0.6	-
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	02/05/2024	75	12.5	-	-	12.5	-	-
5	Solar Development Site 4	25/06/2024	44.44	22.22	-	5.56	27.78	-	-
6		25/06/2024	66.67	11.11	-	-	16.67	-	20
7		25/06/2024	40	-	-	20	20	-	20
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	08/07/2024	74.4	14.3	14.3	-	-	-	-
1	Solar Development Site 1	16/07/2024	95.7	-	-	4.3	-	-	-
3		17/07/2024	96	-	-	-	-	4	-
2		18/07/2024	97.5	-	-	2.5	-	-	-

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Percentage of Bats Species Recorded						
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown
5	Solar Development Site 4	10/09/2024	54.55	18.18	-	18.18	9.09	-	-
6		10/09/2024	-	100.00	-	-	-	-	-
7		10/09/2024	33.33	66.66	-	-	-	-	-
4	Solar Development Sites 2 and 3	24/09/2024	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	Solar Development Site 1	10/10/2024	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2		11/10/2024	50	-	-	50	-	-	-
3		14/10/2024	86	-	-	11	-	3	-
8	Solar Development Site 6	20/05/2025	56.25	18.75	-	6.25	18.75	-	-
9	Solar Development Site 7	21/05/2025	50	25	-	-	25	-	-
9	Solar Development Site 8	21/05/2025	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Solar Development Site 6	16/07/2025	72.22	11.11	-	-	16.67	-	-

Transect	Solar Development Site	Survey Date	Percentage of Bats Species Recorded						
			Ppi	Ppy	Pna	My	Noct	Nyct	Unknown
9	Solar Development Site 7	18/07/2025	40	40	-	-	20	-	-
9	Solar Development Site 8	18/07/2025	66.67	-	-	33.33	-	-	-
9	Solar Development Site 7	08/09/2025	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	Solar Development Site 8	08/09/2025	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	Solar Development Site 6	09/09/2025	62.5	25	-	12.5	-	-	-

3.3.2 Below is a summary of the bat activity recorded for each Solar Development Site during the NBWs.

Solar Development Site 1

3.3.3 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Site 1 (Transect 1, 2 and 3), 322, 280, and 38 bat passes were recorded on the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, *Myotis sp*., and *Nyctalus sp.* The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 97.8%, 96% and 84% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features, with passes recorded on two of the three surveys along the treeline on the western boundary of Field 1.18, along the treelined track leading to Mount Pleasant Farm from the west, and along Ditch 1.7 in the south of Solar Development Site 1 (field reference numbers are detailed within Figure 2.3: Field Numbering Plan (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03.[01-08]**)). Compared to all other Solar Development Sites, Solar Development Site 1 had the highest level of bat activity recorded during the NBWs, however largely comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified. Although Solar Development Site 1 had the highest activity levels of the Solar Development Sites within the Order Limits, activity levels were still typical of this type of habitat in this locality.

Solar Development Site 2 and 3

3.3.4 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Sites 2 and 3 (Transect 4), eight bat passes were recorded on each survey. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, *Pipistrellus sp.,* noctule, and an unidentified bat species. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 75%, 74.4% and 100% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features, with passes recorded on all surveys in the south-west of Solar Development Site 2 adjacent to the woodland belt outside of the Order Limits, and on two surveys along the treeline on the western boundary of Solar Development Site 3. Overall, Solar Development Site 2 and 3 had low levels of bat activity, and largely comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 4

3.3.5 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Site 4 (Transect 5, 6 and 7), 15, 41, and 15 bat passes were recorded on the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively (Transect 7 now outside the Order Limits). Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, *Myotis sp*., noctule, and an unidentified bat species. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 46.6%, 53.6% and 46.6% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features, with passes recorded on all surveys to

the south of Field 4.10 adjacent to the woodland belt outside of the Order Limits (field reference numbers are detailed within Figure 2.3: Field Numbering Plan (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.02.03**). Overall, activity recorded on the NBWs within Solar Development Site 4 was lower than Solar Development Site 1, and largely comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified. Activity levels were typical of this type of habitat in this locality.

Solar Development Site 6

3.3.6 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Site 6 (Transect 8), 16, 18 and eight bat passes were recorded on the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, *Myotis sp*., and noctule. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 56.25%, 72.22% and 62.5% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features, such as D6.1, D6.3, TL6.1 and TL6.2 (references detailed in Appendix 6.1: Habitats Report (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.06.01**]). Overall, activity recorded on the NBWs within Solar Development Site 6 was low, and comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified. Activity levels were typical of this type of habitat in this locality.

Solar Development Site 7

3.3.7 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Site 7 (Transect 9), four, five and two bat passes were recorded on the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 50%, 40% and 100% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features including the railway lines, and associated vegetation, on the northern and western boundaries. Overall, activity recorded on the NBWs within Solar Development Site 7 was low, and comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 8

3.3.8 During the spring, summer and autumn NBWs on Solar Development Site 8 (Transect 9), one, three and four bat passes were recorded on the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle and *Myotis sp.*. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 100%, 66.67% and 100% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. Bat passes were recorded at field boundary features, and on every survey along D8.1 forming the western boundary of Solar Development Site 8. Overall, Solar Development Site 8 had the lowest level of bat activity recorded across all NBWs completed, and

comprised common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

3.4 Automated static detector deployment

3.4.1 Static detector surveys of Solar Development Sites 1-4 were completed whereby 14 static detectors were deployed each month between April and October 2024 at L1-L14 for five consecutive nights (L3, L13 and L14 now outside of Order Limits). In addition, static detector surveys of Solar Development Sites 6-8 were completed whereby eight static detectors were deployed once each season (spring, summer and autumn) in 2025 at L15-L22 for five consecutive nights. A summary table for each static location is shown in Table 3-3 to Table 3-24 below. The static locations are shown on Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) **[EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09]**. Full data is provided at Annex B.

3.4.2 Please note, as *Myotis sp.* are difficult to determine to species level through bat sound analysis alone, the species group have only been analysed to their genus level to avoid misleading results.

Solar Development Site 1

Table 3-3 Location 1- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys*								
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	Pip Sp.	BLE	Nyc	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	63.79	23.28					12.93		
May	53.63	27.14	0.43				1.50	0.64	16.67
June	65.77	28.50	0.58		0.12			0.35	4.67
July	98.07	0.74	0.44				0.15		0.59
August	83.30	9.94			0.21		0.63	0.42	5.5
September	76.04	23.44							0.52
October				94.87		1.28			3.85

*Ppi - Common pipistrelle, Ppy – Soprano pipistrelle, Pna – Nathusius' pipistrelle, Pip Sp – Pipistrellus sp., BLE – Brown long-eared, Noct – Noctule, Nyc. – *Nyctalus sp.*, Leis – Leislers, Myo – *Myotis sp.*

Table 3-4 Location 2- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	91.67	4.17					4.17
May (fail)							
June	62.07	16.09	3.45	3.45		4.60	10.35
July	70.59						29.41

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
August (fail)							
September	18.78	22.10		2.21	11.05	3.87	41.98
October	15.13	59.66		1.68	0.42	0.42	22.69

Table 3-5 Location 3- percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits)

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo 1
April	93.75	4.17					2.08
May	88.10	8.98		0.30	0.67		1.94
June	82.56	16.28	1.16				
July	89.47	6.77	3.01			0.75	
August	71.13	24.23		1.03	0.52	1.03	2.06
September	64.44	17.63		0.30	11.25	0.30	6.07
October	64	32					17.87

Table 3-6 Location 4 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys								
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	Pip Sp.	BLE	Nyc	Noctule	Leis	Myo
April	100.00								
May	51.03	44.15			0.28		0.55	0.28	3.72
June	91.11	3.89			0.93				4.08
July				89.36					10.64
August	56.54	16.46	0.42		2.95		0.84	2.11	20.67
September	63.27	20.41			8.16				8.16
October				60.81		2.25			36.94

Table 3-7 Location 5 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	62.62	36.17		0.08	0.05		1.07
May	85.61	6.59	2.73	0.30	0.30	0.98	3.48
June	88.27	5.73	5.87			0.14	
July	78.91	18.04	0.66				2.39
August	88.84	8.75		0.15		0.30	1.95

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
September	46.34	22.39				0.22	31.04
October	23.72	36.73	0.07	0.26	0.85	0.22	38.14

Table 3-8 Location 6 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys								
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	Pip Sp.	BLE	Nyc	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	88.89								11.11
May	80.63	8.83	3.97		0.57		0.16	0.42	5.43
June	78.91	18.04	0.66						2.39
July				96.52					3.48
August (fail)									
September	19.99	12.03				5.06			63.92
October				50.88		0.24			48.89

Solar Development Site 1 static detector survey summary

3.4.3 During the static detector deployments in Solar Development Site 1 (Locations 1-6, L3 now outside the Order Limits), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, *Pipistrellus sp*., brown long eared, *Nyctalus sp*., noctule, leislers, and *Myotis sp*. All of these species were recorded at all static locations, excluding *Nyctalus sp.* However, not all species were recorded at every static location every month, e.g. brown long eared was only recorded at Location 1 in June and August. Common or soprano pipistrelle were recorded during every deployment at every location and formed the vast majority of passes recorded within Solar Development Site 1. In addition, *Myotis sp*. were recorded in their highest percentages at Location 6, with 63.92% of the passes during the September deployment at Location 6.

3.4.4 A total of 24,699 passes were recorded at Location 1-Location 6, which is an average of 128 passes per night. Location 1 recorded a total of 3,637 passes (101 per night), Location 2 recorded a total of 547 passes (20 per night), Location 3 (now outside the Order Limits) recorded a total of 2,151 passes (74 per night), Location 4 recorded a total of 4626 passes (132 per night), Location 5 recorded a total of 10,243 passes (284.5 per night), and Location 6 recorded a total of 3,495 passes (116.5 per night).

3.4.5 Most passes per night within Solar Development Site 1 were recorded at Location 5. Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

3.4.6 Due to refinement of the Order Limits through the design development process, Location 3 within Solar Development Site 1 is now outside of the Order Limits, however the results from this location are still included within this report for context.

Solar Development Site 2

Table 3-9 Location 7 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys								
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	Pip Sp.	BLE	Nyc	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	23.77	61.48					12.30	2.46	
May	71.72	8.08					14.14	3.03	3.03
June	91.58	2.99	0.27				1.36		3.81
July	81.75	4.25			1		10.25	0.75	2
August				97.90		0.09			2.01
September	85.68	4.17				5.99			4.17
October	90.51	2.77			1.19				5.54

Solar Development Site 2 static detector survey summary

3.4.7 During the static detector deployments on Solar Development Site 2 (Location 7), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, *Pipistrellus sp.*, brown long eared, *Nyctalus sp.*, noctule, leislers, and *Myotis sp*. Common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle were the only bat species to be recorded during every deployment apart from one, which was the August deployment where the pipistrelle records were identified as *Pipistrellus sp*., so it is likely both species were also present during the August deployment. Common pipistrelle form the majority of passes recorded during the static detector deployments on Solar Development Site 2.

3.4.8 A total of 3,961 passes were recorded at Location 7, which is an average of 113 passes per night. However, during the deployment on 10 August 2024, 1,191 *Pipistrellus sp.* passes were recorded, which is more than double the total passes recorded by all bat species combined on any other night within Solar Development Site 2. As such, this night is taken as an anomaly in the data, and may be the result of multiple passes by a small number of bats, or potentially a recording error. If this night is removed from the average calculation for Location 7, this reduces the passes per night to 81.

3.4.9 Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 3

Table 3-10 Location 8 – percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	**Ppy**	**Pna**	**BLE**	**Noct**	**Leis**	**Myo**
April	77.66	19.86	1.06	0.35	0.35		0.7
May	80.08	11.31	0.02		0.26	0.08	8.27
June	68.50	17.20	0.03			0.13	14.15
July	100						
August	97.54	2.46					
September	39.19	4.50		0.45	48.65	5.86	1.35
October	91.74	8.26					

Solar Development Site 3 static detector survey summary

3.4.10 During the static detector deployments in Solar Development Site 3 (Location 8), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, brown long eared, noctule, leislers, and *Myotis sp*. Common pipistrelle were the only bat species to be recorded during every deployment, forming the highest percentage of passes on all but one deployment.

3.4.11 A total of 7,788 passes were recorded at Location 8, which is an average of 268.5 passes per night. However, during the deployment on 8 May 2024, 3,068 common pipistrelle species passes were recorded, which is approximately four times the total number of passes recorded by all species combined on any other night within Solar Development Site 3. Furthermore, during the 8 May deployment, 543 *Myotis sp.* passes were recorded, with the highest number of *Myotis sp.* passes recorded at this location on any other night comprising three passes. As such, this night is taken as an anomaly in the data and may be the result of multiple passes by an individual/small number of bats, or potentially a recording error. If this night is removed from the average calculation for Location 8, this reduces the passes per night to 92.

3.4.12 Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 4

Table 3-11 Location 9 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	53.57	39.29		3.57	3.57		
May	85.53	7.02	0.84		0.98		5.62
June	24.80	67.65		0.27			7.28
July	26.92	67.47			0.80		4.8
August (fail)							
September	95.18	4.22			0.60		
October (fail)							

Table 3-12 Location 10 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	53.57	39.29		3.57	3.57		
May	77.64	18.34		0.05	1.15		2.81
June (fail)							
July	24.17	68.96		0.12	0.59		6.16
August (fail)							
September	49.72	44.13			6.15		
October	76.24	20.44	0.55				2.76

Table 3-13 Location 11 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	56.061	39.394				3.030	1.515
May	59.08	17.82			9.57		13.53
June	94.49	4.04				0.92	0.55
July	88.07	8.24	0.57				3.12
August	89.22	6.99	0.29	0.04	0.53	0.78	2.16
September	93.63	1.96	0.16		0.65		3.59
October	90.35	3.54		0.32	4.66	0.16	0.96

Table 3-14 Location 12 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Apil (fail)							
May	55.00	29.89	2.31	0.09	1.20	0.17	11.32
June	72.62	26.23			0.31	0.10	0.73
July	39.18	58.47					2.35
August (fail)							
September	50.99	21.19		0.66	12.58	7.95	6.62
October	56.47	13.72	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.24	29.23

Table 3-15 Location 13 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits)

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys								
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	Pip Sp.	BLE	Nyc	Noct	Leis	Myo
April	70.43	29.03							0.54
May	54.73	10.98	5.91		0.34		17.06	0.34	10.64
June	57.63	18.64			3.39			1.69	18.63
July	46.15	38.46							15.38
August	69.84	12.27			0.96		0.35		16.57
September				69.63		16.30			14.07
October	22.75	4.72			0.64		0.54		71.36

Table 3-16 Location 14 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys (now outside of Order Limits)

Month	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Apil (fail)							
May	22.83	19.81	1.70		35.66	2.83	17.17
June	25.81	33.87			37.10	1.61	1.61
July	56.60	41.51					1.89
August	60.00				40.00		
September	14.43	11.34			65.98	3.09	5.15
October (fail)							

Solar Development Site 4 static detector survey summary

3.4.13 During the static detector deployments in Solar Development Site 4 (Locations 9-14, L13 and L14 now outside the Order Limits), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, *Pipistrelle sp*., brown long eared, *Nyctalus sp*., noctule, leislers, and *Myotis sp.* Of these species only common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, *Nyctalus sp*., noctule, and *Myotis sp.* were recorded at all statics locations. However, not all of these species were recorded at every static location every month, e.g. Nathusius' pipistrelle was only recorded at Location 9 in May.

3.4.14 Common or soprano pipistrelle were recorded during every deployment at every location within Solar Development Site 4, and form the vast majority of passes recorded within the Solar Development Site. In addition, noctule were recorded in their highest percentages at Location 14 (with 115 being the highest number of passes recorded during one night by the species), and *Myotis sp.* were recorded in their highest percentages at Location 13 (with 330 being the highest number of passes recorded during one night by the species group). L13 and L14 are now outside of the Order Limits.

3.4.15 A total of 21,950 passes were recorded at Location 9-Location 14, which is an average of 138 passes per night. Location 9 recorded a total of 1,929 passes (107 per night), Location 10 recorded a total of 3,179 passes (127 per night), Location 11 recorded a total of 5,299 passes (155.8 per night), Location 12 recorded a total of 6,782 passes (308 per night), Location 13 (now outside the Order Limits) recorded a total of 3,903 passes (134.5 per night), and Location 14 (now outside the Order Limits) recorded a total of 858 passes (33 per night).

3.4.16 However, during the deployment on 5 October 2024 at Location 12, 1,613 common pipistrelle passes were recorded, which is approximately two times the total number of passes recorded by all species combined on any other night at any other location within Solar Development Site 4. This night at Location 12 also recorded the highest number of passes for *Myotis sp.* across all nights at all locations in Solar Development Site 4. As such, this night is taken as an anomaly in the data and may be the result of multiple passes by an individual/small number of bats, or potentially a recording error. If this night is removed from the average calculation for Location 12, this reduces the passes per night at this location to 209, reducing the average number of passes over all locations in Solar Development Site 4 (Location 9 to Location 14) to 123.8 per night.

3.4.17 Most passes per night within Solar Development Site 4 were recorded at Location 12. Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

3.4.18 Due to refinement of the Order Limits through the design development process, Locations 13 and Location 14 within Solar Development Site 4 are now outside of the Order Limits, however the results from these locations are still included within this report for context.

Solar Development Site 6

Table 3-17 Location 15 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	100						
Summer-July	55	21.88		1.25	16.56		5.31
Autumn-September	64.19	27.16	1.24		2.47		4.94

Table 3-18 Location 16 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	80.05	17.42	0.35		1.78	0.12	0.29
Summer-July	62.95	17.01	0.79	0.48	17.49		1.27
Autumn-September (fail)							

Table 3-19 Location 17 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	93.29	1.34	0.34		2.01	0.67	2.35
Summer-July	94.03	1.07	0.31	0.38	3.21		0.99
Autumn-October	87.92	6.51			0.49	0.13	4.95

Table 3-20 Location 18 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	41.59	1.77		0.89	52.21		3.54
Summer-July	69.95	5.65	0.36	1.46	20.40		2.19
Autumn-September	24.19	1.89	3.21	0.19	68.24	0.57	1.70

Table 3-21 Location 19 – percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	68.26	6.52		2.61	5.22	1.30	16.09
Summer-July	88.15	1.98		1.234568	7.65		0.99
Autumn-September	81.45	13.72	0.34	0.62	2.08		1.79

Solar Development Site 6 static detector survey summary

3.4.19 During the static detector deployments in Solar Development Site 6 (Locations 15 - 19), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, brown long eared, noctule, Leisler's, and *Myotis sp*. All of these species were recorded at all static locations, excluding Leisler's which was not recorded at Location 15. Additionally, not all species were recorded at every static location every season, e.g. Nathusius' pipistrelle was only recorded at Location 19 in September. Common pipistrelle were the only bat species to be recorded during every deployment at every location, forming the highest percentage of passes on all but two deployments. Both of these two deployments were at Location 18 where noctule formed 52.21% of the pass in spring and 68.24% of the passes in autumn.

3.4.20 A total of 10,836 passes were recorded at Location 15 - 19, which is an average of 148.9 passes per night. Location 15 recorded a total of 610 passes (38.13 per night), location 16 recorded a total of 2368 passes (215.3 per night), location 17 recorded a total of 3848 passes (240.5 per night), location 18 recorded a total of 1191 passes (74.4 per night), and location 19 recorded a total of 2819 passes (176.2 per night).

3.4.21 Most passes per night were recorded at Location 17. Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 7

Table 3-22 Location 20 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	77.78			11.11			11.11
Summer-July	61.88	15.31		0.94	13.75		8.13
Autumn-September	21.44	59.40		0.09	2.78		10.27

Solar Development Site 7 static detector survey summary

3.4.22 During the static detector deployments in Solar Development Site 7 (Location 20), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, brown long eared, noctule, and *Myotis sp*. Common pipistrelle, brown long eared and *Myotis sp*. were the only bat species to be recorded during every deployment, with common pipistrelle forming the highest percentage of passes in two of the three deployments (spring and summer). Soprano pipistrelle formed the highest percentage on the third deployment (autumn).

3.4.23 A total of 2,389 passes were recorded at Location 20, which is an average of 149.3 passes per night. However, during the deployment on 18 September, 1,200 soprano pipistrelle passes were recorded, which is six times the total passes recorded by all bat species combined on any other night within Solar Development Site 7. As such, this night is taken as an anomaly in the data, and may be the result of multiple passes by a small number of bats, or potentially a recording error. If this night is removed from the average calculation for Location 20, this reduces the passes per night to 45.4.

3.4.24 Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

Solar Development Site 8

Table 3-23 Location 21 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	90.14	2.52		0.46	3.44		3.44

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Summer-July	78.04	7.52		0.58	6.94	4.05	2.89
Autumn-September	91.39	6.33	0.26	0.65	0.26	0.06	0.26

Table 3-24 Location 22 - percentage of each bat species recorded throughout static surveys

Season	Species % of bats across static surveys						
	Ppi	Ppy	Pna	BLE	Noct	Leis	Myo
Spring-May	82.88	5.29		1.06	2.33	0.63	7.82
Summer-July	57.61	12.38		0.57	1.73	2.18	3.69
Autumn-October	63.33	33.01			0.11	0.65	2.90

Solar Development Site 8 static detector survey summary

3.4.25 During the static detector deployments on Solar Development Site 8 (Locations 21 and 22), species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, brown long eared, noctule, Leisler's, and *Myotis sp*. All of these species were recorded at both static locations, excluding Nathusius' pipistrelle which was not recorded at Location 22. Additionally, not all species were recorded at every static location every month, e.g. Nathusius' pipistrelle was only recorded at Location 21 in September. Common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, noctule and *Myotis sp* were recorded during every deployment at both locations, with common pipistrelle forming the highest percentage of passes on all deployments.

3.4.26 A total of 6847 passes were recorded at Locations 21 and 22, which is an average of 213.9 passes per night. Location 21 recorded a total of 2142 passes (133.9 per night) and location 22 recorded a total of 4705 passes (294.1 per night).

3.4.27 Most passes per night within Solar Development Site 8 were recorded at Location 22. Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for this type of habitat in this locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified.

3.5 GLTA

3.5.1 A GLTA survey was completed on ~~77~~88 trees and two treelines proposed for removal/pruning within the Order Limits (as per Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**]).

3.5.2 Of the trees surveyed, ~~66~~71 individual trees and two treelines were determined to have no potential suitability for roosting bats 'None' and these trees are listed below. ~~Nine~~Ten trees were assessed as PRF-I, having suitability for individual/low numbers of bats, and two trees were assessed as PRF-M, having suitability for multiple bats. In addition, five trees were assessed as Further Assessment Required (FAR), outlining that further surveys are required to determine if there are any PRFs present within the tree, and the roosting potential of any PRFs present.

3.5.3 Table 32 summarises the PRF-I, PRF-M and ~~PRF-M~~FAR trees, including a description of the tree and their PRFs, the tree's location within the Order Limits, and the impact on the tree as a result of the Proposed Development. These trees are also shown on Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09**].

3.5.4 Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**] has been completed as a worst-case scenario and as such in reality, tree loss may be less than currently anticipated. However, when assessing this worst-case scenario, the Proposed Development would result in the removal of two PRF-M trees, one FAR tree, and six PRF-I trees, and the pruning of ~~three~~four PRF-I trees and four FAR trees.

3.5.5 The tree reference numbers included in the tables below are taken from Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**] for consistency.

3.5.6 Individual trees with no suitability for roosting bats 'None' following the GLTA are~~:~~ listed below. All trees within Treeline 9.19 (Tree Group 2667 in AIA) and Treeline 9.20 (Tree Group 2669 in AIA) were also assess as "None":

2534	1345	1639	1804	1974	2190	2501
2593	1546	1677	1826	2005	2227	2502
149	1547	1678	1880	2006	2247	2503
353	1548	1679	1901	2019	2248	2504
781	1549	1690	1913	2023	2260	2529
837	1550	1691	1925	2140	2293	2531
1097	1554	1696	1960	2146	2455	2336
1186	1555	1698	1964	2177	2460	2665
1187	1559	1701	1965	2178	2489	2656
1188	1638	1702	1968	2189	2491	2684
2687						

Table 3-25 Description of PRF-M and PRF-I tress following GLTA

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
[redacted]	[redacted]	Mature common oak *Quercus robur* hedgerow tree with significant old and also more recent storm damage, 8 m tall. Four RPFs: PRF 1: 5 m high, south orientation, knot hole on main stem PRF 2: 5 m high, south orientation, knot hole on main limb, angled upwards but may extend in PRF 3:3 m high, south orientation, wounds/rot on main trunk and rot around broken limb may offer suitable PRF. PRF 4: 5 m high, west-west orientation, knot hole on main stem	[redacted]	Complete Removal	[redacted]

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
[redacted]	[redacted]	Mature common oak in hedgerow with existing partial crown removal, 9 m tall. Eight PRFs: PRF 1: 3 m high, south orientation, double knot hole on main stem at junction between trunk and small side branch PRF 2: 4 m high, south orientation, knot hole on main stem when branch has been removed/lost PRF 3: 5 m high, south-east orientation, wound and adjacent cleaved bark on main stem PRF 4: 2.5 m high, south-east orientation, wound on main stem PRF 5: 6 m high, south-west orientation, large knot hole on trunk, just above main limb. Has rot around edge and cleaved bark	[redacted]	Complete removal	[redacted]

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
		PRF 6: 7 m high, west orientation, knot hole at terminal end of main limb, and adjacent cleaved bark PRF 7: 8 m high, damage/rot/cleaver bark around top of trunk (on all sides) where crown has been removed PRF 8: 5 m high, north-east orientation, knot hole on main stem			

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2683	Where CRC 4-POC meets Site 4 on Roe Lane	Semi-mature ash *Fraxinus excelsior* approximately 17 m tall. Ivy coverage fully surrounds the main stem. The ivy is not mature, with no clear lattice structure, so does not for a PRF itself, but could obscure PRFs beneath.	FAR	~~2~~Complete removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description			Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
~~2684~~2655	CRC 1-4, on track off Skipwith Road	Mature oak tree adjacent to farm track, approximately 19 m tall. Two PRFs: PRF 1: Flaking bark PRF 2: Multiple dead branches	FAR	~~?~~Potential pruning- Outer canopies raised to 5.5 m with no large branch removal			

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description			Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
~~2687~~2657	CRC 1-4, on track off Skipwith Road	Mature oak tree adjacent to farm track, approximately 19 m tall. Three PRFs: PRF 1: Flaking bark PRF 2: Deadwood PRF 3:Linear cracks	FAR	~~?~~Potential pruning- Outer canopies raised to 5.5 m with no large branch removal			

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description			Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2660	CRC 1-4, on track off Skipwith Road	Mature oak tree adjacent to farm track within Hedgerow 9.146, approximately 18 m tall. Three PRFs: PRF 1: Flaking bark PRF 2: Dead cracked branches PRF 3:Splits within stem	FAR	Potential pruning- Outer canopies raised to 5.5 m with no large branch removal			


Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description			Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2663	CRC 1-4, on track off Skipwith Road	Mature oak tree adjacent to farm track within Hedgerow 9.146, approximately 18 m tall. Three PRFs: PRF 1: Flaking bark PRF 2: Knot holes PRF 3: Fissures in stem	FAR	Potential pruning- Outer canopies raised to 5.5 m with no large branch removal			

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2695	CRC 1-4 neighbouring Dam Dyke (Ditch 9.28)	Mature oak tree adjacent to Ditch 9.28, approximately 16 m tall. One PRF: PRF 1: Broken branches	PRF-I	~~Pruning~~ Potential pruning-Outer canopies raised to 5.5 m with no large branch removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
1558	CRC 1-4 neighbouring Black Fen Lane	Isolated common alder *Alnus glutinosa* along a former hedge line, 12 m tall. Two PRFs: PRF 1: 4 m high, south orientation, healed pruning cut/knot hole PRF 2: 5 m high, south orientation, branch tear-out wound/knot hole	PRF-I	Complete Removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2365	Highways Improvements Areas on Dam Lane	Recently storm damaged crack willow *Salix fragilis* which had collapsed/fallen from approximately 3-4 m up the main stem creating splits/cavity in the main trunk area. There is also significant cavity damage higher up in the main trunk, which was not possible to inspect from ground level, 11 m tall. One PRF: PRF 1:4 m high, recent storm damage and major collapse of trunk resulting in crack/tears in main trunk area around damage	PRF-I	Complete Removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2375a	Highways Improvements Areas on Field Lane	Mature oak (1st of 3) along a ditch bank that was covered in ivy, 18 m tall. Two PRFs: PRF 1: 6 m high, south orientation, ivy cover. PRF 2: 6 m high, south orientation, small side branch has broken off which has caused a split to form along the branch. Torn/split branch is estimated to be beyond the extent of the proposed pruning limit.	PRF-I	Prune back by 2-3 m on southern aspect	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2375b	Highways Improvements Areas on Field Lane	Mature oak (2nd of 3) along ditch bank that was covered in ivy, 18 m tall. One PRF: PRF 1: 6 m high, ivy cover.	PRF-I	Prune back by 2-3 m on southern aspect	
2375c	Highways Improvements Areas on Field Lane	Mature oak (3rd of 3) along a ditch bank that was covered in ivy. One PRF: PRF 1: 6 m high, ivy cover.	PRF-I	Prune back by 2-3 m on southern aspect	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
1963	Where CRC 1-4 crossed Hillam Road	Small roadside hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna* that is isolated from the rest of a defunct hedge, 6 m tall. One PRF: PRF 1: Significant damage/rot is present along the main trunk.	PRF-I	Complete Removal	
2037	CRC 4-POC on A162	Semi-mature ivy-covered common ash ~~*Fraxinus excelsior*~~ within defunct roadside hedge/scrub, 10 m tall. One PRF: PRF 1: 6 m high, ivy cover covering entire main stem	PRF-I	Complete Removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
2038	CRC 4-POC on A162	Semi-mature ivy-covered common ash within defunct roadside hedge/scrub, 11 m tall. Three PRFs: PRF 1: 6 m high, ivy covering entire main stem PRF 2: 3 m high, east orientation, knot hole in damaged side branch PRF 3: 3 m high, east orientation, lifted bark where side branch has snapped off and caused rot	PRF-I	Complete Removal	
2017	CRC 1-4	Mature hedgerow oak, 13 m tall. Four PRFs: PRF 1: 6 m high, south-west orientation, knot hole on side limb, angled half upwards PRF 2: 6 m high, south orientation, knot hole/wound on underside of limb	PRF-I	Complete Removal	

Tree Number	Location	Tree and PRF Description	Bat Roosting Potential	Impact to Tree	Photo
		PRF 3: 7 m high, east orientation, knot hole on south side of east facing limb PRF 4: 6 m high, west orientation, broken/snapped branch, possible suitable gaps in wound/knot that has developed behind			

3.6 Emergence Surveys

3.6.1 No bats were recorded emerging from Tree 1961 or Tree 505 during the nocturnal emergence surveys. Footage captured using NVA cameras was analysed in full, with no bats seen emerging from either tree. It can therefore be concluded that bats do not currently roost within Tree 1961 or Tree 505

3.6.2 During the emergence surveys on Tree 505, very low levels of bat commuting and foraging activity by common and widespread species was recorded. During Visit 1, the combined recordings from both surveyors totalled nine passes of common pipistrelle, three passes of myotis sp. and one noctule pass. Many of these calls were heard but not seen, however one bat was seen to commute along the adjacent hedge. Visit 2 and Visit 3 also had very low levels of activity recorded by the same species, with the addition of soprano pipistrelle.

3.6.3 During the emergence surveys on Tree 1961, there was similarly low levels of bat commuting and foraging activity recorded by common and widespread species. During Visit 1, passes of noctule and common pipistrelle were recorded, with common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle recorded at Visit 2, and soprano pipistrelle and noctule recorded at Visit 3. Foraging and commuting was noted mostly along the adjacent hedgerow and road.

4 Conclusion

4.1.1 Overall, the level of bat activity recorded during the static detector deployments was similar across all the Solar Development Sites and was typical for the type of habitat present in its locality, largely comprising common and widespread species, with no significant bat assemblage identified. The main species recorded included common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, *Myotis sp.,* and noctule, with less frequent Nathusius' pipistrelle, brown long-eared, and leislers.

4.1.2 During the NBWs within the Solar Development Sites, Solar Development Site 1 had the highest level of bat activity recorded however, activity levels were still typical for the habitat type present in this locality, with no significant bat assemblage identified. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle, *Myotis sp*., and *Nyctalus sp*. The majority of passes were of common pipistrelle, comprising 97.8%, 96% and 84% of the passes recorded in the spring, summer and autumn surveys respectively. In comparison, Solar Development Site 8 had the lowest level of bat activity recorded during the NBWs, with only eight bat passes recorded on all NBWs combined. Species recorded comprised common pipistrelle and *Myotis sp.*.

4.1.3 For Solar Development Site 1, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on two of the three surveys along the treeline on the western boundary of Field 1.18, along the treelined track leading to Mount Pleasant Farm from the west, and along Ditch 1.7 in the south. In addition, during the static surveys within Solar Development Site 1, Location 5 had the highest number of passes per night.

4.1.4 For Solar Development Site 2, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on all surveys in the south-west adjacent to the woodland belt outside of the Order Limits, and for Solar Development Site 3, bat passes were recorded on two out of three surveys along the treeline on the western boundary.

4.1.5 For Solar Development Site 4, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on all surveys to the south of Field 4.10 adjacent to the woodland belt outside of the Order Limits, and during the static surveys Location 12 had the highest number of passes per night.

4.1.6 For Solar Development Site 6, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on two surveys each at field boundary features, such as D6.1, D6.3, TL6.1 and TL6.2. The static surveys within Solar Development Site 6 recorded the highest average number of passes per night at Location 17.

4.1.7 For Solar Development Site 7, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on two surveys along the railway lines, and associated vegetation, on the northern and western boundaries.

4.1.8 Finally, for Solar Development Site 8, during the NBWs, bat passes were recorded on every survey along D8.1 forming the western boundary. The static surveys within Solar Development Site 8 recorded the highest number of passes per night at Location 22.

4.1.9 No buildings are located within the Order Limits that could support roosting bats, and the Design Principles have aimed to retain and buffer all trees within the Order Limits where practicable. However, as detailed in Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**]), ~~77~~88 individual trees and two treelines are proposed for removal/pruning within the Order Limits as a worst-case assessment. This figure includes the 11 individual trees and two treelines added for removal/pruning as a result of the Change Application submitted during Examination.

4.1.10 A GLTA completed on these ~~77~~ trees found ~~66~~71 individual trees and two treelines were determined to have no potential suitability for roosting bats 'None', ~~nine~~10 trees were assessed as PRF-I, having suitability for individual/low numbers of bats, and two trees were assessed as PRF-M, having suitability for multiple bats. In addition, five trees were assessed as FAR, outlining that further surveys are required to determine if there are any PRFs present within the tree, and the roosting potential of any PRFs present. These trees are shown on Figure 6.9: Bat Activity Transects and Static Locations (ES Volume 2) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.02.06.09**].

4.1.11 Appendix 16.2: Arboriculture Impact Assessment (ES Volume 3) [**EN0110012/APP/LVS/06.03.16.02**] has been completed as a worst-case scenario and as such in reality, tree loss may be less than currently anticipated. However, when assessing this worst-case scenario, the Proposed Development would result in the removal of two PRF-M trees, one FAR tree, and six PRF-I trees, as well as the pruning of four PRF-I trees and four FAR trees.

~~4.1.11~~4.1.12 The required works to the PRF-I trees can be completed under the supervision of an ecologist (further discussed within Chapter 6: Biodiversity (ES Volume 1) [**EN0110012/APS/LVS/06.01.06]).** ~~However, nocturnal emergence surveys were completed on the two trees assessed as PRF-M (Tree 505 and Tree 1961) to confirm presence/likely absence of roosting bats.~~

~~4.1.12~~4.1.13 As the two PRF-M trees scheduled for potential removal were identified during the January 2026 GLTA (and were not added as a result of the Change Application during Examination), nocturnal emergence surveys were able to be completed on the two PRF-M trees in 2026 (Tree 505 and Tree 1961) to confirm presence/likely absence of roosting bats. The nocturnal emergence surveys concluded that bats do not currently roost within Tree 1961 or Tree 505. In addition, very low levels of bat commuting and foraging activity were recorded during the emergence surveys, by common and widespread species only.

4.1.14 Of the 11 trees added as potentially requiring removal/pruning as a result of the Change Application, one PRF-I tree requires pruning, four FAR trees require pruning, and one FAR tree requires removal. However, due to seasonal constraints, the further surveys required on the FAR trees cannot be completed before the end of the Examination period. The further bat surveys on the FAR trees will be undertaken in a suitable surveying season prior to the start of works to determine the potential roosting suitability of the tree, and whether bats are currently roosting within the tree.

References

Ref 1 CIEEM (2022) Code of Professional Conduct, CIEEM, Winchester

Ref 2 Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Ref 3 Mitchell-Jones, A.J, & McLeish, A.P. (eds). (2004) 3rd Edition Bat Workers' Manual., JNCC, Peterborough, ISBN 1 86107 558 8

Ref 4 Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London. ISBN-978-1-7395126-0-6

Ref 5 Time and Date, “Weather in York – October 2024,” 2024. [Online]. Available at: https://www.timeanddate.com/weather/uk/york/historic?month=10&year=2024

Light Valley
Solar

W: Lightvalleysolar.co.uk
E: info@lightvalleysolar.co.uk