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## 1.1.

 DCO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
### 1.1.1. This technical appendix supports the assessment contained in Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision B) (Volume II).

1.1.2. This-Revision B of Appendix 9.4 - Bats and Hedgerows Assessment replaces and supersedes-(AS-031, AS-033 to AS-038) superseded Revision A of Appendix 9.4 (APP-102 to APP-105) to take account of updated survey data that was not presented within the Revision A.
1.1.2.1.1.3. This Revision C of Appendix 9.4 replaces and supersedes Appendix 9.4 (Revision B) to provide updated figures (Figures 9.4.1 to 9.4.11) in response to proposed design changes as outlined in Table i.i of Chapter I of the ES Addendum. The proposed design changes have not resulted in any changes to the text within baseline methodology, results and summary of this appendix.
1.1.3-1.1.4. The Applicant intends to build and operate a new underground carbon dioxide $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ pipeline from Cheshire, England to Flintshire, Wales with necessary Above Ground Installations (AGIs) and Block Valve Stations (BVSs). It is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and will require a Development Consent Order (DCO) under the Planning Act 2008 ('PA2008') granted by the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS).
1.1.4-1.1.5. The DCO Proposed Development will form part of HyNet North West ('the Project'), which is a hydrogen supply and Carbon Capture and Storage ('CCS') project. The goal of the Project is to reduce $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions from industry, homes and transport and support economic growth in the North West of England and North Wales. The wider Project is based on the production of low carbon hydrogen from natural gas. It includes the development of a new hydrogen production plant, hydrogen distribution pipelines, hydrogen storage and the creation of CCS infrastructure. CCS prevents $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ entering the atmosphere by capturing it, compressing it and transporting it for safe, permanent storage.
1.1.5-1.1.6. The DCO Proposed Development is a critical component of HyNet North West which, by facilitating the transportation of carbon, enables the rest of the Project to be low carbon. The hydrogen production, distribution and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ capture and storage elements of the Project do not form part of the DCO Proposed Development and will be delivered under separate consenting processes.
1.1.6-1.1.7. The DCO Application will seek consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of the following components which are part of the DCO Proposed Development, namely:

- Ince Above Ground Installation (AGI) to Stanlow AGI Pipeline - a section of new underground onshore pipeline ( $20^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter) to transport $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$;
- Stanlow AGI to Flint AGI Pipeline - a section of new underground onshore pipeline ( 36 " in diameter) to transport $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$;
- Flint AGI to Flint Connection Pipeline - a section of new underground onshore pipeline (24" in diameter) to transport $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$;
- Flint Connection to Point of Ayr (PoA) Terminal Pipeline - a section of existing Connah's Quay to Point of Ayr (PoA) underground onshore pipeline ( 24 " in diameter) which currently transports natural gas but would be repurposed and reused to transport $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The Flint Connection to PoA Terminal Pipeline is scoped out of the EIA, except for the areas adjacent to the three BVSs that are within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary;
- Four AGIs - Ince AGI, Stanlow AGI, Northop Hall AGI, and Flint AGI;
- Six Block Valve Stations (BVSs) - located along:
- The new Stanlow AGI to Flint AGI Pipeline (three in total);
- The existing Flint Connection to PoA Terminal Pipeline (three in total);
- Other above ground infrastructure, including Cathodic Protection (CP) transformer rectifier cabinets and pipeline marker posts;
- Utility Connection infrastructure, including power utilities and Fibre Optic Cable (FOC); and
- Temporary ancillary works integral to the construction of the Carbon Dioxide Pipeline, including Construction Compounds and temporary access tracks.
1.1.7.1.1.8. Further details of each element of the DCO Proposed Development are set out in Chapter 3 - Description of the DCO Proposed Development (Volume II) (APP-055)-and subsequent addenda.


## 1.2.

 ECOLOGICAL BACKGROUND1.2.1. Extended Phase 1 habitat surveys were undertaken from March 2021 to June 2022 and in December 2022 across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary for the DCO Proposed Development. The Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary is predominantly arable through industrial and rural village landscapes. Hedgerows, woodland, and grassland habitats were present throughout and will be subject to both the direct and indirect effects of the DCO Proposed Development. A detailed description of habitats is provided in Appendix 9.1 Habitats and Designated Sites Survey Report of the 2022 ES (APP-091-APP-093).(Volume III).
1.2.2. The extended Phase 1 habitat surveys incorporated an ecological desk study that was completed in November 2021. The desk study reviewed existing ecological baseline information, recorded the habitats present and identified the presence, or potential presence, of protected habitats or species which could pose legal and, or planning constraints. This included bat species data recorded within 5km of the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary from the last 10 years (as of February 2020). Additionally, habitat with high suitability for bats was reviewed, with Ancient Woodland data from Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and Natural England (NE), along with Ancient Hedgerow data compiled from digitised historical maps from Cheshire Archives and Local Studies and National Library of Wales utilised.

## 1.3. <br> BRIEF SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The Applicant commissioned hedgerow surveys of all hedgerows located within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary. The purpose of this survey was to:

- Assess the potential for hedgerows along the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary to support bats and determine the type of activity and the species utilising the hedgerows;
- Determine whether the hedgerows could be classed as 'Poor', 'Good’ or 'Excellent' under the criteria developed by the Applicant that would inform survey effort, such as, automated static detectors and modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys;
- Identify any resultant legal or planning constraints; and
- Make recommendations with regards to mitigation/compensation requirements should loss or breaching of 'Good' or 'Excellent' be unavoidable.
1.3.2. This report (Revision B) supersedes Revision A. Further surveys were completed from July 2022 to September 2022 which were not reported within Revision A. The results of these surveys are presented within this report. The impact assessment and recommendations for compensation and mitigation are presented within Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision-B)(Volume II).
1.3.3. The bats and hedgerow assessment detailed within this report, is an innovative approach developed by the Applicant. Liaison regarding this innovative approach has been conducted with Natural Resources Wales and Natural England, with methodologies and approach agreed and detailed within Table 9.1, Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision-B) (Volume II).


## 1.4.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND POLICY
1.4.1. This report has been compiled with reference to the following relevant nature conservation legislation, planning policy and the UK Biodiversity Framework from which the protection of sites, habitats and species is derived in England.
1.4.2. In England and Wales, the Wildlife and Landscape Criteria in the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 (Ref. 1) (hereafter referred to as 'the Regulations') are intended to protect 'Important' countryside hedgerows from destruction or damage. Hedgerows are assessed against a number of criteria in relation to their archaeology, and history, and wildlife and landscape value, from which it is determined whether a hedgerow is Important as defined by the Regulations.
1.4.3. As laid out in Section 2, the criteria outlined in the Regulations were adapted to fit with a tailored approach aimed towards bat interactions with hedgerows. This drew on several important criteria from the Regulations - see paragraph 2.2.4 - and as such both 'Excellent' and 'Good' Bat Hedgerow Suitability Assessment (BHSA) classified hedgerows were recognised as equivalents to Important under the Regulations.
1.4.4. Under the Regulations, any person wishing to remove a hedgerow must submit a hedgerow removal notice to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The LPA will then decide whether to approve the notice or issue a hedgerow retention notice if the hedgerow has been identified as Important under the Regulations.
1.4.5. All native hedgerows are also listed as Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) in accordance with Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006) (Ref. 2). HPIs are habitats in England and Wales that were identified as requiring action in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) and continue to be regarded as conservation priorities in the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework which superseded the UK BAP. The definition of this priority habitat has been amended from the pre-existing Habitat Action Plan for ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows and is as follows: A hedgerow is defined as any boundary line of trees or shrubs over 20 m long and less than 5 m wide, and where any gaps between the trees or shrub species are less that 20 m wide (Ref. 1, Ref. 3,).
1.4.6. Under Section 40 of the NERC Act (2006) (Ref. 2), LPAs are required to have due regard for these habitats when exercising their functions, including determining planning applications.
1.4.7.

Bat species are afforded a high level of protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations') (Ref. 4). The legislation outlines that it is an offence to

- 'Deliberately capture, injure, or kill a bat,
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat
- Deliberately disturb bats in such a way as to be likely
a) to impair their ability -
i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or
ii) to hibernate or migrate; or
- to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species'.
1.4.8. Protection is also partially afforded under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (Ref. 5) with respect to disturbance of animals when using places of shelter or protection, and obstruction of access to places of shelter or protection.
1.4.9. Certain species of bats including noctule Nyctalus noctula, brown long-eared bat Plecotus auritus and soprano pipistrelle Pipistrellus pygmaeus are also listed as a Species of Principal Importance (SPI) for the Conservation of Biodiversity in accordance with Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 (Ref. 2). Under Section 40 of the NERC Act (Ref. 2), public bodies (including local planning authorities) have a duty to have regard for the conservation of SPI when carrying out their functions, including determining planning applications.
1.4.10. Certain species of bat, including barbastelle Barbastella barbastellus, Bechstein's bat Myotis bechsteinii, noctule, brown long-eared bat, lesser horseshoe bat Rhinolophus hipposideros, greater horseshoe bat Rhinolophus ferrumequinum, common pipistrelle Pipistrellus pipistrellus and soprano pipistrelle are also listed as SPI for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in relation to Wales under Section 7 of the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 (Ref. 6). Section 6 under Part 1 introduced an enhanced biodiversity and resilience of ecosystems duty (the S6 duty) for public authorities in the exercise of functions in relation to Wales, superseding provisions previously set out in the NERC Act 2006 (Ref. 2).


## 2.

 BASELINE METHODOLOGY
## 2.1.

DESK BASED ASSESSMENT
POTENTIAL HEDGEROW MAPPING
2.1.1. Before field surveys commenced, potential hedgerows were mapped using freely available aerial imagery to help gain an understanding of the extent of the hedgerow count across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary and plan surveys accordingly.

## ANCIENT HEDGEROW SEARCH

2.1.2. An Ancient Hedgerow search was undertaken for the DCO Proposed Development, using digitised maps from the National Library of Wales and Cheshire Archives.
2.1.3. Any results of the ancient hedgerow search were then checked against the potential hedgerow database before the extended Phase 1 habitat surveys of the hedgerow locations to determine if these ancient hedgerows still existed.

## EXTENDED PHASE 1 HABITAT SURVEYS

2.1.4. Extended Phase 1 habitat surveys were undertaken from March 2021 until November 2021 and continued from January 2022 until June 2022. The data collected on these surveys was used to ground-truth the desk based data and add additional optimal bat habitat for consideration within the final BHSA calculation. Once hedgerows were identified/confirmed through the extended Phase 1 habitat surveys, a hedgerow survey was undertaken.

## TREE AND STRUCTURE ROOST ASSESSMENT

2.1.5. Preliminary Bat Roost Assessments (PBRA), Aerial Inspections, and Dusk Emergence/ Dawn Re-entry Surveys were undertaken to assess the potential direct and indirect effects of the DCO Proposed Development during construction and operation (emphasis on construction rather than operation due to the nature of the DCO Proposed Development) on bats.
2.1.6. The roost surveys were completed within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary and were taken into consideration when undertaking the BHSA. Potential and known roosts identified throughout the survey season were mapped alongside the desk-study data and where possible were included within the BHSA.
2.1.7. Roosts recorded after the completion of BHSA were taken into consideration during the data analysis and mitigation design. Bat activity data from roost surveys are available in Appendix 9.3 Bat Activity Survey Report (Revision B) (Volume III).

## 2.2. HEDGEROW ASSESSMENT

2.2.1. Hedgerow survey data was recorded using the ArcGIS Collector application (© ESRI) on tablets. Digital proformas were filled in on the application. The location of the hedgerow was recorded and images of the hedgerow captured. This method of recording data commenced during June 2021, as all previous surveys undertaken using paper proformas were subsequently digitised.

## HEDGEROW FIELD SURVEYS

2.2.2. The hedgerow field survey undertaken across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary aimed to collect data on specific characteristics taken to be beneficial to bat community and diversity. Aligning with Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment, a hedgerow condition assessment within the Higher Level Stewardship Farm Environment Plan (FEP) Manual (Ref. 7) was used to influence elements of the assessment categories, alongside a literature review (Annex B) of relevant research and guidance notes.
2.2.3. In accordance with the Regulations, the hedgerows were measured from the point or points where there was a gap of more than 20 metres between the end of the hedgerow and the nearest line of hedgerow. Gaps within a hedgerow were included in the total length provided they were 20 metres or less in length.
2.2.4. Notes were made on the following in accordance with the criteria outlined in Table 1:

- Hedgerow length, calculated automatically in the ArcGIS Collector application;
- Hedgerow height; measured from the base of woody growth, excluding trees and banks;
- Hedgerow width, measured from the widest point of the hedgerow canopy;
- Number of woody species in the hedgerow length, including species name;
- Number of standard trees, across the entire hedgerow. This was then used with the hedgerow length to calculate the number of trees within each 50 m stretch of hedgerow;
- Number of gaps in the hedge, measured as a percentage of the total length of the hedgerow; and
- Presence of ditches (whether wet, dry or absent).


## BHSA CALCULATION

2.2.5. All hedgerows within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary were surveyed with regard for the information required by the criteria in the BHSA calculator. This
was developed using a similar approach to the Great Crested Newt Triturus cristatus (GCN) Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) survey, where a number of factors are assessed for hedgerows that provide an estimate of the likely use of that habitat by bats. With the aim that by undertaking this BHSA, survey effort can be better focused across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary, resulting in a proportionate survey effort.
2.2.6. The criteria, outlined in Table 1, were developed to help establish the habitat suitability of each hedgerow for supporting the extant bat populations. This was developed after a literature review looking at which features and characteristics of hedgerows and surrounding habitat influence bat populations positively and negatively (Annex D).
2.2.7. The findings of the literature review, combined with the expert opinion of a full member of CIEEM and specialist bat ecologist with over 15 years bat survey and analysis experience, informed the final criteria. This approach was further ratified by stakeholder liaison with NE and NRW, with feedback from both informing the final criteria.

Table 1 - BHSA Criteria-Developedcriteria developed by WSP

| Criteria | Output | BHSA Scoringscoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Height | Metres | $\geq 2=3$ |
|  |  | $\geq 1=2$ |
|  | Metres | $\geq 1.5=3$ |
| Width | $\geq 1=2$ <br> As a percentage of the <br> total length. | $>20=1$ |
| Gappiness | $>10=2$ |  |
| Woody Species | Number of woody <br> species present along <br> the entire length of the <br> hedgerow. | $>0=3=2$ |
| Diversity | $\geq 0=1$ |  |
| Ditch present | Wet/ Dry/ Absent | Wet = 2 |


| Criteria | Output | BHSA Scoringscoring |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Arable field margin | Metres | $\geq 5.1=4$ |
|  |  | $\geq 2.1=3$ |
|  |  | $\geq 0.1=2$ |
|  |  | $\geq 0=1$ |
| Number of trees | Number of trees present | $\geq 6=4$ |
|  | per 50m of hedgerow ${ }^{1}$ | $\geq 3=3$ |
|  |  | $\geq 1=2$ |
|  |  | $\geq 0=1$ |

2.2.8. Each of the outputs from the criteria were given a score that was then used to calculate an overall BHSA number. The equation outlined shows how the BHSA score was reached. The score was then used to categorise the hedgerows into the three BHSA categories. The score thresholds for each BHSA category can be seen in Table 2.

$$
B H S A=(S l 1 * S l 2 * S I 3 * S I 4 * S l 5 * S I 6 * S l 7)^{1 / 7}
$$

2.2.9. The above criteria and calculations give a maximum score of 3.07, a minimum score of 1 , and a range of 2.07. The threshold scores for each BHSA category were calculated by dividing the range by three and using the intervals of the calculated thirds from the minimum BHSA score upwards.

Table 2 - BHSA Score Translationscore translation

| BHSA Category | BHSA Score |
| :--- | :--- |
| Excellent | $\geq 2.4$ |
| Good | $1.7-2.39$ |
| Poor | $1-1.69$ |

[^0]2.2.10. The BHSA categories attributed to each hedgerow set the level of further survey effort. All 'Good' and 'Excellent' category hedgerows were subject to further survey using Song Meter SM4BAT Full Spectrum (FS) static bat detectors (© Wildlife Acoustics Inc.) (hereafter referred to as 'Statics'). Whereas 'Poor' category hedgerows were discounted and not subject to further survey.
2.2.11. Parameters were developed, highlighted in Table 3, that discounted 'Good' and 'Excellent' hedgerows when certain criteria were met.
2.2.12. Hedgerows that were scoped out in advance of surveying, using the parameters outlined in Table 3, are detailed in Annex E.

Table 3 - Hedgerow Discount Parametersdiscount parameters

| Hedgerow <br> Parameters | Justification |
| :--- | :--- |
| Adjoining <br> residential | Hedgerows adjoining residential areas under the <br> assumption that they will be avoided by the DCO Proposed <br> Development and thus any bat activity along the hedgerow <br> is unlikely to be severed by the Proposed Development. |
| Hedgerow <br> located parallel <br> to proposed <br> route and thus <br> easier to <br> avoid. | Where the hedgerow is located parallel to the indicative <br> Newbuild Carbon Dioxide Pipeline route, with space to allow <br> avoidance, assumptions have been made that the <br> hedgerow will be avoided in favour of open fields and thus <br> the direct and indirect effects on the hedgerow and any <br> associated bat activity will be reduced significantly. |
| Over 50\% of <br> hedgerow <br> located within <br> 50 m of main <br> roads ${ }^{2}$. | If over 50\% of the hedgerow's length (within the Newbuild <br> Infrastructure Boundary) was within 50m of a main road <br> then the hedgerow was downgraded to poor due to the <br> environment main roads create not being conducive to bat <br> activity, as is referenced in Berthinussen and Altringham's <br> research (Ref. 1). |

## BHSA MODIFICATIONS

2.2.13. Due to the BHSA being an innovative assessment, liaison was undertaken with NE and NRW. Through liaison and completing the initial stages of the assessment, the BHSA approach was modified. Alterations and justifications for the changes are detailed within Annex C.

[^1]
### 2.3. AUTOMATED STATIC DETECTOR ASSESSMENT

## FIELD SURVEY

2.3.1. The automated static detector assessment was used to assess BHSA categorised 'Good' and 'Excellent' hedgerows, in order to assess their original categorisation. The process described in Section 2.2 outlines the criteria that was involved in calculating a hedgerows BHSA score and the parameters that could discount an eligible hedgerow from requiring an automated static detector assessment.
2.3.2. Statics were located on 'Good' and 'Excellent' hedgerows to collect recordings of bat echolocation calls and help identify bat activity levels along each hedgerow.
2.3.3. Statics were positioned to cover either individual or groups of hedgerows depending on proximity and connectivity. The hedgerows were assessed as individuals or groups based on the professional judgement of a suitably experienced ecologist and reviewed by a bat specialist with over 15 years bat survey and analysis experience. For 'individual' hedgerows, statics were placed in the centre of the hedgerow where possible. For 'grouped' hedgerows, statics were placed in the best position along a hedgerow to cover all hedgerows within the group, where possible.
2.3.4. Statics were deployed three times, once per season ${ }^{3}$, and set to record for a minimum of five consecutive nights. The detectors were programmed to turn on at sunset and turn off at sunrise on each night.
2.3.5. The statics were triggered to begin recording when a signal exceeding 16khz was detected (a 'trigger event'). Recording continued until there was a gap of 3 seconds between signals, whereafter the recording would stop. At the next trigger event, a new recording would then be created, resulting in one sound file recording per trigger event.
2.3.6. The survey effort for automated static detector assessments on qualifying hedgerows can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4 - Automated Static Detector Assessment Effortstatic detector assessment effort 2022

|  | $\mathbf{1}$ <br> Deployment | $\mathbf{2}$ <br> Deployments | $\mathbf{3}$ <br> Deployments | No <br> deployments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual <br> Static | 3 | 10 | 48 | 10 |

[^2]|  | 1 <br> Deployment | 2 <br> Deployments | 3 <br> Deployments | No <br> deployments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group <br> Static | 2 | 8 | 40 | 2 |

2.3.7. Of the 193 hedgerows which required an automated static detector assessment, 143 were assessed in all three seasons. The locations of the static deployments are presented in Figure 9.4.3 (Annex A). Of the remaining hedgerows, seven were assessed in only one season, 29 in only two seasons, and 15 were not subject to any static detector assessment. A full list of all hedgerows which were not subject to the full survey effort, and the reason for this, is provided within Section 2.7.

## DATA ANALYSIS

2.3.8. Bat echolocation call recordings gathered from the Statics were analysed using specialist computer software Wildlife Acoustics Kaleidoscope Pro 5.4.7 (KalPro).
2.3.9. A 'bat pass' was defined as one trigger event. If multiple species were recorded within a single recording file, there would be one bat pass for each species recorded. This approach was used to standardise the definition of a bat pass. It should be recognised that a series of separate sound files may represent a series of different bats commuting within the range of an automated detector, or a smaller number of bats repeatedly triggering the detector (e.g. bats making repeated foraging passes within the range of a detector).
2.3.10. All files were categorised by the auto-identification analysis on KalPro. All files identified as 'noise', 'no.id', and species which were not a Pipistrellus sp., were subject to manual analysis. Additionally, Pipistrellus sp. calls with an identification confidence rating of 0.7 or below, were subsequently manually analysed. The manual analysis was completed by a suitably experienced ecologist to confirm or alter the auto-identification.
2.3.11. A random $10 \%$ of the manually checked common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle calls with an identification confidence rating of 0.5 or below, were then quality assured by suitably qualified ecologists with many years' experience analysing bat data. For all other species and noise files, which had been manually analysed, a random $10 \%$ was taken of each category and also quality assured to confirm no bat echolocation calls were being routinely misidentified.
2.3.12. The number of bat passes recorded was used to calculate a Bat Activity Index Value (BAIV). This provides an indication of the activity levels of each bat species at each hedgerow, per season, and overall, that was identified for an
automated static detector assessment within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary.
2.3.13. The BAIV of each species, and overall, for the assessed hedgerows was calculated using the number of bat passes per night recorded during each automated static detector assessment. The number of bat passes was divided by the total number of nights the automated static detector assessment took place. This provided the average passes per night (ppn) for each bat species and the ppn overall for all species combined (the 'total ppn'), for each assessed hedgerow.
2.3.14. Inter-quartile analysis was used to identify hedgerows with particularly high ppn in each season. This assessment included the calculation of the lower ( $1^{\text {st }}$ ), middle ( $\left.2^{\text {nd }}\right)$ and upper ( $3^{\text {rd }}$ ) quartiles ${ }^{4}$ of the ppn data. The $1^{\text {st }}$ quartile was then subtracted from the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile, to give the inter-quartile range ${ }^{5}$. The 'upper bound' 6 of the inter-quartile range was calculated using the below method, where x is the 'upper bound', y is the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile and z is the inter-quartile range:

$$
X=Y+(1.5 * Z)
$$

2.3.15. This was repeated to calculate quartiles and an 'upper bound' for the ppn of each individual bat species in each season, as well as for the total ppn in each season. This enabled an assessment of whether hedgerows had particularly high or low numbers of ppn:

- Where the ppn, either for a particular bat species or overall, exceeded the relevant $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile, the number of ppn was considered 'high'. This was used to indicate hedgerows with a high level of bat activity (species-specific or in total).
- Where the ppn, either for a particular bat species or overall, was lower than the relevant $1^{\text {st }}$ quartile, the number of ppn was considered 'low'. This was used to indicate hedgerows with low levels of bat activity (species-specific or in total).
- Where the ppn, either for a particular bat species or overall, exceeded the relevant 'upper bound', the number of ppn was considered to be exceptionally higher than expected. This was used to indicate hedgerows with a particularly notable level of bat activity (species-

[^3]specific or in total), which may be especially suitable or important for supporting bat populations.
2.3.16. Leisler's bat Nyctalus leisleri, serotine Eptesicus serotinus and Nathusius' pipistrelle Pipistrellus nathusii had an average of less than 1ppn across all seasons. Therefore, within this report, the data for these species has been presented as part of the following groups:

- Nyctalus sp - Leisler's bat, noctule, and any passes identified only as Nyctalus sp. calls.
- NSL - serotine, and any passes identified only as NSL
- Pipistrellus sp. - including Nathusius' pipistrelle and any passes identified only as Pipistrellus sp.
2.3.17. Given the aims and objectives of this assessment and the behaviour of these species, this is considered to provide sufficient information for the purposes of this report.
2.3.18. The bat activity data from the automated static detector assessments also provided information on the timings of the bat activity. This data was evaluated to determine whether there were any trends in bat activity during particular hours of the night, which may indicate how the hedgerow was being used by bats.


### 2.4. FINAL BHSA CATEGORIES

2.4.1. The results of the automated static detector assessment were used to assess the BHSA category of hedgerows subject to the assessment.
2.4.2. Parameters were set to determine whether the BHSA category of an assessed hedgerow should be upgraded to a higher category or downgraded to a lower category. Hedgerows within static groups were assessed as a group. However, if only a single hedgerow within a Static group qualified against the parameters for upgrading or downgrading, then the categories for all hedgerows within the group were altered accordingly. The BHSA category of assessed hedgerows which did not meet the parameters for either upgrading or downgrading remained unchanged.
2.4.3. The parameters used to determine whether a hedgerow's BHSA category should be upgraded or downgraded are listed below in Table 5.

Table 5 - BHSA Category Alteration Parameterscategory alteration parameters

| Parameters for upgrading the BHSA category | Parameters for downgrading the BHSA category |
| :---: | :---: |
| The number of ppn for an Annex II7 or 'sensitive' species ${ }^{8}$ exceeds the 'upper bounds' for that species in at least two seasons; and/or <br> The number of total ppn exceeds the 'upper bounds' for total ppn in all three seasons. | The number of total ppn is lower than the 1st quartile for total ppn in all three seasons. |

2.4.4. As a result, assessed hedgerows were assigned a 'final BHSA category'. Hedgerows identified within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary which had a BHSA category of 'Poor', or were scoped out following the initial BHSA calculation, were not required to undergo the automated static detector assessment and subsequent evaluation. The BHSA category for these hedgerows remained 'Poor' or was altered to a final BHSA category of 'Scoped out'.
2.4.5. Hedgerows identified within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary which had a BHSA category of 'Good' were not subject to further evaluation under the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys.
2.4.6. Any hedgerows with a final BHSA category of 'Excellent' were then subject to further evaluation under the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys. Any outstanding modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys are due to be completed prior to construction.
2.4.7. The final BHSA categories, in combination with the results of the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys, have been used to inform recommendations for mitigation and compensation as discussed in the Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision-B)of the ES (Volume II).

[^4]
## 2.5.

 MODIFIED DEFRA LOCAL SCALE SURVEYS
## FIELD SURVEY

2.5.1. 'Excellent' hedgerows were assessed using a modified version of the DEFRA Local Scale survey methods that have been designed to detect important commuting routes in terms of linear infrastructure ${ }^{9}$.
2.5.2. To conduct these surveys, two suitably qualified ecologists were positioned on points along the hedge 30m apart (the potential extent of hedgerow loss), or a modified location based on the connections between hedgerows. Where possible, surveyors were positioned on opposite sides of the hedge.
2.5.3. The surveys were carried out for 60 minutes following sunset or 60 minutes before dawn. Where bat activity was clearly associated with the hedgerow, surveyors recorded the height of bat activity, the species and the behaviour exhibited on data survey sheets (proformas). Elekon Batlogger M, Elekon BatScanner, Echometer Touch Pro 2 (©Wildlife Acoustics Inc.), or Anabat Express Bat Detectors were used to record echolocation calls.
2.5.4. Two surveys per hedge were initially conducted. Up to four additional surveys were subsequently undertaken if the existing DEFRA thresholds were reached. These thresholds are defined as any hedgerow which records 10 or more commuting bat passes of a single species or genus ( 1 for rare species ${ }^{10}$, depending upon rarity) then a full set of surveys should be conducted (Ref. 8).
2.5.5. As of the end of October 2022, a minimum of two Modified Defra Local Scale surveys had been undertaken on 32 of 45 hedgerows requiring further survey. The outstanding survey effort is the result of the exceptionally high quantity of hedgerows within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary and the practicable limit on resources. Where the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys are not completed in full within the 2022 bat survey season, these will be completed prior to construction. These surveys will form pre-construction requirements.

## DATA ANALYSIS

2.5.6. Modifications to the DEFRA Local Scale surveys occurred in the definitions attributed to the safe and unsafe crossing assessment. As there is no risk of collision post-construction, the assessment was limited to the 'in use' definition and the 'at risk' definition was removed. This meant all commuting activity was included within the assessment of use of linear features.

[^5]2.5.7. Data recorded during the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys was assessed as to whether the bats recorded were considered to be using the hedgerow:

- 'In-use' is defined as bats commuting within 5 m of the hedgerow.
- 'Non-use' is considered a bat commuting at a distance further than $5 m$ from the hedgerow, or any activity considered foraging rather than commuting.
2.5.8. In conjunction with the surveyors' notes made during each modified DEFRA Local Scale survey, analysis of recorded files resulted in the identification / confirmation of species of bats and their activity. Bat echolocation call recordings gathered from the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys were analysed using specialist computer software Kaleidoscope Pro 5.4.7. A random $10 \%$ of survey visits were then quality assured by suitably qualified ecologists with experience analysing bat data to ensure no bat echolocation calls were being routinely mis-identified. In order to determine numbers of in-use or nonuse bat passes, the proformas and sound files recorded by both surveyors during a survey were analysed simultaneously to enable comparison between them. This allowed any duplicate recordings to be removed. A duplicate recording was defined as the identification of the same bat species exhibiting the same behaviour (e.g., travelling in the same direction), at the same time, or within 30 seconds, by both surveyors. This prevented double counting of a single bat.
2.5.9. Number of passes were recorded on the proforma by the surveyor depending on observations in the field. Where this was notwasn't recorded, one bat pass was considered to be equivalent to one sound file. Where the surveyor indicated consistent activity within a timeframe or between a range of track numbers, all sound files within these periods were analysed and included in total counts.
2.5.10. Where the surveyor did not state the bat behaviour on the proforma, the corresponding sound files were analysed to aid in behaviour classification. If one feeding buzz was present in the pass, it was determined that this was likely a bat feeding 'on the wing' (e.g., while travelling), therefore the pass was precautionarily classified as commuting and included in the 'in-use' total count. If multiple feeding buzzes were present in the pass, or the proforma indicated various circular flight paths, it was determined that this was likely foraging behaviour and so included in the 'non-use' count.
2.5.11. When calls from bats were heard on the bat detectors but the surveyor did not see the bat pass, the data was recorded as 'heard not seen' (HNS). All recorded events, including any HNS instances, were assigned a species based on comparing times between the proforma and the sound recordings for consistency.
2.5.12. Each hedgerow was considered on a case-by-case basis as to whether HNS records should be included within the results. Where surveyors were on opposite sides of the hedgerow and therefore both sides could be observed, HNS data was not used in the analysis of results. Where surveyors were on the same side of the hedgerow and both sides could not be observed, HNS data was included in the analysis. In this case, HNS data was analysed under a precautionary principle of being an 'in-use' pass, as it cannot be confirmed that the bats were not using the hedgerow at the time it was heard. Additionally, as a precautionary measure, if an Annex II species was recorded, but was HNS, it was included in the total count.
2.5.13. When the surveyor observed a bat, but the detector did not record any calls, the data was recorded as 'seen not heard' (SNH). Where the surveyor was able to identify the bat species or genus, this was included towards the total count in order to maintain a precautionary approach.
2.5.14. For modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys, total 'in-use' counts for each species were taken for each crossing point visit. Total 'non-use' counts were also recorded to provide an indication of the level of foraging activity and activity in the surrounding area.
2.5.15. Upon completion of a minimum of two survey visits for each of the 'Excellent' hedgerows, an assessment will be undertaken to determine if it is appropriate to reassess and downgrade those hedgerows to 'Good'. This will comprise assessing the bat passes recorded and the overall bat behaviour exhibited by the bats recorded, to determine if the hedgerow is an important foraging resource and as such would remain as 'Excellent'. This will be completed on a case-by-case basis.


### 2.6. CALL IDENTIFICATION

2.6.1. Where possible, bat calls are identified to species level. However, species of the genus Myotis are grouped together in most cases as their calls are similar in structure and have overlapping call parameters, making species identification problematic (Ref. 9). For Pipistrellus species the following criteria, based on measurements of peak frequency, were used to classify calls:

- Common pipistrelle $\geq 42$ and $<49 \mathrm{KHz}$;
- Soprano pipistrelle $\geq 51 \mathrm{KHz}$;
- Nathusius' pipistrelle $<39 \mathrm{KHz}$;
- Common/soprano pipistrelle $\quad \geq 49$ and $<51 \mathrm{KHz}$; and
- Common/Nathusius' pipistrelle $\geq 39$ and $<42 \mathrm{KHz}$.
2.6.2. In addition, the following categories were used for calls which could not be identified with confidence due to the overlap in call characteristics between species or species groups:
- Pipistrellus sp. (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, or Nathusius' pipistrelle);
- Nyctalus sp. (Leisler's bat or noctule); and
- NSL (noctule, serotine, or Leisler's bat).


## 2.7. <br> NOTES AND LIMITATIONS

2.7.1. The majority of hedgerow surveys took place between April and October 2021, in-line with the guidelines outlined by the DEFRA Hedgerow Survey Handbook: A Standard Procedure for Local Surveys in the UK, 2nd edition (Ref. 3). Those that were not surveyed within the recommended window and were surveyed before April 2021 were revisited later in the year to confirm initial surveying was accurate.
2.7.2. Methodologies within the Regulations, which are used for specific hedgerow assessment, were adapted within this innovative assessment approach. In contrast to the Regulations, the approach taken by the Applicant did not stop measuring a hedgerow after intersection or junction with another hedgerow provided the hedgerow in question continued, after the intersect or junction, on a similar trajectory. This was done as bats using these linear features will not discern between a hedgerow before or after a junction. Therefore, it is not deemed necessary to define hedgerow limits by junctions but by the tangible cessation of the hedge, a clear change in hedgerow direction or the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary. This deviation from a standard hedgerow assessment technique is deemed a valid approach for this bat assessment.
2.7.3. Ground flora data was collected for Phase 1 habitat mapping but not taken into consideration when calculating BHSA score of hedgerows. This was due to the optimum time to gather data on ground flora being June-July and the size of the hedgerow data set not allowing for all hedgerows to be practicably surveyed in that time window. Whilst this data would help further substantiate the BHSA scoring for the hedgerows, it is considered that the existing method for calculating the BHSA score is substantiative enough to provide robust BHSA results.
2.7.4. In order to avoid referencing confusion throughout the different survey methods, hedgerows were assigned a permanent hedgerow $(\mathrm{H})$ number during the initial desk study drawing of all potential hedgerows across the original Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary. As the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary has been refined and Phase 1 surveys have taken place, many potential and actual hedgerows have been ruled out. This is the reasoning behind 'missing' $H$ numbers from the results seen in Annex D.
2.7.5. The methodology for the Automated Static Detector surveys in this report differs from previous iterations in several ways:

1. Within previous iterations, the Summer season included June and July, with the Autumn season covering August and September. This was subsequently altered to extend the Summer season to cover June, July and August, and the Autumn season was shifted to September and October. Temperatures in August were consistently high and much of the month was considered part of a heatwave. Temperatures in October were also warmer than average, with lows of only $7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. As a result, it is considered that by shifting the Autumn season later by a month, a truer representation of the difference in bat activity across the seasons was achieved and this deviation from the methodology is not thought to have negatively impacted the results of the assessment.
2. As per the Spring submission of this report, all sound files produced during the Static surveys were to be cut into 15 -second intervals during the data analysis process, with the resulting 15-second file defining one 'bat pass'. Processing the data this way would have increased the number of sound files, by cutting one sound file into several shorter ones. However, this method was not deemed necessary in order to inform a robust baseline, therefore files were assessed using the defined triggered events as per Section 2.3.
3. As described in Section 2.3, the Static detectors were set to record from sunset to sunrise. This differs from the previous methodology, which determined that they would begin recording 30 minutes before sunset until 30 minutes after sunrise. The majority of bat passes for all species were recorded later in the night (between two hours after sunset to two hours before sunrise). No Annex II species or other 'sensitive' species showed high numbers of bat passes within the first hour after sunset or the final hour before dawn. It is not considered that recording the additional 30-minute buffer around sunset and sunrise would have altered the results of the assessment.
2.7.6. It was not always possible to place Statics centrally within the hedgerow (for individual hedgerows), or in the best position along the hedgerow to cover all hedgerows within the group (for grouped hedgerows). This was due to a variety of reasons, including land access restrictions, the presence of livestock within fields, fences or ditches limiting proximity to sections of the hedge or high levels of dense vegetation. For the same reasons, it was not always possible to place the Static in the same location on hedge for every deployment as conditions changed between seasons. In these circumstances, Statics were placed in the next closest suitable location where coverage of the hedge and grouped hedges remained sufficient.
2.7.7. For twenty-three of the 70 modified Defra Local Scale surveys undertaken, at least one surveyor recorded data in zero crossing rather than full spectrum. This
comprised two survey visits for eight hedgerows and one survey visit for seven hedgerows. Zero crossing detectors record the most prominent frequency of an incoming sound. Therefore, zero crossing data does not contain amplitude information and multiple frequencies at any one point are not recorded. The consequence of such, is that bat harmonic calls, overlapping calls and fainter bat calls are not recorded. The modified Defra Local Scale data analysis primarily relies on information from surveyors proformas. As a result, the zero crossing data is not considered to have altered the assessment of whether the hedgerows did or did not meet the threshold for further surveys. The data and conclusions discussed in this report are valid and able to confirm the significance of effects and the mitigation prescriptions described in Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision-B)of the ES (Volume II). All further modified Defra Local Scale surveys will be undertaken using detectors that record in full spectrum.
2.7.8. In some instances, due to health and safety constraints, it was not possible for surveyors to be positioned on opposite sides of the hedgerow for modified Defra Local Scale surveys. For these surveys, as per the methodology, the HNS calls were included in the total counts of 'in-use' passes. This is to precautionarily include recordings that may have been bats using the feature as a commuting route on the other side of the hedgerow. It is acknowledged that in some cases this may have increased the number of bat passes on these hedgerows and lead to these hedgerows meeting the threshold for further surveys. This methodology is considered to be in line with the precautionary principle and therefore the most accurate way to compensate for the constraint in access to both sides of the hedgerow.
2.7.9. Of the 123 hedgerows where a Static was to be deployed, for 35 hedgerows it was not possible to undertake an automated static detector survey in every season. Twelve of these hedgerows were not subject to any automated static detector surveys, five were surveyed once, and 18 were surveyed twice. These hedgerows were inaccessible at certain times, either due to a lack of agreed land access or health and safety concerns relating to the presence of cattle. A list of all hedgerows which did not receive the full survey effort is presented in
Table 6Error! Reference source not found.below. Where the hedgerows were only accessed for one deployment, there was insufficient data for reassessment and the original BHSA was retained.

Table 6 - Hedgerows not Subjectsubject to the Full Survey-Effortfull survey effort

| Hedgerow | Grouped <br> with | Spring <br> deployment | Summer <br> deployment | Autumn <br> deployment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | n/a | N - not included <br> in the <br> assessment at <br> this stage | N - no access <br> due to cattle in <br> the field | Y |
| 27 | n/a | Y | N - no access <br> due to cattle in <br> the field | Y |
| 31 | 28 | Y | N - no access <br> due to cattle in <br> the field | Y |
| 47 | n/a | N - no land <br> access agreed | Y | Y |


| Hedgerow | Grouped with | Spring deployment | Summer deployment | Autumn deployment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 283 | 973 | N - no land access agreed | Y | Y |
| 317 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 331 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 335 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 336 | 340, 341 | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 342 | 344 | N - no land access agreed | Y | N - no land access agreed |
| 343 | 944 | N - no land access agreed | Y | N - no land access agreed |
| 356 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 358 | 359 | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 364 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 368 | n/a | Y | N - no land access agreed | Y |
| 388 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 398 | 400, 399 | Y | N - no land access agreed | Y |
| 449 | n/a | N - not included in the assessment at this stage | Y | N - no land access agreed |


| Hedgerow | Grouped with | Spring deployment | Summer deployment | Autumn deployment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 522 | n/a | N - not included in the assessment at this stage | Y | N - no land access agreed |
| 657 | n/a | Y | N - no land access agreed | Y |
| 678 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 710 | 715 | Y | Y | N - no land access agreed |
| 906 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 913 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |
| 954 | 812, 937 | Y | N - no land access agreed | Y |
| 993 | 134, 138 | N - no land access agreed | Y | Y |
| 1008 | n/a | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed | N - no land access agreed |

2.7.10. To date, 32 'Excellent' hedgerows have been subject to two initial Modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys. The initial two surveys for the remaining 13 'Excellent' hedgerows will be completed prior to construction along with any further surveys required for hedgerows which meet the threshold in order to confirm the significance of effects and the mitigation prescriptions for each hedgerow. A precautionary approach has been taken for those hedgerows yet to be surveyed, as outlined in Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision-B) (Volume II).
3.
3.1.

ANCIENT HEDGEROW SEARCH
3.1.1. An Ancient Hedgerow search was undertaken for the DCO Proposed Development, which returned two records of ancient hedgerow within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary. These are highlighted in Figure 9.4.1 (Annex A).
3.1.2. The results of the ancient hedgerow search were initially checked against the potential hedgerow database before Phase 1 habitat surveys of the hedgerow locations determined that these ancient hedgerows no longer exist.

### 3.2. HEDGEROW FIELD SURVEYS

3.2.1. Following completion of the hedgerow field surveys in 2022, 357 hedgerows were identified within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary. Details of the data collected for each hedgerow can be seen in Annex $\mathbf{D}$ and the locations of each are shown in Figure 9.4.2 (Annex A). All identified hedgerows were subject to a BHSA.

## 3.3. <br> BHSA CALCULATIONS

3.3.1. The data provided by the hedgerow field surveys allowed for the BHSA score and categories to be calculated for each hedgerow. The BHSA score and category for each hedgerow can be seen in Annex D. Table 7Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found. provides a summary breakdown of the quantity of hedgerows within each category.

Table 7 - BHSA Summary

| BHSA Category | Total Number |
| :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 23 |
| Good | 250 |
| Poor | 82 |
| n/a (Not assessed - scoped out) | 2 |

3.3.2. The BHSA calculations identified 23 'Excellent' hedgerows and 250 'Good' hedgerows that would potentially require automated static detector assessment.
3.3.3. Table 8Error! Reference source not found. highlights the discounting parameters that would rule out an 'Excellent' or 'Good' hedgerow from requiring an automated static detector assessment.
3.3.4. In total, 7 'Excellent' and 73 'Good’ hedgerows were discounted through these parameters. Hedgerows which were adjoining residential, easier to avoid, or no longer a hedgerow were 'Scoped out'. Hedgerows within 50m of a road were downgraded to 'Poor' due to being less suitable for supporting bats.

Table 8 - BHSA Category Discount Parameters

| Hedgerow Parameters | 'Excellent' Hedgerows <br> Impacted | 'Good' Hedgerows <br> Impacted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjoining residential | 0 | 9 |
| Hedgerow located parallel <br> to proposed route and <br> thus easier to avoid. | 6 | 44 |
| Majority of hedgerow <br> located within 50m of main <br> roads. | 1 | 18 |
| No longer a hedgerow | 0 | 2 |

3.3.5. Those remaining after the discounting process were allocated either an individual Static or were grouped depending on location. A full breakdown of automated static detector assessment distribution for individual and grouped Statics can be seen in Annex E. Table 9 shows a breakdown of the number of hedgerows requiring automated static detector assessments, following the implementation of each parameter.

Table 9 - BHSA Category Static Distribution

| BHSA Category | Individual Static | Grouped Static |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 5 | 11 |
| Good | 66 | 111 |

3.3.6. In total, 122 of the hedgerows requiring a Static were compiled into 52 groups, with each group assigned one Static. The remaining 71 hedgerows requiring a Static were individually assigned one Static each. In total, 123 Statics were required.

### 3.4. AUTOMATED STATIC DETECTOR ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

3.4.1. At least 10 bat species were recorded across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary during the automated static detector assessments undertaken during 2022. The following species were recorded:

- Serotine;
- Common pipistrelle;
- Soprano pipistrelle;
- Nathusius' pipistrelle;
- Noctule;
- Leisler's bat;
- Myotis sp.;
- Brown long-eared bat;
- Lesser horseshoe bat.
3.4.2. Overall, an average of 234.50 ppn was recorded during the automated static detector surveys, over 1,825 nights during 2022, from 111 Statics.
3.4.3. Bat data recorded from the automated static detector assessments can be seen in-depth in Annex G, for Spring (Tables G.2-G.102), Summer (Tables G. 104 - G.201) and Autumn (Tables G. 203 - G.303). A summary of bat passes per night can be seen for each season in Annex G, Tables G.1, G. 103 and 202.
3.4.4. A summary of the data recorded in each season, for each species, is provided below.
3.4.5. Total ppn for all hedgerows, over all seasons, is presented on Figure 9.4.4 (Annex A). A summary of bat passes per night in each season for Annex II, sensitive species, and species with the highest levels of activity (common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle) is presented on Figure 9.4.5 - Figure 9.4.9 (Annex A).


## SPRING 2022 SURVEY RESULTS

3.4.6. An average of 245.84 ppn was recorded over a combined 622 nights of automated static detector assessments during Spring 2022, from 103 statics. The full Static data from Spring 2022 is shown in Annex G.
3.4.7. The hedgerows with the highest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022 were hedgerows 145 and 429. These two hedgerows recorded average activity levels of 1,888.00ppn and 1,628.17ppn, respectively. Hedgerows 67 and 64 also had over 1,000.00ppn with 1,445.17ppn and 1130.80ppn, respectively recorded.
3.4.8. The hedgerow with the lowest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022 was hedgerow 113, which had no recorded activity. A further five hedgerows (117, 78, 156, 27, 954) had an average activity level of <1.00ppn.
3.4.9. The thresholds for data displayed in summary Tables $10-17$ has been determined based on hedgerows scoring average ppn above the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile for each respective species. The exception to this is Table 11 and Table 20 which display all hedgerows with recorded lesser horseshoe and NSL activity, respectively. This is due to a low number of hedgerows with recorded activity being greater than the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile threshold for those species.

## Brown long-eared bat (BLE)

3.4.10. Hedgerow 398 was recorded as having the most BLE activity with an average of 16.33ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest amount of BLE activity were hedgerows 64 and 1004 that had average activity levels of 13.80ppn and 13.33ppn, respectively.
3.4.11. Activity levels of BLE for hedgerows in Spring are presented on Figure 9.4.5a. Table 10 highlights all the hedgerows with an average of $>1.16 \mathrm{ppn}$ for BLE.

Table 10 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with BLE Activityactivity >1.16ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 16.33 |
| $\mathbf{6 4}$ | 13.80 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 13.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 11.40 |
| $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ | 10.43 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ | 9.80 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 8.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | 7.57 |
| $\mathbf{5 3}$ | 7.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | 5.80 |
| $\mathbf{5 1}$ | 5.33 |


| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 9}$ | 4.83 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 1}$ | 4.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 3.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | 2.83 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 6}$ | 2.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 2.40 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 2.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5 , 1 3 3}$ | 2.17 |
| $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | 2.14 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0 , 4 2 2}$ | 1.60 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 1.57 |
| $\mathbf{6 7 , 1 8 7}$ | 1.17 |
| $\boldsymbol{y y y y}$ |  |

3.4.12. Of the remaining hedgerows, two hedgerows had activity between 1.16 to 1.00ppn with the remaining 76 hedgerows having an activity level below 1.00ppn. Thirty-eight of these hedgerows recorded no BLE activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Lesser horseshoe

3.4.13. Hedgerow 419 was recorded as having the highest lesser horseshoe activity with an average of 5.40ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest numbers of lesser horseshoe activity were hedgerows 1004 and 420 that had an average 4.00ppn and 3.40ppn, respectively.
3.4.14. Activity levels of lesser horseshoe recorded in Spring are presented on Figure 9.4.6a.
3.4.15. Table 11 highlights all the hedgerows that recorded lesser horseshoe activity.

### 3.4.14. Table 11 highlights all the hedgerows that recorded lesser horseshoe activity.

Table 11 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Lesser Horseshoe Activity Duringlesser horseshoe activity during Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Lesser horseshoe ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 419 | 5.40 |
| 1004 | 4.00 |
| 420 | 3.40 |
| 199 | 1.20 |
| 429 | 1.17 |
| 434 | 1.17 |
| 246 | 1.14 |
| 414 | 0.80 |
| 206, 422, 196, 229, 974 | 0.60 |
| 251 | 0.57 |
| 353 | 0.43 |
| 202, 940, 268, 1011 | 0.40 |
| 438, 396, 223 | 0.33 |
| 403, 394 | 0.20 |
| 398, 956, 267, 426, 427 | 0.17 |
| 247, 354, 255 | 0.14 |

3.4.16-3.4.15._The remaining 71 hedgerows did not record any lesser horseshoe activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Myotis sp.

3.4.17.3.4.16._Hedgerow 429 was recorded as having the highest Myotis sp . activity with an average of $347.83 p p n$. Hedgerow 1004 recorded the second highest Myotis sp. activity with an average of 227.33ppn. Hedgerows 51, 199, 818 and 145 all had an average activity level of over 100.00ppn.
3.4.18-3.4.17. Activity levels of Myotis sp. for hedgerows in Spring are presented on Figure 9.4.7a. Table 12 highlights all the hedgerows with an average Myotis sp. activity level of >9.29ppn.

Table 12 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Myotis sp. Activityactivity >9.29ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 429 | 347.83 |
| 1004 | 227.33 |
| 51 | 142.83 |
| 199 | 129.00 |
| 818 | 115.57 |
| 145 | 105.50 |
| 206 | 51.40 |
| 398 | 47.50 |
| 368 | 34.83 |
| 403 | 32.40 |
| 956 | 30.83 |
| 419 | 30.20 |
| 196 | 26.60 |
| 414 | 20.80 |
| 426 | 19.67 |
| 810 | 18.17 |
| 202 | 17.80 |
| 491 | 17.00 |
| 67 | 14.33 |
| 940 | 14.00 |
| 420 | 13.80 |


| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 394 | 13.40 |
| 396 | 13.33 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 9}$ | 12.14 |
| 229 | 9.80 |

3.4.19-3.4.18. Of the remaining hedgerows, 11 hedgerows had an average of 9.28$>5.00$ ppn and 58 hedgerows had an average activity level 4.99->0.00ppn. Only 10 hedgerows recorded no Myotis sp. activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Common pipistrelle

3.4.20-3.4.19. Hedgerow 67 was recorded as having the highest common pipistrelle activity with an average of 1393.00ppn. Hedgerows 64, 810, 819 and 145 had average activity scores of 795.20ppn, 711.83ppn, 656.86ppn, and 647.33ppn, respectively.
3.4.21.3.4.20. Activity levels of common pipistrelle for hedgerows in Spring are presented on Figure 9.4.8a. Table 13 highlights all the hedgerows with an average common pipistrelle activity level of >226.16ppn.

Table 13 -Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Common-Pipistrelle Activitycommon pipistrelle activity >226.16ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{6 7}$ | 1393.00 |
| $\mathbf{6 4}$ | 795.20 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | 711.83 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 9}$ | 656.86 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | 647.33 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 536.80 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 522.00 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 1}$ | 473.67 |


| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 399.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 394.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 374.00 |
| 818 | 366.14 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 352.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 339.40 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | 329.40 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 4}$ | 328.71 |
| $\mathbf{6 9}$ | 312.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | 274.43 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 2}$ | 272.57 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 6}$ | 272.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | 272.00 |
| $\mathbf{5 1}$ | 271.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 3}$ | 267.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 265.86 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | 259.40 |
|  |  |

3.4.22.3.4.21. Of the remaining hedgerows, one hedgerow had an average recorded activity level of >200.00ppn, a further 21 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 199.99->100.00ppn, 15 hedgerows had an activity level of 99.99->50.00ppn, and 38 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 49.99->0.00ppn. Only three hedgerows recorded no common pipistrelle activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022, hedgerows 78, 81 and 113.

## Soprano pipistrelle

3.4.23-3.4.22. Hedgerows 145 and 429 had the highest average recorded soprano pipistrelle activity scores of 967.55 ppn and 864.50 ppn, respectively. Hedgerows 30 and 199 had the next highest average recorded activity scores of 391.60ppn and 304.80ppn, respectively.
3.4.24-3.4.23. Activity levels of soprano pipistrelle for hedgerows in Spring are presented on Figure 9.4.9a. Table 14 highlights all the hedgerows with an average soprano pipistrelle activity level of $>46.16 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 14 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Soprano-Pipistrelle Activitysoprano pipistrelle activity >46.16ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | 967.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 864.50 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 391.60 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 304.80 |
| $\mathbf{6 4}$ | 294.40 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | 268.60 |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | 209.40 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 182.00 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 1}$ | 168.67 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 1}$ | 21.38 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | 127.67 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | 127.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 112.83 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 6}$ | 111.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | 110.29 |
|  | 109.60 |
|  | 106.83 |


| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 102.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | 91.67 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 86.00 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 6}$ | 81.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | 70.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 4}$ | 52.14 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | 50.40 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 48.86 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | 46.17 |

3.4.25-3.4.24. $\qquad$ Of the remaining hedgerows, 27 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 45.83-> 10.00ppn, and 43 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of $9.99->0.00 \mathrm{ppn}$. Eight hedgerows recorded no soprano pipistrelle activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Pipistrellus sp.

3.4.26-3.4.25. Hedgerows 145 and 482 had the highest average Pipistrellus sp. activity scores of 159.33 ppn and 143.86 ppn, respectively. Hedgerows 398 and 374 had the next highest average recorded activity scores of 100.33ppn and 90.29ppn, respectively.
3.4.27.3.4.26. Table 15 highlights all the hedgerows with an average unidentified Pipistrellus sp. activity level of $>4.50 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 15 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Pipistrellus sp.
Activityactivity >4.50ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 145 | 159.33 |
| 482 | 143.86 |
| 398 | 100.33 |
| 374 | 90.29 |
| 810 | 67.83 |
| 1004 | 65.33 |
| 403 | 57.20 |
| 422 | 51.20 |
| 426 | 49.00 |
| 51 | 24.00 |
| 49 | 20.86 |
| 64 | 18.40 |
| 427 | 16.50 |
| 438 | 14.33 |
| 199 | 13.20 |
| 804 | 11.71 |
| 22 | 9.67 |
| 196 | 9.00 |
| 491 | 7.43 |
| 202 | 6.80 |
| 189 | 6.40 |
| 188 | 6.00 |
| 791 | 5.83 |


| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 940 | 5.80 |
| 956 | 5.17 |

3.4.28-3.4.27. Of the remaining hedgerows, 42 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 4.50->0.00ppn. Thirty-six hedgerows recorded no activity within the Pipistrellus sp. group during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Nyctalus sp.

3.4.29-3.4.28. Hedgerow 804 recorded the highest average activity levels for the group Nyctalus sp. in Spring, with 83.29ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest levels were hedgerows 808 and 797 which had 32.14ppn and 21.57ppn, respectively.
3.4.30-3.4.29. Table 16 highlights all the hedgerows with an average Nyctalus sp . activity level of $>5.28 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 16 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Nyctalus sp. Activityactivity >5.28ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow number | Nyctalus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 0 4}$ | 83.29 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 8}$ | 32.14 |
| $\mathbf{7 9 7}$ | 21.57 |
| $\mathbf{7 9 1}$ | 20.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | 18.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 8}$ | 17.43 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | 17.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 6}$ | 16.33 |
|  | 15.83 |


| Hedgerow number | Nyctalus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | 12.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | 11.57 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 11.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | 10.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | 9.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 3 3}$ | 9.17 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 6}$ | 8.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 8.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ | 8.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ | 7.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 2}$ | 7.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | 6.60 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 9}$ | 6.57 |
|  | 6.00 |
|  | 5.43 |

3.4.31-3.4.30. Of the remaining hedgerows, 55 hedgerows had activity levels between 5.28ppn and 0.16ppn. Twenty-three hedgerows had no records within the Nyctalus sp. group.

## NSL

3.4.32.3.4.31. Hedgerow 804 recorded the highest level of NSL sp. activity, with an average of 3.00 ppn. Only 18 hedgerows had records grouped under NSL.
3.4.33-3.4.32. Table 17 highlights all the hedgerows that recorded activity identified within the group NSL sp.

Table 17 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with NSL Activity Duringactivity during Spring 2022

| Hedgerow number | NSL sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 0 4}$ | 3.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 6}$ | 1.60 |
| 956 | 1.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 1.40 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 0.80 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 8}$ | 0.57 |
| $\mathbf{5 1}$ | 0.33 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ | 0.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 0.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 0.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | 0.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 0.17 |
|  | 0.17 |
|  | 0.17 |
|  |  |

3.4.34-3.4.33._The remaining hedgerows had no recorded activity which fell into the NSL group.

## SUMMER 2022 SURVEY RESULTS

3.4.35-3.4.34. An average of 278.31ppn was recorded over a combined 602 nights of automated static detector assessments during Summer 2022, from 98 Statics. The full Static data from Summer 2022 is shown in Annex G.
3.4.36-3.4.35. Hedgerows 348 and 161 recorded an average activity of 1171.57ppn and 1011.17 ppn , respectively. These were the highest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.
3.4.37-3.4.36. Hedgerow 819 recorded average activity levels of 24.14ppn, the lowest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022
3.4.38-3.4.37. The thresholds for data displayed in summary Table 18 -Table 25 have been determined based on hedgerows scoring average ppn above the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile for each respective species.

## Brown long-eared (BLE)

3.4.39-3.4.38. Hedgerow 403 was recorded as having the highest level of BLE activity with an average of 24.17 ppn . The hedgerows with the next highest amount of BLE activity were hedgerows 206 and 482 that recorded average activity levels of 21.00 ppn and 16.71 ppn , respectively.
3.4.40-3.4.39. Activity levels of BLE for hedgerows in Summer are presented on Figure 9.4.5b. Table 18 highlights all the hedgerows with an average of $>4.75$ ppn for BLE.

Table 18 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with BLE Activityactivity >4.75ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 24.17 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 21.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ | 16.71 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 16.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | 15.83 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | 15.33 |
| $\mathbf{6 9}$ | 13.20 |
| $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ | 10.00 |
| $\mathbf{5 1}$ | 9.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 3}$ | 8.43 |


| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}, \mathbf{5 3}$ | 7.00 |
| $\mathbf{5 9}$ | 6.57 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 7 , 8 1 0}$ | 6.50 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0}$ | 6.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 1 , 1 4 5}$ | 6.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 5 , 4 2 2}$ | 5.67 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ | 5.57 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 5.17 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 6 , \mathbf { 2 1 0 }}$ | 5.00 |

3.4.41.3.4.40. Of the remaining hedgerows, 46 hedgerows had an average activity level of 4.67ppn->1.00ppn. Twenty-two hedgerows had activity level of 0.99ppn$>0.14$ ppn. Six hedgerows recorded no BLE activity during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## Lesser horseshoe

3.4.42.3.4.41. Hedgerow 429 was recorded as having the highest lesser horseshoe activity with an average of 10.33 ppn . The hedgerows with the next highest amount of lesser horseshoe activity were hedgerows 229 and 419 that had an average of 1.86 ppn and 1.83 ppn , respectively.
3.4.43-3.4.42. Activity levels of lesser horseshoe for hedgerows in Summer are presented on Figure 9.4.6b. Table 19 highlights all the hedgerows with an average of $>0.17 \mathrm{ppn}$ for lesser horseshoe.

Table 19 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Lesser Horseshoe Activitylesser horseshoe activity >0.17ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Lesser horseshoe ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 10.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 9}$ | 1.86 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | 1.83 |


| Hedgerow Number | Lesser horseshoe ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 1.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | 1.33 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4 , 2 0 2}$ | 1.17 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 3}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 0.60 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0}$ | 0.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 5}$ | 0.43 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 6 , 4 2 0 , 4 2 2}$ | 0.33 |
| $\mathbf{9 7 4}$ | 0.29 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 7 , \mathbf { 2 0 7 } , \mathbf { 4 1 6 , 4 1 4 , 3 7 7 , 3 9 6 , 3 5 1 , 4 2 6 }} \mathbf{2 0 6 , 3 9 8}$ | 0.17 |

3.4.44-3.4.43._Two hedgerows recorded activity levels of 0.14 ppn and the remaining 71 hedgerows did not record any lesser horseshoe activity during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## Myotis sp.

3.4.45-3.4.44. Hedgerow 354 was recorded as having the highest Myotis sp. activity with an average of 487.57ppn. Hedgerow 1004 recorded the second highest Myotis sp. activity with an average of 255.17 ppn. Hedgerows 176, 420, 210, 426, 429, 206, and 157 all had an average activity level of over 100.00ppn.
3.4.46-3.4.45. Activity levels of Myotis sp. for hedgerows in Summer are presented on Figure 9.4.7b. Table 20 highlights all the hedgerows with an average Myotis sp. activity level of >32.66ppn.

Table 20 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Myotis sp. Activityactivity >32.66ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 354 | 487.57 |
| 1004 | 255.17 |


| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 176 | 252.00 |
| 420 | 203.00 |
| 429 | 193.50 |
| 426 | 161.67 |
| 206 | 153.67 |
| 210 | 144.00 |
| 157 | 143.17 |
| 202 | 93.50 |
| 196 | 90.00 |
| 348 | 87.71 |
| 90 | 82.83 |
| 398 | 80.17 |
| 434 | 67.50 |
| 156 | 64.67 |
| 958 | 60.17 |
| 187 | 50.83 |
| 427 | 45.00 |
| 974 | 41.57 |
| 419 | 36.00 |
| 811 | 34.43 |
| 83 | 33.33 |

3.4.47.3.4.46. Of the remaining hedgerows, 25 hedgerows had an average of 32.66ppn->13.48ppn and 48 hedgerows had an average activity level 13.48$>0.00 \mathrm{ppn}$. One hedgerow recorded no Myotis sp. activity during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## Common pipistrelle

3.4.48-3.4.47. Hedgerow 161 was recorded as having the highest common pipistrelle activity with an average of 915.67 ppn. Hedgerow 67 was recorded as having the second highest common pipistrelle activity with an average of 733.60 ppn. Hedgerows $83,81,157,145$ and 348 all had activity levels greater than 500.00ppn.
3.4.49-3.4.48. Activity levels of common pipistrelle for hedgerows in Summer are presented on Figure 9.4.8b. Table 21 highlights all the hedgerows with an average common pipistrelle activity level of >223.09ppn.

Table 21 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Common Pipistrelle Activitycommon pipistrelle activity >223.09ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6 1}$ | 915.67 |
| $\mathbf{6 7}$ | 733.60 |
| $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 666.67 |
| $\mathbf{8 1}$ | 645.83 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 7}$ | 635.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 7}$ | 607.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | 605.40 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 8}$ | 547.43 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 432.29 |
| $\mathbf{9 0}$ | 418.67 |
| $\mathbf{6 9}$ | 358.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 9}$ | 346.67 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | 341.33 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 8}$ | 328.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 311.33 |
| $\mathbf{9 9 3}$ | 302.17 |
|  |  |


| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 295.67 |
| $\mathbf{4 4 9}$ | 288.71 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 5}$ | 284.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 277.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | 253.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 6}$ | 241.67 |
| $\mathbf{9 1}$ | 236.83 |
| $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | 230.86 |

3.4.50-3.4.49. Of the remaining hedgerows, 23 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 220.50 ppn ->100ppn, 22 hedgerows had an activity level of 99.99->50.00, and 27 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of $49.99->10.00 \mathrm{ppn}$. The final two hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 8.17 ppn and 4.67 ppn . There were no hedgerows with no common pipistrelle activity recorded during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## Soprano pipistrelle

3.4.51-3.4.50. Hedgerows 1004 and 30 had the highest average recorded soprano pipistrelle activity score of 315.33 ppn and 249.17 ppn, respectively. Hedgerows 83 and 78 also recoded average activity levels of $>100.00 \mathrm{ppn}$.
3.4.52.3.4.51. Activity levels of soprano pipistrelle for hedgerows in Summer are presented on Figure 9.4.9b. Table 22 highlights all the hedgerows with an average soprano pipistrelle activity level of $>37.04 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 22 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Soprano-Pipistrelle Activitysoprano pipistrelle activity >37.04ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1004 | 315.33 |
| 30 | 249.17 |
| 83 | 172.67 |
| 78 | 101.17 |
| 145 | 98.60 |
| 426 | 98.50 |
| 403 | 77.17 |
| 354 | 74.57 |
| 87 | 72.83 |
| 427 | 71.67 |
| 157 | 69.50 |
| 81 | 68.67 |
| 283 | 67.33 |
| 176 | 60.14 |
| 491 | 58.50 |
| 67 | 55.60 |
| 429 | 53.83 |
| 90 | 51.17 |
| 268 | 49.40 |
| 189 | 48.50 |
| 398 | 43.67 |
| 419 | 42.67 |
| 351 | 38.00 |


| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 489 | 37.67 |

3.4.53-3.4.52. Of the remaining hedgerows, 45 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 36.83 ppn->10.00ppn, and a further 26 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 9.99ppn->1.00ppn. Three hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 0.99ppn->0.00ppn.

## Pipistrellus sp.

3.4.54-3.4.53. Hedgerow 81 had the highest average recorded Pipistrellus sp. group activity scores of 197.50ppn. Hedgerows 30 and 403 had the next highest average recorded activity scores of 43.33ppn and 34.33ppn, respectively.
3.4.55-3.4.54._Table 23 highlights all the hedgerows with an average Pipistrellus sp. activity level of $>4.58 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 23 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Pipistrellus sp. Activityactivity >4.58ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 1}$ | 197.50 |
| $\mathbf{3 0}$ | 43.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 34.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 6}$ | 28.29 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 1}$ | 25.83 |
| $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 24.83 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | 20.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | 20.40 |
| $\mathbf{9 0}$ | 19.17 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 5 , 4 2 7}$ | 15.86 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 8}$ | 14.33 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 6}$ | 13.67 |


| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 993 | 11.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 8 3}$ | 11.00 |
| 449 | 9.14 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 6}$ | 8.83 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 3}$ | 7.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ | 6.86 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 7}$ | 6.17 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 8}$ | 6.00 |
| $\mathbf{8 7 4 2}$ | 5.67 |

3.4.56-3.4.55._Of the remaining hedgerows, 56 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of between $4.58->0.14$ ppn. Eighteen hedgerows did not have any activity recorded within the Pipistrellus sp. group during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## Nyctalus sp.

3.4.57.3.4.56. Hedgerows 427 and 348 had the highest average numbers of Nyctalus sp. activity, recording 591.17ppn and 168.67ppn, respectively. The next highest numbers of ppn were recorded at hedgerows 426 and 522 , with 333.33ppn and 148.33ppn, respectively.
3.4.58-3.4.57. Table 24 highlights all the hedgerows with an average Nyctalus sp . activity level of $>9.58 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 24 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Nyctalus sp.
Activityactivity >9.58ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow number | Nyctalus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 427 | 591.17 |
| 348 | 497.71 |
| 426 | 333.33 |
| 522 | 148.33 |
| 196 | 77.50 |
| 206 | 43.17 |
| 351 | 41.50 |
| 170 | 39.67 |
| 353 | 31.86 |
| 202 | 30.33 |
| 420 | 27.67 |
| 173 | 24.83 |
| 489 | 20.17 |
| 434 | 19.00 |
| 188 | 16.67 |
| 491 | 16.50 |
| 429 | 16.50 |
| 164 | 15.67 |
| 30 | 13.17 |
| 413 | 12.83 |
| 267 | 12.80 |
| 958 | 12.33 |
| 482 | 12.14 |


| Hedgerow number | Nyctalus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | 10.83 |

3.4.59-3.4.58. Of the remaining hedgerows, 50 had average activity levels of between 9.58ppn and 3.46ppn and 34 hedgerows had average activity levels of between 3.46 ppn and 0.00 ppn . All hedgerows recorded some level of Nyctalus sp. activity.

NSL
3.4.60-3.4.59. The hedgerow with the highest average activity within the NSL group was hedgerow 522, with 116.50ppn. The second highest was hedgerow 351 which recorded 11.17ppn.

### 3.4.61-3.4.60

$\qquad$ Error! Reference source not found_Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average NSL sp. activity level of $>0.35 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 25 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with NSL SP. Activitysp. activity >0.35ppn Duringduring Summer 2022

| Hedgerow number | NSL ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 2 2}$ | 116.50 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 1}$ | 11.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | 6.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ | 6.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 4}$ | 5.17 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0}$ | 4.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 4.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 6}$ | 3.17 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | 2.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 2.00 |


| Hedgerow number | NSL ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 0 8}$ | 1.17 |
| $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | 1.17 |
| $\mathbf{7 9 1}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 3}$ | 0.67 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 4}$ | 0.67 |
| $\mathbf{8 4 9}$ | 0.50 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 3}$ | 0.43 |
| $\mathbf{4 7}$ | 0.43 |

3.4.1. Of the remaining hedgerows, 19 recorded an average activity level of between 0.35 ppn and 0.00 ppn . 55 Fifty-five hedgerows recorded no activity within the NSL group during automated static detector assessments in Summer 2022.

## AUTUMN 2022 SURVEY RESULTS

3.4.2. An average of 191.84 ppn was recorded over a combined 600 nights of automated static detector assessments during Autumn 2022, from 101 Statics. The full Static data from Summer 2022 is shown in Annex G.
3.4.3. The hedgerow with the highest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022 was hedgerow 67. Hedgerow 67 recorded average activity levels of $1036.29 \mathrm{ppn}_{2}$ and was the only hedgerow that exceeded activity levels of 1,000.00ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest amount of bat activity were hedgerows 91 and 87 that recorded average activity levels of 969.33 ppn and $965.33 p p n$, respectively.
3.4.4. The hedgerows with the lowest bat activity levels throughout automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022 was hedgerow 791 which had an average activity level of 1.80ppn. A further three hedgerows (1004, 808, 3) had an average activity level of $<5.00 \mathrm{ppn}$.
3.4.5. The thresholds for data displayed in summary Table $26=$ Table 35 has been determined based on hedgerows scoring average ppn above the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartile for each respective species.

## Brown long-eared (BLE)

3.4.6. Hedgerow 154 was recorded as having the most BLE activity with an average of 25.50ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest amount of BLE activity were hedgerows 491 and 489 that had 17.83ppn and 12.17ppn, respectively.
3.4.7. Activity levels of BLE for hedgerows in Autumn are presented on Figure 9.4.5c. Table 26 highlights all the hedgerows with an average of >2.83ppn for BLE.

Table 26 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with BLE Activityactivity >2.83ppn Duringduring Spring 2022

| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 5 4}$ | 25.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | 17.83 |
| $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ | 12.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | 10.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 9.83 |
| $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | 9.67 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | 9.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 8.83 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | 8.67 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | 8.33 |
| $\mathbf{8 7}$ | 7.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 9 6}$ | 6.17 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 6}$ | 5.83 |
| $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 5.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ | 5.17 |
| $\mathbf{9 0}$ | 4.83 |
|  |  |


| Hedgerow Number | BLE ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 5 1}$ | 4.33 |
| $\mathbf{1 0 1 1}$ | 3.83 |
| $\mathbf{2 8 3}, \mathbf{1 5 7 , 4 1 9}$ | 3.67 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 3}$ | 3.50 |
| $\mathbf{1 4 0 , 3 8}$ | 3.33 |

3.4.8. Of the remaining hedgerows, 31 hedgerows had activity between 2.83-1.00ppn and 42 hedgerows having an activity level below 1.00ppn. Eleven of these hedgerows recorded no BLE activity in Autumn.

## Lesser horseshoe

3.4.9. Hedgerow 199 was recorded as having the highest lesser horseshoe activity with an average of 7.00 ppn . The hedgerows with the next highest amount of lesser horseshoe activity were hedgerows 974 and 419 that had an average 5.50ppn and 5.17ppn, respectively.
3.4.10. Activity levels of lesser horseshoe for hedgerows in Autumn are presented on Figure 9.4.6c. Table 27 - Summary of hedgerows with lesser horseshoe activity of $>0.4 \mathrm{ppn}$ in Autumn 2022Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found.highlights all the hedgerows that recorded lesser horseshoe activity of $>0.4 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 27 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Lesser Horseshoe
Activitylesser horseshoe activity of >0.4ppn in Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Lesser horseshoe ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | 7.00 |
| $\mathbf{9 7 4}$ | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | 5.17 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0}$ | 4.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 9}$ | 3.86 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 3.71 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 4}$ | 2.83 |


| Hedgerow Number | Lesser horseshoe ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 6 2}$ | 2.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 2.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 7 6}$ | 1.80 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 7 , 2 1 4 , \mathbf { 2 8 7 }}$ | 1.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 5}$ | 1.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2 , 3 4 8 . 4 3 8}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 2 3}$ | 0.83 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 8}$ | 0.71 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0 , 2 0 2}$ | 0.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 3 6} \mathbf{2 4 6 , 3 5 4}$ | 0.50 |

3.4.11. The remaining hedgerows, 16 recorded activity levels of $0.40 \mathrm{ppn}->0.00 \mathrm{ppn}$. Sixty hedgerows did not record any lesser horseshoe activity during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## Myotis sp.

3.4.12. Hedgerow 354 was recorded as having the highest Myotis sp. activity with an average of 644.67 ppn. Hedgerow 87 recorded the second highest Myotis sp. activity with an average of 376.83 ppn. Hedgerows 91, 287, 199, 422 and 154 all had an average activity level of over 100.00ppn.
3.4.13. Activity levels of Myotis sp. for hedgerows in Autumn are presented on Figure 9.4.7c. Table 28 Error! Reference source not found-Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average Myotis sp. activity level of >26.00ppn.

Table 28 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Myotis SP. Activitysp. activity >26.00ppn Duringduring Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 5 4}$ | 644.67 |
| $\mathbf{8 7}$ | 376.83 |


| Hedgerow Number | Myotis sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 91 | 184.83 |
| 287 | 177.00 |
| 199 | 160.33 |
| 422 | 149.83 |
| 154 | 109.50 |
| 348 | 92.50 |
| 67 | 92.29 |
| 47 | 63.29 |
| 38 | 54.83 |
| 940 | 54.00 |
| 167 | 53.57 |
| 140 | 43.33 |
| 420 | 42.50 |
| 416 | 40.83 |
| 818 | 35.67 |
| 954 | 35.00 |
| 210 | 33.50 |
| 974 | 31.17 |
| 351 | 29.17 |
| 419 | 28.67 |
| 90 | 28.33 |
| 188 | 27.67 |
| 489 | 26.83 |

3.4.14. Of the remaining hedgerows, 38 hedgerows had an average of $26.00->5.00 \mathrm{ppn}$ and 38 hedgerows had an average activity level 4.99->0.00ppn. No hedgerows recorded no Myotis sp. activity during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## Common pipistrelle

3.4.15. Hedgerow 91 was recorded as having the highest common pipistrelle activity with an average of 651.17 ppn . The next highest common pipistrelle activity was found at hedgerows 187 and 67 which had average activity scores of 516.43ppn and 505.57 ppn , respectively.
3.4.16. Activity levels of common pipistrelle for hedgerows in Autumn are presented on Figure 9.4.8c. Table 29Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average common pipistrelle activity level of >147.50ppn.

Table 29 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Common-Pipistrelle Activitycommon pipistrelle activity >147.50ppn Duringduring Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{9 1}$ | 651.17 |
| $\mathbf{1 8 7}$ | 516.43 |
| $\mathbf{6 7}$ | 505.57 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 498.50 |
| $\mathbf{8 7}$ | 464.83 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 7}$ | 385.57 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 3}$ | 383.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 1}$ | 370.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 4}$ | 345.17 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 1}$ | 338.50 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 0}$ | 299.50 |
| $\mathbf{9 4 5}$ | 259.20 |
| 209.86 |  |


| Hedgerow Number | Common pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 422 | 197.67 |
| 974 | 188.83 |
| 207 | 184.67 |
| $\mathbf{9 0}$ | 184.17 |
| $\mathbf{4 7}$ | 180.86 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 9}$ | 176.33 |
| 287 | 176.17 |
| 246 | 163.50 |
| 154 | 163.33 |
| $\mathbf{3 8}$ | 153.67 |

3.4.17. Of the remaining hedgerows, six hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of $>100.00 \mathrm{ppn}$, a further 19 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 99.99->50.00ppn, and 51 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 49.99->0.00ppn. No hedgerows recorded no common pipistrelle activity during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## Soprano pipistrelle

3.4.18. Hedgerows 140 and 67 had the highest average recorded soprano pipistrelle activity scores of 438.67 ppn and 432.29 ppn, respectively. Hedgerows 145 and 167 had the next highest average recorded activity scores of 316.71 ppn and 289.14ppn, respectively.
3.4.19. Activity levels of soprano pipistrelle for hedgerows in Autumn are presented on Figure 9.4.9c.
3.4.19. Table 30Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the-Table 30Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average soprano pipistrelle activity level of $>38.58 \mathrm{ppn}$.
3.4.20. Table 30 - Summary of hedgerows with an average-soprano pipistrelle activity tevel of $>38.58 \mathrm{ppn}$ -

Fable 30-Summary of Hedgerows with Soprano-Pipistrelle Activity >38.58ppn During during Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 140 | 438.67 |
| 67 | 432.29 |
| 145 | 316.71 |
| 167 | 289.14 |
| 438 | 221.80 |
| 47 | 127.71 |
| 91 | 122.00 |
| 429 | 112.60 |
| 87 | 110.17 |
| 427 | 108.00 |
| 187 | 93.57 |
| 940 | 89.33 |
| 287 | 74.50 |
| 22 | 74.33 |
| 38 | 72.50 |
| 422 | 69.50 |
| 157 | 65.17 |
| 420 | 64.50 |
| 31 | 62.83 |
| 489 | 61.50 |
| 64 | 61.17 |
| 414 | 57.67 |
| 83 | 49.17 |


| Hedgerow Number | Soprano pipistrelle ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 954 | 44.33 |
| 354 | 39.17 |

3.4.21-3.4.20. Of the remaining hedgerows, 34 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of $38.58 \mathrm{ppn}->10.00 \mathrm{ppn}$, and 42 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 9.99 ppn->0.00ppn. Four hedgerows recorded no soprano pipistrelle activity during automated static detector assessments in Spring 2022.

## Pipistrellus sp.

3.4.22.3.4.21. Hedgerows 287 and 156 had the highest average recorded Pipistrellus sp. group activity scores of 123.00 ppn and 82.67 ppn , respectively. Hedgerows 27 and 414 had the next highest average recorded activity scores of 42.84ppn and 10.00ppn, respectively.
3.4.23-3.4.22. Table 31Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average Pipistrellus sp. activity level of $>1.23 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 31 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Pipistrellus SP. Activitysp. activity >1.23ppn Duringduring Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 8 7}$ | 123.00 |
| $\mathbf{1 5 6}$ | 82.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 7}$ | 42.84 |
| $\mathbf{4 1 4}$ | 10.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 7 4}$ | 8.67 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | 8.17 |
| $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 8.00 |
| $\mathbf{9 0 , 3 8}$ | 5.50 |
| $\mathbf{6 7}$ | 4.71 |
| $\mathbf{2 6 7}$ | 4.57 |


| Hedgerow Number | Pipistrellus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 87 | 4.50 |
| 940 | 4.17 |
| 164, 214 | 4.00 |
| 426 | 3.60 |
| 91 | 3.17 |
| 117 | 2.33 |
| 429 | 2.20 |
| 223, 31 | 2.00 |
| 154 | 1.83 |
| 427 | 1.60 |
| 176 | 1.40 |
| 187 | 1.28 |

3.4.24-3.4.23. Of the remaining hedgerows, 42 hedgerows had an average recorded activity level of 1.17->0.00ppn. Thirty-four hedgerows had no activity identified within the Pipistrellus sp. group during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## Nyctalus sp.

3.4.25-3.4.24. Hedgerows 348 had the highest average numbers of Nyctalus sp. activity, recording 83.16ppn. The hedgerows with the next highest average activity levels were hedgerows 113 and 414 , with 19.34 ppn and 19.00 ppn, respectively.
3.4.26-3.4.25. Table 32Error! Reference source not found.Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average Nyctalus sp. activity level of >2.00ppn.

Table 32 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with Nyctalus SP.
Activitysp. activity >2.00ppn Duringduring Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow number | Nyctalus sp. ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| 348 | 83.16 |
| 113 | 19.34 |
| 414 | 19.00 |
| 351 | 18.83 |
| 353 | 13.00 |
| 117 | 8.50 |
| 90 | 8.16 |
| 354 | 6.67 |
| 419 | 6.34 |
| 91 | 6.00 |
| 954, 940 | 5.50 |
| 420 | 5.17 |
| 427 | 4.60 |
| 426 | 4.40 |
| 422 | 4.33 |
| 161 | 4.16 |
| 157 | 3.83 |
| 64 | 3.17 |
| 154, 27 | 2.84 |
| 88 | 2.50 |
| 78 | 2.33 |
| 416 | 2.17 |

3.4.1. Of the remaining hedgerows, 51 had average activity levels of between 2.00ppn and 0.00 ppn . Twenty-six hedgerows recorded no activity identified within the Nyctalus sp. group during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## NSL

3.4.2. The hedgerow with the highest average activity within the NSL group was hedgerow 348, with 5.33 ppn. The second highest was hedgerow 429 which recorded 2.00ppn.
3.4.3. Table 33Error! Reference source not found-Error! Reference source not found. highlights all the hedgerows with an average NSL activity level of $>0.14 \mathrm{ppn}$.

Table 33 - Summary of the Hedgerowshedgerows with NSL Activityactivity >0.14ppn Duringduring Autumn 2022

| Hedgerow number | NSL ppn |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 4 8}$ | 5.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | 2.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 1}$ | 1.33 |
| $\mathbf{6 4 , 4 2 6}$ | 1.00 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 3}$ | 0.83 |
| $\mathbf{4 2 7}$ | 0.80 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 4}$ | 0.50 |
| $\mathbf{9 5 6 , 6 7}$ | 0.43 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ | 0.33 |
| $\mathbf{4 3 8}$ | 0.20 |
| $\mathbf{1 6 1 , 8 3} \mathbf{8 8 , 9 7 4 , \mathbf { 4 1 3 } , \mathbf { 4 2 2 , 8 1 8 , 1 9 6 } ,}$ | 0.17 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 , 8 0 8} \mathbf{2 0 6}$ |  |

3.4.1. Of the remaining hedgerows, three recorded an average activity level of between 0.14 ppn and 0.00 ppn. Seventy-five hedgerows recorded no activity within the NSL group during automated static detector assessments in Autumn 2022.

## 3.5. <br> FINAL BHSA CATEGORY

3.5.1. Of the 193 hedgerows assessed, 30 hedgerows were upgraded from 'Good' to 'Excellent', one hedgerow was downgraded from 'Excellent' to 'Good', four hedgerows were downgraded from 'Good' to 'Poor' and 159 hedgerows remained unchanged. Of the remaining hedgerows which were not subject to any assessment, 97 remained 'Poor' and 66 were 'Scoped out'.
3.5.2. In total, 45 hedgerows have a final BHSA category of 'Excellent', 144 have a category of 'Good' and 102 have a category of 'Poor'.
3.5.3. Table H. 1 in Annex H lists all the hedgerows identified within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary, their final BHSA category, and the reason for any BHSA category alterations. Table 34 below summaries all hedgerows which have a final BHSA category of 'Excellent'. Final BHSA categories are presented on Figure 9.4.10.

Table 34 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows with Finalfinal BHSA Gategoriescategories of 'Excellent'

| Hedge | BHSA <br> category | Final <br> BHSA <br> Category | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | Excellent | Excellent | Grouped with 'Good' hedgerow 31, which <br> did not meet any parameters for upgrade or <br> downgrade |
| $\mathbf{6 6}$ | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 67 - see below |
| $\mathbf{6 7}$ | Good | Excellent | The number of total ppn was above the <br> upper bounds for Spring, Summer and <br> Autumn |
| $\mathbf{8 2}$ | Excellent | Excellent | Grouped with 'Good' hedgerow 81 which <br> did not meet any parameters for upgrade or <br> downgrade |
| $\mathbf{9 1}$ | Excellent | Excellent | Grouped with 'Good' hedgerow 93 which <br> did not meet any parameters for upgrade or <br> downgrade |
| $\mathbf{1 4 5}$ | Excellent | Excellent | The number of total ppn was above the <br> upper bounds for Spring, Summer and <br> Autumn |


| Hedge | BHSA category | Final <br> BHSA <br> Category | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 196 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 199 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring, Summer and Autumn |
| 202 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 206 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 229 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring, Summer and Autumn |
| 236 | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| 237 | Excellent | Excellent | Grouped with 238 - see below |
| 238 | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| 247 | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| 267 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Summer and Autumn |
| 283 | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| 289 | Excellent | Excellent | Grouped with 'Good' hedgerow 287 which did not meet any parameters for upgrade or downgrade |
| 348 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Summer and Autumn |
| 349 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 348 and 350 - see above |


| Hedge | BHSA category | Final BHSA <br> Category | Justification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 350 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 348 and 349 - see above |
| 353 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 354 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Summer and Autumn |
| 374 | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| 398 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 399 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 400 and 398 - see above |
| 400 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 399 and 398 - see above |
| 402 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 403 - see below |
| 403 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Summer |
| 405 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 406 and 1004 - see below |
| 406 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 406 and 1004 - see below |
| 414 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring and Autumn |
| 419 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring, Summer and Autumn |
| 420 | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or sensitive species was above the upper bounds in Spring, Summer and Autumn |
| 421 | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 420 - see above |


$\left.$| Hedge | BHSA <br> category | Final <br> BHSA <br> Category | Justification |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{4 2 2}$ | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Spring and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{4 2 9}$ | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Spring, Summer and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ | Excellent | Excellent | Did not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| $\mathbf{4 8 8}$ | Good | Excellent | Grouped with 489 - see below |
| $\mathbf{4 8 9}$ | Excellent | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Spring and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{4 9 1}$ | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Spring and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{9 4 0}$ | Excellent | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Summer and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{9 7 4}$ | Good | Excellent | The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or <br> sensitive species was above the upper <br> bounds in Spring and Autumn |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0 4}$ | Good | Excellent | Excellent | | Eid not meet the parameters for downgrade |
| :--- |
| The number of ppn for an Annex II and/or |
| sensitive species was above the upper |
| bounds in Spring and Summer | \right\rvert\, | Did |
| :--- |

## 3.6. <br> MODIFIED DEFRA LOCAL SCALE SURVEYS

## OVERVIEW

3.6.1. A total of 10 bat species / species groups were recorded across the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary during the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys, at the 32 'Excellent' hedgerows subject to survey to date. The following species were recorded:

- Common pipistrelle;
- Soprano pipistrelle;
- Nathusius' pipistrelle;
- Pipistrellus sp.;
- Noctule;
- Nyctalus sp.
- NSL;
- Myotis sp.;
- Lesser horseshoe bat; and
- Brown long-eared bat.
3.6.2. Of the 32 hedgerows which have been surveyed so far, 10 hedgerows had total species counts for in-use passes which exceeded the DEFRA thresholds. Seven hedgerows met the threshold of 10 or more bat passes from at least one species, two hedgerows met the threshold of at least one pass from an Annex II species, and one hedgerow met the threshold for both reasons. A summary of hedgerows where total species count for in-use passes exceeded the DEFRA thresholds is shown below in Table 35.
3.6.3. The survey information of each modified DEFRA Local Scale survey is detailed in Table $I .1$ in Annex I and the data recorded for all modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys undertaken in 2022 can be seen in Table J. 1 in Annex J. The relative locations of each 'Excellent' hedgerow subject to the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys and those that met the thresholds are presented in Figure 9.4.11.

Table 35 - Summary of Hedgerowshedgerows where Total Species-Counttotal species count for at Least One Survey Exceededleast one survey exceeded the DEFRA Threshold (Surveythreshold (survey where Threshold Was Metthreshold was met is Highlightedhighlighted in Blueblue)

| Hedgerow | PIPPIP | PIPPYG | NYCNOC | MYOSP | RHIHIP | PIPSP | PLEAUR | NYCSP | NSL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 145 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 202 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 206 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 229 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 237 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Hedgerow | PIPPIP | PIPPYG | NYCNOC | MYOSP | RHIHIP | PIPSP | PLEAUR | NYCSP | NSL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 267 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 34 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 354 | 16 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 419 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 940 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 7 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 974 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

4.1.1. Three hundred and fifty-seven hedgerows were identified within the Newbuild Infrastructure Boundary during the hedgerow field surveys. Sixty-six hedgerows were scoped out of further assessment. Of the remaining hedgerows, 98 were categorised as 'Poor' and needed no additional assessment. One hundred and ninety-three hedgerows, which were assigned the BHSA category 'Good' or 'Excellent', required further survey by automated static detectors.
4.1.2. Based on the data collected by the automated static detector surveys, the BHSA category of 'Good' or 'Excellent' hedgerows was downgraded, confirmed or upgraded. As a result, final BHSA categories were assigned as follows:

- 45 'Excellent' hedgerows;
- 144 ‘Good’ hedgerows;
- 102 'Poor’ hedgerows; and
- 66 hedgerows which were scoped out.
4.1.3. Modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys are due to be conducted for the 45 'Excellent' hedgerows. To date, 32 'Excellent' hedgerows have been subject to two initial surveys, 10 of which met the relevant thresholds and require a further four survey visits prior to construction. The initial two surveys for the remaining 13 'Excellent' hedgerows will be completed prior to construction along with any further surveys required for hedgerows which meet the threshold, in addition to the remaining surveys required for the 10 hedgerows to date which have met the threshold.
4.1.4. The final BHSA categories, in combination with the results of the modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys, have been used to confirm the significance of effects and the mitigation prescriptions described in Chapter 9: Biodiversity (Revision B) (Volume II). This will be revaluated again once the remaining modified DEFRA Local Scale surveys have been completed prior to construction and a final assessment is made.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hedgerow length was calculated automatically using the ESRI ArcGIS Collector application and was then used to calculate the number of trees per 50 m post survey.

[^1]:    2 'Main roads' were defined by expert opinion from field ecologists based on vast experience working across the entire Development and the typical flow of traffic and any on-street lighting they experienced on those roads. The only caveat for not downgrading due to proximity to main roads was that the hedgerow was tall and dense enough to provide sufficient cover from noise and light pollution.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Seasons = spring (April/May); summer (June/July/August); autumn (September/October).

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Where the $1^{\text {st }}$ quartile represents the value under which $25 \%$ of the lowest data points are found, the $2^{\text {nd }}$ quartile is the median, and the upper quartile represents the value over which $25 \%$ of the highest data points are found.
    ${ }^{5}$ The range of the middle $50 \%$ of the data, which lies between the $1^{\text {st }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ quartiles.
    ${ }^{6}$ Where the 'upper bound' is the highest value in the expected data range, and any values above the upper bound are considered outliers.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ Annex II species include Barbastella barbastellus, Myotis bechsteinii, Rhinolophus hipposideros and Rhinolophus ferrumequinum. Myotis bechsteinii were not considered to form part of the assessment due to the surveys taking place outside of their known geographical range.
    ${ }^{8}$ Sensitive species $=$ Myotis sp. and brown long-eared bat

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ WC1060 Development of a cost-effective method for monitoring the effectiveness of mitigation for bats crossing linear transport infrastructure - Local Scale Effects
    ${ }^{10}$ Rare species are defined as Annex II species which include Barbastella barbastellus, Myotis bechsteinii, Rhinolophus hipposideros and Rhinolophus ferrumequinum.
    Myotis bechsteinii were not considered to form part of the assessment due to the surveys taking place outside of their known geographical range.

