

# Site Registration Form - WML-CL40

## HS2 Bat Mitigation Class Licences: Bats in tree roosts

Please note - Applications to register a site under WML-CL40 must be submitted to  
HS2wildlifelicencing@naturalengland.org.uk



**Please ensure you provide all records are kept for at least 12 months following the completion of licensed activities and monitoring period (where applicable).**

### SECTION A

1. Primary Registered Consultant Unique ID reference (e.g. B40RC001)

RC003

2. Why is a licence needed?

This license is required in order to destroy one occasional day roost of a Soprano Pipistrelle in T1, one occasional day roost of a Soprano Pipistrelle in T2, an occasional day roost of a Soprano Pipistrelle in T3 and one occasional day roost of a Common Pipistrelle in T3. In addition, this licence is required to destroy one occasional day roost of a Common Pipistrelle plus a small maternity roost (4).

3. Is HS2 Ltd the land owner?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Please supply the landowner details below:

a. Landowner's Name

CSJV

b. Landowner's phone number

[REDACTED]

c. Landowner's email address

[REDACTED]@csjv.co.uk

d. Site Name

MSD

e. Site Address

MSD Animal Health, Breakspear Road South, Ickenham, Uxbridge

f. County

Greater London

g. Post Code

UB9 6LS

4. Applicant Details (this is the HS2 Contractor, who will become the Licensee)

a. Applicant's Name

CSJV

b. Applicant's phone number

[REDACTED]

c. Applicant's Address

7th Floor, The Tower, 1 Eversholt Street, London

d. County

Greater London

e. Post Code

NW12DN

f. Applicant's email address

[REDACTED]@csjv.co.uk

5. Are the proposed works directly related to construction of HS2 Phase 1?

☒ Yes

☐ No

6. Purpose Test (regulation 55(2)(e)). Indicate which of the two purposes is served by this activity (only one must apply).

Imperative reasons of overriding public interest

7. Confirm that to your knowledge, the site being applied for is not subject to any recent, concurrent, pending or future applications for bat mitigation licence(s):

☐ Yes

☒ No

**If No, please supply information on other existing or known future applications in the miscellaneous text box between section 18 and 19.**

### SITE FEATURES

8. a. Number of trees within site registration area

5

b. Number of trees suitable for bats

5

c. Number of trees surveyed

5

d. Number of trees in which evidence is found

7

9. a. Number of trees that this site registration covers 7

b.

Tree reference no.	Species	Tree condition and potential bat roost features
1	Soprano pipistrelle	Tree 1 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature ash tree covered in ivy, potentially hiding features <span style="float: right;">+</span>
2	Soprano pipistrelle	Tree 2 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature ash tree with one feature only. This was a branch <span style="float: right;">+</span>
3	Soprano pipistrelle	Tree 3 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature pedunculate oak tree with a number of features <span style="float: right;">+</span>
4	Common pipistrelle	Tree 3 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature pedunculate oak tree with a number of features <span style="float: right;">+</span>
5	Common pipistrelle	Tree 4 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature ash tree with numerous features of suitability to <span style="float: right;">+</span>
6	Soprano pipistrelle	Tree 4 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature ash tree with numerous features of suitability to <span style="float: right;">+</span>
7	Soprano pipistrelle	Tree 5 - <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">XXXXXXXXXX</span> A mature pedunculate oak tree with a rot hole in deadwood <span style="float: right;">+</span>

## SURVEY DETAILS

10. Please complete the following table for each tree covered by the site registration request

		Most recent emergence/re-entry/ activity/aerial survey			Other recent emergence/re-entry/ activity/aerial survey
Tree no.	Date of survey	Description of bats found	Date of survey	Description of bats found	Were other surveys undertaken OR is there any other survey information you wish to be taken into account?
1	24 Jul 2019	No evidence of roosting <span style="float: right;">+</span>	23 May 2019	1x soprano pipistrelle <span style="float: right;">+</span>	No bats were recorded roosting <span style="float: right;">+</span>
2	6 Aug 2019	No evidence of roosting bats recorded during ground-level endoscopic survey of Tree 2. Only one feature was present on this tree and therefore the tree was fully surveyed.	20 Jun 2019	1x soprano pipistrelle was recorded emerging at 21:37 hours from the branch cavity on an E aspect during the dusk emergence survey.	Another ground-level endoscopic survey was undertaken on 22/07/19, with no evidence of roosting bats recorded. Only one feature was present on this tree and therefore the tree was fully surveyed.
3	23 Jul 2019	No evidence of roosting bats recorded during this dawn survey of Tree 3.	21 May 2019	1x soprano pipistrelle emerged at 21:40 hours from one of the woodpecker holes on a SW aspect during the dusk emergence survey.	During a dusk emergence survey on an adjacent tree on 13/05/19, 1x common pipistrelle was recorded emerging at 21:17 hours. The bat emerged from one of the woodpecker holes on a SW aspect.  Another dawn re-entry survey was undertaken on 12/06/19, and no evidence of roosting bats was recorded.
4	22 Jul 2019	1 x common pipistrelle emerged at 21:40 hours during the dusk emergence survey of Tree 4. This bat emerged from the woodpecker hole on the north-western aspect.	5 Jun 2019	During this dusk emergence survey, 4 x soprano pipistrelles emerged from rot holes on the southern aspect of the tree. 2 bats emerged at 21:40; and 2 bats at 21:49.	No evidence of roosting bats recorded during a dawn survey undertaken on 04/07/19.

5	3 Jul 2019	No evidence of roosting bats recorded during this dusk survey of Tree 5.	16 May 2019	During the dusk emergence survey of an adjacent tree, 4 x soprano pipistrelles were recorded emerging from a rot hole on the southern aspect of Tree 5. Each bat emerged separately at 21:14, 21:22, 21:23, and 21:26 hours.	No evidence of roosting bats recorded during a dusk survey on 13/06/19, nor during a dawn survey on 30/05/2019. Note that the survey on 16/05/19 was on an adjacent tree.
6					
7					

11. If the most recent survey was more than 3 months before submission of the site registration, please confirm that a walk-over survey/check has been undertaken to ensure that conditions have not changed, in accordance with WML-CL40 ☐ Yes, please supply date:  ☐ No ☒ N/A

If 'No' this must be undertaken before you apply.

### SPECIES AND ROOST INFORMATION

12. Please complete the following table for each tree covered by the site registration request.  
If only droppings, feeding remains or other evidence of bats were found during survey work undertaken please enter species, an estimated peak count and roost type in the table below.

a. Tree no.	Species	Peak count <i>highest no. indicated in any one survey for tree</i>	Roost Type affected	Location of Roost <i>e.g. large split on main stem at 2m above ground level.</i>	Other signs detected <i>e.g. droppings, feeding remains, dead bats, urine staining, oil residue from fur, etc.</i>
1	Soprano pipistrelle	1	Transitional/occasional	Tree 1/Roost 1 - Rot hole in an overhanging branch at a height of 6m on a south-western aspect.	None
2	Soprano pipistrelle	1	Transitional/occasional	Tree 2/Roost 2 - Branch cavity at a height of 2.5m with an eastern aspect.	None
3	Soprano pipistrelle	1	Transitional/occasional	Tree 3/Roost 3 - Woodpecker hole at a height of 10m on a south-western aspect.	None
4	Common pipistrelle	1	Transitional/occasional	Tree 3/Roost 4- Woodpecker hole at a height 10m on a south-western aspect.	None
5	Common pipistrelle	1	Transitional/occasional	Tree 4/Roost 5 - Woodpecker hole at a height of 6m with a north-western aspect.	None
6	Soprano pipistrelle	4	Small maternity roost	Tree 4/Roost 6 - Rot hole at a height of 12m on a southern aspect.	None
7	Soprano pipistrelle	4	Small maternity roost	Tree 5/Roost 7 - Rot hole at a height of 5m on a southern aspect.	None

- b. If any droppings were found and were suitable for DNA analysis, please confirm the results:

n/a

c. Confirm that there is no evidence (past or present) to indicate the presence of a roost type or species not covered by licence WML-CL40

☒ Yes, I confirm ☐ No

## IMPACTS, MITIGATION AND COMPENSATION UNDER THIS LICENCE

There is a requirement to submit **Map 1** which must clearly show:

- Date
- Red line boundary of land within the Consolidated Construction Boundary (CCB)
- Blue line boundary of area which will be subject to licensed activities as part of this Site Registration Request
- Locations of Trees and Roosts subject to this Site Registration Request, to include Tree Reference Numbers, to be consistent with Table 9b, and Roost Reference Numbers, to be consistent with Table 13.
- Indicate approximate location of compensation, if relevant.

Any compensation to be provided should be in line with Annex B (Table 1 and Table 2) of the licence and should be proportionate.

13. Please complete the following table for each tree and roost to be impacted.

Tree No.	Roost No.	Impact Type	Impact Level	Proposed mitigation and/or compensation at part of this Site Registration Request (Number, type and location of new roosts)	Date of provision of mitigation and compensation
1	1	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low	Two bat boxes suitable for day roosting bat	24 Dec 2018
2	2	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low	Two bat boxes suitable for day roosting bat	24 Dec 2018
3	3	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low	Two bat boxes suitable for day roosting bat	24 Dec 2018
3	4	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low	One bat box suitable for day roosting bats	24 Dec 2018
4	5	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low	Two woodcrete bat boxes suitable for day r	4 Oct 2019
4	6	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low-moderate	Two woodcrete bat boxes suitable for mate	4 Oct 2019
5	7	Permanent loss (destruction)	Low-moderate	Two woodcrete bat boxes suitable for mate	4 Oct 2019

14. a. Total no. of roosts to be damaged but not destroyed  b. Total no. of roosts to be destroyed

*i.e. number of roosts in all structures (not the number of individual bats).*

15. Confirm the impacts of this proposal fall within the impacts permitted by licence WML-CL40 ☒ Yes, I confirm

16. Please indicate which licensed methods and/or mitigation measures you have agreed with the application to be used:

☒ Capture by hand

☒ Artificial light (e.g. torches)

☒ Endoscopes

☒ Capture by hand-held static nets

☒ Exclusion by blocking entrances to unoccupied features

☒ Destructive search prior to felling

☒ Destruction by soft (section) felling

☐ Destruction by felling (low potential trees only)

☐ Temporary or permanent exclusion by techniques specified in the Bat Workers' Manual

17. a. Please complete within the table below the features, monitoring, management and maintenance to be provided.

Compensation for Roost No.	Features to receive post impact monitoring	Type and Duration of post impact monitoring	Management and maintenance requirements (To include type and frequency of checks)
1	Two bat boxes (Schwegler 2F) at Comp	The boxes are to be subject to a single	A check will be made within the licenc

Compensation for Roost No.	Features to receive post impact monitoring	Type and Duration of post impact monitoring	Management and maintenance requirements (To include type and frequency of checks)
2	Two bat boxes (Schwegler 2F) at Comp	The boxes are to be subject to a single	A check will be made within the licenc
3	Two bat boxes (Schwegler 2FN) at Con	The boxes are to be subject to a single	A check will be made within the licenc
4	One bat box (Schwegler 2FN) at Comp	The boxes are to be subject to a single	A check will be made within the licenc
5	Two woodcrete bat boxes at Compens	The boxes are to be subject to a single	A check will be made within the licenc
6	Two woodcrete bat boxes, one at Com	The maternity boxes are to be subject	A check will be made within the licenc
7	Two woodcrete bat boxes, both at Cor	The maternity boxes are to be subject	A check will be made within the licenc

b. Does your client wish to provide any additional enhancements? ☐ Yes ☒ No

## LICENCE PERIOD

18. a. Month and year when licensable works will commence

b. Month and year when licensable works will end

## MISCELLANEOUS

Please provide any additional comments below:

**Note** this section is not intended for large volume of details to be added. Please keep it concise and only complete where required.

The compensation sites have been selected as all are within 500m of the roosts scheduled to be destroyed, and therefore fall within the Core Sustenance Zone (CSZ) of both common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle. The sites have been selected as they are deemed as the closest sites of similar roosting and foraging habitats, and will remain connected to the wider landscape.

Compensation Site 1 (approximate grid ref ) Broadleaf hedgerow with trees, with bat boxes installed around newly created ponds.

Compensation Site 2 (approximate grid reference ) Bridleway lined by mature trees and scrub, surrounded by grassland and arable fields.

Compensation Site 3 (approximate grid reference ) Broadleaf woodland edge as part of Uxbridge Golf Course. The golf course also supports grassland, parkland, and a series of lakes close within 200m of the proposed location for compensation.

## SECTION B

19. Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (Purpose).

*Natural England has concluded in a previous assessment that the High Speed Two (Phase One) project has met the Imperative Reasons for Overriding Public Interest Test and therefore, it is not necessary to consider again the overall 'need' for the project.*

20. Please state here the site-specific objective of the activity for which a licence is required and how these works are essential in enabling the overall project to be successfully implemented:

The five trees must be felled so that the railway can be built.

21. No satisfactory alternatives to the proposed activities.

It must be demonstrated that the option chosen has the least impact or poses the least risk of harm to the bat population while still meeting the need.

Other solutions	Please describe each alternative considered	Will these resolve the problem or specific need for which the licence is sought? If not, why?	Are there any feasible alternatives that would have less impact on the protected species than the proposed solution? If not, why?
Do nothing	N/A - previously assessed	N/A	N/A

Alternative sites	N/A - Alternative routes previously assessed	N/A	N/A
At a site specific scale, please describe any <u>alternative engineering designs and mitigation designs</u> that could have been considered at this stage of design.	Extending the section in which the HS2 route was underground in a tunnel would have avoided the need to remove the tree roosts at these locations.	Yes, tunnel section would have been deep enough to avoid the need for tree removal.	No. Extending the tunnel section of the route is not financially feasible, nor is it a suitable engineering option due to existing environmental factors. There is no acceptable alternative that retains this trees and the roosts.
At a site specific scale, please describe any <u>alternative layouts</u> that could have been considered at this stage of design.	The planned construction route for track could have been altered to avoid the bat roosts.	Yes, altering the planned footprint for track installation could have avoided the need to remove the trees supporting the existing roosts.	No. The roost is located in the footprint of the proposed location where track shall be constructed. Due to the engineering requirements necessary to support the rolling stock, altering the route curvature to avoid the bat roosts is not possible for health and safety reasons in relation to engineering.
At a site specific scale, please describe any <u>alternative timings</u> that could have been considered at this stage of design.	Delaying the clearance of trees supporting the roost to 2021 could have taken place.	No, the licence would have been required to enable the tree removal in 12 months time.	No. Delaying tree removal was explored, however, the enabling works required to ensure that the installation of the HS2 track are such that the removal of trees supporting the roosts is on the 'critical path' for construction. If the trees were not removed in 2019 it shall mean future delays when subsequent subcontractors come to continue the HS2 construction works. The roosts would not have been retained either way.

## SECTION C

### NAMED ASSISTANTS

22. I wish to register Level 1 Assistant/s for this specific site registration ☐ Yes ☒ No

23. I wish to register Level 2 Assistant/s for this specific site registration ☒ Yes ☐ No

Level 2 - Assistant #1

Surname  Forename

Organisation/Consultancy/Other *if 'Other' please state in what capacity they are related to the site*

The Ecology Consultancy -  has undertaken several of the surveys and inspections on these trees.

Register another assistant? ☐ Yes ☒ No

### DECLARATIONS

Please ensure that all records are kept for at least 12 months following the completion of licensed activities and monitoring period (where applicable).

### PRIMARY REGISTERED CONSULTANT

I declare, as the Registered Consultant acting on behalf of my client, the applicant, and with their permission for this site registration, that:

25. I personally have completed this site registration form request. ☒ Yes, I confirm

26. I accept responsibility for the accuracy of the information I have provided to meet the NSA Test in Section B.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
27. I have landowner and/or HS2 Contractor permission, in writing, and they have accepted the terms and conditions of this Licence.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
28. If the site is on or adjacent to a designated site for bats, I can confirm I have the relevant permission(s).  
☒ Yes, I confirm ☐ N/A
29. Bat surveys to have been undertaken to the appropriate standard.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
30. I have considered all impacts and there will be no additional impacts on the population, to the best of my belief and knowledge, which will take the works above the criteria to be met for this licence.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
31. I have submitted Map 1 in line with the Impacts section.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
32. The mitigation proposed is in line with the licence WML-CL40.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
33. Any compensation that is being provided is proportionate and in line with Annex B of WML-CL40 and should bat boxes be provided, I have explained to my client that they are expected to remain in place for a minimum period of 5 years.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
34. My client, the applicant, has agreed in writing that mitigation and compensation (if required) will be provided and within the timescales stated within the site registration form. I will also submit licence returns as required on my client's behalf, including confirming that any compensation measures have been provided.  
☒ Yes, I confirm

#### APPLICANT

*Important note: The Applicant will become the Licensee should the site be registered under WML-CL40*

I declare, as the Applicant, that:

35. To the best of my belief and knowledge that information in this site registration request is accurate.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
36. I agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of licence WML-CL40.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
37. To the best of my belief and knowledge, there will be no additional works, which will take the works above the criteria to be met for this licence.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
38. Any mitigation and compensation that is being provided is proportionate and in line with this licence WML-CL40.  
☒ Yes, I confirm
39. Any mitigation and compensation will be provided as set out in the authorised site registration form, as agreed with the Primary Registered Consultant, and with the timescales stated.  
☒ Yes, I confirm

Submit by Email