

Unlucky number 13? Unlucky for BATS - all supposed to be highly protected. https://nantmithilenergypark.wales/wp-content/uploads/2024-04-30_Volume-3_Appendix-7.5_Bat-Risk-Assessment.pdf for bat risk assessment



Pipistrelle species and Noctules are high-flyers particularly at risk of collision with turbine blades



The BUTE Bat Risk Assessment 2022 Survey results show:

Table 5.2 – Total number of bat passes recorded for each species across all detectors – 2022

Species/Species Group	No. of Passes	Percentage of Total (%)	Bat Passes Per Night
Common pipistrelle	52,823	72.05	66.78
Soprano pipistrelle	13,933	19	17.61
Noctule	1,864	2.54	2.36
Daubenton's	1,840	2.51	2.33
Brown long-eared	1,773	2.42	2.24
Myotis (species unidentified)	652	0.89	0.82
Natterer's	302	0.41	0.38
Brandt's	49	0.07	0.06
Whiskered	29	0.04	0.04
All <i>Myotis</i> combined (to compare with 2020 data)	2872	3.92	3.63
Barbastelle	27	0.04	0.03
Lesser horseshoe	14	0.02	0.02
NSL spp.	11	0.02	0.01
Nathusius' pipistrelle	2	0.00	0.00
Total	73,319	100	92.69

The Nant Mithil Site scores **91%** of maximum site-importance for bats in this part of Wales.

The BUTE Bat Risk Assessment explains how the scoring works:

The Bat Mitigation guidance uses a scoring system based on the number of different bat species present to determine the level of Site importance (see Table 3.3, pp 30, Reason *et al*, 2023). The maximum score for a site in **north or mid Wales** is **36**, based on the presence of three widespread species (1 point per species - score 3), five less-abundant species (2 points per species - score 10), one rare species (3 point per species - score 3), and five very rare species (4 point per species, score 20).

This is <u>not</u> looking good ... but, somehow, the <u>Non-Technical Summary</u> manages to conclude (p27): "With mitigation, impacts on bats reduce from minor to negligible"