

PRELIMINARY BAT HABITAT ASSESSEMENT AND
EMERGENCE SURVEY,
45, MANOR GREEN ROAD,
EPSOM,
SURREY, KT19 8RN.

Furesfen



Tel/fax 020 8974 6670
Mob.0786 750 7086
Email alison@furesfen.co.uk
Website: www.furesfen.co.uk

REPORT CONTENTS

CONTROL SHEET

Introduction

 Background.....

 Site Description.....

 Development Proposals.....

 Scope of this Report

 Aims of Assessment.....

METHODOLOGY.....

 Building Inspection

 Surveyor Information.....

 Limitations

RESULTS

 Desk study.....

 External building Inspection

 Internal building inspection

 General.....

 Emergence survey.....

ASSESSMENT

 Discussion of Findings.....

 Potential Impacts of the Development.....

RECOMMENDATIONS

 Mitigation

 Precautionary Approach

REFERENCES

Appendix.....

Abbreviations:

SBAP	Surrey Biodiversity Action Plan
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
HAP	Habitat Action Plan
SAP	Species Action Plan
SNCI	Site of Nature Conservation Importance
SBG	Surrey Bat Group



CONTROL SHEET

Author Alison Fure BSc, MSc C.ENV MCIEEM

Job Title.

Purpose Planning

The information provided within this report is true at the time of writing. It has been prepared in accordance with the guidance of the MCIEEM professional institution’s Code of Professional Conduct. It cannot be used for any purpose other than stated above without the permission of the author. It cannot be made available to the public domain until all accounts have been settled.



Introduction

Background

- 1.1 Furesfen was asked to undertake a bat assessment of a c1940's south facing bungalow at 45, Manor Green Road, Epsom, Surrey, by Alan Sharp Associates. This was due to the demolition of the building, in order to construct a detached house.

Site Description

- 1.2 The bungalow is in a derelict condition as the ceiling has been removed, exposing the trusswork. The plot is in a quiet residential road, which is within 1 km of the northern edge of Epsom and Ashted Commons. The gardens are large and leafy.
- 1.3 The National and local designations are conferred on Epsom Common and the environs, such as SSSI (Special Site of Scientific Interest) and LNR (Local Nature Reserve). The site is contiguous to Ashted Common National Nature Reserve (NNR). Horton C.P. (LNR) lies 2.5 km to the north. These designations signal an enhanced risk of the presence of wildlife within this area. Stones Pond lies within 1 km to the east of the site.

Development Proposals

- 1.4 The development proposals comprise the demolition of the shell of the bungalow and the erection of a detached house.

Scope of this Report

- 1.5 This report outlines the methodology and findings of the Bat Habitat Assessment and emergence survey carried out at the site 5.8.16.

Aims of Assessment

- 1.6 The purpose of this assessment was to:
 - (a) Determine any potential impacts to bats, or their roosts; posed by the demolition; and,
 - (b) Advise of any further surveys and mitigation measures that may be required to ensure that the proposed works proceed lawfully.
- 1.7 Details of enhancement measures that may be required to proceed lawfully with the proposed works are provided based on the findings of the assessment.



METHODOLOGY

Building Inspection

- 2.1 The ground-based building inspection was undertaken during the evening of 5.8.16. The survey was carried out using close focussing binoculars and high-powered torches.
- 2.2 An emergence survey was carried out the same evening by two surveyors, using recordable Bat Box 4 detectors and an Anabat Walkabout, played through an Edirol (RO9) recorder.
- 2.3 The survey was conducted during suitable temperature and weather conditions.
- 2.4 The survey methods were in accordance with The Bat Conservation Trust's *Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines – 3rd Edition* (Collins, 2016), and *The Bat Worker's Manual* (Mitchell-Jones and McLeish, 2004).

Surveyor Information

- 2.5 The surveys were undertaken by A Fure Class 2 Bat Licence (Natural England licence number 2015-10381-CLS-CLS) full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) assisted by B. Fure.

Limitations

- 2.6 Normally, bat surveys are undertaken prior to removal of the floors and ceiling. In this case only the shell of the building was surveyed. Only one emergence survey was performed due to the condition of the building and the results of the first survey.

RESULTS

Desk study

- 3.1 Data obtained from the Surrey Bat Group indicated that a large roost of common pipistrelle bats has been recorded in an adjoining road; as well as small roosts of soprano pipistrelles close to Horton C.P., Epsom Common and the hospital sites. No roosts have been recorded in Manor Green Road.

External building Inspection

- 3.2 The bungalow was an 'L' shape, which had a pitched and hipped tiled roof with a valley in between (usually a weak point). There were no missing tiles on the main roof except:
 - one at the west facing pitch; and
 - along the south face of the roof line, (where there were several missing tiles; but only 2.5m from the ground).



3.3 A hole was located in one of the ridge tiles, the rest were sound. There was a patched hole in the roof, where they may have been a projecting flue or roof light. This had been covered to prevent rainwater ingress.

3.4 A barge board on the front gable had a small amount of damage at the north elevation, although this has not created an access point into the eaves or soffit.

3.5 The front is painted white and it would be easy to see any droppings or staining that might arise from bat ingress at the gable apex or soffit box. The soffits were intact and there was no gap between the wood and the elevation. No droppings or staining was noted that might indicate bat ingress.

3.6 The bungalow was in a poor state of repair as could be seen from flaking paint around the single glazed metal windows.

3.7 Limited bat potential was noted as follows:

- A hole at a ridge tile;
- One slipped tile;
- Slipped tiles at the roof line; and
- A hole where a flue had been removed.

Internal building inspection

3.8 The ceiling has been removed and the trusses are exposed. The sarking board could be seen. There were no droppings located on the concrete floor indicating that any bats have been flying around the internal void.

3.9 Daylight could be seen through the roof where an old roof light/flue had been removed and covered, leaving gaps with suitable potential for bat ingress.

General

3.10 Vegetation links were poor, although there is a fruit tree in the front garden and a magnolia and fruit trees some 20m from the bungalow at the rear.

Emergence survey

3.11 The emergence survey began thirty minutes before sunset, with surveyors positioned at the south-east and south-west quadrants.



- 3.12 The surveyors took note of all of the features mentioned at 3.7. No surveyors were positioned at the north elevation, as no points of ingress were found and it appeared too brightly lit for bat interest.
- 3.13 During the emergence survey no bats were recorded emerging from the building. Two bat species were recorded: a noctule bat as well as common pipistrelle bats.
- 3.14 The first bat was a high flying noctule bat, a species that roosts exclusively in trees (at 21.01). The first common pipistrelle bat arrived from the south at 21.20 (sunset + thirty seven minutes).
- 3.15 Pipistrelle bats were recorded as late arrivals at the site, comprising of commuting passes, flying from west to east. Bats could be seen out of the range of the bat detector to the north and east as the lack of tree canopy and cloud cover led to light sky conditions.

Table 2. Photographs – Building Inspection



Photograph 1. Hole in roof



Photograph 2. Hole in ridge tile, west facing slope





Photograph 3. Exposed truss work as viewed through ceiling



Photograph 4 Trees at the rear of the garden

ASSESSMENT

Discussion of Findings

- 4.1 The survey found the bungalow to be of low potential for bat interest, with few features suitable for a colony, although there were features that would permit ingress for bats roosting as singles on a casual basis.
- 4.2 Few bat passes were detected on bat recording equipment, indicating there was limited interest for bats at this location. The first bat pass was >thirty minutes after sunset, indicating bats may have travelled to arrive at this location. They did not remain to feed, but flew from west to east, and these were recorded as commuting passes.
- 4.3 Only one emergence survey has been undertaken due to the condition of the property and lack of potential. This imposes limitations on the survey that should be overcome before demolition by recommended mitigation measures.

Potential Impacts of the Development

- 4.4 Without further mitigation, the proposed works have potential to cause injury to any bats that might be present on a casual basis, during the demolition works and there are a number of ways that this can be avoided.
- 4.5 All species of bat found in Britain, and their roosts, receive protection under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). These legislative tools make it an offence for any person to:



- Deliberately **capture, injure or kill a bat**;
- Intentionally or recklessly **destroy a breeding or resting place (roost) of a bat**; and,
- Intentionally or recklessly **obstruct access for bats to a roost** or to otherwise significantly alter the structure of a roost so as to render it unsuitable to support roosting bats.

4.6 Therefore, the mitigation measures provided below could be implemented in order to ensure unlawful impacts to bats, or their roosts, are avoided as a result of the works.



RECOMMENDATIONS

Mitigation

- 4.7 Mitigation measures to avoid direct impacts to bats as well as features with potential to support roosting bats, are provided in table 3, below (as well as other protected species such as birds which are protected at their nests).

Table 3. Mitigation Measures

Area of works	Species	Summary Mitigation
Hedgerow/shrubs Annex	Bird	Demolition of the bungalow is best undertaken during the autumn. No works to vegetation should be carried out during the bird nesting season March-September
House	Bat	Works should proceed during the autumn, which is the best time to undertake this type of work (breeding has finished/but before bats hibernate).
Roof tiles and ridge tile with hole	Bat	Care should be taken also when removing the ridge tiles. If any droppings are found then work must be halted and advice sought and a decision made about whether a bat avoidance strategy can continue or whether a European Protected Species licence is required.
Additional external lighting	All species	Is not recommended.
Features	Bats	The new build should incorporate features that may be of interest. These should be agreed before the planning submission
Spun membranes	Bats	Woven Tyvek type membranes should not be used in the new building

Precautionary Approach

- 4.8 If the building is not demolished by March 2017 another emergence survey should be conducted.
- 4.9 In the unlikely event that bats are encountered during the proposed works then all works must cease immediately and a licensed bat ecologist must be called to site. In this event, works may not recommence until the ecologist has consulted Natural England and agreed a suitable and lawful way to proceed.

REFERENCES

Collins, J., Ed. (2016) Bat Surveys, Good Practice Guidelines. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Magic <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

Data search Surrey bat Group August, 2016

Appendix

Table 4. **Bat activity (.8.16)**

Conditions: Sunset: 20.43. Cloud Cover 1/8. Temperature 19°C at start. Wind at Beaufort 2.

Time	Detectors used: Duets. Anabat Walkabout AF (south-west quadrant) BF (south-east quadrant)
20.30	Start time
22.00	End time