

**Garage at 60 Vann Rd,
Fernhurst,
Haslemere
GU27 3NS**

Phase 1 Daytime Bat Assessment

Dr. Jonty Denton FRES FLS MCIEEM CEcol

20th February 2024

Written by:

Dr. Jonty Denton (Chartered Ecologist) 31 Thorn Lane, Four Marks, Hampshire,
GU34 5BX. email: jontydenton@aol.com



Quality Control

The information and data which has been prepared and provided is true and has been prepared and provided in accordance with the *Code of Professional Conduct issued by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)*. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions.

The contents of this report were correct at the time of the site visit. The report is provided for the sole use of the named client and is confidential.

All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this situation without written consent.

Summary

Consultant Chartered Ecologist Dr.Jonty Denton FRES FLS MCIEEM CEcol was commissioned to undertake a Daytime Bat Assessment (Phase 1) of garage at 60 Vann Rd., Fernhurst, West Sussex, GU27 3NS.

The Daytime Bat Assessment / Phase 1 Bat Survey was undertaken in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines (Collins, 2023).

The garage has a close-fitting tiled roof and close-fitting hang tile-faced upper gables. These and the soffit and fascias are all closed off with no potential access points for bats.

There is potential access around the wooden doors on the upper part of the north gable, but there was no sign of any bat activity within the garage which is open internally with no enclosed voids, and the internal space is permanently illuminated via a window and the timbers are nailed with no holes or gaps.

Therefore, the structure has negligible potential for roosting bats and a phase 2 bat survey is *not* recommended.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Consultant Chartered Ecologist Dr.Jonty Denton FRES FLS MCIEEM CCol was commissioned to undertake a Daytime Bat Assessment (Phase 1) of garage at 60 Vann Rd., Fernhurst, West Sussex, GU27 3NS. (GR:SU896284).

This report presents the findings of the survey undertaken on the 20th February 2024 which is aimed at assessing the suitability of the property to support bat species.

Site Setting and Description

The garage is situated to the north of Vann Rd., in a village setting in Fernhurst. It is orientated southwest-northeast and situated to the southwest of the main house. It is flanked by other detached and semi-detached properties with small gardens to the north and east with a belt of ancient woodland to the west.

METHODS

Introduction

Phase 1 Bat Survey Methods

The Daytime Bat Assessment / Phase 1 Bat Survey was undertaken in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines (Collins, 2023).

The Phase 1 Bat Survey comprised of a daytime walkover of the site, internally and externally, to record evidence of any protected bat species.

The garage was investigated externally to identify potential bat access/egress locations and roosting areas such as gaps or holes between wooden cladding, roof tiles, fascias and soffits and to record direct evidence of bat presence such as droppings and urine staining. This was followed by a detailed investigation of all accessible internal spaces to record evidence of bat roosting activity such as droppings, feeding remains, live animals, corpses, urine staining and fur staining. The building was assessed as to its suitability for supporting roosting bats. The survey conformed to current Bat

Conservation Trust guidelines (Bat Conservation, (2023) *Bat surveys for professional ecologists: Good practice guidelines* 4th edition).

The details of the assessment criteria used to determine the ecological value of on-site attributes are outlined below. During the Phase 1 survey, the assessment criteria are based on the potential for the site to support the species considered. However, in many cases Phase 2 surveys will be required to confirm the presence /absence of any bat species and hence the importance of a population at the site, therefore the assessment of value should be considered as provisional.

Where possible, a provisional assessment of potential will be made although this may well require Phase 2 surveys to confirm status.

High Potential- High potential buildings are those that have multiple enclosed voids and/or complex internal spaces. This can include soffits and extensive areas of roof with under-tile spaces (especially where backed by lining in good condition), with numerous potential access points in the form of gaps in tiling, flashings etc. Similarly, extensive areas of vertical surfaces covered in hang tiling are also highly attractive to bats where external openings are available. Such sites could support large numbers of bats on a regular basis including roosts of high conservation status. Further Phase 2 surveys will be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

Medium Potential- Medium potential buildings typically have one inaccessible internal void (including soffit boxes), and/or under-tile spaces with at least one or two potential openings. Such sites are unlikely to support roosts of high conservation status. Further Phase 2 surveys are likely to be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

Low Potential- Low potential buildings are those that provide limited bat roosting potential typically without internal voids and only very limited potential for bats (small areas of hang tile, occasional gap under ridge and roof-tiles which could be used by individual bats opportunistically. These are unlikely to open into under-tile spaces beyond the tile in question. A further Phase 2 survey limited to one visit is likely to be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

No/Negligible Potential – These are buildings that are unsuitable for roosting bats, having no accessible voids or under-tile spaces. Phase 2 surveys are unlikely to be required for structures of this kind.

Phase 1 Survey Timing and Weather Conditions

The Phase 1 bat survey was carried out on the evening of the 20th of February 2024 was a cloudy, calm day with 100% cloud cover and an ambient temperature of approx. 10 °C.

Phase 1 Survey Equipment

During the Phase 1 survey, the surveyor was equipped with 10 x 42 close-focus binoculars and a high-powered torch.

RESULTS

Bats are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended, and also receive additional protection via The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations (2017) from intentional killing and injury and from intentional damage, destruction or obstruction of access to a place of shelter. It is an offence to kill or injure a bat or interfere with any roosting or resting site. A bat roost is interpreted as "any structure or place used for shelter or protection" whether or not bats are present at the time or not. Barbastelle Bats, Bechstein's Bat, Noctule, Soprano Pipistrelle, Brown Long-eared Bat, Greater Horseshoe Bat and Lesser Horseshoe Bat are also UK BAP Priority Species and SPI.

According to the DEFRA's MagicMap, three bat licenses have been issued for properties within 1km of the garage. The closest is 120m to the north which was issued in 2011 and covered brown long-eared, common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle.

Building assessment

The garage dates to 2000 and is built of breeze block faced with brick with a pitched hipped roof of close-fitting cement tiles (see figures 1 and 2). One of these has broken off but the stub is still *in situ* with no access beneath. The gable ends are faced with close-fitting hang tiles with a wooden 'hayloft type double door at the north end. This is made of lap-planking which is unlined internally (See figures 3 and 5).

One tile is broken on the south gable but as with the roof the stub of the tile is *in situ* and no opening is available for bats. The fascias are of wood and are tight-fitting with no entry points. The roof is lined internally with bituminous felting which is in excellent order (see figure 4) and the internal space is permanently illuminated via a window on the eastern wall (see figures 2 and 4). There are no potential roost spaces in the framing or walls.



Figure 1. Northern and western elevation of garage looking south.



Figure 2. Southern and eastern elevation of garage looking north.



Figure 3. Northern elevation of garage showing doors.



Figure 4. Garage roof looking southwest.



Figure 5. Garage roof looking northeast.

EVALUATION, IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The garage has a close-fitting tiled roof and close-fitting hang tile faced upper gables. These and the soffit and fascias are all closed off with no potential access points for bats.

There is potential access around the wooden doors on the upper part of the north gable, but there was no sign of any bat activity within the garage which is open internally with no enclosed voids, and the internal space is permanently illuminated via a window and the timbers are nailed with no holes or gaps.

Therefore, the structure has negligible potential for roosting bats and a phase 2 bat survey is *not* recommended.

In the unlikely event of any bats being found during demolition or construction, all work must stop immediately, and Natural England must be called. Additional

information is available on the Bat Conservation Trust website at <https://www.bats.org.uk/advice/imworking-on-a-building-with-bats/ive-found-a-bat-during-works>.

New exterior lighting should be avoided, but if necessary for security purposes, then the latest updated lighting guidance note (GN08/23) should be followed. This is available at Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting | Institution of Lighting Professionals (theilp.org.uk) and supersedes all previous guidance.

REFERENCES

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

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