



BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT

NORTH LODGE, PARK LANE, SWANMORE SO32 2QQ

FINAL REPORT

October 2023

Report conditions

<i>Report title</i>	Bat Roost Assessment – North Lodge, Park Lane, Swanmore, Hampshire SO32 2QQ		
<i>Client</i>	MR F Kinchin		
<i>Report status</i>	Final		
<i>Survey date</i>	24 th July 2023		
<i>Written by</i>	Trevor Codlin MCIEEM	<i>Date</i>	26 th July 2023
<i>Reviewed by</i>	Izabel Phillips	<i>Date</i>	8 th August 2023
<i>Updated by</i>	Trevor Codlin MCIEEM	<i>Date</i>	4 th October 2023
<i>Reviewed by</i>	Izabel Phillips	<i>Date</i>	13 th October 2023

Disclaimers

This report has been prepared by Phillips Ecology for the sole use of the client named above. Survey work, assessment, and report writing have been undertaken with all reasonable skill and care, and unless otherwise explicitly stated, is appropriate only for the work, scheme, or project brief provided by the client and intended purposes. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and Phillips Ecology. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where data, drawings, plans or other technical information has been provided to Phillips Ecology for the purposes of preparation of this report, either by the client, their agents or other parties (including but not limited to biological data sets, laboratory results, and mapping), it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by Phillips Ecology for inaccuracies in such data supplied by other parties.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of Phillips Ecology and the client. Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work, under standard limitations of access to third party land and other limitations as described in the report.

It is the client's responsibility to note and comply as necessary with any recommendations made in this report, planning conditions derived from these, and any relevant licensing regimes. Phillips Ecology bears no responsibility for any failure to note and comply with legal requirements for works carried out by or in behalf of the client at the above site and for the project this report has been produced to support.

Executive Summary

- This bat roost assessment report has been prepared in order to assess the status of bat roosts at North Lodge, Park Lane, Swanmore, Hampshire SO32 2QQ.
- A preliminary roost assessment survey was undertaken on 24th July 2023.
- The building was considered to provide moderate suitability for roosting bats based on the features identified externally and old evidence of bat usage and as a result there is considered to be a reasonable likelihood that bats will be present and impacted by the proposed works.
- In order to confirm the presence/absence of further roosting bats, characterise any bat roosts, assess the extent that they may be affected by the proposed works and develop a proportionate and appropriate mitigation strategy, further survey work in accordance with Natural England standing advice and the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition) was undertaken for the house. The recommended survey effort for structures with moderate roost suitability is two presence/absence surveys.
- Two presence/absence surveys comprising two dusk emergence surveys were carried out during August and September 2023.
- The surveys have confirmed that the zone of impact supports a common pipistrelle day, and probable male mating roost.
- The proposed extension works will result in the destruction of the identified bat roost beneath the roof tile by the chimney stack. As such, a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence will be required to enable the development to proceed lawfully under a derogation from the Habitat Regulations 2017.
- A mitigation strategy has been designed that would ensure the maintenance of the favourable conservation status of bats. In summary, this comprises the provision of replacement roost opportunities which are proportionate to the scale of impact and the exclusion of bats and removal of roost features by hand, under the supervision of a licenced bat worker to ensure that individual bats are not killed or injured.
- Precautionary measures have been provided for nesting birds, should they be found to be nesting on the building, although no evidence of such was recorded during the Phase 1 survey.
- Information regarding the length of time the findings of this report are valid for can be found in section 5.

Contents

Contents	iii
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Report purpose	1
1.2 Description of proposal	1
1.3 Report context.....	1
1.4 Survey area.....	1
1.5 Limitations.....	1
1.6 Relevant documents	1
2. Survey Methodology	2
2.1 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Methodology	2
2.1.1 Surveyor/s	2
2.1.2 Survey area	2
2.1.3 Survey date	2
2.1.4 Survey description	2
2.1.5 Survey equipment.....	2
2.1.6 Weather conditions	2
2.1.7 Assessment methodology	3
2.2 Emergence Survey Methodology	3
2.2.1 Surveyor/s	3
2.2.2 Survey area	3
2.2.3 Survey date	3
2.2.4 Survey description	4
2.2.5 Survey limitations	4
2.2.6 Survey equipment.....	4
2.2.7 Weather conditions	4
3. Survey results	5
3.1 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.....	5
3.1.1 General site overview	5
3.1.2 North Lodge	5
3.1.3 Site grounds description relevant to bats	8
3.2 Emergence Surveys.....	8
3.2.1 Visit 1 – 22 nd August 2023 – Emergence Survey.....	8
3.2.2 Visit 2 – 14 th September 2023 – Emergence Survey.....	9
3.4 Other protected or notable species	10
4. Discussion and Assessment of Impacts	10
4.1 Bat roost assessment	10
4.2 Assessment of impacts	10
4.3 Relevant legislation and policy.....	10
5. Recommendations.....	12
5.1 Requirement for further surveys	12
5.1.1 Bats	12
5.2 Mitigation strategy	12
5.2.1 Introduction	12
5.2.2 Bats	13
5.2.3 Breeding birds	15
5.3 Enhancements	15

6. Conclusion 16
7. References 17

1. Introduction

1.1 Report purpose

This report presents the findings of the bat roost assessment undertaken of the dwelling, North Lodge, Park Lane, Swanmore, Hampshire SO32 2QQ located at National Grid Reference SU 58314 18062.

1.2 Description of proposal

The current proposals are for:

- A two-storey extension to the southern elevation.
- The raising of the ridgeline to the southern projection.
- Rationalising the ground floor layout.
- Upgrading the existing, dilapidated single storey extensions.

1.3 Report context

This report has been produced to assess the status of roosting bats at the site, in order to ensure compliance with the current legislation protecting all bat species.

1.4 Survey area

The survey area comprised the existing building, including all internal spaces where accessible and the immediate surrounds.

1.5 Limitations

No limitations to the survey were identified.

1.6 Relevant documents

The relevant proposals plan is provided in Appendix 1.

2. Survey Methodology

2.1 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Methodology

2.1.1 Surveyor/s

The survey was carried out by Trevor Codlin MCIEEM of Phillips Ecology, a Level 2 (CL18) licenced bat surveyor.

2.1.2 Survey area

The survey area comprised the existing dwelling and the immediate surrounds where they will be impacted by the proposals. The survey area extended to all areas which will be modified by the proposed works in such a way that bats or their roosts could be impacted (directly or indirectly).

2.1.3 Survey date

The survey was carried out during the daytime on the 24th July 2023.

2.1.4 Survey description

The survey did not depart from the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition) which states that "A preliminary roost inspection survey is a detailed inspection of the exterior and interior of a structure to look for features that bats could use for entry/exit and roosting and to search for signs of bats".

The external features of the structure which will be modified by the proposed works in such a way that bats or their roosts could be impacted (directly or indirectly) if present, were systematically inspected in detail to compile information on potential and actual bat access points and roosting places such as lifted or broken tiles, loose brickwork and open eaves. This included a thorough search for evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings, urine splashes and fur staining.

2.1.5 Survey equipment

Survey equipment comprised:

- High-powered torch
- Camera
- 8x magnification binoculars
- Ladder
- Endoscope

2.1.6 Weather conditions

Weather during the survey can be described as mostly dry with occasional light showers, 100% cloud cover, a light (BF1) north-easterly breeze and 19°C. The weather conditions did not hinder the ecologist's ability to carry out the survey effectively.

2.1.7 Assessment methodology

The suitability of the building for supporting bat roosts will be assessed against the guidelines within Table 1 which have been adapted from the BCT Good Practice Guidelines.

Table 1 Suitability assessment guidelines

<i>Suitability</i>	<i>Description of Roosting Habitats</i>
<i>Negligible</i>	Structure has no reasonable likelihood of supporting roosting bats i.e. no suitable roosting features present.
<i>Low</i>	A structure which could be used opportunistically by individual bats i.e. one or more potential roost sites which do not provide sufficient space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions (e.g. temperature, light, humidity) and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats.
<i>Moderate</i>	A structure which could be used by bats but is not likely to support a roost of high conservation status (e.g. maternity roost). This structure would support features which exhibit suitable size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat for roosting bats.
<i>High</i>	A structure which is obviously suitable for supporting larger numbers of bats, on a regular basis and for longer periods of time.

2.2 Emergence Survey Methodology

2.2.1 Surveyor/s

The surveys were led by Trevor Codlin MCIEEM and Duncan Gilmartin (a level 1 licenced bat ecologist), both supported by two suitability experienced bat ecologists.

2.2.2 Survey area

The survey area comprised all elevations of the North Lodge building. This enabled survey coverage of all suitable access/egress and roosting features which were recorded during the preliminary bat roost assessment and will be affected by the proposal.

2.2.3 Survey date

The date and timings of the emergence and re-entry surveys are presented in Table 2. The emergence surveys commenced 15 minutes prior to sunset and continued for at least 1.5 hours.

Table 2 survey dates and timings

Survey type	Date	Start	Finish	Sunset/sunrise
<i>Emergence</i>	22/08/2023	19:57	21:42	20:12
<i>Emergence</i>	14/09/2023	19:01	20:53	19:23

2.2.4 Survey description

The emergence surveys were undertaken in accordance Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition). One surveyor was positioned in order to provide sufficient coverage of all potential access/egress points when stationary. All emergences, re-entries and general activity were recorded during the course of each survey. Recordings were later analysed using Sonobat and/or Kaleidoscope bat call analysis software to confirm species identification.

2.2.5 Survey limitations

No limitations were encountered during the course of the surveys.

2.2.6 Survey equipment

Survey equipment comprised:

- Pettersson D240X bat detector
- Echometer Touch
- Pulsar Helion XQ38F thermal imager

2.2.7 Weather conditions

Weather conditions during the surveys are provided in Table 3:

Table 3 emergence and re-entry weather conditions

Survey	Date	Precipitation		Temperature		Wind		Cloud Cover	
		Start	Finish	Start	Finish	Start	Finish	Start	Finish
Emergence	22/08/2023	Nil	Nil	20°C	17°C	Bf 1	Bf 0	10%	50%
Emergence	14/09/2023	Nil	Nil	18°C	15.0°C	Bf 1	Bf 1	10%	10%

3. Survey results

3.1 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

3.1.1 General site overview

The site comprises a single dwelling, situated in a well-managed garden with associated outbuildings: a detached garage and a shed. The dwelling is located in the northwest corner of the site with the grounds extending to the east and consisting of managed lawn areas and ornamental shrub and flower beds.

The North Lodge site is located in a rural setting on the south side of Park Lane, approximately 1 mile to the north of the village of Swanmore and 1.75 miles to the east of the town of Bishops Waltham. To the north, beyond Park Lane an area of woodland, Beechen Copse/Phrymth Copse is located. This 22.25-hectare woodland is designated a Local Wildlife Site (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation: SINC) due to it comprising an area of woodland where there is a significant element of ancient semi-natural woodland surviving or supporting some characteristics of ancient woodland.

3.1.2 North Lodge

North Lodge is a detached two storey, two bedroomed dwelling, which appears to have been originally constructed on a 'T' shaped footprint, with later, single storey extensions to the north and east (Figures 1 and 2).



Figure 1: Southern elevation.



Figure 2: Eastern elevation, showing existing single storey extension.

The walls are predominantly of Flemish brickwork with a double plinth course to the original building. The original southern projection has been rendered and painted (Figure 1). The roof to the main portion of the dwelling is pitched with plain clay tiles and brick gabled ends, incorporating feature brick detailing. The main roof features a large brick chimney positioned centrally on the ridgeline.

The later additions are largely covered with felt flat roofs with a small, pitched gable roof to both the east and north elevations (Figure 2). There are no soffits or fascias present on the two-storey building section and rafter feet extend beyond the wall plate on the northern and part of the southern elevation.

Internally, there are three internal void areas, one each to the west and east of the

centrally located chimney stack and one over the southern wing. The latter is accessed via a small door on the first floor and a small window on the southern elevation illuminates the interior.

Void 1: This is the larger of the two voids and extends in a westerly direction from the central chimney stack. The roof is constructed with traditional rafters and a single beam extends along the ridge. The clay tiles are underlain with a bitumen type felt underlay and sheets of chipboard cover the floor (Figure 3).



Figure 3: Void 1 – extends in a westerly direction from the central chimney.



Figure 4: Void 2 – extends in an easterly direction from the central chimney.

Void 2: This void is constructed as void 1 but extends in an easterly direction from the central chimney stack. The floor was only partly covered with sheets of boarding and loft insulation in present (Figure 4).

Void 3: Void 3 is effectively a small box room, that extends over the southern wing. It is accessed via a small door and a small window is present at the southern end. The void is plastered internally and therefore it was not possible to see the underside of the roof. The room is current used for storage (Figure 5).



Figure 5: Void 3 – showing plastered ceiling and window at southern end.

Recorded evidence and suitability.

The exterior of the building is generally in good condition, although there were some small gaps on the roof where the tiles had slightly raised up (Figure 7) or broken creating apparent gaps and where mortar had dropped out from beneath a ridge tile on both the

northern (Figure 6) and southern elevations (Figure 8). In all cases it was not possible to examine these areas in more detail as they were located high up on the roof and above ladder height.



Figure 6: Ridge tile with apparent gap where mortar had dropped out on northern elevation (red oval). Another apparent gap was also present on the southern side.



Figure 7: Raised tile on northern elevation by chimney stack.

Further gaps were present where a tile was raised on the southern elevation, again next to the chimney stack and where some hanging tiles had broken on the western elevation above the porch (Figure 9).



Figure 8: Ridge tile with apparent gap where mortar had dropped out on southern elevation (red oval). Another apparent gap was also present on the northern side.



Figure 9: Broken hanging tiles above the porch.

The only evidence of bat activity recorded was two old pipistrelle species *Pipistrellus* sp. droppings from within Void 1, the western roof void. These were very old and discoloured and not considered to be evidence of recent activity. However, it should be noted that pipistrelle bat species are typically a crevice dwelling and therefore would likely exploit voids between roof tiles and any underlay present, rather than accessing a roof void.

Voids 1 and 2 were both lightly cobwebbed in the apex, Void 2 was more heavily cobwebbed than Void 1. Table 2 presents a summary of the bat features identified.

Table 4: Summary of potential roost and access features and confirmed bat evidence.

	<i>Suitability</i>	<i>Evidence</i>
<i>North Lodge - Exterior</i>	Potential bat access features noted during the survey are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps where hung tiles had broken (above porch). • Gaps beneath a ridge tile, where mortar had dropped out on the northern and southern sides. • Gaps where the roof tiles had slightly raised up and broken on parts of the roof. 	No evidence of bat activity was recorded on the external elevations of the building.
<i>North Lodge - Interior</i>	Potential roosting locations within the roof void: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to the ridge beam. • Adjacent to chimney breast. 	The only evidence recorded internally was two old pipistrelle type droppings recorded within Void 1.

Assessment

The only bat evidence recorded was two old pipistrelle type bat droppings recorded within Void 1. No evidence was recorded on the external elevations of the building, however, a small number of suitable features were identified.

When assessed against the criteria in Table 1, it is considered that the building has moderate suitability for bat usage i.e. “a structure which could be used by bats but is not likely to support a roost of high conservation status (e.g. maternity roost).”

3.1.3 Site grounds description relevant to bats

The site is located in a rural setting and next to an area of woodland that shows some ancient characteristics. Bat activity is likely to be quite high in this location due to the rural nature, lack of extensive artificial lighting and prey availability. However, the site itself is small compared to the available foraging habitat offsite and lacks areas of high quality foraging habitat such as extensive areas of scrub and ponds. It is therefore considered that bats will likely pass through and use the site for foraging, but the available foraging resource is likely to be only a small part of that required by local populations.

3.2 Emergence Surveys

3.2.1 Visit 1 – 22nd August 2023 – Emergence Survey

During the course of the emergence survey carried out on the 22nd August 2023, one common pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from beneath a raised tile at the base of the chimney stack on the southern elevation of the building at 20:34 (Figures 10 and 11).



Figures 10 & 11: Location of confirmed common pipistrelle bat roost

Foraging activity involved five bat species, common *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and soprano pipistrelle *P. pygmaeus*, serotine *Eptesicus serotinus*, brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* and bats of the *Myotis* genus, considered to be Natterer's *Myotis nattereri*, based on call parameters. Activity was first recorded at 20:29 when a common pipistrelle bat appeared from the tree lined avenue to the south. Subsequent to this first registration a further three bats were recorded coming from the same broad area. On each occasion the recorded bat flew over the property and towards the woodland to the north.

At 20:36 a serotine appeared from the east of the site, flew over the property, and entered the woodland. This bat or another, was recorded continuously throughout the survey, with a second bat following it. Given the behaviour exhibited it is considered that two bats were possibly a female and her offspring, indicating that there is likely a maternity roost nearby. Other foraging activity involved a soprano pipistrelle at 21:00, several passes of the presumed Natterer's between 20:37 and 21:19 and two long-eared bat registrations.

3.2.2 Visit 2 – 14th September 2023 – Emergence Survey

During the course of the emergence survey carried out on the 14th September 2023, no confirmed emergences were recorded, but a common pipistrelle was seen to fly away from the chimney stack at 19:33 and immediately social call. It is considered that this bat emerged from the same location as that identified on the 22nd August 2023.

Foraging activity involved five species, common and soprano pipistrelle, serotine, a bat of the *Myotis* genus, considered to be Natterer's based on call parameters and a western barbastelle *Barbastella barbastellus*. Activity was lower than recorded during the August survey, with only occasional passes by single/two bats, of the species recorded. The first registration was of the common pipistrelle that was presumed to have emerged at 20:33. Between 19:39 and 19:41, two common pipistrelle bats appeared to be interacting over the property. This behaviour indicates that the identified roost is also used as a male mating roost, with a male displaying to attract a female to the roost.

Single soprano pipistrelle bats were recorded at 19:33 and 19:59. Serotine bat activity involved only four passes, at 19:38, 19:39, 19:42 and 19:43, one bat was recorded on each occasion. At 20:11 one presumed Natterer's, based on call parameters was recorded to the east of the building. The western barbastelle flew past the surveyor

located on the eastern side of the property at 20:05, it was not seen to emerge from the building.

3.4 Other protected or notable species

During the survey, consideration was given to the potential for other protected species to be present, and as such potentially impacted by the proposals. No other ecological constraints were identified other than some potential for nesting birds to utilise parts of the building on an ad-hoc basis.

4. Discussion and Assessment of Impacts

4.1 Bat roost assessment

The preliminary roost assessment of North Lodge building identified it as providing moderate suitability for bat roosting, and evidence, in the form of pipistrelle type bat droppings were recorded within the southern roof void.

On the basis that the proposals involve the removal of the roof tiles, above where the droppings were located, there was considered to be a reasonable likelihood that bats would be present and affected by the proposed works which will impact the features detailed in Table 4.

The phase 2 surveys have confirmed that the building supports a common pipistrelle day roost, and based on the behaviour observed it is considered that the roost is also a male mating roost.

The bat mitigation guidelines identify the scale of impact caused by the destruction of a mating roost to be medium, although roosts of single bats of common species, such as the common pipistrelle, are considered to be of low conservation status.

4.2 Assessment of impacts

The common pipistrelle day roost will be lost to the proposed extension works to the building. This work would potentially cause the killing, injury or disturbance to any bats present within the roosts when the works are undertaken.

The assessment of the roost characteristics, the nature of the development and the conservation status of the roost that will be impacted by the proposed development has informed a strategy to avoid, mitigate and compensate for the identified impacts.

The application site is supports commuting bats leaving or returning to roost and a small number of a range of foraging bat species. Increasing lighting could impact this behaviour which would indirectly impact roosts.

4.3 Relevant legislation and policy

Circular 06/2005 identifies that applicants should not be required to provide information on protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood that they will be present and affected by the proposed development. The site is considered to support habitats with

suitability and potential for protected species and these may be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal triggers 'reasonable likelihood' under the Circular.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations) may apply should protected species be confirmed on site.

In the case that a protected species is found to be present and impacted by the proposal, the local planning authority will be required to engage with the Habitat Regulations. Permission will be granted unless:

- a) the development is likely to result in a breach of the Habitat Regulations, and
- b) is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law (under licence).

When considering whether Natural England would not be unlikely to grant a licence for the identified impact, the local planning authority must consider the three tests which are set out in the Habitat Regulations:

1. the consented operation must be for 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))
2. there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and
3. the action authorised 'will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).

Case-law (*Morge vs. Hampshire County Council*) has clarified that planning authorities are able to grant permission for developments that would cause a breach of the Regulations is likely (i.e. in the case of this proposal, destruction of a bat roost), provided that sufficient information is provided to give the planning authority assurance that the relevant EPSM licence is not unlikely to be granted - i.e. planning authorities also have a duty to assess planning applications against these tests.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Requirement for further surveys

Where there is a reasonable likelihood that a protected species will be present and impacted by the proposed development, planning authorities require further surveys to properly assess development proposals against relevant planning policy. An assessment into the requirement for further surveys is presented below, however in summary, all further surveys considered necessary for the proposed extension works at the North Lodge site have been undertaken.

It is important that works are informed by the most up-to-date ecological survey information. As a result, there is a limited time frame that phase 1 and phase 2 surveys are valid before becoming outdated. This time frame can vary depending on any changes to the proposed project plans, but it is generally considered that phase 1 ecological surveys are valid for a period of 18 months (CIEEM, 2019). Where projects run for a longer period than 18 months, there may be the requirement to carry out further ecological surveys to ensure planning authorities have the most up-to-date survey information in order that they can make well informed, evidence-based decisions.

5.1.1 *Bats*

In order to provide robust confirmation of the status of bat roosts at the site and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed works as required by Circular 06/2005, further survey work in accordance with Natural England standing advice and the BCT Good Practice Guidelines was required for the house. This same survey work will be used to inform the third test of the Habitat Regulations and licence application.

In accordance with these guidelines, further survey effort took the form of two dusk emergence presence/absence surveys, undertaken during the bat active season.

The proposals do not involve the loss of any extensive areas of habitat, therefore further surveys are considered unnecessary for understanding impacts on foraging and commuting bats beyond the presence/absence surveys which have been undertaken, subject to precautionary avoidance measures including a sensitive lighting scheme.

5.2 Mitigation strategy

5.2.1 *Introduction*

The overarching aim of the ecological survey and assessment work carried out at North Lodge site is to inform the planning proposals in order to demonstrate how the proposals can proceed whilst avoiding or mitigating impacts on ecological receptors. The 'mitigation hierarchy' is an accepted approach which guides this process. The first consideration should always be to design a scheme that avoids the identified impact. Where this is not possible the next step should be to mitigate any impacts that cannot be avoided. The third, which should be used as a last resort, is compensation: this should only be used to off-set any unavoidable impacts.

5.2.2 Bats

Licensing

As this work will result in the destruction of a bat roost, an EPSM licence will need to be obtained from Natural England before the proposed extension works can commence. A licence can be applied for once planning permission has been obtained. Natural England will grant the relevant licence to allow the developer to legally carry out the work that would otherwise be illegal – i.e. to destroy a bat roost and disturb / take bats. Provided the development accords with other national and local planning policy in terms of being an acceptable development that will provide a modern, energy efficient dwelling and helping the Local Authority meet local housing needs, the first two tests should be passed.

The Bat Mitigation Strategy set out below will ensure the development passes the third of the derogation tests, that of maintaining the favourable conservation status of bats.

Demolition mitigation strategy

The following measures will be required where there is a need to remove potential/identified bat roosting features (e.g. roof tiles, fascia boards and ridge tiles).

- The destructive search of North Lodge will be carried out during the active season i.e. April to late-October.
- A toolbox talk will be given to contractors prior to the roof/ridge tile stripping works commencing. The toolbox talk will provide an introduction to the legal protection afforded to bats, the status of bats at the site including likely species and roosting locations, evidence to look out for and the protocol which will be followed if a roosting bat is located. Appropriate signage will be provided and displayed on site to inform contractors of the required protocol when working where a bat roost has been recorded.
- The destructive search works will be led by a licensed bat worker, accompanied by construction contractors. There will be no disturbance of identified roost features without the supervision of a bat worker. This is because during any proposed tile stripping period bats, if present, may be very difficult to locate and easily be overlooked by contractors.
- Immediately prior to any tile stripping works commencing, inspections of the identified roost features will be carried out by a licensed bat worker, using an endoscope where required, to check for the presence of roosting bats. Any bats encountered and accessible will immediately be transferred to a holding bag before being placed within the previously erected bat box within the site grounds.
- Following this, the roof materials will be carefully removed by/under the supervision of the licensed bat worker using hand tools. The works will be carried out from a suitably erected scaffold or mobile elevated work platform.
- Any bats which are found during the destructive search works will be captured by the licenced bat worker with the use of thin gloves or a hand net. The bat will immediately

be transferred to a holding bag before being placed within the previously erected bat box within the site grounds. Any injured bats will immediately be taken into care.

- Once the licensed bat worker is satisfied that the roost has been safely removed, the contractors can complete the extension works, whilst being mindful that a bat may try to return to a favoured roost site.
- If a bat is found during unsupervised works, all works will cease and the supervising bat worker will be contacted immediately.

Provision of new roosting sites

One Schwegler 2F bat box or similar will be installed on a mature tree located within the site grounds. This will provide a temporary alternative roost site whilst the proposed development works are undertaken and will be retained as compensatory roost features post development.

As stated above, the proposals are to maintain the existing features in-situ within the extended building. This would involve creating a gap beneath a roof tile on the extended building, ideally in the same location or as close as possible to the identified roost.

In addition, the extended building will support several new roost features which replicate existing characteristics and are proportionate to the roosts which will be lost and modified. The proposed features will comprise:

- Raised roof tiles – Roosting opportunity will be provided in the form of two additional raised tiles (with a gap of 15mm), on different elevations of the building. These will provide alternative roosting opportunity with different environment conditions.
- Raised hanging tiles – if the extended building supports hanging tiles, the proposals will involve raising two tiles, to provide access gaps approximately 15mm deep for bats to enter.

If no hanging tiles are present on the newly extended building, the following will be provided.

- Modified ridge tiles – Roosting voids will be created beneath two ridge tiles on the newly extended part of the roof. Access to the voids will be created by leaving a gap in the mortar line below the ridge tiles. A batten measuring at least 20mm high by 50mm long will be inserted into the wet mortar and removed in order to create a gap of sufficient size.
- Traditional roof membrane - Modern breathable membranes can be extremely harmful to bats, causing them to become entangled and die, while the bats make the membrane ineffective as they damage it. Traditional bitumen membrane should be used instead. Natural England will refuse bat licence applications where modern breathable membranes are proposed. See <https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/non-bitumen-coated-roofing-membranes> for more information on the current research into this.

In order to limit any effects on foraging and commuting bats, external lighting should be limited to only that which is absolutely necessary for safety purposes, both during the construction phase and once the proposals are complete. The following lighting measures are required:

- Construction works between March and October should be undertaken during daylight hours only to avoid disturbance to bats that may forage and commute through or near the site.
- Lighting to the completed development should be as low brightness as possible, kept at a low level and directed away from existing roof. Lighting on sensors should not be so sensitive that foraging bats trigger them.

5.2.3 *Breeding birds*

Although no evidence of nesting birds was recorded care should be taken to ensure that the proposed works do not disturb breeding birds. The bird nesting season is taken to be from March to August, inclusive. If an occupied nest is present, then the nest must not be removed and works around the nest can only recommence once the nest becomes unoccupied of its own accord, for example when chicks have fledged the nest.

5.3 **Enhancements**

The delivery of biodiversity enhancement is promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Where opportunities exist, it is best practice to provide enhancement features which encourage greater biodiversity within development sites in accordance with the NPPF and Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under the NERC Act.

Opportunities for enhancement which are proportionate to the scale of the proposed works will depend on the design of the new building, but could include:

- The provision of new roosting opportunity for bats, in the form of a Schwegler 2F bat box, or equivalent, will be provided. The bat boxes will be erected a mature trees located within the site grounds. The boxes will be erected on the southern side of the tree, against the trunk and at least three metres about the ground. The box should be located with clear flightlines in order that access for bats in unimpeded.

6. Conclusion

The preliminary roost assessment confirmed that the North Lodge property to be impacted by the proposals provides moderate suitability for bat roosting.

Given the moderate suitability assessment further survey work was required in order to confirm presence/likely absence and status of any roosts present.

This survey work has confirmed that the property supports a common pipistrelle male mating roost and day roost.

The proposals will result in the loss of the identified common pipistrelle roost and as such a Natural England EPSM licence will be required in order for the proposed works to proceed. A mitigation strategy has been designed that would provide alternative roosting opportunities within the proposal which are proportional to the scale of impact. The mitigation strategy also sets out recommended timings and methods to be followed during the development.

Precautionary measures have been provided for breeding birds, but only in the event they are nesting within the building.

Enhancement measures have been recommended for bats.

7. References

- **Altringham J D, 2003**, British Bats, Collins New Naturalist
- **Bat Conservation Trust, 2016**, BCT Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines Third edition
- **Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 2017**, *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*. CIEEM, Winchester
- **ILP and BCT, 2023** *Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night: Guidance Note GN08/23*. ILP, Warwickshire.
- **MHCLG, 2018**. *National Planning Policy Framework*. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government; London.
- **Mitchell Jones AJ, 2004**, *Bat Mitigation guidelines*, English Nature
- **Mitchell Jones AJ and McLeish A P, The Bat Workers Manual**, JNCC
- **Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006**, Ch 3, s. 40
- **Natural England, 2011** Frequently asked wildlife questions: Bats. Natural England
- **Stanbury, A., Eaton, M., Aebischer, N., Balmer, D., Brown, A., Douse, A., Lindley, P., McCulloch, N., Noble, D., and Win I. 2021**. The status of our bird populations: the fifth Birds of Conservation Concern in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man and second IUCN Red List assessment of extinction risk for Great Britain. *British Birds* 114: 723-747.



07760 208562

info@phillipsecology.co.uk

www.phillipsecology.co.uk

Hampshire office:
Clifton Cottage
Bucks Head Hill
Meonstoke
Hampshire
SO323NA