

**11A Pine Grove**

**Honiton**

**Bat and Breeding  
Bird Survey**

**Client: Mr M. Lane  
Project no. 2324114  
Issued: March 2024**

**JG Ecological Surveys Ltd**  
**33 Cranford Avenue**  
**Exmouth**  
**EX8 2QA**

**Tel: 01395 271417**

**Company reg no: 6623813**

[jason@jgecologicalsurveys.co.uk](mailto:jason@jgecologicalsurveys.co.uk)

**CONTENTS**

**1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE ..... 2**

    1.1 GENERAL .....2

    1.2 SURVEY AIMS .....3

    1.3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....3

    1.4 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED WORKS .....3

**2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY..... 5**

    2.1 SITE SURVEY.....5

    2.2 SURVEY LIMITATIONS .....5

**3. RESULTS ..... 6**

    3.1 DESCRIPTION .....6

    3.2 FINDINGS .....6

**4. CONCLUSIONS ..... 8**

**5. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 9**

    5.1 BATS.....9

    5.2 NESTING BIRDS .....9

**APPENDICES ..... 11**

**1. INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE**

**1.1 General**

JG Ecological Surveys Ltd was commissioned by Mr Martin Lane to carry out a bat, Barn owl and breeding bird survey of 11A Pine Grove, Honiton, Devon, EX14 2HT.

The site location is given in Figure 1.

The survey was commissioned ahead of a proposal to add a small extension to the southwestern elevation.



(c) Crown copyright, All rights reserved. 2024. License number 0100031673

**Figure 1 Site Location**

## 1.2 Survey Aims

Fieldwork was undertaken in order to identify whether roosting bats would be impacted by the proposed works and to check for the presence of nesting birds including Barn owl *Tyto alba*.

## 1.3 Summary of Results

### *Bats*

No bat field signs or potential bat roost access points were found on or around the area of the building impacted by the proposal. The UPVC soffits were in excellent condition and offered no potential bat access points at any point around the dwelling including the area affected by the addition of the proposed extension. The profiled concrete tiles laid flat to each and offered no potential bat access points in the immediate vicinity of the area impacted by the works (the remainder of the roof was also in excellent condition with no obvious potential bat access points). It was concluded that roosting bats would not be affected by this limited body of works.

### *Barn owl*

There were no field signs of Barn owl. The building was considered unsuitable for the species and no further consideration will be given to the species in this report.

### *Breeding Birds*

There was no evidence of previous nesting activity within or on the affected areas of the building.

## 1.4 Implications for the Proposed Works

### *Bats*

Bats are fully protected under both the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In combination these pieces of legislation make it an offence to:

1. Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat
2. Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturb bats
3. Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time)
4. Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat
5. Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost

Due to the absence of bat field signs it is not considered that any disturbance will occur as a result of the proposed works.

### *Nesting birds*

Nesting birds receive legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The nesting season is typically mid March to mid to end August but is prone to local variation depending on such things as weather conditions and food supply.

Works that might impact on nesting birds would need to be timed for commencement after the last fledgling has stopped returning to the nest, and prior to the nesting season of the following year (the initiation of nest building is considered the point at which the sites are protected from disturbance). Alternatively a check could be carried out immediately prior to the works and if no active nesting is underway then works could continue.

**2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY****2.1 Site Survey***Visual Inspection*

A visual inspection survey of the building was undertaken by Jason Gillingham (a Natural England licensed bat surveyor), on the 06/03/2024. The building was searched visually, using binoculars, endoscope (where required) and a high-powered torch, for field evidence of bats and breeding birds with particular attention being paid to sheltered areas such as window ledges and stored items where bat droppings might lie undisturbed from the weather. The eaves and gable wall tops were inspected for potential bat access points in the areas impacted by the works. The tiles immediately surrounding the affected area were inspected for potential bat access points.

The building was assigned a category for its potential to support a bat roost on the basis of Table 1 of Appendix 1.

The presence of current, or deserted bird nest sites were noted during survey.

**2.2 Survey Limitations**

There were no significant limitations to the survey.

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1 Description

<b>Wall construction</b>	Rendered block and brick work (refer to Photograph 1)
<b>Roof construction</b>	Concrete interlocking tiles in excellent condition with a bitumen felt lining. UPVC soffits sealed to the wall tops



**Photograph 1: Southern elevation where the extension will be located**

#### 3.2 Findings

##### *Bats*

The building was in excellent condition (refer to Photograph 1). It had clearly been well maintained. The soffit boxes were in excellent condition around the dwelling, including the area where the extension will be located. The render of the wall top and the gable boards were sealed and offered no potential bat access points. The interior of the gable wall was inspected for any signs of bat use such as droppings clinging to the interior wall surfaces or droppings on the loft floor. None were found. The remainder of the loft was also clear of any signs of bat roosting.

The mortar fillet to the tiles was complete and in good condition, so no potential bat access points existed for bats to access the space between the tiles and bitumen lining felt.

In summary no bat field signs or potential access points were noted.

The impacted area of the building was assessed as being of negligible bat roost potential due to its construction methods and materials along with its excellent condition.



*Breeding birds*

No evidence of nesting birds was noted either within or on the building.

**4. CONCLUSIONS**

*Bats*

It could be concluded that the proposed addition of the extension would have no impacts on roosting bats as the building was assessed as having negligible potential to support them.

*Breeding birds*

It could be concluded that nesting birds were not using the building at the time of survey.

**5. RECOMMENDATIONS****5.1 Bats*****Legislative recommendations***

There are no legislative recommendations due to the absence of field signs typical of roosting and no potential bat access points into the building.

The minor works to enable the construction of the extension will not cause disturbance to bats and therefore it is considered that no further ecological survey work is required for this project.

**5.2 Nesting Birds*****Legislative recommendations***

The works would be ideally timed to commence outside of the bird breeding season, which is generally considered to be between March to August inclusive, although it is important to note that depending upon the weather conditions and/or food supply nesting can extend outside this period. Nesting is determined as being from when birds first initiate nest building up until the point when fledglings stop returning to the nest. If these timing constraints cannot be adopted then a check immediately prior to works commencing should be carried out and if any active nest/breeding sites are identified these nests, and the immediately surrounding area, should remain undisturbed until all the young have fledged naturally. If no nests were present then works could continue through this period.

**6. References**

Collins, J. (ed) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4<sup>th</sup> edn)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mitchell-Jones A. (2004). *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

**APPENDICES****Appendix 1**

Classification criteria for assessing the potential value of buildings

It should be noted that the grading system below only reports on the situation at the time of survey; should bat activity levels change after the initial survey, or should the buildings be modified (for example if roof tiles are removed or fascia boards develop cracks), the category may need revision.

*Please note: Intermediate categories (for example Low – Moderate value) may apply.*

<b>Category (Potential value)</b>	<b>Description</b>
No/negligible value	Buildings with no or very few features capable of supporting roosting bats. Often buildings are of 'sound' well-sealed structure, or have a single skin and no roof void. They tend to have high interior light-levels, and little or no insulation. Buildings without any roofs may also fall into this category.
Low value	Buildings of largely unsuitable construction, but with few features of potential value to bats (e.g. gaps above windows, apparently shallow crevices). No supporting evidence (e.g. droppings / staining) found. Buildings may be surrounded by poor or sub-optimal bat foraging habitat, as is often the case in urban-centre locations.
Moderate value	Buildings usually of brick or stone construction with a number of features of obvious potential value to roosting bats e.g. loose roof / ridge tiles, gaps in brickwork, gaps under fascia boards, and/or warm sealed roof-spaces with under-felt.
High value	Buildings with a large number of features of obvious potential value to bats (as above). Bats may be suspected to roost within the building (at least at certain times of year), but no supporting evidence found.
Confirmed roost	Bats discovered roosting within the building, or recorded emerging from / entering the building at dusk and / or dawn. Building found to contain conclusive evidence of occupation by bats, such as bat droppings. A confirmed record (as supplied by an established source such as the local bat group) would also apply to this category.

Table 1. Appendix 1

