

CLARE KEMPKENS

LIME KILN HOUSE, CLAYDON

PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA)

MARCH 2024



Wardell Armstrong

Armstrong House, Lamdin Road, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, United Kingdom, IP32 6NU Telephone: +44 (0)1284 765 210 www.wardell-armstrong.com



DATE ISSUED: MARCH 2024

JOB NUMBER: BE10986

REPORT NUMBER: 0001 VERSION: V0.1

STATUS: FINAL

CLARE KEMPKENS

LIME KILN HOUSE, CLAYDON

PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA)

MARCH 2024

PREPARED BY:

James Whiffen-Brown Ecologist

REVIEWED AND

APPROVED BY:

Richard Sands Technical Director

This report has been prepared by Wardell Armstrong LLP with all reasonable skill, care and diligence, within the terms of the Contract with the Client. The report is confidential to the Client and Wardell Armstrong LLP accepts no responsibility of whatever nature to third parties to whom this report may be made known.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Wardell Armstrong LLP.





CONTENTS

E)	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1			
1	INT	FRODUCTION	2	
	1.1	Background	2	
	1.2	Development Description	2	
	1.3	Aim and Objectives	2	
2	ME	THODOLOGY	3	
	2.1	Desk Study	3	
	2.2	Preliminary Roost Assessment	3	
3	RES	SULTS	4	
	3.1	Site Location and Surroundings	4	
	3.2	Preliminary Roost Assessment and Likelihood of Bat Roosts Occurring	5	
4	IM	PACT RISK ASSESSMENT	5	
	4.1	Summary of Relevant Legislation	5	
	4.2	Impact Risk Assessment	6	
5	REG	COMMENDATIONS	6	
	5.1	Actions for Compliance with Wildlife Legislation	6	
6	CO	NCLUSION	8	
7	RFI	FERENCES	9	

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Site Photographs



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wardell Armstrong was commissioned by Beanland Associates Architects Ltd to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment of Lime Kiln House, Claydon, IP6 0AD, centred on approximate National Grid Reference (NGR) TM131495. It is understood that the Local Planning Authority have requested a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) for bats.

The proposed works are understood to consist of works to the roof of the kitchen extension.

The site visit was undertaken on the 05.03.24 by an ecologist who is covered by a Natural England Level 2 Class licence for bats (2015-11578-CLS-CLS).

No void space was present within the roof affected by the works. The roof of the extension also contained no roof tiles or refuge places for bats. A few crevices under surrounding tiles were in the potential zone of influence from scaffolding and/or lighting if used for the works, and were therefore investigated with an endoscope. No bats, droppings or any other evidence of bats were found associated with those.

The following precautions are to be included in the works to avoid any risk of impact to bats or bat roosts:

- No lighting is to be used in relation to the works.
- If any scaffolding would be in front of the tiles on either side of the kitchen extension, an ecologist covered by a Natural England bat survey licence will be called out to check the crevices for any signs of bats in case bats have moved in since the check undertaken for this report. If bats are found to be using those crevices, the design of scaffolding will be adapted to avoid obstructing the roost.

With the impact avoidance measures as described, it was considered that works could proceed in compliance with bat-related wildlife legislation with negligible risk of harm to bats, bat roosts or the local bat population.



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Wardell Armstrong was commissioned by Beanland Associates Architects Ltd to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment of Lime Kiln House, Claydon, IP6 OAD, centred on approximate National Grid Reference (NGR) TM131495. It is understood that the Local Planning Authority have requested a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) for bats. It is understood that there is a bat hibernation site in the garden of the house.

1.2 **Development Description**

1.2.1 The proposed works are understood to consist of works to the roof of the kitchen extension (see photograph 1 in appendix 1) to install roof windows. The plans used to determine the likely impacts were "Lime Kiln House Proposed and Existing Plans", Drawing No. 3044_100/101/200/300/400, dated October 2023, which was produced by Beanland Associates Architects Limited.

1.3 Aim and Objectives

- 1.3.1 The aim of this report is to determine the risk of impact of the proposed works on bats, taking into account the numbers and type of roosts potentially present, the likelihood of such roosts being present, and the degree of hazard presented by the proposed works. The need and potential for impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement are then determined as appropriate based on the impact risk assessment.
- 1.3.2 To achieve this aim, the report has the following objectives:
 - to identify and describe potentially significant impact risks to bats relevant to planning and legislation that is associated with the proposed works;
 - to identify ways in which any significant risk of deleterious impacts could be avoided, wherever reasonably possible;
 - for any significant impact risks to bats that could not reasonably be avoided, to describe the risk outstanding, and actions required.



2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Desk Study

2.1.1 The surrounding habitat was assessed using a combination of maps (Google Earth, 2024 and MAGIC, 2024) and observations of the surrounding landscape from the site, to enable the site to be put into its local habitat context and identify any statutory wildlife sites where bats are a reason for designation and could be affected by the proposed activity.

2.2 **Preliminary Roost Assessment**

Survey method

- 2.2.1 The site visit was undertaken on the 05.03.24 by an ecologist who is covered by a Natural England Level 2 Class licence for bats (2015-11578-CLS-CLS) and a second ecologist under accreditation.
- 2.2.2 The bat assessment methods followed CIEEM Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Reason and Wray, 2023) and Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Guidelines (Collins et al., 2023) and therefore considerations were:
 - the availability of access points of a size large enough to allow entry of bats to roosts;
 - the presence and suitability as roosts of cracks, crevices, holes, dense ivy Hedera helix covering and other places;
 - signs of bat activity or presence.
- 2.2.3 Definite signs of bat activity were taken to be:
 - the bats themselves;
 - droppings;
 - dead bats;
- 2.2.4 Signs of possible bat presence were taken to be:
 - grease marks;
 - moth and butterfly wings.
 - audible bat squeaks;
 - scratch marks;



- urine splatter.
- 2.2.5 The outsides of the building was checked for gaps, cavities, access points and crevices, and any signs of bats, in accordance with BCT Good Practice Guidelines (Collins et al., 2023).
- 2.2.6 The insides of the building was then checked as accessed allowed for signs and evidence of bat activity and opportunities for roosts.
- 2.2.7 As many crevices internally and externally as could be safely accessed were checked for suitability and signs of bats.
- 2.2.8 The suitability of places to roost was assessed based upon factors such as:
 - size;
 - illumination;
 - access (clutter and cobwebs);
 - materials (including presence of breathable membrane).
- 2.2.9 The locations of bat signs and potential roost access points were noted.
- 2.2.10 Gaps under tiles on the roof of the main house were too high to be checked under by torch or endoscope at the time of survey, however all crevices near the kitchen extension that could reasonably be affected by works were accessed. The bat risk assessment has taken that into account.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Site Location and Surroundings

Site location and landscape context

- 3.1.1 The site was located at the southern end of the village of Claydon, around 300m south of the village centre. There was a moderate amount of tree cover to the south of the village, adjacent to the site, providing high foraging habitat for bats.
 - Summary of habitats on and adjacent to site
- 3.1.2 The site consisted of a relatively modern extension on a large house surrounded by lawn, gravel and hard landscaping, with residential areas and tree lines surrounding. Further out the landscape was dominated by adjacent woodland and farmland with some pasture, and more residential houses leading into Claydon village centre (Google Earth, 2022).



Statutory wildlife sites citing bats

- 3.1.3 Two SSSI's occur within 2km of the site, with the nearest being Great Blakenham Pit SSSI at 1.5km and Sandy Lane Pit Barham SSSI at 1.9km. Both SSSI's are cited for their geological interest (MAGIC, 2024).
- 3.1.4 No other Statutory wildlife sites occurred within 2km of the site (MAGIC, 2024).
- 3.1.5 Little Blakenham Pit SSSI is 2.3km from the site and is cited for being one of the largest underground roosts for hibernating bats known in Great Britain. Three species of bat regularly use the tunnel between September and April, in numbers often totalling 450 or more (MAGIC, 2024).
- 3.1.6 No SSSI's cited for bats occurred within 10km of the site (MAGIC, 2024).

3.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment and Likelihood of Bat Roosts Occurring

3.2.1 The external walls and roof of the flat roof kitchen extension were checked for crevices or gaps within the roofing material that could offer bat roost potential (See photograph 2 in appendix 1). There were no roof void or tiles on this section of the house. No bats, droppings or any other evidence of bats were found. Several crevices under tiles of the adjacent wall/roof gable/apex above the flat roof of the kitchen were inspected with an endoscope, however no bats, droppings or any other evidence of bats were found.

4 IMPACT RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Summary of Relevant Legislation

- 4.1.1 Bats are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, as well as the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside Rights of Way Act 2000. Offences likely to be relevant to development are to:
 - deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat;
 - deliberately disturb a bat in a way that would affect its ability to survive, breed, rear young, hibernate or migrate or significantly affect the local distribution or abundance of the species;
 - damage or destroy a roost;
 - intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat at a roost;
 - intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost.



4.2 Impact Risk Assessment

Roosting Bats

- 4.2.1 The area of extension roof and adjacent wall of the house that would be directly impacted by the proposed works contain no features suitable for roosting bats, so no direct impact on bats are likely.
- 4.2.2 The proposed windows in the kitchen roof would not face nearby crevices suitable for bat roost exit points, so no impacts on roosting bats are expected from the use of the kitchen after works are completed.
- 4.2.3 If bat roosts exit/entry points around the gable end of the house around the kitchen extension were blocked by scaffolding or illuminated, then there would be a risk of obstructing or partly obstructing roosts. As none of the crevices that could reasonably be blocked or illuminated during works were found to contain any signs of bats, the risk of obstructing or partly obstructing roosts was considered to be very low.
- 4.2.4 The client has agreed to incorporate the recommendations in Section 5 of this report to reduce the risk of affecting bats from the proposed works to negligible.
 - Foraging and Commuting Bats
- 4.2.5 It is understood that all trees and hedgerows are to be retained on site in the proposed development, therefore no direct impact on foraging bats is likely.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Actions for Compliance with Wildlife Legislation

Further survey

- 5.1.1 As the impact risk to bats if the precautions described below are followed would be negligible, no further surveys are required at this stage.
 - Impact avoidance precautions
- 5.1.2 No lighting is to be used in relation to the works.
- 5.1.3 If any scaffolding would be in front of the tiles on either side of the kitchen extension, an ecologist covered by a Natural England bat survey licence will be called out to check the crevices for any signs of bats in case bats have moved in since the check



undertaken for this report. If bats are found to be using those crevices, the design of scaffolding will be adapted to avoid obstructing the roost.

Expiry of Report

5.1.4 If the works have not been undertaken within eighteen months of the surveys outlined in this report, the risk of impact to bats should be re-assessed.



6 CONCLUSION

6.1.1 With the impact avoidance measures as described, it was considered that works could proceed in compliance with bat-related wildlife legislation with negligible risk of harm to bats, bat roosts or the local bat population.



7 REFERENCES

BSI., 2013. *BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity - Code of Practice for Planning and Development*. British Standards Institute, London.

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

Google Earth., 2024. *Aerial View of Lime Kiln House, Claydon and Surroundings*. Image dated November 2022.

Hundt, L., 2012. *Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd edition*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

MAGIC Map., 2024. *Statutory Wildlife Sites near Lime Kiln House, Claydon*. Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside, London. Accessed March 2024.

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S., 2023. *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats*. Version 1.1. Charted Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management: Ampfield.



APPENDICES



Appendix 1 Site Photographs taken by James Whiffen-Brown on 05.03.2024.



Photograph 1 – Lime Kiln House



Photograph 2 – Kitchen Extension with flat roof.



CLARE KEMPKENS LIME KILN HOUSE, CLAYDON PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA)



wardell-armstrong.com

STOKE-ON-TRENT

Sir Henry Doulton House Forge Lane Etruria Stoke-on-Trent ST1 5BD Tel: +44 (0)1782 276 700

BIRMINGHAM

Two Devon Way Longbridge Technology Park Longbridge Birmingham B31 2TS Tel: +44 (0)121 580 0909

BOLTON

A1-50 Futura Park Aspinall Way Middlebrook Bolton BL6 6SU Tel: +44 (0)1204 227 227

BRISTOL

Temple Studios Temple Gate Redcliffe Bristol BS1 6QA Tel: +44 (0)117 203 4477

161. +44 (0)117 203 447

BURY ST EDMUNDS Armstrong House

Lamdin Road Bury St Edmunds Suffolk IP32 6NU

Tel: +44 (0)1284 765 210

CARDIFF

Tudor House 16 Cathedral Road Cardiff CF11 9LJ Tel: +44 (0)292 072 9191

CARLISLE

Marconi Road Burgh Road Industrial Estate Carlisle Cumbria CA2 7NA Tel: +44 (0)1228 550 575

EDINBURGH

Great Michael House 14 Links Place Edinburgh EH6 7EZ Tel: +44 (0)131 555 3311

GLASGOW

24 St Vincent Place Glasgow G1 2EU Tel: +44 (0)141 428 4499

LEEDS

36 Park Row Leeds LS1 5JL Tel: +44 (0)113 831 5533

LONDON

Third Floor 46 Chancery Lane London WC2A 1JE Tel: +44 (0)207 242 3243

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

City Quadrant 11 Waterloo Square Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 4DP Tel: +44 (0)191 232 0943

TRURO

Baldhu House Wheal Jane Earth Science Park Baldhu Truro TR3 6EH Tel: +44 (0)187 256 0738

International office:

ALMATY

29/6 Satpaev Avenue Hyatt Regency Hotel Office Tower Almaty Kazakhstan 050040 Tel: +7(727) 334 1310

