

PRELIMINARY ROOST APPRAISAL (PRA) REPORT

7th May 2024

18 West Way, Broadstone, Dorset, BH18
9LR

On behalf of: David King and Simone Ulyate

Agent/planner: Integrated Design Studio

REPORT ISSUE SHEET:

Draft/Final:	Final (no further survey recommendations)
Version no:	1.1
Previous report version(s) and date(s):	N/A
Client:	David King and Simone Ulyate
Agent/planner:	Integrated Design Studio
Author(s):	Zoe Barrett MSc
Report prepared for issue by:	Zoe Barrett MSc
Report approved for issue by:	Becci Smith BSc (Hons) MCIEEM
Local Planning Authority:	BCP Council (Poole area)
Planning application number (if known):	Unknown

Copyright disclaimer

The copyright of this document remains with ABR Ecology Ltd. The contents of this document therefore must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of ABR Ecology Ltd. ABR Ecology Ltd shall not be liable for the use of this report for purposes other than those for which the report was prepared and provided.

Survey data lifespan


Information and data provided within this report is considered accurate at the time of writing. Bat survey data is considered valid for 18 months from the survey date for planning purposes only. However, as bats are a highly mobile species, update survey(s) will likely be required if (but not limited to):

- a) The condition of the buildings and/or general site changes; and/or*
- b) If the nature and/or extent of the proposed works change.*

If a Natural England bat licence is required (i.e., if a bat roost is identified during an update survey(s) and impacts on the bat roost(s) will occur), update bat survey(s) will likely be required for the bat licence application. Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) (i.e., building inspections) data is considered valid for 3 months prior to a bat licence application; and bat activity survey data (emergence/re-entry surveys) is considered valid within the then 'current' bat survey season (e.g., if activity surveys are conducted in the summer survey season (May-September) 2023, emergence/re-entry data is considered valid until 30th April 2024 for the bat licence application).

Reporting and data validity

This report has been produced using all reasonable skill and care, and a Quality Assurance (QA) review process has been conducted prior to issue of this report. However, ABR Ecology Ltd cannot accept responsibility for any inaccuracies and/or discrepancies with third-party data supplied within this report.

	ABR Ecology Ltd		
	Suite 7, The Old Pottery, Manor Way, Verwood, Dorset BH31 6HF		
	Tel:	01202 821325	Web: www.abrecology.com
	Lead ecologist email:	Russell.abrecology@gmail.com	
	Registered Limited company in England and Wales no:	11266688	

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Legislation and planning policy	5
3. Methodology	7
4. Results	10
5. Conclusions, mitigation and ecological enhancements	12
6. References	14
Appendix 1: Existing elevations	15
Appendix 2: Proposed elevations	16
Appendix 3: Photographs	17
Appendix 4: Biodiversity enhancement	19

Executive summary

- ABR Ecology Ltd were commissioned by David King and Simone Ulyate to undertake a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) at 18 West Way, Broadstone, Dorset, BH18 9LR to advise on the presence/absence of bats at the property. This report was requested to support a planning application for a proposed development.
- The PRA was undertaken on the 23rd August 2023 by Natural England class 2 licensed bat ecologist Russell Hoyle and graduate ecologist Zoe Barrett. The survey revealed no evidence of bats in the form of droppings, staining or the presence of bats internally and the external assessment of the property revealed that the buildings held '**negligible potential**' for roosting bats due to a lack of access points and roosting provisions.
- The buildings are not considered to hold the potential to support roosting bats and so no further works are required. However, should 18 months pass without works taking place (and/or any material change occur to the buildings or roofs), this report will no longer be valid and an update site visit to reassess the buildings would be required.
- There are bat records within 1km of the site. A 'bat-friendly' lighting strategy is detailed in Section 5 to ensure the proposed works do not impede foraging and commuting bats which may be using the gardens and general surrounding area.
- To ensure the application is compliant with The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy, two 'Manthorpe Swift Bricks' will be provided. This is detailed in Section 5 of this report.

1. Introduction

ABR Ecology Ltd were commissioned by David King and Simone Ulyate to undertake a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) at 18 West Way, Broadstone, Dorset, BH18 9LR (central grid reference: SZ 00124 95483) to advise on the presence/absence of bats at the property. This report was requested to support a full application for a proposed development.

The PRA was undertaken on the 23rd August 2023 by Natural England class 2 licensed bat ecologist Russell Hoyle and graduate ecologist Zoe Barrett. Existing elevations and provided in Appendix 1 and proposed plans are provided in Appendix 2.

Site context

The application site comprises a residential property consisting of a detached bungalow with a detached garage in Broadstone, Dorset, within an urban area. The immediate surrounding landscape comprises residential housing and gardens with mature trees. The wider surrounding landscape comprises urban residential development with gardens, pockets of woodland, recreational grounds and heathland to the east and west. The Castleman Trailway, a disused railway lined with mature trees, is located approximately 110m to the east. The surrounding landscapes are considered to provide good foraging opportunities and commuting corridors for bats.

Aims and scope of this report

This report is based on the results of the PRA, which was principally aimed at determining if a bat roost is present within the property and/or whether the buildings have 'potential' to support roosting bats in line with The Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Survey Guidelines (Collins, 2016).

This report aims to establish whether the proposed works hold the potential to impact on roosting bats and identifies whether there is a requirement for further activity (emergence/re-entry) surveys, which may inform the need for a bat European Protected Species (EPS) licence or Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL) to allow the works to proceed lawfully.

2. Legislation and planning policy

Legislation and UK BAP priority bat species

Legislation

In England, all bats are legally protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended). Additionally, all bats are fully protected under Annex IV of the EC Habitats and Species Directive (1992), which is transposed into UK law under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

The legislation protects bats from many activities and acts, including to:

1. Deliberately take, injure or kill a wild bat.
2. Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturbing a group of bats.
3. Destroy or damage a place used by bats for breeding or roosts (even if bats are not occupying them at the time).
4. Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.
5. Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat species found in the wild in the EU (dead or alive) or any part of a bat.

UK BAP priority bat species

Several species are listed under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) (JNCC, 2016) as priority species due to their vulnerability or rarity as listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006), and Section 40 places a duty to conserve biodiversity on all public authorities.

These include bats including barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*), Bechstein's bat (*Myotis bechsteinii*), brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), both species of horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus spp.*), soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) and noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*).

National and local policy

NPPF – The National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2021) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. In the context of this report, Section 15 of NPPF is relevant and applicable, Section 15 states:

'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.'

New developments and projects are supported where plans promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue measurable net gains for biodiversity.

To ensure this application is compliant with Section 15 of NPPF, ecological enhancements are required as part of the project/development.

The Poole Local Plan (2018)

The Poole Local Plan (Poole Borough Council, 2018) Policy PP33 'Biodiversity and geodiversity' states:

'Proposals for development that affects biodiversity, and any sites containing species and habitats of local importance, including Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), Local Nature Reserves (LNR), ancient woodland, veteran trees and species and habitats of principal importance must a) demonstrate how any features of nature conservation and biodiversity interest are to be protected and managed to prevent any adverse impact; b) incorporate measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate disturbance of sensitive wildlife habitats throughout the lifetime of the development; and c) seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the restoration, improvement or creation of habitats and/or ecological networks'.

It is the applicant's/landowner's responsibility to ensure that the proposed development proceeds in full compliance with this report and/or any update version report thereafter, that works are undertaken lawfully, in compliance with national and local policy, and in accordance with all conditions of the obtained planning consent.

3. Methodology

Desktop data search

Dorset Environmental Records Centre (DERC, 2023) was contacted to provide any records of bats and any bat roosts within a 1km radius of the application site. These records were used to inform the assessment of the site in its potential to support roosting bats and identifying any potential cumulative impacts on bats from the proposed development.

Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA)

Natural England class 2 licensed bat ecologist Russell Hoyle and graduate ecologist Zoe Barrett undertook the PRA of the property on site. Timing and weather conditions for the survey are provided in the table below:

Survey date	Time of survey	Surveyor(s)	Equipment used	Weather conditions		
23/08/2023	11:00am	Russell Hoyle and Zoe Barrett	High-powered torch, extendable ladder, and binoculars	Temp:	Okta cloud cover:	Beaufort wind force:
				20°C	0/8	0/12

The survey was undertaken in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Survey Guidelines (Collins, 2016). A thorough search for evidence of bats was undertaken in any internal loft spaces or voids and on any external features of the buildings, notably any windowsills, walls, floors and flat surfaces. Evidence of roosting bats include:

- Presence of live/dead bats;
- Bat droppings - distinguished from rat/mouse droppings by their crumbly texture;
- Staining from fur around access points; and
- The presence of feeding remains, such as insect wings and casings.

The buildings were identified as a 'confirmed' bat roost if evidence of roosting bats was recorded. If bat droppings were present, a sample of droppings were collected and sent to Swift Ecology Ltd for DNA analysis to confirm the species of bat present.

Most native bats in the UK are crevice-dwelling species, with bats roosting in remote areas, such as between tiles and membrane, behind cladding, at wall tops, in cavities, soffits and behind lead flashing, to name a few examples. Evidence of these species is often concealed and/or inaccessible due to the remote nature of the roost. Therefore, where no evidence of roosting bats was recorded, an assessment on the

availability of potential roosting areas and bat access points around the buildings, as well as the quality/availability of surrounding bat habitat, was conducted. The buildings were then assigned a category based on a sliding scale of ‘negligible’ to ‘high potential’, in accordance with the BCT Guidelines (Collins, 2016):

Bat roosting potential	Description
‘High potential’	A building with one or more potential roosting sites that are highly suitable for use by many bats on a regular basis and for a longer period of time.
‘Moderate potential’	A building with one or more potential roosting features that could be used by bats due to appropriate conditions but are unlikely to support a bat roost of important conservation status (roost type only, not species).
‘Low potential’	The building features one or more potential roosting features that could be used by bats opportunistically. These features do not provide the appropriate conditions to be used on a regular basis by large numbers of roosting bats.
‘Negligible potential’	The features of the building are negligible and are highly unlikely to be used by roosting bats.

Survey limitations

Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) – property survey

Potential evidence of crevice-dwelling bats may have been missed due to the nature and remote location of potential roosting areas. However, binoculars were used to identify any potential bat droppings on the exterior features of the buildings, where possible.

The site visit provides a ‘snapshot’ of the site and does not take into account seasonal variation. Species may have been overlooked due to the constraints of the season and time in which the survey was undertaken. A lack of evidence of a species does not confirm its absence from site, rather there was no indication of its presence at the time of survey.

Reporting and data validity

The data within this report should not be seen as comprehensive. Data obtained from the DERC (DERC, 2023) data search is unlikely to provide a complete record of species within the search area. It is therefore possible that a bat species may occur within the vicinity that has not previously been identified within the data search.

This report is considered valid for 18 months from the survey date for planning purposes only; and is only intended for the proposed plans outlined within this

report. If any material changes to the buildings/site occur or if the nature and/or extent of the proposed development changes, an update visit to reassess the buildings will be required, as any conclusions provided herein may not be valid.

4. Results

Desktop data search

DERC (DERC, 2023) provided records of bats and bat roosts within a 1km radius of the site, and the results of which are provided below.

Species	Number of records	Most recent record	Closest record to site
Brown long-eared bat	2	2016	890m northwest
Common pipistrelle	31	2021	160m north
Daubenton's bat	1	2019	925m southeast
Long-eared bat sp.	4	2020	350m northwest
Myotis bat sp.	5	2019	290m southwest
Nathusius's pipistrelle	3	2015	975m east
Natterer's bat	1	2007	1km southwest
Noctule	10	2021	290m southwest
Pipistrelle sp.	4	2020	575m east
Serotine	15	2019	290m southwest
Soprano pipistrelle	14	2020	290m southwest
Western barbastelle	2	2019	865m southeast

There are records for several bat species within 1km of the property, as bats are known to be within the area, a 'bat-friendly' lighting strategy is detailed in Section 5 of this report.

Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA)

Building descriptions

Descriptions of the buildings surveyed for roosting bats are provided in the table below and photographs of the buildings are provided in Appendix 3:

Building name	Description
Bungalow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property comprises a detached brick built bungalow. • The window frames, door frames, soffits and fascias are constructed from uPVC. • The roof is pitched with concrete interlocking tiles. • An external chimney is present on the northern elevation sealed with lead flashing. • One loft void is present within the bungalow and a description of which is provided below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The loft void runs from north to south and measures approximately 10m in length, 3m in width and 1.25m in height to the apex. - The roof is lined with bituminous 1F felt. - The void is not boarded and has two layers of fibreglass insulation present throughout. - The loft void is constructed from purlins with a wooden ridge beam present. - A water tank is present.
Garage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single-storey detached garage is present to the north of the bungalow, constructed from brick and a flat bituminous felt roof.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An up and over door is present on the front eastern elevation. • No loft void is present within the garage.
--	--

Evidence of bats recorded

No evidence of roosting bats was recorded within or around the buildings on site, despite a thorough inspection.

Buildings assessment – potential bat roosting areas and bat access points

An inspection of the internal and external features of the buildings was undertaken to identify any potential bat access points and potential areas where bats could roost, and these are summarised below:

Building name	Potential bat access points	Potential roosting provisions	Potential of the building
Bungalow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof tiles were in good order and were flush with no potential ingress points noted. The soffits were tight and flush along the elevations. Tile verges were well sealed. No suitable gaps or access points were noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No potential roosting provisions were present, no external crevices were noted. 	'Negligible potential' for roosting bats
Garage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roof was tight and flush along the elevations. No suitable gaps or access points were noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No potential roosting provisions were present. 	'Negligible potential' for roosting bats

The bungalow and garage were assessed and were deemed to hold 'negligible potential' for roosting bats in line with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Survey Guidelines (Collins, 2016); this was due to a lack of potential bat roosting provisions and/or bat access points around the building's exterior. Roosting bats are not considered to be impacted by the proposals for alterations and extensions to the bungalow. Further details regarding the validity of this report are provided in Section 5 below.

5. Conclusions, mitigation and ecological enhancements

Conclusions on roosting bats

The PRA of the bungalow and garage was undertaken, and the buildings were considered to hold 'negligible potential' for roosting bats due to a lack of suitable bat roosting provisions and potential access points around the property. Roosting bats are not considered to be impacted as part of the proposed works and therefore no further action is recommended in relation to the proposed works.

It must be noted that the PRA provides a 'snapshot' of the conditions at the time of survey and does not account for seasonal changes. It is always possible for bat species to ingress at any point in the future, and therefore it is recommended that if 18 months pass and no works have been undertaken, and/or if the condition of the buildings change, an update PRA is undertaken to assess whether the potential of the buildings to support roosting bats has altered.

In the unlikely event bat(s) are encountered at any stage, work will cease and Natural England or a suitably qualified bat ecologist must be sought for advice by the applicant/landowner. The applicant must be aware of the severe penalties associated with bat crimes and their legal obligation to report this information.

In the event a bat is discovered, the nature of the advice will concern allowing the bat(s) to leave on their own accord or waiting for a licensed person to remove the bat(s). A bat licence may then be deemed necessary following the necessary survey work. **All building contractors/roofers are explicitly forbidden from handling bats or interfering with bats in any way.**

Foraging and commuting bats

The site supports commuting and foraging bats and the following luminaire specifications must be adhered to for new lighting around the site and is based on the 'Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night' Guidance Note BN08/23 (BCT & ILP, 2023):

- ◆ Preferably, no external light fixtures will be installed. If external lighting is required, this will be limited and only installed where required for safety purposes. No external luminaires will be installed where these will cast light spill onto surrounding vegetation such as mature trees.
- ◆ All luminaires will lack UV elements when manufactured. Metal halide, compact fluorescent sources will not be used.
- ◆ LED luminaires only will be used due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability.

- ◆ A warm white light source (2700Kelvin or lower) will be adopted to reduce blue light component.
- ◆ Light sources will feature peak wavelengths higher than 550nm to avoid the component of light most disturbing to bats (Stone, 2012).
- ◆ Internal luminaires will be recessed only (as opposed to using a pendant fitting) where installed in proximity to windows to reduce glare and light spill.
- ◆ Column heights must be carefully considered to minimise light spill and glare visibility. This must be balanced with the potential for increased numbers of columns and upward light reflectance.
- ◆ Only luminaires with a negligible or zero Upward Light Ratio, and with good optical control, will be used.
- ◆ Luminaires must always be mounted horizontally, with no light output above 90° and/or no upward tilt.
- ◆ External security lighting will be set on motion sensors and set to a 1 minute timer.
- ◆ Bollard or low-level downward-directional luminaires will not be installed. This is due to a considerable range of issues, such as unacceptable glare, poor illumination efficiency, unacceptable upward light output, and increased upward light scatter from surfaces.
- ◆ Only if all other options have been explored, accessories such as baffles, hoods or louvres can be used to reduce light spill and direct it only to where it is needed. However, due to the lensing and fine cut-off control of the beam inherent in modern LED luminaires, the effect of cowls and baffles is often far less than anticipated and must not be relied upon solely.

Biodiversity enhancement

To comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy, two 'Manthorpe Swift Bricks' (or similar approved) (<https://www.nhbs.com/manthorpe-swift-brick>) will be installed in the northern elevation as close to the apex/eaves as possible on north facing elevations. The bricks are designed for swifts (colony nesters) but are also used by non-target species such as house sparrows (see Appendix 4 for approximately location and design).

6. References

Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) and Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) (2023). *Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night' Guidance Note BN08/23*. Accessed from: <https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/>.

Collins, J (ed) (2016). *Bat Surveys for Professionals Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Poole Borough Council (2018). *The Poole Local Plan*.

Department for Communities and Local Government (2005). *Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System*.

Dorset Environmental Records Centre (DERC) (2023). *18 West Way, Broadstone - bats only data search 1km radius*.

JNCC (The Joint Nature Conservation Committee) (2016). *UK BAP priority terrestrial mammal species*.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Stone, E.L., Jones, G., Harris, S. (2012). *Conserving energy at a cost to biodiversity? Impacts of LED lighting on bats*. Glob. Change Biol. 18, 2458–2465

Appendix 3: Photographs



Photo 1: Internal loft void of bungalow.



Photo 2: Internal loft void of bungalow.



Photo 3: Rear elevation of the bungalow.



Photo 4: Front elevation of the bungalow.



Photo 5: The detached garage.



Photo 6: Northern elevation and external chimney of the bungalow.

Appendix 4: Biodiversity enhancement

