Preliminary Roost Appraisal Report

Site Location:
41 Harcourt Drive, Reading RG6 5TL

Date:
06/11/2026

Author:
Sean Darlow BSc (Hons) MSc
Ecological Consultant

Report Version:
V2

Report Release Sheet

Draft/Final:	Final Report
Issue Number:	26-5057
Version:	Version 2
Date:	06.11.2026
Client:	Wild Earth Ecology
Author:	Sean Darlow BSc (Hons) MSc
Contributors/Surveyors:	Sean Darlow BSc (Hons) MSc

Quality Control

Report Prepared for Issue by:

[redacted]

Sean Darlow BSc (Hons) MSc

Report Approved for Issue by:

.....

Laura Kahane MRSB BSc (Hons) MRes

This report remains valid for 12 months from the date of issue. All survey data included are valid for 18 months from the date which the survey was undertaken. If the described development proposals are amended which results in impacts on habitats and/or protected species which has not been mitigated for, or alterations to the red line boundary, or on-site habitats significantly change, re-assessment of the site with regards to habitats protected species will likely be required.

Disclaimer:
This report has been produced by suitably qualified ecologist Sean Darlow on behalf of Wild Earth Ecology in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing 2017[1] and CIEEMs Code of Professional Conduct. All opinions expressed represent true and professional bona fide opinions.
This report has been produced by suitably qualified ecologist Sean Darlow on behalf of Wild Earth Ecology for use solely as a PRA assessment report. Sean Darlow and Wild Earth Ecology accept no liability or any use that is made of this document other than that by the client for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared. This is a technical report which does not represent legal advice. You may wish to seek legal advice if this is required. This report is not intended to be submitted with a planning application for a proposed development without necessary supporting documentation. It is the duty of care of the landowner/developer to act responsibly and comply with current environmental legislation.

Contents

Report Release Sheet 1

Quality Control 1

1.0 Executive Summary 3

2.0 Introduction 4

3.0 Legislation and Policy 5

4.0 Assessment Methodology 6

5.0 Results 11

6.0 Recommendations and Mitigation Measures 13

7.0 Recommended Enhancements 14

8.0 References 15

9.0 Appendices 16

1.0 Executive Summary

Sean Darlow was commissioned by Wild Earth Ecology to undertake a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) assessment at 21 Harcourt Drive, Reading, RG6 5TL to advise on the presence/likely absence of bats and birds at the property.

This report was requested to inform the proposed development of an extension and change of use at the property. A PRA and nesting birds survey was undertaken on 13/09/2026 by experienced ecologist Sean Darlow BSc (hons) MSc.

The property was semi-detached, brick-built with a newly refurbished roof with a new west-facing dormer and associated new hanging tiles. The main roof is pitched with concrete tiles and a gable end on the southern elevation. The 1st floor has an existing extension on the south elevation with an open car port below on the ground floor. A garage and attached existing extension were also present in the southwestern part of the property. The rear garden was small and vegetated with a disused wooden storage shed at the rear. The shed had no bat roost potential. No internal loft void was present as the ceiling between the 1st floor and void was not present.

No evidence of bats was recorded on the property. No droppings were identified at any point during the survey either internally or externally. No bats were observed during the survey. Hence the property was deemed to have Negligible bat roost potential. No further bat surveys were considered proportionate or required on the property. Precautionary mitigation measures have been recommended in the unlikely event that a bat is encountered during works. See Section 6 of the report for details.

The site was found to have Low potential for supporting an assemblage of foraging and commuting bats. Precautionary mitigation measures for foraging and commuting bats are outlined in Section 6 of the report.

No evidence of nesting birds was identified during the site visit, however, vegetation in the rear garden was suitable for nesting birds. Therefore, precautionary mitigation for nesting birds has been outlined in Section 6 of the report.

In order to ensure that the development application is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026), proportionate biodiversity enhancements have also been recommended in Section 7 of the report.

2.0 Introduction

Scope

2.1 This preliminary bat roost appraisal report sets out the details of the ecological features present in relation to suitable habitats for roosting bats where relevant to the development proposals for the site. This includes:

- Executive Summary;
- Assessment Methodology;
- Assumptions and Limitations;
- Baseline Results;
- Recommendations;
- Conclusion.

2.2 The aims of this study are:

- Inspect accessible internal and external building or structure features for evidence of bats and potential bat roosting features.
- Identify whether the building, structure or associated features have potential for summer roosting, transitional roosting or winter hibernation.
- Assess potential hibernation suitability in both classic and non-classic situations.
- Inspect accessible features for active or disused bird nests and potential nesting locations.
- Identify whether further survey, mitigation, compensation, enhancement or licensing is required before works proceed.
- Provide clear constraints and contractor advisories to avoid wildlife offences.

Site Description

2.3 The application site comprised of a single semi-detached brick-built residential property at 41 Harcourt Road, Reading. The immediate locale comprised of a large residential urban area with a large public green space in proximity west of the site, with associated lines of trees and mature vegetation (Figure 1).

Development Proposals

2.4 The development proposals consist of various extensions to the residential dwelling.

3.0 Legislation and Policy

3.1 Although it is not the purpose of this report to present legislation and planning context in the relation to the development proposals, their applicability was explained where appropriate.

3.2 The following wildlife legislation and policy were considered in relation to the proposed development and protected species:

- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended) 2017 amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU exit) Regulations 2019;
- The Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) (as amended) 1981;
- The Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000;
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006;
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) revised 2025;
- Environment Act 2021.

3.3 **It is the responsibility of the applicant(s) to ensure that the proposed development proceeds in full compliance with legislation, national and local policy, and in accordance with all conditions of the obtained planning consent(s). It is also the responsibility of the applicant(s) to request a report amendment / reassessment of the site for roosting bats and nesting birds where the scale/nature of the proposed plans subsequently change.**

3.4 The Government has set out its policies for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity through the planning system in the National Planning Policy Framework Section 15 (NPPF, 2026).

3.5 The PRA assessment was based on professional experience and industry-standard habitat assessment methodologies. The following guidance were consulted, where applicable:

- Bat Conservation Trust (BCT), Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition (Collins, 2023);
- Bird Survey and Assessment Steering Group Bird Survey Guidelines for Assessing Ecological Impact, v1.1.1 (2023);

4.0 Assessment Methodology

Desk Study

4.1 Existing ecological and nature conservation data relevant to the site was collated from various sources including the 'Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside' (MAGIC) online database (magic.defra.gov.uk) and the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC).

Zone of Influence (ZoI) for bats

4.2 The results of the desktop data search and the proposed plans were used to determine a Zone of Influence (ZoI) for bats; the ZoI is defined by CIEEM (2017b) as '*the areas/resources that may be affected by the biophysical changes caused by activities associated with a project*'.

4.3 Due to the localised and small-scale nature of the development proposals the ZoI for roosting bats is confined to the site boundary. The ZoI for foraging bats may extend just beyond the site boundary where artificial lighting is concerns, however, this is considered to be minimal if lighting mitigation is implemented, and therefore the survey area was confined to the building footprint only.

4.4 The National Biodiversity Atlas (NBN) was also used to inform the assessment including a 1 km search radius from the site boundary. Google Maps and/or Google Earth software were used to view aerial imagery and maps in order to assess the ecological context of the site.

Field Survey

4.5 Experienced ecologist Sean Darlow BSc (hons) MSc was commissioned to undertake a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) survey on 13.09.2026.

4.6 The PRA was undertaken in accordance with The Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Guidelines 4th ed (Collins, 2023). A systematic search was made of any internal building areas / loft spaces and exterior building areas. Where present, information was compiled on the potential and actual bat entry/exit points (where possible); potential and actual bat roosting locations; and any evidence of bats found.

4.7 The internal inspection involved a search of internal building areas and where loft spaces were present, the ecologists undertook a search of areas such as beams/felt; fibreglass insulation/flooring; crawl boards; water tanks; internal chimney stacks; gable ends; and stored materials etc.

4.8 The external building assessment included an inspection of the ground/flooring, and where present, any windowsills, windowpanes, behind peeling paintwork/lifted render, brick/block work, chimneys, eaves, lead flashing, tiles and soffits etc.

4.9 Evidence of roosting bats can include;

- The presence of physical live/deceased bats
- Bat droppings (distinguished from rodent droppings by their crumbly texture)
- Fur-oil staining around entry/exit points
- Urine splashing
- Feeding remains such as insect wings and casings

4.10 The building would be identified as a 'confirmed' bat roost where bat evidence was recorded. If droppings were present, a sample of the droppings were collected and couriered to an appropriate laboratory for DNA analysis to confirm the species of bat present.

4.11 Any/all linear habitat features both within and connecting the site to the wider landscape, were visually assessed for their likely use as foraging and commuting corridors. Any other on-site habitats were also visually assessed for their suitability as foraging habitat for bats.

4.12 Most native bats in England are crevice-dwelling species, with bats roosting in remote areas, such as under roof tiles; behind cladding; in cavities; soffits; and behind lead flashing etc, and evidence of these species is often concealed and/or inaccessible. Therefore, where no evidence of roosting bats was recorded, an assessment on the availability of potential roosting areas and bat exit/entry points around the building(s) was conducted. The building was then assigned a category based on a sliding scale of potential for bats, ranging from 'none' to 'high' (Collins, 2023):

Table 1. Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of buildings for bats (Collins, 2023).

Bat roosting potential	Description
'High'	A structure with one of more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis & potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions (temperature, humidity, height above ground level, adverse light levels, or high levels of disturbance), and surrounding habitat. The structure has the potential to support high conservation status roosts for example maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation sites.

'Moderate'	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions (temperature, humidity, height above ground level, adverse light levels, or high levels of disturbance), and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity & hibernation and this is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence if confirmed via the PRA).
'Low'	The building features one or more potential roosting features that could be used by bats opportunistically at any time of year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions (temperature, humidity, height above ground level, adverse light levels, or high levels of disturbance) and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by a larger number of bats.
'Negligible'	There are no obvious habitat features likely to be used by bats, however there is a small element of uncertainty as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion. (*negligible is defined as 'so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant'. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute), but it is unlikely that they would (due to another attribute).
'None'	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/underground levels).

Bat Impact Assessment

4.13 Following the CIEEM Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Reason, P.F. and Wray, S, 2023), the roost(s) onsite were classified in accordance with the following roost types:

- Day roost
- Night roost
- Maternity roost
- Satellite roost
- Hibernation roost
- Feeding perch roost
- Transitional roost

4.14 Information on the roost type(s) and rarity of the bat species within a geographical context was used to assess the importance of the roost(s). Maternity and hibernation roosts are of higher importance than day/night or transitional roosts, which are lower in conservation value due to supporting low numbers of bats; maternity roosts support high numbers of bats and contribute more significantly to the population of the species and are therefore of higher importance.

4.15 Roosts are assigned a value based upon 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA)' (CIEEM, 2018), this ranges from 'site' importance (day roosts of common species) to 'national' importance (hibernation roosts of Annex II species).

4.16 Once the roost(s) on site were identified and classified, the 'Minimum Expectations for Bat Mitigation Compensation, Monitoring and Management' (Natural England, 2023) document was used to design an appropriate bat mitigation, compensation and enhancement plan.

4.17 All UK bat species are protected as European Protected Species (EPS) under the 2017 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended). In relation to EPS, the 2017 Regulations make it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill any wild animal of an EPS;
- Deliberately disturb wild animals of any such species, in particular any disturbance which is likely to: (i) impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or to hibernate or migrate; (ii) affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal; and
- To (a) be in possession of, or to control; (b) to transport any live or dead animal or any part of an animal; (c) to sell or exchange or (d) offer for sale or exchange any live or dead animal or part of an animal of an EPS.

4.18 In addition, all UK bats are protected under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended). All species are listed on Schedule 5 of the Act and are subject to the provisions of Sections 9.4b and 9.4c, which make it an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection; and
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection by a bat.

4.19 If works are planned that are likely to constitute an offence under the current legislation, then works should be carried out under an appropriate Natural England licence.

Birds

4.20 Any/all features on site with the potential to support nesting and breeding birds were assessed during the PRA survey for evidence of presence, including active and abandoned/disused nests.

Limitations and Assumptions

4.21 Bats and nesting birds are highly mobile species, and it is therefore possible for bats and nesting birds to occupy the property at any time in the future, particularly if any alterations/changes occur to the property. The PRA only provides a 'snapshot' in time and does not account for seasonal variation; bats and nesting birds may have been overlooked due to seasonal constraints. As such, it is not possible to have complete certainty that bats and nesting birds are not present, rather, there was no indication of bats/nesting birds present at the time of the survey.

4.22 Potential evidence for bats, in particular crevice-dwelling species, may have been overlooked due to access restrictions to remote areas of the building(s). Binoculars were used to help identify any potential bat droppings on the exterior features of the building(s).

4.23 Often bats leave no visible signs of their presence on the outside of a building, and even when they do, wet weather can easily wash evidence away.

4.24 Any limitations specific to the survey (e.g. access to the site or inside buildings, biotic or abiotic factors (e.g., wasps, asbestos) visibility, safety, or adverse weather) are discussed in the report in the conclusions, impacts and recommendations table, and given the appropriate weighting.

Survey Data Lifespan

4.25 **The applicant must note that the survey data has a limited lifespan for any subsequent EPS licence application. An EPS licence application must be informed by a PRA within 3 months of the licence application date, and activity survey data must be obtained from the then 'current' bat survey season (May to August) in which the licence is applied for. For example, activity surveys are conducted and planning is approved in August, and the EPS licence is applied for in July the following year, a minimum of one update dusk survey would be required in the months of May-June in the same year prior to the EPS licence application in July.**

5.0 Results

Desk Study

5.1 The Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) provided records of bats and bat roosts within a 1 km radius of the site as outlined in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Records for bats and bat roosts in relation to the site.

Common name	Latin name	Number of records	Most recent record	Nearest record to site
Brown long-eared bat	*Plecotus auritus*	15	2024	618 m
Common pipistrelle	*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*	75	2023	618 m
Daubenton's bat	*Myotis daubentonii*	12	2023	618 m
Nathusius's pipistrelle	*Pipistrellus nathusii*	2	2020	810 m
Noctule	*Nyctalus noctula*	39	2024	618 m
Pipistrelle sp.	*Pipistrellus sp.*	11	2024	618 m
Serotine	*Eptesicus serotinus*	7	2024	618 m
Soprano pipistrelle	*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*	46	2024	618 m

5.2 There is potential for changes in artificial lighting to impede foraging and commuting bats that may be using the general site and locale; therefore, lighting specifications are detailed in Section 6 of the report to reduce obtrusive lighting impacts to bats on-site.

Preliminary Roost Survey

5.3 A description of the building surveyed for roosting bats is provided in Table 3 below and photographs of the building are provided in the Appendices.

Table 3. Building description.

Building	Description
House	A 2-storey semi-detached brick built residential dwelling comprises The Site, with a newly refurbished main roof and east-facing dormer extensions with newly installed hanging tiles. The main roof is pitched with concrete tiles and a gable end on the southern elevation. The 1st floor has an existing extension on the south elevation with an open car port below on the ground floor. A garage and attached existing extension were also present in the southwestern part of the property. The rear garden was small and vegetated with a disused wooden storage shed at the rear. The shed had no bat roost potential. No internal loft void was present as the ceiling between the 1st floor and void was not present.
Potential bat entry / exit points:	None.
Potential roosting areas:	1st floor southern elevation extension flashing had two small but shallow gaps on both the front and rear sides.

Evidence of bats recorded:	No evidence of bats was recorded on the property. No droppings were identified at any point during the survey either internally or externally. No bats were observed during the survey.
DNA analysis of any dropping samples:	n/a
Roost status/building potential for bats:	Negligible bat roost potential

Bat Impact Assessment

5.4 No bats or roosts were identified during the PRA survey Very shallow gaps were identified in the flashing of the 1st floor southern extension; however, these were considered to be suboptimal for crevice-dwelling bats due to the shallow nature of the gaps. Therefore, the potential for roosting bats within the property has been determined as Negligible, a classification based on the CIEEM Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Reason, P.F. and Wray, S., 2023).

5.5 The hibernation roost potential for the property was also considered, though no evidence of hibernation activity was identified during the survey and the property was not considered to support traditional bat hibernation features such as underground sites/tunnels/basements, and so the site is deemed to have Negligible potential for hibernating bats.

5.6 Due to the findings drawn from the survey, it is not considered appropriate or proportionate to undertake further surveys on the property with regards to bats, such as emergence or activity surveys, in accordance with the BCT guidelines (Collins, 2023).

5.7 The site is considered to have Low potential for foraging and commuting bats due to the small-scale nature of the site, the relatively small size of the rear garden and lack of commuting features around the immediate proximity of the property compared to significantly more suitable foraging and commuting habitat in the wider locale, which would be far more likely to be used by bats.

Nesting Birds

5.8 No evidence of nesting birds was identified during the assessment of the property. Additionally, no active or disused nests were identified elsewhere on site during the assessment. Regardless, standard precautionary recommendations regarding potential nesting birds on site is outlined below in Section 6.

6.0 Recommendations and Mitigation Measures

Roosting Bats

6.1 The PRA assessment of 41 Harcourt Drive was undertaken, and the property was considered to have Negligible bat roost potential. Therefore, no further surveys regarding bats are considered appropriate or necessary.

6.2 Given the low suitability of the features associated with the building and the lack of suitability for hibernation or maternity roosts, works can be completed at any time of year with the implementation of the measures outlined below intended to ensure no death or injury to, or disturbance of, roosting bats if present.

6.3 In the unlikely event that a bat is discovered during works, all works must immediately cease, and a suitably qualified bat-licenced ecologist must be contacted for further advice and next steps.

6.4 If a bat roost is confirmed as present within the building, then a mitigation licence from Natural England will be required to facilitate the proposed development. The approach to licensing and mitigation strategy will need to be agreed with Natural England. Additional surveys may be required to inform the licence application.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

6.5 Due to the site having Low potential for foraging and commuting bats on-site, it is considered appropriate to recommend the following measures to minimise impacts and disturbance to foraging/commuting bats.

6.6 Any new external lighting installed on-site must be designed to minimise impacts to foraging and commuting bats, particularly around areas with mature vegetation and boundary features which may be used by bats. A sensitive lighting strategy, in-line with the BCT and ILP guidance on bats and artificial light at night (2023) should be implemented on-site for any proposed external lighting during the construction and operational phases of development.

Nesting Birds

6.7 Due to the suitability of boundary vegetation for nesting birds, it is recommended to time any vegetation clearance works to these habitats to be timed to occur outside of nesting bird season, which typically runs from March-August inclusive, to avoid any potential impacts of the development to nesting birds.

6.8 If this cannot be feasibly achieved, such works with potential impacts to nesting birds can only be conducted during the nesting bird season after a pre-works check has been undertaken on all potential bird nesting features and habitats by a suitably qualified ecologist, no more than 24 hours prior to the commencement of these activities. Identification of any active nests must be communicated to all on-site personnel, and a minimum of a 5-meter exclusion buffer zone must be implemented around all active

nests until it has been subsequently confirmed by a suitably qualified ecologists that all chicks have fledged the nest(s).

6.9 If the above measures are followed on-site during the construction phase of the proposed development, there should be no impact or disturbance to nesting birds as a result of the proposed development.

7.0 Recommended Enhancements

7.1 In order to ensure that the development application is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026) and relevant local planning policy, **one integrated bat box** must be installed on the south/southwestern elevation, and **one integrated bird nest box** must be installed on the eastern elevation of the property. E.g. Vivara Pro UK build-In Woodstone bat box, and Vivara pro Woodstone House Sparrow next box or Integrated Swift box.

7.2 Integrated bat boxes should be installed as close to the development boundaries as possible and oriented away from the development. Ideally each box should be installed at a 3 – 5 m height in a south or southwest-facing direction with clear flightpaths to and from the box entrances. Each box must be oriented away from any sources of external artificial light. Integrated bird boxes should be installed facing either north or east directions to increase the nesting provision for native bird species on-site at post-development.

8.0 References

Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) (2022). Interim Guidance Note: Use of Night Vision Aids for bat emergence surveys and further comment on dawn surveys.

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

CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2017a). Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (2nd ed). CIEEM, Winchester. Accessed from: https://cieem.net/resource/guidelines-for-ecological-report-writing/

CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2017b). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2nd ed). CIEEM, Winchester. Available from: https://cieem.net/resource/guidance-on-preliminary-ecological-appraisal-gpea/.

CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) in the UK and Ireland. CIEEM, Winchester. Accessed from: https://cieem.net/resource/guidelines-for-ecological-impact-assessment-ecia/

CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2019). Advice Note On The Lifespan Of Ecological Reports & Surveys. CIEEM, Winchester. Accessed from: https://cieem.net/resource/advice-note-on-the-lifespan-of-ecological-reports-and-surveys/

Collins, J (ed) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professionals Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Ed). BCT, London. Accessed from: https://www.bats.org.uk/resources/guidance-for-professionals/bat-surveys-for-professional-ecologists-good-practice-guidelines-4th-edition

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

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2023). The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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

Miller, H. (ed.) (2016) Bat Care Guidelines (2nd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mitchell-Jones A.J. & McLeish A.P. (2004). The Bat Workers' Manual (3rd Edition) Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

Natural England (2023). Bat Earned Recognition: Minimum Expectations for Bat Mitigation, Compensation, Monitoring and Management.

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

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.

Waring S., Essah, E., Gunnell., K., (2011) The Likelihood of Entanglement When Bats Meet Breathable Roofing Membranes.

9.0 Appendices

Appendix 1 – Protected Species Legislation

Bats

All UK bat species are protected as European Protected Species (EPS) under the 2017 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended). In relation to EPS, the 2017 Regulations make it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill any wild animal of an EPS;
- Deliberately disturb wild animals of any such species, in particular any disturbance which is likely to: (i) impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or to hibernate or migrate; (ii) affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal; and
- To (a) be in possession of, or to control; (b) to transport any live or dead animal or any part of an animal; (c) to sell or exchange or (d) offer for sale or exchange any live or dead animal or part of an animal of an EPS.

In addition, all UK bats are protected under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended). All species are listed on Schedule 5 of the Act and are subject to the provisions of Sections 9.4b and 9.4c, which make it an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection; and
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection by a bat.

Barbastelle, Bechstein's, greater horseshoe, lesser horseshoe, brown long-eared, soprano pipistrelle, and noctule bats are all priority species under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) and have also been adopted as species of principal importance in England under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006.

If works are planned that are likely to constitute an offence under the current legislation, then works should be carried out under an appropriate Natural England licence.

Birds

All wild birds in the UK are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) which makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or to take, damage or destroy the nest or its eggs. Some bird species, such as the barn owl Tyto alba, are listed in Schedule 1 of the 1981 Act and receive further protection, making it an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb these birds whilst building a nest or in, on or near a nest containing eggs or young; or to disturb dependent young of such a bird. The NERC Act (2006) inserts a new schedule into the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) to protect the nests of some

bird species that regularly re-use their nests, even when the nests are not in use. This protection currently applies to golden eagle, whitetailed eagle and osprey.

Appendix 2 – Planning Policy and Legislation

Planning and Biodiversity

The biodiversity policies which are most relevant are the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2026), Biodiversity 2020, the Biodiversity Action Plan for Hampshire and the Test Valley Local Plan (2011-2029)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026

NPPF aims to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity. Chapter 19 refers to Habitats & Biodiversity stating that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and

b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Para. 180:

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- Development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons (63) and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should

be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

UK Biodiversity Action Plan & Habitats and Species of Principal Importance

The UK Biodiversity Plan (BAP) was a programme designed to help conserve the UK's biodiversity. It led to the production of 436 action plans between 1995 and 1999 to help many of the UK's most threatened species and habitats to recover. A review of the UK BAP priority list in 2007 led to the identification of 1,150 species and 65 habitats that met the BAP criteria at UK level. Currently 56 Habitats of Principal Importance and 943 Species of Principal Importance are included within Schedule 41 of the NERC Act and these include species and habitats which were identified in the UK BAP and which continue to be considered to represent the conservation priorities of England in the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework.

Species of Principal Importance and Habitats of Principal Importance are those identified as the most threatened and requiring conservation action under the Schedule 41 of the UK Biodiversity Action Plan & Habitats and Species of Principal Importance. Species include West European hedgehog Erinaceus europaeus, great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*, dormouse and common toad *Bufo bufo*.

Appendix 3 – Figures



Figure 1. Site location plan for 41 Harcourt Drive, Reading, illustrated by the red line boundary. *(Copyright: Google 2026).*

Appendix 4 – Site Photographs



Top L: Front of the property.
Upper L: South-facing 1st floor extension front.
Mid L: Shallow gaps in extension flashing front.
Lower L: Property rear and ground extension.
Bottom L: Ground extension roof 1.

Top R: Rear of the property.
Upper R: South-facing 1st floor extension rear.
Mid R: shallow gaps in extension flashing rear.
Lower R: Ground extension rear.
Bottom R: Ground extension roof 2.



Top L: Garage extension front.
Upper L: Ground floor kitchen.
Mid L: Ground extension uPVC soffits and fascias.
Lower L: 1st floor interior up into roof space.
Bottom L: Upper roof space interior 2.

Top R: Ground floor living room.
Upper R: Ground floor extension interior.
Mid R: Garage interior.
Lower R: Upper roof space interior.
Bottom R: Upper roof space interior 3.



Upper Left: 1st floor landing boiler / airing cupboard.
Upper Right: 1st floor bedroom interior.
Middle: 1st floor landing. **Bottom:** 1st floor extension interior.