arbtech

Thomas Doarks BSc (Hons)
Graduate Ecologist
Email: thomasdoarks@arbtech.co.uk
Arbtech Consulting Ltd
arbtech.co.uk

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:
1 Wulwyn Side, Linkway, Crowthorne, Berkshire RG456JB

Client:
Ian Mitchell

Survey date:
06/04/2026

Project:
This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Wokingham Borough Council. This proposal can be described as two single-storey side extensions.

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Contents

Introduction and Context 2
Introduction 2
Methodology 2
Limitations 2
Results, Impacts and Recommendations 3
Site Location and Landscape Context 3
Fauna 6
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan 17
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan 18
Appendix 3: PRA Plan 19
Limitations and Copyright 20
Version Control 20

Introduction and Context

Introduction

The aim of the PRA was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how bats could use the site for roosting, foraging or commuting.

No previous ecology reports have been produced for this site by Arbtech Consulting Ltd or, to the author's knowledge, by any other consultancy.

Methodology

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2025.

Limitations

A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.

Results, Impacts and Recommendations

Site Location and Landscape Context

Table 1: Site location and landscape context

Site Location
The site is located at National Grid Reference SU 83010 64217 and covers an area of approximately 0.056ha. It comprises one residential dwelling and two timber-built sheds, set within a vegetated garden. The site is situated within a suburban setting, immediately surrounded by residential properties and their associated gardens, which include scattered trees and boundary hedgerows. The wider landscape is characterised by well-vegetated, medium-sized gardens with plentiful tree cover, alongside nearby woodland, creating a green suburban environment with relatively high vegetation connectivity. A review of historic maps indicates that much of the woodland landscape has been lost to significant residential development since the 1800's. According to soilscapes the site possess as light, sand or silt-rich, but locally medium, loamy soil and subsoil. Mildly Acidic to Neutral (pH: 4.5 - 6.5).
Priority Habitats and Designated Sites
Summary of Survey Findings <u>Priority Habitats</u> There are five priority habitats located within 2km of the site. These comprise deciduous woodland, traditional orchard, lowland heathland, lowland fens and ancient & semi-natural woodland. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located ~150 m NW of the site beyond residential dwellings with associated gardens and minor roads. The site is well connected to nearby habitats by hedgerows and scattered trees. <u>Designated Sites</u>

There are eight statutory sites within 2km of the site. There is one statutory site within 10 km of the site. These are listed below:

Table 1a: Statutory sites within 2km of the site.

Designation	Distance from site
Heathlake Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	865m N
Heath Lake Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI)	895m N
Edgbarrow Woods LNR	1050m S
Wellington College Bog SSSI	1300m S
Sandhurst To Owlsmoor Bogs And Heaths SSSI	1435m SE
Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA)	1435m SE
Broadmoor To Bagshot Woods And Heaths SSSI	1495m E
Ambarrow Court LNR	1545m S

Table 1b: Statutory sites within 10km of the site.

Designation	Distance from site
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright & Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC) 10km	8110m E

The site does fall within the impact risk zone for Heath Lake SSSI however, the proposed development type is not listed as possible high risk with regard to this designation. Therefore, consultation with Natural England is not required.

The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the local records centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environs of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designable quality.

Impacts

No direct impacts to any designated sites will occur as a result of the proposed development, due to the small scale and low overall impact of the development from such sites (where known).

Recommendations

No recommendations.

Fauna

The site survey was undertaken by Thomas Doarks BSc (Hons), accredited agent for Level 1 activities on Natural England Bat Licence (2025-83880-CL18-BAT).

Table 2: Survey weather conditions

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
06/04/2026	12	56	0	15	None

Table 3: Fauna

Fauna: Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations

This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

Roosting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

A review of the MAGIC database for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) for bats within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. 18 EPSL were identified, as detailed below:

Table 3a: EPSL records within 2km of the site - bats

EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence
2015-7775-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*	~300m SE	Destruction of a resting place
2016-24162-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~350m SE	Destruction of a resting place
2017-31130-EPS-MIT	Whiskered bat	~420m SE	Destruction of a breeding site

		Myotis mystacinus		
	EPSM2013-5937	Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~620m E	Destruction of a resting place
	2016-25037-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* Soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*	~650m NE	Destruction of a resting place
	EPSM2013-6420	Brown long-eared Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~650m NW	Destruction of a resting place
	EPSM2013-5760	Brown long-eared Common pipistrelle	~1.1km SE	Destruction of a resting place
	2017-31639-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~1.1km SW	Destruction of a resting place
	2015-8440-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared	~1.25km NW	Damage to a resting place
	2018-33861-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared	~1.4km NW	Destruction of a resting place
	EPSM2010-2316	Brown long-eared Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~1.4km NW	Destruction of a resting place
	2017-31789-EPS-MIT	Soprano pipistrelle	~1.6km NW	Destruction of a resting place
	2018-37292-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~1.6km SW	Destruction of a resting place Destruction of a breeding site

2018-33541-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~1.65km SE	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2013-5794	Common pipistrelle	~1.75km E	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2011-3144	Brown long-eared Common pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle	~1.75km W	Destruction of a resting place
2020-45340-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared	~1.8km W	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2012-4677	Common pipistrelle	~1.9km E	Destruction of a resting place

There are no Special Areas of Conservation designated for bats within 10km of the site.

Buildings

Building B1 Description			
B1 comprises a residential dwelling with a pitched tiled roof and a single-storey flat roof extension on the southern elevation. The main roof tiles, ridge tiles, verges, brickwork, doors and windows are tight-fitting, and no bat roosting features or access points into the internal void were identified externally. The flat roof of the southern extension was not fully visible during the survey; however, the observable edges showed no defects or potential roosting features. An accessible loft void was present. No bat roosting features, or evidence of bats were identified within the loft void. In line with Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B1 is assessed to have **negligible** suitability for roosting bats.			 *Eastern elevation of B1.*
Feature	**Materials**	**Condition/Suitability**	**Photographs**

	Roof	Clay tiles	The main roof tiles, ridge tiles and roof verges are tight-fitting, and no bat roosting features or access points were identified.	*The roof of B1, facing north.* *The tight-fitting rooftiles of B1, facing north.*	

	Flat roofs	Bitumen felt	The flat roof of the single-storey extension along the southern elevation was not fully visible during the survey and could not be comprehensively inspected. However, the edges of the flat roofs were observable, and no gaps, defects or features for roosting bats were present.	*The flat roof of the single-storey extension, facing east.*	
	Walls	Brick-built	The brickwork around the building appears in good condition with no suitable gaps or cracks in which bats can roost.	*The wall at the northern elevation of B1.*	

	Windows	PVC	The doors and windows of B1 are in good condition with no suitable gaps or cracks in which bats can roost.	*A window on the eastern elevation of B1.*	
	Voids	Bitumen felt	A loft void was recorded within B1. This void is accessible and measures 7.5m in length, 7m in width, and 1.5m in height, with a total area of 52.5m². The void is lined with bitumen felt. No rips or tears were identified in the lining, and no light spill was observed, indicating an absence of access points into the internal void. The flooring of the loft void is partially covered in plywood allowing access to all areas.	*The internal void of B1, facing east.*	

			No rodent droppings were identified within the loft void. No ridge beam is present. No bat roosting features or evidence were identified within this void.	 *The internal roof lining of B1.*

Building B2 Description	
B2 is a detached, single-storey timber-framed shed with a gabled roof clad in bitumen felt. The structure is single-skinned, and the internal space is well sealed, with no gaps, cracks or access points identified that would allow bats to enter the building or access any internal voids. No evidence of bats (e.g. droppings, staining or feeding remains) was recorded during the inspection. The shed also contains large windows, which allow high levels of natural light into the internal space. In addition, the single-skinned timber construction provides little thermal insulation, resulting in significant temperature fluctuations throughout the day and night. These conditions create a bright, exposed and thermally unstable environment, which is unsuitable for roosting	 *The southwestern elevation of B2.*

bats, as bats typically favour dark, sheltered spaces with relatively stable microclimatic conditions. In line with Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B2 is assessed to have **negligible** habitat value for roosting bats, as no features likely to be used by bats at any time of the year were identified.	

Building B3 Description	
B3 is a small, detached, single-storey timber shed of simple construction. The structure is single-skinned, with timber walls and a roof clad in bitumen felt. The internal space is well sealed, with no gaps, cracks or lifted sections identified that would allow bats to access the building or any internal voids. No evidence of bats (e.g. droppings, staining or feeding remains) was recorded during the inspection. Due to the single-skinned timber construction, the shed is likely to experience significant temperature fluctuations, providing poor thermal stability. In line with Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B3 is assessed to have **negligible** habitat value for roosting bats, as no features likely to be used by bats at any time of the year were identified.	 *The southern elevation of B3.*

Impacts

Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within B1, B2 or B3 due to the absence of suitable roosting features and access points. As such, no impacts on roosting bats are anticipated as a result of the proposed development.

Recommendations

In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bat(s) is discovered during the development all work must stop immediately, and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice.

No further surveys are required.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements
The installation of one bat box at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats.
The bat box will be installed on B1. It will be suitable for pipistrelles (which have been identified locally through EPSL data).
Suitable bat boxes include Habibat Bat Box, Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box or similar alternative brand.
Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats within the vegetated garden. The garden is likely to support invertebrate prey, providing suitable foraging resources for local bat populations.

The site is located within a suburban landscape characterised by vegetated gardens, scattered trees and areas of woodland, which together create a network of connected green spaces. The presence of trees immediately adjacent to the site and numerous trees in the surrounding area contributes to the availability of linear and semi-linear features, which bats commonly use for navigation and commuting between roosting and foraging habitats. As such, the site forms part of a wider landscape of suitable bat commuting and foraging habitat.

Impacts

The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats. However, the proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting and foraging bats and deter them from site.

Recommendations

A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting.

No further surveys are required.

Birds

Summary of Survey Findings

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within any of the buildings on site. However, the buildings may provide suitable shelter and could be used by common nesting birds. Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.

Impacts

The proposed development could result in the destruction or disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests during the extension of B1.

Recommendations

Any building works should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the buildings should be undertaken immediately, by a competent person, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.

Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

The installation of a one bird boxes on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Woodstone Nest Box or a similar alternative brand.

Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan

Appendix 2: Site Location Plan

Appendix 3: PRA Plan

Limitations and Copyright

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version Control

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	V0.1	Thomas Doarks BSc (Hons), Graduate Ecologist	10-04-26
Proof	V0.5	Zenobia – Jay Pattison BSc (Hons), Senior Ecologist	14-04-2026
Final	V1.0	Thomas Doarks BSc (Hons), Graduate Ecologist	16-06-2026