

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:

62 Clifton Road, Wokingham, Berkshire, RG411NE

Client:

Mr. Stephen Galt

Survey date:

24/08/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Wokingham Borough Council. This proposal can be described as "upward extension above garage".

On the assumption that site conditions and habitats remain unchanged, the results of this assessment will remain valid for 18 months from the date of this survey i.e. until February 2028, in accordance with CIEEM guidance in the lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys. This survey and report should be updated if a planning application has not been submitted within this timeframe.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission and to comply with legislation. Further information, along with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, are outlined in the proceeding sections of this report.

Table 1: Summary of key findings arising from this survey.

Key Findings
• Precautionary working methods have been recommended for birds, as fully detailed within the fauna section of this report.

1. 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](#).

Survey Details

The site survey was undertaken on 24/08/2026 by Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, accredited on a Level 2 Natural England Bat Licence (number available on request), Graduate Ecologist

Table 2: The weather conditions during the survey.

Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
22.2	50.0	94	25.9	None

Survey Limitations

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This assessment provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of protected species being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the wider landscape, the ecology and biology of species as currently understood.

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.

2. SITE LOCATION AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

2.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Site Location & Context

The site is centred at National Grid reference SU 80062 69581 and has an area of approximately 0.03ha. The site comprises two buildings, a dwelling and a shed (B1 & B2), and associated garden, located to the west of the site. It is situated within the market town and civil parish of Wokingham. Aerial imagery shows the local landscape to be largely urban and residential, though several copses of woodland can be seen close by. The closest woodland parcel lies 100m south, on the far side of a train track and Reading Road. Several water bodies can be found nearby, such as Emm Brook, which lies 34m to the west of the site. Such features likely enhance the area for a variety of species, including bats.

Priority Habitats

There are six priority habitats within 2km of the site. These comprise deciduous woodland, ancient & semi-natural woodland, traditional orchard, wood pasture and parkland, open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and priority ponds. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located 230m SW from the site.

Due to the site being surrounded by residential and urban land on all sides, the site is not considered to be well-connected to any priority, important, or otherwise more extensive, habitats in the immediate vicinity.

Designated Sites

Statutory Designations within 2km

There is one statutory designation within 2km of the site, as detailed below:

Table 3: The statutory designated sites within 2km of the site boundary.

Designation	Distance from Site
Holt Copse & Joel Park Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	365m SE

SSSI Risk Zone

The site does fall within the impact risk zone for Lodge Wood & Sandford Mill SSSI however, the proposed development type is not listed as possible high risk with regard to this designation.

Non-Designated Sites

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.

2.2 Foreseen 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), alongside additional factors such as distance in combination with connectivity disrupting barriers.

2.3 Recommendations

No recommendations.

3. FAUNA: BATS

This section 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.

3.1 Summary of Survey Findings

EPSL data and local records

A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. There are 6 EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site, as detailed below:

Table 4: EPSL survey returns for bats within a 2km radius.

EPSL Reference	Bat Species Affected	Distance from Site (EPSL records are accurate to 100m)	Impacts Allowed by Licence
2016-22176-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>)	~420m south	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2009-1496	Noctule (<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>)	~520m southeast	Destruction of a resting/breeding place
2016-24486-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>)	~580m north	Destruction of a resting place
2015-11806-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>)	~1.2km south	Destruction of a resting place
2020-48489-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>), Common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>), Soprano pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>)	~1.1m east	Destruction of a resting place
2015-13607-EPS-MIT 2015-13607-EPS-MIT-1	Common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>)	~1.2km west	Destruction of a resting place

The site is not within the zone of influence of a bat-designated SAC.

Foraging and commuting habitat

The hedgerows onsite offer good value for commuting and foraging bats. Habitats of high value within the wider landscape (within 2km) include deciduous woodland, ancient & semi-natural woodland, traditional orchard, wood pasture and parkland, open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and priority ponds. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. Most notably, the hedgerows to the west and south of the site are mature and extend beyond the site adding to the continuity of vegetated linear features present in the wider landscape, connecting to other hedgerows and in turn larger parcels of woodland, ponds and streams. Bats are well known to utilise linear features to aid navigation whilst travelling between foraging resources and roost sites.

Roosting habitat

Buildings to be impacted by the proposed development were assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. There are a total of two buildings on site; a residential dwelling (B1) and a shed (B2). B1 will be subject to an extension and B2 will be retained. No evidence of roosting bats was identified on either building.

Buildings

B1 : Residential dwelling

B1 is a residential dwelling. Its primary structure features a pitched roof with interlocking concrete tiles, metal soffits and uPVC windows and doors. It features a single-storey side extension to the north with a bitumen felt roof, which will be undergoing an upward extension.

Due to its modern construction, B1 was seen to be well-sealed with no obvious gaps or crevices externally. The internal void was seen to be well-sealed and offers no suitable crevice or void habitat for roosting bats. The building was assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats owing to a lack of features.



Building B1, western elevation

Table 5a: The roosting features associated with building B1.

Feature	Materials/Details	Condition / description / suitability	Photograph
---------	-------------------	---------------------------------------	------------

Walls	Brick	Condition/description All brickwork across elevations was deemed to be in good condition with no cracks or crevices within the brick and no areas of missing mortar. Suitability/access/evidence of bats No suitability for roosting bats was identified on the walls.	 <i>B1 walls, western elevation</i>
Roof	Interlocking tiles Bitumen felt	Condition/description The interlocking roof tiles across all elevations were seen to be in good condition with no areas of lifting or crevices under which bats could roost. All mortar was equally in good condition, with no gaps or crevices present. The bitumen felt of the flat roof, where the extension will be taking place, was seen to be in good condition, with no areas of lifting present under which bats could roost. Suitability/access/evidence of bats No suitability for roosting bats.	 <i>B1 roof, eastern elevation (above porch)</i>

			 <i>B1 roof, eastern elevation</i>  <i>B1 roof, flat roof section above garage, subject to upward extension</i>
--	--	--	--

Eaves	Metal	Condition/description The eaves were closed, featuring metal soffit boxes on all elevations. Suitability/access/evidence of bats All soffits were observed to be well-sealed and gapless, offering no suitability for roosting bats.	 <i>B1 eaves, western elevation (garage)</i>  <i>B1 eaves, eastern elevation (garage)</i>
-------	-------	--	--

			 B1 eaves, western elevation (main dwelling)
Windows	uPVC	Condition/description The windows and doors of the building are made from uPVC. Suitability/access/evidence of bats All are tightly fitting, with no gaps or crevices where bats could roost between the walls and frames.	 B1 window / doors frames and lintels, western elevation

Internal void 1	Timber rafters. Bitumen felt lining. Brick partition walls	Condition/description The timber rafters were seen to be in good condition with no areas of splitting wood or crevices where bats could roost, though small gaps present between the bitumen felt roof lining and timber rafters could be utilised by roosting bats. Suitability/access/evidence of bats No suitable roosting crevices or points of access were noted at the time of survey, and no areas of light ingress were noted. No evidence of rodents was found, further indicating that no hidden or concealed access points are present within the loft. No evidence of bats was found (i.e. feeding remains, droppings or staining).	 <i>B1 internal void 1, facing south</i>  <i>B1 internal void 1, facing west</i>
------------------------	---	---	--

B2 : Shed

B2 is a timber shed located to the west of B1. One small area of lifting was observed underneath the wooden cladding on the southern elevation; however, the crevice was deemed superficial upon further investigation (measuring less than 1cm in depth), and therefore unsuitable for roosting bats. Overall, the building was seen to lack the traditional features that would typically provide suitable roosting opportunities for bats and is likely to be subject to temperature fluctuations due to the nature of the construction materials (timber and glass), creating an unstable thermal environment that does not support bats roosting. No suitable gaps were observed during the survey. Therefore, B2 is assessed as having negligible value for roosting bats. B2 will be retained in line with development plans.



Building B2, southwestern elevation, facing northeast

3.2 Foreseen Impacts

Roosting habitat [Buildings]

Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within B1 and B2, and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in these locations as a result of the proposed development.

Roosting habitat [Trees]

No trees will be removed in line with current plans, and therefore no impacts are foreseen.

Foraging and commuting habitat

The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats.

Artificial lighting

No new lighting will be installed as a result of the proposed development.

3.3 Recommendations

Roosting habitat [Buildings]

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

Roosting habitat [Trees]

None.

Foraging and commuting habitat

No further surveys are required.

Artificial lighting

Should plans change to involve any new lighting, a low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the western and southern hedgerows to be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website:

<https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/08/bats-and-artificial-lighting-at-night-ilp-guidance-note-update-released>

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

The installation of one bat box at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be incorporated into the fabric of the new extension. Suitable bat boxes include e.g. 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.

4. FAUNA: BIRDS

This section 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.

4.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Buildings

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1 and B2. B1 and B2 are deemed to provide negligible habitat value for nesting birds due to a lack of suitable nesting sites or access points.

Trees and vegetation

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within the hedgerows lining the site boundary to the west of the site; however, hedgerows onsite offer good nesting and foraging resources.

No habitat for Schedule 1 birds was observed.

Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site is not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.

Barn Owls

The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls.

4.2 Foreseen Impacts

Buildings / trees

Buildings

None foreseen

Trees and vegetation

Trees/vegetation

No direct impacts are anticipated on nesting birds as a result of the proposed development; however, the proposed development could result in the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests if present within the hedgerows to the west of the site.

Barn Owls

None foreseen.

4.3 Recommendations

Buildings / trees

Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained habitats so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works.

Trees and vegetation

No additional surveys required.

Barn Owls

No further barn owl surveys required.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

The installation of one bird box retained buildings (integrated bird boxes are favourable where possible) will provide additional nesting habitat for birds, e.g. Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings), Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings), Woodstone Nest Box (buildings or trees) or a similar alternative brand.

Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY/HABITAT MAP



APPENDIX 2: LOCATION MAP



APPENDIX 3: PROPOSED PLAN



LIMITATION 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	0.1	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	27/08/26
Reviewed	0.2	Kelly Smart Dip H.E FISC 3, Senior Ecologist	02/09/26
Final	1.0	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	02/09/26