



Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:

162 Reading Road Wokingham RG41 1LH

Client:

Rajesh Kumar Kedia

Survey date:

02/04/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Wokingham Borough Council. This proposal can be described as a garage conversion/double storey side extension to the west and a single storey side extension to the east.

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

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 Tables 1, 3 & 4 of this report.

Key Findings

- Buildings 1-5 have been assessed to have negligible suitability for roosting bats. No further surveys are required as a result of the outcome of this survey. **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.**

Contents

Introduction and Context	3
Introduction	3
Methodology	3
Limitations	3
Results, Impacts and Recommendations	4
Site Location and Landscape Context	4
Fauna	5
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan	15
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan	16
Appendix 3: PRA Plan	17
Appendix 4: Site Photographs	18
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.

A Preliminary Roost Assessment was completed by Arbtech in 2022. No evidence of bats was found and no features were identified within the report. Findings of the updated report are consistent with those outlined in the previous report.

Methodology

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024](#).

Limitations

Whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report is a preliminary assessment and does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. Nor does it represent a full botanical assessment. It assesses the likelihood of protected, notable and important habitats and species being present, based on a site and landscape level habitat value-based risk assessment. This is based upon the ecology, biology and known distribution 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.

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 79614 69553 and has an area of approximately 0.18ha comprising one main dwelling and four outbuildings. It is situated within the historic market town of Wokingham, Berkshire. There are scattered trees within the site and extending into the local garden landscape. Aerial imagery shows the landscape to have a residential character, with developed areas interspersed with woodland glades and parks. Waterbodies can be found nearby, such as Windmill Pond (100m south) and Emm Brook (300m east).				
Priority Habitats and Designated Sites				
Summary of Survey Findings <u>Priority Habitats</u> There are 4 priority habitats located within 2 km of the site, comprising deciduous woodland, traditional orchard, ancient & semi-natural woodland and wood pasture and parkland. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located ~195 m SE of the site. The site is considered disconnected from these nearby habitats, given that it is immediately surrounded by urban and residential land on all sides, along with Reading Road to the north which is subject to high volumes of vehicle traffic. <u>Designated Sites</u> There is 1 statutory site within 2 km of the site. This is listed below: <i>Table 1a: Statutory sites within 2km of the site.</i> <table><tr><th>Designation</th><th>Distance from site</th></tr><tr><td>Holt Copse & Joel Park Local Nature Reserve</td><td>790m E</td></tr></table>	Designation	Distance from site	Holt Copse & Joel Park Local Nature Reserve	790m E
Designation	Distance from site			
Holt Copse & Joel Park Local Nature Reserve	790m E			

The site falls 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.

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

Recommendations

No recommendations.

Fauna

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

Table 2: Survey weather conditions

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
02/04/2026	8.1	67	75	14.8	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. 8 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
2016-24486-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>)	700m northeast	Damage/destruction of a resting place
EPSM2009-1496	Noctule (<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>)	600m east	Affects/damage/destruction to a breeding place
2015-11806-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	850m west	Damage/destruction of a resting place
2015-13607-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	950m east	Destruction of a resting place
2016-22176-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>)	1.6km south	Destruction of a resting place
2020-48489-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>), brown long-eared bat	1.5km east	Damage/destruction of a resting place
2014-2425-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat, common pipistrelle	1.6km east	Destruction of a resting place
2014-964-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat	1.5km east	Damage/destruction of a resting place

Buildings

Building B1 Description

B1 is a two-storey, detached, brick-built dwelling. The main roof is gabled and constructed with interlocking concrete tiles. The front and rear of the property feature dormer windows, clad with concrete hanging tiles. Across all elevations, the windows and doors are uPVC windows. The soffit boxes, present on the northern and southern elevations are also comprised of uPVC.

All brickwork was seen to be in perfect condition. All interlocking tiles were seen to be gapless with none missing, and the hanging tiles present on the dormer windows were flush. The condition of the building was consistently excellent, and no defects were noted. No suitability for crevice or void dwelling species of bat was noted around the building or within it.

No bat evidence was recorded during the survey of this building.

In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B1 is assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats owing to an absence of features that could be used by void or crevice dwelling species of bats.



B1, main dwelling, northern elevation

			 <i>B1, southern elevation</i>
Feature	Materials	Condition/Suitability	Photographs
Voids	Bitumen felt	There is one void space within B1, featuring timber beams and a bitumen felt lining. To the east and west, the gable ends were comprised of brick. The floor was uninsulated, and comprised of floorboards. No light ingress or access points were noted within the void, and no bat evidence such as droppings, staining or feeding remains were found during the inspection.	

			Loft void, B1, facing east
--	--	--	----------------------------

Building B2 Description			
B2 is a single-storey, semi-detached, brick-built garage with metal soffit boxes. The main roof is flat and constructed from metal sheeting. All soffits were observed to be gapless. The brickwork was seen to be in excellent condition, with no cracks or suitable crevices that could be used by bats. The building was thoroughly inspected, and no access points were seen leading into the building. No bat evidence was found during the survey of this structure. In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B2 is assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats due to an absence of features that could be used by crevice or void dwelling species of bats.		 B2, northern elevation	

Building B3 Description			
-------------------------	--	--	--

B3 is a detached, single-storey, pitched-roof plastic shed. It was well sealed, and no points of access were noted internally or externally. No bat evidence was found anywhere within the building.

In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B3 is assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats since it lacks the traditional features that could be used by crevice or void dwelling species.



B3, eastern elevation

Building B4 Description

B4 is a single-storey, detached, timber-framed office building. The main roof structure is flat and constructed of timber. No bat evidence was recorded during the survey of this building.

The timber walls were inspected and no cracking, splitting or overlapping was noted across the elevations. No access points were noted into the void. Internally, the void also lacks any features that could be used by void dwelling species.

In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B4 is assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats since it lacks any features that could be used by void or crevice dwelling species.



B4



B4

Building B5 Description

B5 is a detached, single-storey, timber-framed shed. The main roof is pitched and clad in bitumen felt. The walls were seen to be in good condition, with no areas of split wood or overlapping timber that could provide roosting opportunities for crevice dwelling species of bat.

The building's construction renders the building's void unsuitable for roosting bats, since the large glass windows and timber walls subject it to constant fluctuations in temperature. The windows also allow large amounts of light ingress into the interior.

No bat evidence was found during the survey.

In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B5 is assessed to have negligible habitat value for roosting bats due to no features that could be used by void or crevice dwelling species.



B5

There were no trees onsite that were deemed to have suitable features for roosting bats; all trees will be retained in line with current development plans.

Impacts

Trees

All trees are to be retained and therefore no impacts on roosting bats are anticipated as a result of the development.

Buildings

In line with development plans, B1 will be undergoing a double storey side extension to the west and a single storey side extension to the east. Buildings B2-B5 are to be retained. All buildings onsite have been assessed to have negligible suitability for roosting bats, and no features that could be used by bats were identified on B1-B5. No impacts on roosting bats are anticipated as a result of the development.

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.

Recommendations

None.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

The vegetated garden and associated trees and shrubs onsite could be used by local bat populations to forage and commute. The site is well connected to other suitable habitats via a network of hedgerows and scattered trees that characterise the local garden landscape.

Impacts

No habitats will be lost to facilitate the development and no new lighting will be installed as a result of the proposed development. No impacts to bats are anticipated as a result of the development.

Recommendations

The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for foraging bats:

- The installation of two bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats.

The bat boxes will be incorporated either into the fabric of the new dwelling or on retained trees around the site. They 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.

Birds

Summary of Survey Findings

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on the site. B1-B5 were assessed to have negligible suitability for nesting birds; however, all vegetation and trees onsite could offer suitable nesting and nest building opportunities for 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

No suitable habitat will be removed to facilitate the development; however, the proposed development could result in the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests in the vicinity.

Recommendations

Works should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of surrounding vegetation should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work.

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, depending on species present, until the young have fledged.

Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plans



BLOCK PLAN
Based upon the Ordnance Survey 1:1250 map
with permission of the controller of her Majesty's
Stationary Office @ Crown Copyright.
Licence number 100060020

DATE	NOTE	REV	MR & MRS KEDIA SINGLE & DOUBLE STOREY EXTENSION 162, READING ROAD WOKINGHAM RG41 1LH PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN 10/P-02
SCALE 1:500 @ A4	FEB 2026	VK	

Appendix 2: Site Location Plan



Appendix 3: PRA Plan



Appendix 4: Site Photographs



Photo 1: B1, main dwelling, northern elevation



Photo 2: B1, southern elevation



Photo 3: B2, northern elevation



Photo 4: B3, eastern elevation



Photo 5: B4, southern aspect



Photo 6: B4 internal inspection



Photo 7: B5, southern elevation

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	0.1	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	15/04/2026
Proof	0.5	Kelly Clarke (Dip H.E), Senior Ecologist	16/04/2026
Final	1.0	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	16/04/2026