



Mr Craig Riley
11 Dukes Wood
Crowthorne Berkshire
RG45 6NF

10 September 2024

Dear Craig,

Re: Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment – 11 Dukes Wood, Crowthorne, RG45 6NF

I am writing to confirm that I completed a preliminary bat roost assessment (PRA) of the above property on 4 September 2024 during daylight hours in dry and bright weather conditions. I am a professional ecologist with 30+ years of experience and a licenced bat surveyor¹.

Survey Approach

I completed a systematic inspection of the exterior of the dwelling house and its adjoining garage, and internal inspection of the loft space in the house and interior of the garage using binoculars, and a high powered torch to look for evidence of bats and potential roost features that could be adversely effected by the development proposal. The survey was completed in accordance with current best practice bat survey guidelines², at a time of year when bats were active and evidence of their presence on unsheltered external surfaces would have been expected to be visible.

Survey Findings

The house was of brick construction dating from the 1970s and had a pitched concrete pantile covered gable ended roof with dormers on opposite pitches and was completely devoid of evidence of bat presence. The exterior of the dormers and gable ends of the house were covered in shiplap timber cladding. The loft space was clean and dry with a traditional 1F roofing felt evident below the tiles. The loft was devoid of any evidence of bats, which included a complete absence of bat dropping and other debris on the fibreglass insulation across the loft floor that appeared, from a notice or work pinned to a rafter, to have been installed 16 years ago. The garage was a simple brick built building with an unlined cement sheet mono-pitch roof covering with unsealed eaves and was also devoid of bat evidence.

The house was in good structural condition with no missing, lifted or slipped roof tiles, and the shiplap cladding on the gable ends and dormers was all tightly fitted with no obvious gaps suitable for bats to access behind the cladding. The roof soffits were also all intact and tightly fitted and offered no obvious access points for roosting bats. There were two small lead flashing lifts around the base of the two roof mounted chimneys but no associated evidence bats.

¹ Holds three separate licences pertaining to bat survey: WML-CL18; WML-CL21; and WML-CL32 and has been a registered bat roost volunteer visitor for Natural England (WML-CL15). Holds class licences in relation to badger (WML-CL35) and great crested newt (WML-CL09 & WML-CL33), hazel dormouse (WML-CL10A), and native crayfish (WML-CL11).

² Collins, J (2023) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist – Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition)*. BCT, London,

In summary given the complete absence of bat evidence and lack of potential bat roost features, I would suggest that the house and garage do not support roosting bats, and I would assess both buildings as having **negligible bat roost suitability**, requiring no further survey or assessment in relation to your redevelopment proposal.

A selection of Site photos taken on the day of survey are provided below.



Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

Dr Duncan Painter CEnv MCIEEM

Director

On behalf of Applied Ecology Ltd