

Bat Emergence and Re-Entry Surveys (BERS)

Survey site:

Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN

Client:

Hall Hunter Partnership (Farming)

Report date:

9th July 2024

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application for the proposal described as:
The demolition of the existing buildings and the creation of three new residential plots.

This report is supplementary to the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment report completed by Arbtech Consulting Ltd (2024).

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

This report is an addendum to and must be read in conjunction with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment completed by Arbtech Consulting Limited (2024) for the same site address and client.

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.

Executive Summary

Buildings B1, B3, B4 and B5 were assessed as having low value for roosting bats due to access features on the buildings (holes in the soffit boxes, lifted tiles and gaps around the hanging tiles). As a result of the BERS surveys no bat roosting activity was observed and bats are unlikely to be using B1, B3, B4 or B5. The demolition of these buildings will not likely impact bats. Recommendations for precautionary working methods and enhancements are in table 2.

The site surveys were designed and managed by Nicole Gullan, Holder of Natural England Class 1 Bat Licence and Accredited Agent on a Class 2 Bat Licence.

See surveyor locations in the **BERS plan in Appendix 1.**

Limitations

The western elevations of B4 and B5 were not observable because of the proximity of the tree line on the site boundary, however no bat roosting features were deemed to be present along these elevations during the PRA so this is not assessed to limit the findings or the conclusions of this report.

Table 1: Field Survey							
Dusk Emergence Survey 1							
Building B1, B3, B4 & B5							
Surveyor and position		Lead Surveyor 1 – Autumn Nielsen –observing the south and east elevations of B1 Surveyor 2 – Fraser Barnes –observing the north and west elevations of B1 Surveyor 3 – Stevie Cooper –observing the north and west elevations of B3 Surveyor 4 – Tom Drew –observing the south and east elevations of B3 Surveyor 5 – Bryony Haines –observing the south elevation of B4 Surveyor 6 – Thomas Smith –observing the east elevation of B4 Surveyor 7 – Douwe Boesveld –observing the east elevation of B5					
Weather (start/end)		Temperature (°C): 17.3 Relative humidity (%): 58 Cloud cover (%): 100 Wind (m/s): 0.3 Rain: None			Temperature (°C): 14.9 Relative humidity (%): 72 Cloud cover (%): 100 Wind (m/s): 0 Rain: None		
Equipment used		Echo Meter Touch 2, Magenta 4, Nightfox Whisker Goggles, Nightfox XB5 Infrared Torch					
Results							
Date of survey	Start, end and sunset time	Species and numbers	Roost type	Structure reference	Roost location	Access points	Dimensions and explanation of roost location
04/07/2024	21:06 22:51 21:21	N/A	N/A	B1 B3 B4 B5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Surveyor observations							
Surveyor 1		No bat boosting activity observed. First bat activity at 21:35, a common pipistrelle heard not seen. From 21:41 until 22:05, common pipistrelles were foraging around line of trees between B1 and B3.			N/A		

	flying along southern and western elevations of B1. Last bat activity was at 22:44, a common pipistrelle heard not seen for two minutes.	
<i>IR position</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 1.	<i>Figure 1: Darkest part of survey.</i> 
<i>Surveyor 2</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The first bat activity was at 21:29, a common pipistrelle was heard not seen. Common pipistrelles were then heard and seen foraging regularly along the western elevation from 21:41 until 21:59. Last bat activity was at 22:04, a common pipistrelle passed north to south along western elevation.	N/A
<i>IR position</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 2.	<i>Figure 2: Darkest part of survey.</i>

		
Surveyor 3	No bat roosting activity observed. First bat recorded was a common pipistrelle seen flying from the southeast to the northwest and social calling at 21:29. From 21:35 to 22:20, a common pipistrelle was seen foraging along the tree lines, over the B3, and along the hedgerow. From 22:44 to 22:47, a common pipistrelle was heard not seen. The last bat activity was a brown long-eared bat at 22:47 heard not seen.	N/A
IR position	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 3.	Figure 3: Darkest part of survey.

		
Surveyor 4	No bat roosting activity observed. First bat activity at 21:29, common pipistrelle heard not seen. Common pipistrelles were then seen and heard foraging until 21:55, circling over B3 and along hedge to north of B3. Last bat activity was a common pipistrelle heard not seen at 22:47.	N/A
IR position	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 4.	<i>Figure 4: Darkest part of survey.</i> 
Surveyor 5	No bat roosting activity observed.	N/A

	First bat activity was a common pipistrelle at 21:29, heard not seen. Common pipistrelles were observed foraging in open space between buildings and treeline intermittently between 21:41 and 22:13. Last bat activity was a noctule at 22:47, heard not seen.	
<i>IR position</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 5.	<i>Figure 5: Darkest part of survey.</i> 
<i>Surveyor 6</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The first bat activity was a noctule seen passing northwest to southeast to the south of B4/B5 at 21:31. Between 21:43 and 22:15, 14 common pipistrelles were observed foraging above B4 and B5. Their flight path would regularly take them north to south and vice versa, often circling towards B3. The last bat of the survey was a common pipistrelle foraging from the east to the southwest at 22:47.	N/A
<i>IR position</i>	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 6.	<i>Figure 6: Darkest part of survey.</i>

		
Surveyor 7	No bat roosting activity observed. First bat activity was a noctule at 21:31, seen flying northwest to southeast at the southern end of B4/B5. Between 21:43 and 22:13, common pipistrelles were regularly seen foraging over the top of the B5. At 22.15, 22.16 and 22.47 common pipistrelles were seen passing along the eastern elevations of B4/B5, flying southwest to northeast, the last being the last bat activity of the survey.	N/A
IR position	No bat roosting activity observed. The footage reflected the view of surveyor 7.	<i>Figure 7: Darkest part of survey.</i> 

Table 2: Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations	
<i>Survey Results Summary</i>	No bat roosting activity was observed by surveyors or from a review of IR camera footage. As such, a likely absence of roosting bats is confirmed from B1, B3, B4 and B5.
<i>Impact Assessment</i>	Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within these buildings (B1, B3, B4 and B5) and as such, there are not any anticipated impacts on bats at this site as a result of the proposed development. Artificial Lighting The proposed development will include the use of lighting which could spill on to bat roosting, foraging or commuting habitat and deter bats from using these areas.
<i>Recommendations</i>	In the unlikely event a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice. Artificial Lighting A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during and post-development, which will include the following measures: • Light spill on to the trees and shrubs should be avoided (as this is a foraging corridor for common pipistrelles and likely other species of bat). • Use narrow spectrum light sources to lower the range of species affected by lighting. • Use light sources that emit minimal ultra-violet light. • Avoid white and blue wavelengths of the light spectrum to reduce insect attraction and where white light sources are required in order to manage the blue shortwave length content they should be of a warm / neutral colour temperature <4,200 kelvin. • Not use bare bulbs and any light pointing upwards. The spread of light will be kept in line with or below the horizontal. • Light spill will be reduced via the use of low-level lighting used in conjunction with hoods, cowls, louvers and shields. Lights will also be directional to ensure that light is directed to the intended areas only.

	External lighting will be on PIR sensors that are sensitive to large objects only (so that they are not triggered by passing bats) and will be set to the shortest time duration to reduce the amount of time the lights are on. Wall lights and security lights will be 'dimmable' and set to the lowest light intensity settings. There are several products on the market that allow the control of the light intensity and the duration that the lights are on. All lighting on the developed site will make use of the most up to date technology available.
<i>Enhancements</i>	The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF (2023). The following are suggested enhancements which could be incorporated into the proposal to improve the biodiversity value of the site post-development. - The installation of three bat boxes (one for each new dwelling) at the site to provide roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes should be incorporated into the fabric of the new dwellings. They should be suitable for pipistrelles (which have been identified as using the site during BERS). Suitable bat boxes include Habitat Bat Box, Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box or similar alternative brand. - Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level in a southern or southwestern direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light. - Planting of native trees and shrubs throughout the development as this is a foraging habitat for common pipistrelles and likely other species of bat.
<i>Bibliography</i>	- Arbtech Consulting Ltd. (2024). Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment: Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN. - Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London. - Garland, L. & Markham, S. (2008) Is Important Bat Foraging and Commuting Habitat Legally Protected? http://biodiversitybydesign.co.uk/cmsAdmin/uploads/protection-for-bat-habitat-sep-2007.pdf - Institution of Lighting Professionals (2018). Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK. Bats and the Built Environment Series Publication: http://www.bats.org.uk/news.php/406/new_guidance_on_bats_and_lighting.

	- JNCC (2004). Bat Workers Manual, 3rd Edition. http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2861 - Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough. - Wray, S., Wells, D., Long, E. and Mitchell-Jones, T (2010). Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment. IEEM In-Practice. Number 70 (December 2010). Pp. 23-25.
--	---

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Autumn Nielsen (BSc, MSc), Assistant Ecologist	09/07/2024
Proof	0.2	Nicole Gullan, Senior Ecological and Arboricultural Consultant	09/07/2024
Final	1.0	Nicole Gullan, Senior Ecological and Arboricultural Consultant	09/07/2024

Appendix 1: BERS Plan

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

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.