

47 Samborne Drive
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 1GF

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Report ref.: R3057_PRA_a

Report Quality Control Information	
Author	Meghan Porter-Smith (Qualifying member of CIEEM)
Reviewer	Vicky Potts MCIEEM

October 2025



1 Diesel House, Honey Hill, Wokingham, Berkshire RG40 3BL
Telephone: 0118 3271810 Mobile: 07979 403099 E-mail: info@wenman-ecology.co.uk
www.wenman-ecology.co.uk

John Wenman Ecological Consultancy LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC339057.
Registered office: 100 New Wokingham Road, Crowthorne, Berkshire RG45 6JP where you may look at a list of members' names.

CONTENTS PAGE

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.1	Project Background.....	4
2.2	Site Location and Context.....	4
2.3	Report Objectives	4
3	LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY BACKGROUND.....	5
3.1	Relevant Legislation.....	5
3.2	Planning Policy	5
3.3	Mitigation Licensing	6
4	SURVEY METHODOLOGY	7
4.1	Desk Study	7
4.2	Building Inspection.....	7
5	SURVEY RESULTS.....	10
5.1	Desk Study	10
5.2	Building Inspection.....	10
6	DISCUSSION	14
6.1	Assessment of Roost Suitability.....	14
6.2	Impact Assessment and Recommended Actions.....	14
7	REFERENCES	15
	APPENDIX 1 – POTENTIAL SUITABILITY CATEGORIES FOR ROOSTING BATS	16
	APPENDIX 2 – FURTHER SURVEY RATIONALE	17
	APPENDIX 3 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS	18

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1.1** John Wenman Ecological Consultancy was instructed by Mr Jack Smith to prepare a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) for 47 Samborne Drive in Wokingham, Berkshire. The PRA was commissioned to accompany a planning application to be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council seeking consent for the conversion of the loft into a habitable space.
- 1.1.2** A site visit was undertaken on the 14th October 2025 by Meghan Porter-Smith and Jake Morgan, both registered under Natural England Survey Class Licence CL17.
- 1.1.3** There was no evidence of bats observed within the roof void, and no external features providing ingress opportunities for void-dwelling bats, such as common brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*) bats and therefore it is considered highly unlikely these species are present. There was a gap below the verge cap at the apex of the southern gable, which could provide a suitable crevice for any opportunistic use by roosting bats, such as the locally recorded pipistrelle species. Therefore, the house has been classified as low suitability for roosting bats (see **Appendix 1** for potential suitability categories).
- 1.1.4** The potential roost feature at the gable will remain unaffected by the development proposals, which includes the conversion of the loft void into habitable space with the addition of skylights on the front and rear elevation of the roof, and therefore it is considered highly unlikely to result in the damage and/or destruction of a bat roost or cause disturbance, injury and/or death of bats. Therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required for the works to proceed lawfully.
- 1.1.5** In the unlikely event that bats are encountered during the works, works must stop immediately and a suitably licensed ecologist should be called to site attend to the bat and provide advice on how to proceed.
- 1.1.6** This report contains information regarding a mobile species so it will likely be valid for 12 months only (CIEEM 2019).

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Project Background

2.1.1 John Wenman Ecological Consultancy was instructed by Mr Jack Smith to prepare a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) for 47 Samborne Drive in Wokingham, Berkshire.

2.1.2 The PRA was commissioned to accompany a planning application to be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council seeking consent for the conversion of the loft into a habitable space (Refer to proposed and existing plans in **Appendix 3**)

2.2 Site Location and Context

2.2.1 The end of terrace house is located on the northern side of Samborne Drive, in Wokingham, approximately 1.5km east of the town centre (central OS grid reference: SU 82972 68692).

2.2.2 The site is surrounded by residential properties and their respective gardens, with a tree-lined footpath 85m to the west and open grassland of Buckhurst Meadows 160m to the south-east. The wider landscape is characterised by urban buildings to the north and west, with open greenspace and parcels of woodland present to the south-east.

2.3 Report Objectives

2.3.1 The aim of the PRA is to ascertain if there is evidence of the presence of bats and/or potential for roosting bats to be present, and therefore whether further survey and/or mitigation would be required for the proposed development activities.

3 LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY BACKGROUND

3.1 Relevant Legislation

3.1.1 In England and Wales, all bat species found in the wild are fully protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (WCA) and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended); the regulations are commonly referred to as the Habitat Regulations and hereafter referred to as such. The Habitat Regulations refer to European Protected Species (EPS) and all species of bats in the United Kingdom (UK) are EPS. Although the UK left the European Union on the 31st January 2020 and is therefore no longer tied to European legislation, the Habitat Regulations have been retained in their current format.

3.1.2 The legal framework underpinned by the WCA and Habitat Regulations makes these specific actions an offence as follows:

- Deliberately kill, injure, capture or take a wild bat;
- Deliberately, intentionally or recklessly disturb bats; in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, to rear or nurture their young, to hibernate or migrate, or to significantly affect local distribution or abundance;
- Damage or destroy a place used by a bat for breeding or resting; and
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any place used by a bat for shelter or protection.

3.2 Planning Policy

3.2.1 The biodiversity duty imposed through the Environment Act 2021 states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) must consider what action they can take to conserve and enhance biodiversity in England. Government planning policy, such as the ODPM Circular 06/2005, requires LPAs to account for the conservation of protected species when considering and determining planning applications.

3.2.2 The ODPM Circular 06/2005 states that *'the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat.'* This policy means that in instances where there is a reasonable likelihood of bats being present and affected by a development, surveys must be undertaken to inform a mitigation strategy to be agreed prior to granting planning permission.

3.3 Mitigation Licensing

3.3.1 The government's statutory nature conservation body, Natural England, is responsible for issuing European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licences that would permit activities that would otherwise lead to an infringement of the Habitat Regulations. An EPS mitigation licence can be issued if the following three tests derived from Regulation 55 have been satisfied:

- (2)(e) – the derogation is for the purposes of '*preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment.*'
- (9)(a) – there is '*no satisfactory alternative*' to the derogation; and
- (9)(b) – '*the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.*'

3.3.2 LPAs have a statutory duty under Regulation 7(3)(e) of the Habitat Regulations to consider and determine whether these three tests are likely to be satisfied by planning proposals affecting EPS before granting planning permission. If an EPS mitigation licence is necessary, a licence can be sought once all the necessary planning consents have been granted. Natural England aims to issue a decision on licence applications within 30 working days of submission.

3.3.3 The Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL) scheme allows ecologists to apply to become Registered Consultants to use this licence for low conservation status roosts, i.e. roosts comprising small numbers of seven commonly occurring species. A site registration form must be completed as a condition of the licence and submitted to Natural England at least three weeks before the licensable activities are due to start; Natural England aims to register sites within two weeks of submission.

3.3.4 Baseline survey information supporting EPS mitigation licence applications or BMCL site registrations must be up-to-date and have been completed within the current or most recent optimal season. A suitably experienced ecologist will be required to undertake a site walkover/check within three months prior to application/registration submission to confirm that conditions have not changed since the most recent survey.

4 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

4.1 Desk Study

4.1.1 A desk-based study for bats was undertaken to collate and review existing information about the site and the surrounding land. The study utilised the following open access resources:

- Google Earth and OS maps – satellite imagery and maps were used to identify potential flight paths and foraging habitats;
- MAGIC – examined to locate granted European Protected Species (EPS) licences; and
- Pre-existing bat reports – any available reports were obtained from the client or relevant planning portal to provide background information for the site.

4.2 Building Inspection

Survey Details

4.2.1 A detailed inspection of the exterior and interior of the property was undertaken on the 14th October 2025 by Meghan Porter-Smith registered under Natural England Bat Survey Class Licence CL17 (Registration no.: 2023-11300-CL17-BAT) and Jake Morgan registered under Natural England Bat Survey Class Licence CL17 (Registration no.: 2025-80417-SCI-CL17), in accordance with good practice guidelines (Collins 2023). The equipment used during the inspection comprised binoculars, a high-power (1 million candlepower) LED torch, a headtorch, ladder and PPE (facemask, gloves etc.). The inspection involved a systematic search of the exterior and interior of the building during daylight hours to compile information on potential and actual bat access points; potential and actual bat roost sites; and any evidence of bat presence.

External Survey

4.2.2 Frequently used bat access points and/or roost sites include (but are not limited to) spaces:

- behind hanging tiles, weatherboarding, soffit boxes and barge boards;
- under lead flashing (particularly around chimneys) and roof tiles/slates; and
- in existing bat boxes.

4.2.3 It is important to note that the two most abundant and widespread bat species, common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*),

typically only require gaps measuring 15mm by 20mm to gain access to a roost inside a building.

4.2.4 The external survey involved a systematic search for evidence of bats including:

- live or dead specimens;
- droppings;
- urine marks;
- fur-oil staining; and
- squeaking noises.

4.2.5 It should be noted that bats can be present in a building while leaving no visible signs externally and wet weather has the potential to wash any evidence away. The search for evidence was focused on (but was not limited to) the ground, windowsills, windowpanes and walls (including cladding and hanging tiles); particularly in places near to potential bat access points and/or roost sites.

Internal Survey

4.2.6 The internal survey comprised a systematic search for evidence of bats on the upper floors of the building (i.e. checking the exterior from windows) and inside the roof and eave spaces. Evidence of bats found during an internal inspection can include:

- live or dead specimens;
- droppings;
- urine marks;
- fur-oil staining;
- feeding remains (i.e. moth wings);
- squeaking noises;
- bat-fly (Nycteribiid) pupal cases; and
- odour.

4.2.7 It should be noted that only specimens or droppings can be relied upon in isolation to confirm the presence of a bat roost.

4.2.8 Frequently used roosting locations within the roof include (but are not limited to):

- the apex of the gable end or dividing walls;

- the top of chimney breasts;
- ridge and hip beams;
- mortise and tenon joints;
- behind purlins; and
- between tiles and roof lining.

Survey Limitations and Validity

- 4.2.9** There were no significant survey limitations because PRAs can be carried out at any time of year under any weather conditions and the building was fully accessible.
- 4.2.10** It should be noted that it is not always possible to inspect all potential roost sites during a survey, particularly for bat species which typically roost in hidden crevices. Therefore, an absence of bat evidence found during a survey does not necessarily equate to evidence of bat absence in a building.
- 4.2.11** This report contains information regarding a mobile species so it will likely be valid for 12 months only (CIEEM 2019).

5 SURVEY RESULTS

5.1 Desk Study

- 5.1.1** The site is located on an urban area with nearby lines of trees to the west of the site, which likely acts as a flight path to nearby open grassland, offering high quality foraging habitat for any bats roosting locally.
- 5.1.2** Bat mitigation licences that have been granted within the last 10 years inside a 2km radius of the site are detailed in **Table 1** below.

Table 1. Bat mitigation licences granted within a 2km radius (Source: MAGIC).

Case Reference of Granted Licence	Species on the Licence	Licensable Period	Licensable Works	Distance (m)
2018-34805-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared & common pipistrelle	2018 – 2023	Destruction of a resting place	~1330SW
2018-37587-EPS-MIT-1	Brown long-eared, common pipistrelle & soprano pipistrelle	2018 – 2023	Destruction of a breeding site and resting place	~1550NE
2019-43804-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle & soprano pipistrelle	2020 – 2025	Destruction of a resting place	~2000NE

5.2 Building Inspection

Overview

- 5.2.1** The findings from the external and internal inspections carried out for the house are described with photographs, as follows:

External Survey

- 5.2.2** The end of terrace house was of modern brickwork construction, with a pitched roof (**Photographs 1 & 2**).



Photograph 1. Front of the property viewed from the west.



Photograph 2. Rear of the property viewed from the east.

- 5.2.3** The roof featured flat overlapping roof tiles with occasional plastic vent tiles present on the eastern elevation (**Photograph 3**). The roof featured tightly fitted ridge tiles across the roof (**Photograph 4**).



Photograph 3. Flat roof tiles with vents (rear elevation).



Photograph 4. Tight and intact ridge tiles (front elevation).

- 5.2.4** The lead flashing was flat where the porch roof joined the house on the front elevation (**Photograph 5**). The barge board was tight to the brickwork on both the front and rear elevations (**Photograph 6**). The verge caps along the southern gable were tight to the brickwork, while the verge cap at the apex had a slight gap underneath, which could offer roosting opportunities for crevice-dwelling species (**Photograph 7; Target note 1**).



Photograph 5. Lead flashing flush to wall above porch roof (front elevation).



Photograph 6. Barge board tight to brickwork (rear elevation).



Photograph 7. Gap below the verge cap at the apex (southern elevation).

- 5.2.5** No evidence of bat roost presence was identified during the external inspection.

Internal Survey

- 5.2.6** The inside of the void had a floor to ridge height of approximately 3m and was of pre-trussed rafter construction (**Photograph 8**). The roof was lined with a breathable roofing membrane that was mostly intact, apart from slight gaps created for ventilation tiles and extraction flues (**Photograph 9**).



Photograph 8. Roof void.



Photograph 9. Tear in breathable roofing membrane around ventilation tile (roof void).

- 5.2.7** The ridge was clear of cobwebs (**Photograph 10**). The void was partly boarded, with thick fibreglass insulation present throughout which filled the eaves (**Photograph 11**).



Photograph 10. The cobweb free ridge (roof void).



Photograph 11. Fibreglass insulation on floor filling the eaves (roof void).

- 5.2.8** The party wall was of plasterboard construction, with fibreglass insulation present between the edge of the boarding and the timber rafters (**Photograph 12**). The southern gable was of chipboard construction which was tight to the timber rafters (**Photograph 13**).




Photograph 12. Fibreglass insulation present around party wall (roof void).



Photograph 13. Southern gable of chipboard construction tight to rafters (roof void).

5.2.9 No evidence of bats or nesting birds was identified during the internal inspection.



n. External target note		n. Internal target note		First roof void	Loft hatch
Drawn by:	Date:	Scale:	47 Samborne Drive, Wokingham		
MP-S	October 2025	Not to scale	Preliminary Roost Assessment Plan		

The logo for John Wenman Ecological Consultancy, featuring the company name in a stylized font with a small graphic of a tree and a sun.

Figure 1. Plan of Preliminary Roost Assessment findings

6 DISCUSSION

6.1 Assessment of Roost Suitability

6.1.1 The site is located within an urban area with a nearby line of mature trees within 100 metres to the western side of the site, which likely acts as a flight path to nearby open grassland, offering high quality foraging habitat for any bats roosting locally. Three bat mitigation licences have been granted within a 2km radius covering three species – brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*).

6.1.2 The house lacks any evidence of roosting bats within the roof void, which is of a size and condition that is suitable for void-dwelling species, such as the locally recorded brown long-eared (*P. auritus*) bat. Externally, there was a gap beneath the verge cap at the apex of the southern gable which could be used by crevice-dwelling bats, such as the locally recorded common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*). Therefore, the house has been classified as having low bat roost suitability (see **Appendix 1** for potential suitability categories).

6.2 Impact Assessment and Recommended Actions

6.2.1 The development proposals include the conversion of the roof void into habitable space, with the addition of skylights on the front and rear elevations and therefore the external potential roost feature at the gable will be retained and available for use by bats in the future. Based on this assessment, no further survey to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats (i.e. emergence survey) is deemed necessary (see **Appendix 2** for Further Survey Rationale).

6.2.2 The proposals are considered highly unlikely to result in the damage and/or destruction of a bat roost or cause disturbance, injury and/or death of bats. Therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required for the works to proceed lawfully.

6.2.3 In the unlikely event that bats are encountered during the works, works must stop immediately and a suitably licensed ecologist should be called to site attend to the bat and provide advice on how to proceed; works should not continue until further written advice has been received. At this stage, an EPS mitigation licence may be required to permit the works to recommence lawfully.

7 REFERENCES

CIEEM (2019). *Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys*. CIEEM, Winchester.

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mathews F., Kubasiewicz L.M., Gurnell J., Harrower C.A., McDonald R.A., Shore R.F. (2018). *A Review of the Population and Conservation Status of British Mammals*. A report by the Mammal Society under contract to Natural England, Natural Resources Wales and Scottish Natural Heritage. Natural England, Peterborough.

Mitchell-Jones, A. J. & McLeish, A. P. (2004). *Bat Workers' Manual (3rd edition)*. JNCC, Peterborough.

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2025). *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats*. Version 1.2. CIEEM, Ampfield.

APPENDIX 1 – POTENTIAL SUITABILITY CATEGORIES FOR ROOSTING BATS

The categories detailed in **Table 2** below are derived from the '*Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition)*' (Collins 2023) and provide guidance for assessing the potential suitability of buildings (and other structures) for roosting bats. These categories are applied using professional judgement and irrespective of whether the presence of a bat roost has been confirmed during a survey, as additional bat roosts could be present which have not yet been discovered.

Table 2. Categories for potential suitability of buildings (and other structures) for roosting bats.

Potential Suitability	Category Justification
None	A building (or structure) that has no features likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of cracks, crevices or voids that could provide suitable shelter).
Negligible	A building (or structure) that has no obvious features likely to be used by roosting bats, but in this case a small element of uncertainty remains as bats will occasionally use small and apparently unsuitable features. This category may also be used where a bat could potentially roost due to one attribute, but it is considered unlikely due to another attribute (e.g. a feature that is subject to constant illumination from artificial lighting).
Low	A building (or structure) that has one or more potential roost sites suitable for opportunistic use by individual bats at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites for bats do not provide sufficient space, shelter, protection, conditions and/or surrounding suitable habitat to be used regularly or by large numbers (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for a maternity colony and not a classic hibernation site).
Moderate	A building (or structure) that has one or more potential roost sites suitable for regular use by individual bats, or small non-breeding groups, due to sufficient space, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat. However, these potential roost sites for bats are unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status with regards to the type of roost only (i.e. maternity colonies and classic hibernation sites).
High	A building (or structure) that has one or more potential roost sites suitable for use by large numbers of bats more regularly and for longer periods of time due to sufficient space, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat. These potential roost sites for bats are capable of supporting high conservation status roosts (i.e. maternity colonies and classic hibernation sites).

APPENDIX 2 – FURTHER SURVEY RATIONALE

In cases where no evidence of use by bats is found during a building inspection but the possibility of their presence cannot be ruled out, further presence/likely absence survey is likely to be required if the development proposals will impact potential roost sites. Emergence surveys are carried out to establish the presence or likely absence of roosting bats in buildings (and other structures) and these are designed in accordance with the '*Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition)*' (Collins 2023) detailed in **Table 3** below.

Table 3. Recommended further survey for establishing presence/likely absence of roosting bats in buildings (and other structures).

Potential Suitability	Further Survey
None	No further surveys are required.
Negligible	No further surveys are required.
Low	A minimum of one dusk emergence survey visit should be undertaken in the period of May to August. However, if all areas (including cracks, crevices and voids) can be thoroughly inspected and no evidence of use by bats is found, then emergence surveys may not be required. In cases where a complete inspection cannot be carried out, professional judgement and proportionality should be applied when assessing the impacts of the development proposals.
Moderate	A minimum of two dusk emergence survey visits should be undertaken in the period of May to September, with at least one of the surveys between May and August; the survey visits should be spaced at least three weeks apart.
High	A minimum of three separate dusk emergence survey visits should be undertaken in the period of May to September (inclusive), with at least two of the surveys between May and August; the survey visits should be spaced at least three weeks apart.

In cases where the PRA and/or further survey establishes the presence of roosting bats in a building (or structure), this will likely trigger the need for roost characterisation to collect sufficient information to inform the impact assessment and mitigation strategy. The roost characterisation comprises information collected during the PRA, emergence surveys and by other methods, such as DNA analysis of bat droppings, and ultimately aims to determine the bat species roosting; the number of bats the roosts support; the roost access points; the locations of the roosts and the types of roost present. This information is crucial when applying for planning permission and/or a European Protected Species mitigation licence.

APPENDIX 3 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

