

Inspired Education Group
24th June 2025.

Dear James Parsons,

Planning reference 243228; Final bat survey results to inform proposed new boarding house.

This letter is written to conclude the results from the phase 2 bat surveys undertaken on several trees and a Maintenance Building at Reddam House, where their removal and demolition is required to build a new boarding house.

Recommendations for further surveys were made within a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA, Ethos Environmental Planning, Dec 2024) on several trees and one building with potential roosting features. Further surveys were requested by the council to inform their decision on the planning application.

Background

The following recommendations were made within the PEA:

“The following further surveys will be required and the results presented within an Ecological Impact Assessment:

- *One emergence survey should be carried out on the maintenance building during the active bat season (May – August inclusive) to ascertain the buildings status in regard to roosting bats.*
- *T13, T18 and the double trunked beech tree from G5 should be subject to further aerial inspection surveys to determine whether they support roosting bats. All of these trees are accessible from the adjacent car park and the features may be able to be inspected through use of a MEWP. If not, tree climbing surveys will be required to identify whether the features are suitable for roosting bats. The surveys will determine whether bats are present as well as the requirements for mitigation, compensation and licensing to allow the trees to be removed legally without impacting bats.*
- *T21 is to be retained as part of the development however, if it is likely to be impacted by the introduction of artificial lighting, surveys would also be required on this tree, similar to T18 and T13. The surveys should be spread across the survey season where possible, but at least 1 month apart.”*

Surveys Undertaken Onsite: Buildings

Maintenance Building

A single emergence survey was undertaken on the Maintenance Building on 3rd June 2024 and did not record any emerging bats or other use of the building by bats and concluded that this is unlikely to be a roost. It was noted that the damaged roof tiles, had a patch repair of roofing felt since last surveyed in December 2024.

Two surveyors and one thermal camera (Flir t540) were utilised to survey the building with suitable coverage of any potential roosting features. The survey started 15 minutes before sunset and concluded 1.5hrs post sunset. Each surveyor was equipped with a EMT2 Pro as a bat detector. One surveyor was positioned at the north of the building, covering NE and NW elevations, the second surveyor was at the south of the building with thermal camera covering SW and SE elevations. The footage from the thermal camera was reviewed post survey to ensure no bats were missed.

A summary of the survey found very little bat activity with Soprano and Common pipistrelle bats only, with minimal foraging behaviour noted around the building and occasional commuting.

It is concluded that the building is unlikely to support roosting bats and no further surveys are recommended on this building prior to its demolition.

Surveys Undertaken Onsite: Trees

Survey 1; 3rd June 2025

Four trees with potential features for bats that could be impacted by the proposals had one initial climbing survey conducted. All features could be suitably accessed. Two of the trees can be downgraded to PRF-I only or negligible. Remaining two (T13+T18) trees offered good PRF-m features however no evidence of bats was recorded. Results are provided in the table below.

Survey 2; 24th June 2025

Trees T13 and T18 had the subsequent second climb to assess the PRF-m features. T13 had one notable tear out/rot hole feature that extended 2m up the trunk but had a sludgy internal substance with the cavity and no signs of bats. Two other PRF-m features remained in the same condition and no signs of bats were recorded.

T18 offers a single PRF-m feature on a trunk that was fully investigated. The feature was in the same condition as survey 1 and no field signs of bats were recorded.

Recommendations

Bats

No further surveys are recommended for this site providing the following mitigation and compensation is provided, which should be conditioned in the first instance.

All PRF-I features identified within the surveys, ground level assessment and climbing surveys, should be compensated on a 1:1 ratio as recommended by best practice. These compensation boxes should be secured by condition once the final surveys are completed onsite. Table 3 below outlines the number of boxes to be supplied as compensation.

Compensation boxes should replicate the loss of potential roosting features on a like for like basis, as such 2 boxes suitable for multiple bats (maternity boxes), as well as 12 standard boxes more suited for small numbers of bats must be installed in suitable locations around the school.

For the enhancement of the site for bats, a further 2 standard bat boxes are recommended to be installed. All bat boxes should be made of a woodcrete style material to ensure the longevity of the compensation.

The specification and location of these boxes should be part of the condition required by the council when discharging conditions.

Table 1: Recommended bat compensation and enhancement features

Tree reference	Number/type PRFs	Total	Bat box requirements
T13	PRF-m x 1 PRF-I x 7	PRF-m = 2 PRF-I - 12	2 x maternity boxes 14 x standard boxes
T18	PRF-m x 1 PRF-I x 0		
T21	PRF-I x 5		
G5 (twin trunk sweet chestnut)	None found.		

Birds

Bird boxes, with a range of entrances should be installed as compensation for the loss of potential nesting habitat within onsite trees. Given that three old bird nests were recorded during the climbing surveys and a total of 14 cavities are being lost, some of which are likely to also be suitable for nesting birds, a total of 10 bird boxes are recommended. All bird boxes should be made of a woodcrete style material to ensure the longevity of the compensation.

The specification and location of these boxes should be part of the condition required by the council when discharging conditions.

Tree removal timing is recommended to be outside of breeding bird season, which runs between March-end of August each year. The felling of these trees in winter will ensure that nesting birds are not impacted (under the Wildlife and Countryside Act). If the trees must be removed during the breeding bird season for unavoidable program works, a breeding bird check prior to their removal will be required. This breeding bird check may require the use of tree climbers to ensure that cavity nests are inactive, as this may not be visible from the ground level following usual survey methods.

Conclusions

Tree climbing and emergence surveys for potential bat presence has been undertaken at Reddam House to facilitate the planning process of the proposed new boarding lodge. Further surveys were undertaken in line with the recommendations of the PEA. The findings did not identify any roosting bats within building or trees, and the overall bat activity was low onsite. The Maintenance building requires no further survey and is unlikely to support roosting bats. Onsite surveys found two trees offering PRF-m features which were surveyed on two occasions by tree climbing surveys. Given the overall bat activity onsite being low, and two negative surveys, the survey effort is proportionate and the recommended compensation features is adequate for the loss of onsite features.

Recommendations have been made and should be followed to ensure best practice and the avoidance of breaking legislation in the protection of fauna.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew Attrill
Principal Ecologist,
Ethos Environmental Planning

Table 2: Results from survey one

Tree reference	Results
T13	PRF 1 15m high on N limb. decaying tear out facing SE. tear out entrance is 40cm high x 5cm wide. recesses upwards 29cm with a depth of 8cm. does not recess down. inside cavity dry and clean with no evidence of bats. used endoscope to fully inspect and UV light. apex is domed. PRF 2 small decaying knot hole on S limb (dead at top). feature facing N. entrance is 10cm high x 5cm wide and recess upwards 5cm with a depth of 3cm. densely cobwebbed with no evidence of bats. PRF3 woodpecker hole with decaying knot hole on SE limb approximately 8m high. two features are linked facing SE and SW respectively. recess down 5cm to old bird nest and 5cm up to wedge apex. woodpecker hole densely cobwebbed at entrance. entrance height of WPH 5cm and width 5cm. entrance height and width of knot hole 8cm x 8cm. the depth of the feature is 8cm. PRF 4 is a decaying tear out. entrance is 10cm wide x 15cm high facing N on C stem. no down recess, with high accumulation of debris. recess up at least 1.2m.
T18	dead limb is not a feature does not recess. all apparent features blind. PRF2 tear out on top of S limb approximately 10m high. feature faces upwards. smells of dirt. 28cm high entrance and 11cm wide. spire apex full of sludge. dry closer to entrance. recesses 60cm up limb with entrance facing NE. DBH at feature 18cm.
T21	lifted bark is generally superficial will limited cavities. the small cavities under the lifted bark is dry but exposed to the elements and does not offer a stable environment. fissure identified on E elevation is blind and does not recess. Woodpecker holes are not features. dead limb (PRF4) 15m high facing NW has tear out on end of limb approximately 3m from stem. feature facing slightly up and recesses 10cm. feature is open.
G5 (double trunked sweet chestnut)	Only potential features are the missing tips of both trunks of the tree. On inspection features were some flaking bark but no recess. decay patches are superficial and do not recess. downgrade tree to negligible.

Table 3: Tree results from survey 2

Tree reference	Results
T13	2x additional potential PRFs identified at 16m prf 5 and 17m prf 6 high, facing SW. same stem as PRF 1. both PRFs are decaying knot holes but neither recess into a suitable feature. DBH at both PRFs 20cm. prf 5 entrance height is 2cm, width 5cm and recess of 5cm. densely cobwebbed internally. prf 5 entrance height is 15cm and width 6cm with recess of 2cm. PRF 1 as before no evidence of bats. fully inspected. DBH at prf is 20cm. PRF 7 small decaying knot hole below PRF 1 likely dismissed last survey. entrance height 6cm, width 4cm and recess upwards 2cm DBH 20cm. no evidence of bats. PRF 2 same as previous, DBH 20cm. no evidence of bats. PRF4 fully inspected. recess 2m up stem. high sludge throughout + woodlice and slugs. feature PRF-M but due to sludge less suitable than first assessed. DBH 30cm. PRF 3. same as before. DBH 20cm. no evidence of bats
T18	No new features found on trees and existing feature at 10m on S limb was fully inspected with no evidence of bats found.

Table 4: Results summary of tree climbing survey

Tree reference	Recommendation	Photo	
G5 (double trunked sweet chestnut)	Downgrade tree to negligible suitability.	Southern trunk 	Northern trunk 
T13	Compensate for loss of features	Tear out at 15m   Tear out with internal cavity	Internally linked woodpecker holes 

T18	Compensate for loss of features	Tear out with cavity 	
T21	Reduce feature suitability from PRF-m to multiple PRF-I and compensate for impact to features	Largest desiccation crack  Example birds nest 	Example lifted bark 