

8 Culver Lane  
Earley  
Wokingham  
Berkshire  
RG6 1DS

## Preliminary Roost Assessment

Report ref.: R2101\_PRA\_a

| Report Quality Control Information |                     |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Author                             | Lauren Hayward      |
| Reviewer                           | Conor Watson ACIEEM |

**June 2025**



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

|          |                                                                              |           |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                                               | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>                                                     | <b>4</b>  |
| 2.1      | Project Background.....                                                      | 4         |
| 2.2      | Site Location and Context.....                                               | 4         |
| 2.3      | Report Objectives .....                                                      | 4         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY BACKGROUND .....</b>                               | <b>5</b>  |
| 3.1      | Relevant Legislation.....                                                    | 5         |
| 3.2      | Planning Policy .....                                                        | 5         |
| 3.3      | Mitigation Licensing .....                                                   | 6         |
| <b>4</b> | <b>SURVEY METHODOLOGY .....</b>                                              | <b>7</b>  |
| 4.1      | Desk Study .....                                                             | 7         |
| 4.2      | Building Inspection.....                                                     | 7         |
| <b>5</b> | <b>SURVEY RESULTS.....</b>                                                   | <b>10</b> |
| 5.1      | Desk Study .....                                                             | 10        |
| 5.2      | Building Inspection.....                                                     | 10        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>DISCUSSION .....</b>                                                      | <b>17</b> |
| 6.1      | Assessment of Roost Suitability and Presence/Absence.....                    | 17        |
| 6.2      | Impact Assessment and Recommended Actions.....                               | 17        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>REFERENCES .....</b>                                                      | <b>18</b> |
|          | <b>APPENDIX 1 – POTENTIAL SUITABILITY CATEGORIES FOR ROOSTING BATS .....</b> | <b>19</b> |
|          | <b>APPENDIX 2 – DEFINITION OF BAT ROOST TYPES .....</b>                      | <b>20</b> |
|          | <b>APPENDIX 3 – FURTHER SURVEY RATIONALE .....</b>                           | <b>21</b> |

## **1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1.1** John Wenman Ecological Consultancy LLP was commissioned by Mr Usman Ulhaq to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at 8 Culver Lane in Earley, Berkshire. The PRA was commissioned to accompany a planning application to be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council seeking consent for the demolition of the existing bungalow and single garage followed by the construction of a replacement residential dwelling and double garage.
- 1.1.2** A previous PRA produced by John Wenman Ecological Consultancy in August 2021 concludes that: *'The bungalow and garage showed no signs of use by bats and lacked suitable bat roost features and as such, the proposed demolition is considered highly unlikely to lead to the disturbance of bats or lead to the loss of a bat roost during the works and therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required to allow the works to go ahead lawfully.'* The previous PRA is no longer valid and needs to be repeated to provide up-to-date ecological information.
- 1.1.3** A detailed inspection of the exterior and interior of the property was undertaken on the 20<sup>th</sup> May 2025 by Conor Watson ACIEEM (CL18 registered) and Lauren Hayward – seasonal ecologist.
- 1.1.4** The detached bungalow had mostly intact overlapping plain roof tiles and intact soffits that do not provide potential roosting sites for bats. The detached garage was of simple construction with no potential roost sites. Furthermore, no evidence of roosting bats was found in either building during the inspection. Therefore, the detached bungalow and garage have been assigned negligible suitability for roosting bats. As a result, no further survey to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats (i.e. emergence survey) is deemed necessary.
- 1.1.5** The survey findings demonstrate that the proposals are highly unlikely to result in the death, injury or disturbance of bats; the damage or destruction of a bat roost; or the obstruction of access to a bat roost. Therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required to allow the development proposals to proceed lawfully. 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 LLP was commissioned by Mr Usman Ulhaq to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at 8 Culver Lane in Earley, Berkshire. The PRA was commissioned to accompany a planning application to be submitted to Wokingham Borough Council seeking consent for the demolition of the existing bungalow and single garage followed by the construction of a replacement residential dwelling and double garage.
- 2.1.2** A previous PRA was produced by John Wenman Ecological Consultancy in August 2021 for the same development proposals (Report ref.: R2864/a). The report concludes that: *‘The bungalow and garage showed no signs of use by bats and lacked suitable bat roost features and as such, the proposed demolition is considered highly unlikely to lead to the disturbance of bats or lead to the loss of a bat roost during the works and therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required to allow the works to go ahead lawfully.’*
- 2.1.3** In accordance with the Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys (CIEEM 2019b), the previous PRA is no longer valid and needs to be repeated to provide up-to-date ecological information.

### **2.2 Site Location and Context**

- 2.2.1** The property is located on the corner of Culver Lane and Anderson Avenue in Earley, Berkshire (OS grid reference: SU 74264 72977).
- 2.2.1** The property is in an urban residential area adjacent to the A3290 and its wooded embankments. Nearby green infrastructure includes Palmer Park (less than 100m west), Maiden Erlegh School (approx. 400m southwest), Bulmershe School (approx. 400m east) and Highwood Local Nature Reserve (approx. 550m southeast).

### **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 31<sup>st</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup> May 2025 by Conor Watson ACIEEM - registered under Natural England Bat Survey Class Licence CL18 (Registration no.: 2024-11877-CL18-BAT) and Lauren Hayward – Seasonal Ecologist, 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 structure 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 property is in an urban residential area adjacent to the A3290; its wooded embankments could potentially provide a nearby commuting corridor but overall the bungalow is considered to be in a sub-optimal location for roosting bats.
- 5.1.2** Bat mitigation licences that have been granted within the last 10 years inside a 2km radius of the property 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) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| 2020-48353-EPS-MIT                                                 | Soprano pipistrelle                         | 2020-2026         | Destruction of resting place          | 1660NE       |
| 2015-17476-EPS-MIT<br>2015-17476-EPS-MIT-1<br>2015-17476-EPS-MIT-2 | Brown long-eared bat<br>Soprano pipistrelle | 2016-2021         | Destruction of resting place          | 1760NE       |
| 2020-48694-EPS-MIT                                                 | Common pipistrelle<br>Soprano pipistrelle   | 2020-2025         | Damage & destruction of resting place | 1830NE       |
| 2018-34839-EPS-MIT<br>2018-34839-EPS-MIT-1                         | Soprano pipistrelle                         | 2018-2023         | Destruction of resting place          | 1900NE       |

### 5.2 Building Inspection

#### *Overview*

- 5.2.1** The findings from the external and internal inspections carried out for the bungalow are described with photographs and are annotated in a plan (see **Figure 1**), as follows:

#### *External Survey*

- 5.2.2** The detached bungalow was of brick construction with a hipped roof, covered in overlapping plain tiles, and an attached uPVC and brick side conservatory (**Photographs 1 & 2**). The front elevation of the bungalow had a porch and two bay windows with flat roofs. A detached garage was positioned at the southeast end of the property (**Photograph 3**).



*Photograph 1. Front of bungalow viewed from southwest.*



*Photograph 2. Side conservatory viewed from southeast.*



*Photograph 3. Detached garage viewed from northwest.*

- 5.2.3** The overlapping plain tiles were tight and intact across the roof, with the exception of two missing roof tiles on the northeast elevation (**Photograph 4; Target note 1**). The hip and ridge tiles were mostly intact across the roof, apart from occasional pieces of missing mortar at the southern end of the bungalow (**Photographs 5 & 6; Target note 2**). The bitumen felting on the flat roof of the porch and bay windows was tight to the uPVC fascia's and the plain roof tiles (**Photograph 7**).



*Photograph 4. Two missing roof tiles (northeast elevation).*



*Photograph 5. Occasional missing hip mortar (southeast elevation).*



*Photograph 6. Occasional missing hip mortar (front elevation).*



*Photograph 7. Tight bitumen flat roofs (front elevation).*

- 5.2.4** The uPVC soffits were intact and tight to the brick work around the bungalow (**Photograph 8**). There was a small gap between the joining of the fascias on a bay window but it was heavily cobwebbed and of limited extent (**Photograph 9**).



*Photograph 8. Intact soffits (northwest elevation).*



*Photograph 9. Superficial gap in fascias on bay window (front elevation).*

- 5.2.5** There were no gaps associated with the uPVC windows and brickwork of the conservatory; the glazed roof was covered by a canvas during the survey (**Photographs 10 & 11**).



*Photograph 10. Tight uPVC to brick base and side of conservatory (south elevation)*



*Photograph 11. uPVC of the conservatory roof tightly fitted to the brick work (south-east elevation)*

- 5.2.6** The detached garage was of simple breezeblock construction with a sloping corrugated asbestos roof (**Photograph 12**).



*Photograph 12. Sloping corrugated asbestos roof (southeast elevation).*

#### *Internal Survey*

- 5.2.7** The detached bungalow had one large roof void that was accessed via a ground-floor loft hatch and had a ridge to floor height of approximately 3m (**Photograph 13**).



*Photograph 13. Large roof void.*

- 5.2.8** The roof was of 'cut and pitch' construction with a ridge beam and rafters (**Photograph 17**). The eaves were open into the soffits and the ridge was heavily cobwebbed (**Photograph 17 & 18**). There was old mouse poison in the loft space. The loft space had no sign of bat activity.



*Photograph 14. Timber 'cut and pitch' roof construction with heavily cobwebbed ridge.*



*Photograph 15. Roof void open at the eaves.*

**5.2.9** The roof was lined with bituminous paper and horse hair lining that had several large tears, including at the hipped ends of the roof, exposing large areas of roof tiles (**Photograph 16, 17 & 18; Target notes 3 & 4**). The floor was mostly covered in loose fitting boards with fibreglass insulation between the joists (**Photograph 19 & 20**). There was a small timber frame area of tight fitted bitumen felting where the chimney had been removed (**Photograph 21**).



*Photograph 16. Large tears in the roof lining.*



*Photograph 17. Large tears in the roof lining at the hipped ends.*



*Photograph 18. Large tears in the roof lining at the hip of the roof.*




*Photograph 19. Fibreglass between joists.*



*Photograph 20. Mostly boarded floor.*



*Photograph 21. Old chimney removed and tight bitumen felting.*



  Roof void   
 H Loft hatch   
 **n.** External target note   
 **n.** Internal target note

|           |          |              |                                                      |  |
|-----------|----------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Drawn by: | Date     | Scale:       | 8 Culver Lane<br>Earley                              |  |
| LH/CW     | May 2025 | Not to scale | Figure 1 - Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Findings |  |

Figure 1. Building Inspection Plan.

## 6 DISCUSSION

### 6.1 Assessment of Roost Suitability and Presence/Absence

6.1.1 The property is in an urban residential area adjacent to the A3290; its wooded embankments could potentially provide a nearby commuting corridor but overall the bungalow is considered to be in a sub-optimal location for roosting bats. The search of granted bat mitigation licences identified three species – brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) – known to be roosting within a 2km radius of the property, but the closest was over 1.5km away.

6.1.2 The detached bungalow had mostly intact overlapping plain roof tiles and intact soffits that do not provide potential roosting sites for bats. Two missing roof tiles (**Target note 1**) and occasional missing hip mortar at the southern end of the bungalow (**Target note 2**) were not considered suitable for crevice-dwelling bats due to corresponding large tears in the roof lining internally. The detached garage was of simple construction with no potential roost sites. Furthermore, no evidence of roosting bats was found in either building during the inspection.

6.1.3 Based on the above assessment, the detached bungalow and garage have been assigned negligible suitability for roosting bats (see **Appendix 1** for potential suitability categories). As a result, no further survey to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats (i.e. emergence survey) is deemed necessary.

### 6.2 Impact Assessment and Recommended Actions

6.2.1 The proposed construction plans involving the for the demolition of the existing bungalow and garage followed by the construction of a replacement two-storey residential dwelling and double garage. The survey findings demonstrate that these proposals are highly unlikely to result in the death, injury or disturbance of bats; the damage or destruction of a bat roost; or the obstruction of access to a bat roost. Therefore, a European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence would not be required to allow the development proposals to proceed lawfully.

6.2.2 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*. JNCC, Peterborough.

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats*. 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 – DEFINITION OF BAT ROOST TYPES

The potential suitability of a building in conjunction with any evidence of bat presence is used to provide an initial assessment of likely roost type and importance. The types of roost considered are based on the following Natural England definitions:

- Day roost – a summer resting place used by individual bats, or small non-breeding groups, during the day;
- Night roost – a resting place used by individual bats on occasion, or by a whole colony regularly, during the night;
- Feeding perch – a resting place used by individual bats, or a few individuals, primarily for short periods of feeding during the night;
- Transitional roost – a place used by a few individual bats, or occasionally small groups, for a short period of time upon waking from hibernation or in the period prior to hibernation;
- Maternity roost – a place used by small to large groups of female bats to give birth and raise their young to independence;
- Hibernation roost – a place used by individual bats, or in groups, during winter where there is a constant cool temperature and high humidity; and
- Satellite roost – a place used by a few individuals to small groups of breeding female bats found in close proximity to the main nursery colony throughout the breeding season.

The importance of a bat roost is underpinned by the conservation status of the suspected species (i.e. the distribution/rarity of a species in a specific geographic location) and the type of roost (i.e. not all roosts have the same level of importance in supporting the local bat population). Further roost characterisation surveys may be required to fully determine the importance of a confirmed roost to allow for a robust impact assessment.

### APPENDIX 3 – 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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.<br><br>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.