



## Bat Roosting Assessment

Outbuilding at 35 High Street,  
Ashwell, Hertfordshire

August 2026

For and on behalf of:  
CB Architects  
Room 4  
1 Market Place  
Royston  
Hertfordshire



**ELMAW Consulting**  
Consultant Ecologists &  
Wildlife Managers

### Author

Keith Seaman BSc., Dip.HE, CertHE, CBiol, MRSB, MCIEEM  
Chartered Biologist & Principal Consultant

### Date of Report

August 2026

### Declaration

*This report has been produced endeavouring to follow the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's Code of Professional Conduct and ecological information has been provided in accordance with British Standards BS 42020 2013-Biodiversity-Code of practice for planning and development.*

*Whilst every effort has been taken to ensure this report accurately identifies potential ecological constraints to development or the likely presence or absence of species and the spatial and temporal use of the site by such species, it must only be viewed as a snapshot in time and reflects the ecological status of the site at the time of survey.*

*No liability can be assumed for ecological changes that may or may not occur on the site surveyed after the production of this report. The author of this report must be consulted as to the current applicability of the report if there are any seasonal delays in the use of this report.*

*This report can only be used for the purposes for which it was instructed and agreed at the time of commission.*

### Quality Assurance

|                         |                                    |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Author                  | Keith Seaman                       |
| Checked and approved by | Emma Seaman<br>Head of Consultancy |

Report produced by:



**ELMAW Consulting**  
Consultant Ecologists  
& Wildlife Managers



Chartered  
Biologists

Royal Society of  
**Biology**

Greys Farm, Therfield Road, Royston, Herts SG8 9NW

Phone: 01763 245900

E mail: [info@elmaw.co.uk](mailto:info@elmaw.co.uk)

Website: [www.elmaw.co.uk](http://www.elmaw.co.uk)

|                                                              |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Executive Summary .....</b>                               | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.0 Introduction .....</b>                                | <b>2</b>  |
| 1.1 Background .....                                         | 2         |
| <b>2.0 Planning Policy and Legislation .....</b>             | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1 Relevant National and Local Planning Policies .....      | 3         |
| 2.2 Local Plan Policies .....                                | 4         |
| 2.3 Legislation.....                                         | 5         |
| <b>3.0 Methodology .....</b>                                 | <b>6</b>  |
| 3.1 Bat Roosting Assessment (PRA).....                       | 6         |
| 3.2 Limitations of PRA Survey .....                          | 7         |
| 3.3 Evening Bat Roost Emergence Surveys.....                 | 8         |
| 3.4 Assessment & Mitigation .....                            | 8         |
| 3.5 Limitations of the Bat Activity Surveys .....            | 9         |
| 3.6 Desk Study.....                                          | 9         |
| <b>4.0 Resulting Baseline Ecological Conditions.....</b>     | <b>10</b> |
| 4.1 Designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance ..... | 10        |
| 4.2 Bat Records within the 2km Zol .....                     | 10        |
| 4.3 Building Assessment.....                                 | 11        |
| 4.4 Results from Evening Bat Roost Emergence Surveys.....    | 12        |
| <b>5.0 Ecological Evaluation &amp; Conclusions.....</b>      | <b>13</b> |
| 5.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Results .....             | 13        |
| <b>6.0 References.....</b>                                   | <b>14</b> |
| <b>7.0 Appendix 1 .....</b>                                  | <b>15</b> |
| 7.1 Legislation Relating to Bats.....                        | 15        |
| <b>8.0 Appendix 2 .....</b>                                  | <b>16</b> |
| 8.1 Survey Equipment Map.....                                | 16        |
| 8.2 Bat Activity Map .....                                   | 17        |
| <b>9.0 Appendix 3 .....</b>                                  | <b>18</b> |
| 9.1 Still Shots from Evening Emergence Surveys .....         | 18        |

## Executive Summary

|                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Purpose of Report</b>      | To detail the findings of a Bat Roosting Assessment of an outbuilding at 35, High Street, Ashwell, Hertfordshire with respect to proposals to redevelop the outbuilding.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Key Issues</b>             | <p>The application site is not recorded as currently supporting a bat roost, although common and soprano pipistrelle bats are recorded locally.</p> <p>The PRA concluded that the outbuilding had a moderate bat roosting potential although no inductive signs of bat roosting were found in the outbuilding.</p> <p>The emergence surveys found no evidence to suggest the presence of either an important summer or hibernation roost at this time.</p>                                   |
| <b>Works Undertaken</b>       | The Preliminary Bat Roosting Assessment survey was carried out on the 4 <sup>th</sup> August 2026 and two evening emergence surveys were carried out on the 4 <sup>th</sup> and 24 <sup>th</sup> of August 2026 by Natural England Level 2 Class Licence holder Keith Seaman – Principal Ecologist with ELMAW Consulting.                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Report Recommendations</b> | Whilst there is no evidence of an important summer or winter bat roost, the presence of PRFs suggests that there is the potential for individual transitory bats to be present at any time of the year. Therefore it is recommended that the redevelopment of the outbuilding is carried out under a precautionary approach and, should any evidence of bats be discovered during the redevelopment, work should cease and the advice of a Natural England bat ecologist sought immediately. |

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 A planning application is being prepared for the demolition of an existing outbuilding and the erection of a detached three-bay cart lodge, under planning reference r26/01511/FPH, at the rear of number 35, High Street, Ashwell, in north Hertfordshire.
- 1.1.2 At the request of the Local Planning Authority (LPA), a Preliminary Bat Roosting Assessment (PRA) has been completed by ELMAW Consulting, licensed bat surveyors, in August 2026, in order to ensure protected species, in this case bats, are not unlawfully harmed or disturbed or their place of shelter damaged or destroyed during the redevelopment of the outbuilding.
- 1.1.3 This PRA was undertaken by Mr Keith Seaman BSc., Principal Ecologist who holds Natural England Class and Mitigation licences for all species of UK bat. The assessment was carried out in ideal weather conditions, with no restrictions on access and no noted limitations. The building subject to this application is outlined in yellow below.



Plate 1: Aerial photograph with indicative application site location

## 2.0 Planning Policy and Legislation

### 2.1 Relevant National and Local Planning Policies

#### National Planning Policy Framework

2.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) superseded Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9) in March 2012. The NPPF 2024 states that *'planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by'*, in part;

- *'Minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs.'*

It also states that *'when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles'*;

- *'If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused*
- *Development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;*
- *Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and*
- *Development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.'*

## 2.2 Local Plan Policies

- 2.2.1 The North Hertfordshire Local Plan (adopted 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022) is the current local level policy guidance covering the application site. The following policy from the document is, in part, relevant to this study;

### **Policy NE4: Biodiversity and geological sites**

- 2.2.2 *'Planning permission will only be granted for development proposals that appropriately protect, enhance and manage biodiversity in accordance with the hierarchy and status of designations and features listed in Policy SP12.*

*All development should deliver measurable net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity, contribute to ecological networks and the water environment and/or restore degraded or isolated habitats where possible.*

*Applicants should, having regard to the status of any affected site(s) or feature(s):*

- a) Submit an ecological survey that is commensurate to the scale and location of the development and the likely impact on biodiversity, the legal protection or other status of the site;*
- b) Demonstrate that adverse effects can be avoided and/or satisfactorily minimised having regard to the hierarchy of protection below;*
  - i. Locating an alternative site with a less harmful impact;*
  - ii. Providing adequate mitigation measures; or*
  - iii. As a last resort compensated for.*

*The acceptability of approach(es) to avoidance, mitigation and compensation will be commensurate with the status of the asset(s) likely to be affected by the application; compensation is unlikely to be an appropriate solution for proposals affecting nationally or internationally designated sites other than in the most exceptional circumstances.*

- c) Include appropriate measures to manage construction impacts by demonstrating how existing wildlife habitats supporting protected or priority species will be retained, safeguarded and managed during construction;*
- d) Integrate appropriate buffers of complimentary habitat for designated sites and other connective features, wildlife habitats, priority habitats and species into the ecological mitigation and design. The appropriateness of any buffers will be considered having regard to the status of the relevant habitat. 12 metres of complimentary habitat should be provided around*

- wildlife sites (locally designated sites and above), trees and hedgerows. It may be necessary to exceed this distance for fragile habitats such as ancient woodland or to provide appropriate root protection for mature trees; and*
- e) *Provide a long-term management and monitoring plan including mitigation measures as necessary.*

## 2.3 **Legislation**

### The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017

- 2.3.1 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 in the UK implement the EC Habitats Directive in the UK. These regulations mainly deal with the protection of sites that are important for nature conservation in a European context (eg Special Areas of Protection [SACs] and Special Protection Areas [SPAs]). The legislation also gives protection to certain species of flora and fauna.
- 2.3.2 The Regulations makes it an offence to deliberately capture, kill or disturb wild animals and it is also an offence to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal (even if the animal is not present at the time).

### Wildlife & Countryside Act (WCA)

- 2.3.3 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006, consolidates and amends existing national legislation to implement the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (Birds Directive).

### Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act (NERC)

- 2.3.4 The NERC Act of 2006 places a duty on authorities to have due regard for biodiversity and nature conservation during the course of their operations. Section 41 of the Act identifies species and habitats considered Priority for conservation.

### 3.0 Methodology

#### 3.1 Bat Roosting Assessment (PRA)

3.1.1 The specified and adopted methodology for this aspect of the outbuilding's survey has been carried out following the guidelines published by The Bat Conservation Trust (Ref. 1).

3.1.2 It must be acknowledged however, that whilst we endeavour to follow these guidelines, we reserve the right to adapt the survey methodology where appropriate as the aforementioned guidelines state that they do not aim to override expert knowledge and experience and indicate that departure from or adaptation of their guidance based on site specific conditions and professional judgement is often appropriate.

3.1.3 In carrying out the PRA, equipment used included;

- ATP Instrumentation mini vane thermos-anemometer
- Lancelab telescopic camera lance
- Teslong TD450s Articulating 8.5mm Dual-Lens Inspection Camera
- Leica 10x42 BA Binoculars
- Collapsible ladder
- LEDLENSER P7R LED Torch

3.1.4 The building within the application site has been assessed for bat roosting potential based, in part, on the following factors which potentially increase the likelihood of roosting bats; more favourable roosting conditions may include features such as:

- Available records of bats in the locality
- Surrounding bat feeding and foraging habitat
- The presence of architectural features within the building such as roof voids, lofts/attics, bargeboards, soffits, lead-flashing, hanging tiles, cavity walls, weather boarding, mortice and tenon jointed roof timbers and ridge tiles and beams which may offer Potential Roosting Features (PRFs)
- Lined clay tile or slate roofs
- The presence of potential access points such as cracks, voids, crevices and flight openings
- Complex roofs, orientations and wall elevations
- Favourable internal environmental conditions and temperatures

- 3.1.5 The potential for a building or landscape to support roosting or commuting and foraging bats is based on a number of factors which, when taken accumulatively, will result in a subjectively **low, moderate or high** bat roosting potential valuation.

#### Bat Roosting Potential Table

| Suitability Potential         | Features considered important in the bat roosting assessment                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Negligible or very low</b> | No obvious PRFs, often found in areas of negligible or very low bat feeding, foraging and roosting habitat                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>Low</b>                    | One or more PRFs which are more likely to be used by single or low numbers of opportunist or transient bats at any time of the year due to lack of space, shelter or appropriate conditions. Highly unlikely to be suitable for breeding or classic hibernation but may be used by non-classic hibernating individual bats |
| <b>Moderate</b>               | Numerous PRFs that could be used by bats due to the size, space, shelter and conditions but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status such as maternity and classic hibernation                                                                                                                              |
| <b>High</b>                   | Numerous PRFs that support conditions that obviously favour higher numbers of bats, habitual roosting, breeding or classic hibernation of high conservation status, often found in association with high quality surrounding habitat.                                                                                      |

### 3.2 Limitations of PRA Survey

- 3.2.1 It should be acknowledged that the results of the PRA of the building are based on the presence of features, both physical and environmental, generally considered to increase the likelihood of roosting bats and not necessarily on the finding of roosting bats or direct indicative evidence such as bat droppings. Whilst, in some circumstances, the bat roosting assessment can result in a positive conclusion as to the presence of roosting bats, further observational activity surveys may be considered necessary, to confirm any presence of roosting bats and to enable roost characterisation with any certainty.
- 3.2.2 With regard to establishing the presence of roosting bats, it must be further acknowledged that surveys carried out in accordance with industry standards endeavour to establish the presence of bat roosts appropriate to the time of year when the surveys have been carried out. Surveys completed within the optimum period, as required by Natural England, endeavour to establish the presence of non-breeding summer roosts or important summer maternity roosts. Surveys carried out at this time of the year cannot, with any certainty, establish the presence of spring/autumn transitory or winter roosts or seasonally occupied opportunist roosts by single or low numbers of bats.

- 3.2.3 The Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management (CIEEM) advises that where mobile species such as bats are concerned, this PRA is likely to be out of date within 12 - 18 months of reporting and will need updating.

### 3.3 **Evening Bat Roost Emergence Surveys**

- 3.3.1 Results from the PRA showed that further survey work was required as the outbuilding was deemed to have a **Moderate** bat roost potential. Therefore, following specified and adopted methodology following the guidelines published by The Bat Conservation Trust (Ref. 1) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Best Practice Guidelines 4<sup>th</sup> Edition* (Ref. 1), two evening emergence surveys carried out on the 4<sup>th</sup> of August 2026 and the 24<sup>th</sup> of August 2026, commencing fifteen minutes before sunset and continuing for one and three quarter hours after sunset, during the typical bat roosting emergence period. All elevations of the outbuilding that contained PRFs were covered by Night Vision Aids (NVAs), maintained by ecological surveyors.

- 3.3.2 The equipment used included Canon XA series infrared video cameras (XA10, XA15, two XA25s and XA30) mounted on tripods. Additional Ward Optimal Extreme Limited Dark Sun Infrared torches were used for better vision during the darkest period. Each camera was paired with an Echo Meter Touch 2 PRO (EMT2PRO) full-spectrum detector, to record bat echolocation. All cameras and EMT2PROs were time-synced at the start of recording. Each surveyor also carried their own EMT2PRO detector, as well as two-way radios to liaise with other surveyors during the survey. Surveyors monitored the site during the survey, to ensure all technology was running and recording correctly and to maintain the security of the equipment. A selection of end-of-survey still-shots from the infrared cameras has been appended. Analysis of the bat echolocation recordings were undertaken using BatSound software.

### 3.4 **Assessment & Mitigation**

- 3.4.1 The resulting assessment and evaluation of the survey findings and subsequent mitigation and compensatory strategy are informed by the advice and guidance published by The Bat Conservation Trust and Natural England in *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists - Good Practice Guidelines 4<sup>th</sup> Edition 2023* (Ref. 1), *Bat Workers' Manual 2004* (Ref. 4) and *Bat Mitigation Guidelines 2025* (Ref. 3).

### **3.5**      *Limitations of the Bat Activity Surveys*

- 3.5.1      The bat emergence surveys were conducted in appropriate weather conditions with temperatures of above 10°C without heavy rain or strong winds, so the environmental conditions of the surveys do not constrain or limit the results. Survey methods, timings and equipment used were in line with industry standards as advocated by Natural England and the Bat Conservation Trust.

### **3.6**      *Desk Study*

- 3.6.1      To provide context to this study, available bat records from a radius of 2km, hereafter known as the Zone of Influence (Zol), around the application site have been sourced from the Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre, on the 4<sup>th</sup> of August 2026. The results of the data search request were received on the 4<sup>th</sup> of August 2006. In addition, all international sites of nature conservation importance within a 0km Zol, nationally important sites within a 5km Zol and local sites within a 2km Zol of the application site have been sourced.
- 3.6.2      Only species records from the last ten years have been included as it is considered that records older than this are not sufficiently recent to be relevant to this study.
- 3.6.3      Google earth aerial photographs and DEFRA's Magic Map Application images have been examined of the application site and surrounding landscape as have the relevant Ordnance Survey Explorer Maps at a 1:25,000 scale.

## 4.0 Resulting Baseline Ecological Conditions

### 4.1 Designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance

- 4.1.1 The statutory sites of nature conservation importance within their respective Zol of the application site are tabulated below:

| Site Designation                                                                    | Site Name              | Approximate distance from application site | Within the Impact Risk Zone? |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>International designated sites of nature conservation importance within 10km</b> |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     | None recorded          |                                            |                              |
| <b>National designated sites of nature conservation importance within 5km</b>       |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     | None recorded          |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
|                                                                                     |                        |                                            |                              |
| <b>Local sites of nature conservation importance within 2km</b>                     |                        |                                            |                              |
| Local Wildlife Sites                                                                | Ashwell Quarry         | 1.4km                                      | N/A                          |
|                                                                                     | Ashwell Quarry Springs | 1.55km                                     |                              |
|                                                                                     | Partridge Hall Field   | 0.78km                                     |                              |
|                                                                                     | Ducklake Farm Ashwell  | 0.11km                                     |                              |

- 4.1.2 The application site is not a designated site of nature conservation importance, nor does it retain any connectivity to important wildlife sites.

### 4.2 Bat Records within the 2km Zol

- 4.2.1 Five species of bat are recorded local within the last ten years; common and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus* & *P. Pygmaeus*), barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*), Leisler's (*Nyctalus leisleri*), and noctule (*N. noctula*). All five species are recorded from within the village of Ashwell but none are recorded from the application site.

## 4.3

**Building Assessment**

| Building No.       | Building Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Exterior Potential Roosting Features (PRFs)                                                                                                     | Interior Potential Roosting Features                                  | Indicative Roosting Evidence |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Outbuilding</b> | <p>The outbuilding is described as a detached single-storey structure constructed from clunch (chalk) with a blockwork wall on its southern elevation gable end.</p> <p>The roof is pitched with ridge tiles and constructed from bitumastic felt lined slate tiles.</p> <p>Internal timbers; ties beams, roof rafters and purlins are flush-jointed with no obvious open mortice joints.</p> <p>There is a vaulted cellar beneath the outbuilding with a door opening with no door.</p> | On its eastern elevation, some mortar is missing from the ridge, and narrow gaps are found above the wall plate on the southern gable end wall. | There are several recesses in the clunch, providing shallow cavities. | None found.                  |

ROOSTING POTENTIAL: **Moderate**



Plates 2 & 3: Photographs of the exterior & interior of the outbuilding

#### 4.4 Results from Evening Bat Roost Emergence Surveys

##### 4<sup>th</sup> of August 2026

- 4.4.1 The survey commenced fifteen minutes before sunset, which was logged at 20:45. The weather conditions were warm, dry and cloudy, with light wind. The temperature at the start of the survey was 26°C and 20°C at the end of the survey.

| Time  | Minutes after sunset | Species             | Recorded Activity                                                            |
|-------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21:13 | 28                   | <i>Nyctalus sp.</i> | Heard above the site but not observed.                                       |
| 21:21 | 36                   | Common pipistrelle  | Observed flying through the yard from a north-easterly direction.            |
| 21:31 | 46                   | Common pipistrelle  | Observed and recorded intermittently flying around the yard and rear garden. |

##### 24<sup>th</sup> of August 2026

- 4.4.2 The survey commenced fifteen minutes before sunset, which was logged at 20:06. The weather conditions were dry, with no cloud and light to moderate wind. The temperature at the start of the survey was 25°C and 19°C at the end of the survey.

| Time  | Minutes after sunset | Species            | Recorded Activity                                                |
|-------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21.50 | 44                   | Common pipistrelle | Very brief passing contact and not seen.                         |
| 21.59 | 53                   | Common pipistrelle | Recorded in the yard briefly but not seen; possible fly-through. |

## 5.0 Ecological Evaluation & Conclusions

### 5.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Results

- 5.1.1 There are no designated sites of nature conservation importance within a distance that may potentially be adversely affected by the proposed redevelopment and the application site is not reported as supporting roosting bats, at this time.
- 5.1.2 The outbuilding was considered to be of moderate bat roosting potential based on the presence of very few PRFs; the building supported no indicative evidence to suggest the presence of bats. The roof was found to be unlined and therefore lacked any roof voids and the walls also lacked any wall-cavities. Few PRFs were found in the clunch walls though decay and wall damage but, on further examination, the majority were found to be dead-ended, blocked or full of debris. All internal timbers are found to be flush-jointed with no observable open mortice joints, rots holes or cavities. The cellar was found to be dry and draughty due to be lack of a door, with no PRFs. The cellar was considered too dry and draughty to be suitable for bat hibernation.
- 5.1.3 Externally, the only visible PRF on the roof was noted from missing mortar in a ridge tile, but gaps were noted above the wall plate on both gable ends. However no indicative evidence such as bat droppings were found on the gable end walls below these gaps, suggesting a lack of habitual use by multiply numbers of bats.
- 5.1.4 The evening emergence surveys recorded a paucity of bat activity around the outbuilding with very limited foraging observed from just a single common pipistrelle in the yard and garden on one of the two survey occasions. There was no such observable activity on the second survey with only two very brief common pipistrelle contacts 50 minutes after sunset and at least 30 minutes after typical pipistrelle emergence times.
- 5.1.5 An examination of the infrared video recordings of the outbuilding found no recorded emergence from the outbuilding and therefore it has been concluded that there is no evidence to suggest the outbuilding supports either an important summer or winter roost at this time. The proposed redevelopment of the outbuilding is not predicted to result in disturbance to roosting bats or the damage or destruction of an important bat roost. However, as is always the case where a building supports PRFs, a precautionary approach to demolition is advised and should roosting bats or evidence of roosting bats be discovered, works should cease until the advice of Natural England licensed bat ecologist has been sought.

## 6.0 References

---

Ref.1 Bat Conservation Trust. *2023 Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, Bat Conservation Trust, London

Ref. 2 Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management.  
*2017 Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing*

Ref. 3 Altringham, J.D. (2003). *British Bats*. HarperCollins Publishers. London.

Ref. 4 Reason, PF and Wray, S. (2023), *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines*, Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Ref. 5 Joint Nature Conservation Committee. (2004), *Bat Workers' Manual*, JNCC, Peterborough.

## 7.0 Appendix 1

### 7.1 *Legislation Relating to Bats*

7.1.1 All bats and their roosts in the UK are protected by the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

7.1.2 In England the legislation makes it illegal to;

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat,
- Deliberately disturb a bat which is likely to impair their ability to survive, breed or reproduce, rear or nurture their young, hibernate, migrate or affect significantly their local distribution or abundance
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat
- Possess, control, transport, sell, exchange or offer for sale or exchange any live or dead bat or any part of a bat

7.1.3 Bats' roosts (including resting places) are protected whether or not bats are present at the time. The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) additionally makes it an offence to;

- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat at a roost
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost

7.1.4 Finally, under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006, a duty is placed on all public bodies to promote and enhance biodiversity in all its functions. There is a general biodiversity duty in the NERC Act (Section 40) which requires every public body in the exercising of its functions to 'have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 41 draws up lists of species of principal importance to which special attention must be given and a number of bats are included in this list.

## 8.0 Appendix 2

### 8.1 Survey Equipment Map



## 8.2 Bat Activity Map



## 9.0 Appendix 3

### 9.1 *Still Shots from Evening Emergence Surveys*



