

**Garage at
24 Kingsway,
Chandler's Ford,
Hampshire,
SO53 1EN**

PHASE 1 BAT SURVEY

September 2023

Dr.Jonty Denton (Chartered Ecologist) FRES FLS MCIEEM CECol

Level 1 bat license holder no. 2020-46400-CLS-CLS



Prepared by

Dr. Jonty Denton Bsc (Hons) D(Phil) FRES, FLS, MCIEEM, CECol

(Chartered Ecologist)

31 Thorn Lane, Four Marks, Hampshire, GU34 5BX

Phone: (01420) 565647 mobile: 07935594093

SUMMARY

This report constitutes a site survey carried out on the 25th September 2023 and further assessment of the potential impacts arising from the proposed re-development of garage at 24 Kingsway, Chandler's Ford, SO53 1EN.

There was no evidence of bat activity within the garage and the roof has no openings into potential roosting spaces behind the lap-planking, and the under eaves and roof tiles are all sealed off. Therefore, the garage has negligible potential for roosting bats and a phase 2 emergence survey is *not* recommended.

INTRODUCTION

Site Setting and Description

The garage is situated to the north of Kingsway in a semi-rural setting flanked by other detached dwellings with mature gardens (GR:SU437213). There are seven discrete blocks of woodland included on the priority habitat inventory within 1km of the property and there are mature oak trees beside Kingsway within 20m of the garage. The east side of the garage is adjacent to a manicured x leylandii hedge. The habitats in the area provide good foraging and commuting areas for the majority of bat species.

METHODS

Datasearch

According to the DEFRA MAGICmap a protected species licence for common pipistrelles was issued in 2017 for a property 310m to the west, covering common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle serotine and brown long-eared bats.

Phase 1 Bat Survey Methods

Details of the survey methods are given below;-

The garage was investigated externally to identify potential bat access/egress locations and roosting areas such as gaps or holes in roof tiles, fascias and soffits and to record direct evidence of bat presence such as droppings and urine staining. This was followed by a detailed investigation of all accessible internal spaces to record evidence of bat roosting activity such as droppings, feeding remains, live animals, corpses, urine staining and fur staining. The building was assessed as to its suitability for supporting roosting bats. The survey conformed to current Bat Conservation Trust guidelines (Bat Conservation, (2012) *Bat surveys for professional ecologists: Good practice guidelines* 3rd edition).

The details of the assessment criteria used to determine the ecological value of on-site attributes is outlined below. During the Phase 1 survey the assessment criteria are based on the potential for the site to support the species considered. However, in many cases Phase 2 surveys will be required to confirm presence /absence of any bat species and hence the importance of a population at the site, therefore the assessment of value should be considered a provisional.

Where possible, a provisional assessment of potential will be made although this may well require Phase 2 surveys to confirm status.

High Potential- High potential buildings are those that have features highly suitable for use by roosting bats, including gaps around soffits, hanging tiles, extensive roof spaces etc. High potential buildings are often, but not always, buildings of more historic construction. Further Phase 2 surveys will be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

Medium Potential- Medium potential buildings have a moderate number of features that may be utilised by bats for roosting, these may include loose fascias, roof spaces etc. Further Phase 2 surveys are likely to be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

Low Potential- Low potential buildings are those that provide limited bat roosting potential although some features that may be utilised by bats may be present. Further Phase 2 surveys are likely to be required to confirm the presence/absence of bats.

No/Negligible Potential – These are buildings that are extremely unlikely to support roosting bats due to the absence of suitable features. Further Phase 2 surveys are unlikely to be required for buildings with negligible potential.

Phase 1 Survey Timing and Weather Conditions

The Phase 1 bat survey was carried out on the evening of the 25th September 2023 which was a partly cloudy day with 20% cloud cover and an ambient temperature of 15 °C.

Phase 1 Survey Equipment

During the Phase 1 survey the surveyor was equipped with 10x42 binoculars and a high-powered 1 million candlepower Clulite torch.

RESULTS

Phase 1 Bat Survey Results

Building Assessment

The property is a detached single garage built in the late 20th Century. The walls are of plain brick with a small section of lap-planking on the south gable above the up-and-over door (see figure 1).

The roof space is incorporated into a garage which is permanently illuminated via windows on the north gable (see figure 4). There was no sign of any bat activity inside the garrge.

The roof is of close-fitting cement tiles which are in good order with an abundant covering of moss (see figures 2-3). The lap planking is slightly warped, but the gaps do not open into the space between the brick gable and the timbers. The small opening at the southwest corner was examined and does not open into a void (see figure 5). The eaves are sealed off with no potential openings (see figure 4)



Figure 1. Garage looking northeast.



Figure 2. Western and northern elevations looking south.



Figure 3. East face of roof looking south.



Figure 4. East face of garage looking north.



Figure 5. Detail of opening at southwest corner adjacent to gutter: The space beneath is a shallow, closed off opening 40mm deep.



Figure 4. Inside of roof space looking south

EVALUATION, IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The roof has no openings into potential roosting spaces behind the lap planking, and the under eaves and roof tiles are all sealed off. Therefore, the garage has negligible potential for roosting bats and a phase 2 emergence survey is *not* recommended.

REFERENCES

Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004) *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

INTERNET RESOURCES

Google Maps: www.maps.google.co.uk

Magic Interactive Map: www.magic.gov.uk