



PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT

KISMSET ALLINGTON LANE, WEST END, SOUTHAMPTON, SO30 3HQ

FINAL REPORT

September 2023

Report conditions

<i>Report title</i>	Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment – Kismet, West End, Southampton	
<i>Client</i>	Mark & Tracey Chinnery	
<i>Report status</i>	Final	
<i>Survey date</i>	14 th August 2023	
<i>Written by</i>	Connor Hill	<i>Date</i> 14/09/2023
<i>Reviewed by</i>	Izabel Phillips	<i>Date</i> 18/09/2023

Disclaimers

This report has been prepared by Phillips Ecology for the sole use of the client named above. Survey work, assessment, and report writing have been undertaken with all reasonable skill and care, and unless otherwise explicitly stated, is appropriate only for the work, scheme, or project brief provided by the client and intended purposes. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and Phillips Ecology. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where data, drawings, plans or other technical information has been provided to Phillips Ecology for the purposes of preparation of this report, either by the client, their agents or other parties (including but not limited to biological data sets, laboratory results, and mapping), it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by Phillips Ecology for inaccuracies in such data supplied by other parties.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of Phillips Ecology and the client. Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work, under standard limitations of access to third party land and other limitations as described in the report.

It is the client's responsibility to note and comply as necessary with any recommendations made in this report, planning conditions derived from these, and any relevant licensing regimes. Phillips Ecology bears no responsibility for any failure to note and comply with legal requirements for works carried out by or in behalf of the client at the above site and for the project this report has been produced to support.

Executive Summary

- This preliminary roost assessment report has been prepared in order to support a planning application for the proposed extension works at Kismet, Southampton.
- A preliminary roost assessment survey was undertaken on the 14th August 2023.
- Whilst suitable roosting features were recorded on the bungalow in the form of lifted lead flashing and roof tiles, these suitable roosting features were located outside the Zone of Impact (ZOI) of the proposed works.
- Overall, the bungalow is considered to support negligible suitability for roosting bats within the ZOI of the proposals.
- As a result, there is considered to be no reasonable likelihood that bats will be present and affected by the proposed extension works.
- Information regarding the length of time the findings of this report are valid for can be found in section 5.1.
- Provided the recommendations set out in section 5 are followed, the planning authority can be confident that the development would accord with relevant planning policy, legislation and caselaw.

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
1.1	Report purpose	4
1.2	Description of proposal	4
1.3	Report context.....	4
1.4	Survey area.....	4
1.5	Limitations.....	4
1.6	Relevant documents	4
2.	Survey Methodology	5
2.1	Surveyor/s.....	5
2.2	Survey area.....	5
2.3	Survey date.....	5
2.4	Survey description	5
2.5	Survey equipment	5
2.6	Weather conditions	5
2.7	Assessment methodology.....	6
3.	Survey results.....	7
3.1	Building description relevant to bats and their roosts	7
3.2	Site grounds	9
3.3	Other protected species.....	9
4.	Discussion and Assessment of Impacts.....	10
4.1	Preliminary assessment of suitability and potential impacts	10
4.2	Relevant legislation and policy.....	10
5.	Recommendations	12
5.1	Requirement for further surveys	12
5.1.1	Bats	12
5.2	Mitigation strategy.....	12
5.2.1	Bats	12
5.3	Enhancements	12
6.	Conclusion.....	13
7.	References	13
	Appendix 1 – Proposal plan	14

1. Introduction

1.1 Report purpose

This report presents the findings of the preliminary bat roost assessment undertaken of the bungalow at Kismet, Southampton (central grid reference: SU 46401 15729).

1.2 Description of proposal

The current proposal is for the construction of a rear roof extension to the north of the bungalow. The existing roof void will be left intact throughout the construction process.

1.3 Report context

BJP Projects LTD have prepared a planning application on behalf of Mark and Tracey Chinnery (the applicants) for the proposed extension works at Kismet, Southampton. Phillips Ecology have been instructed by the Applicant to undertake an ecological assessment to support this application, which has been submitted to Eastleigh Borough Council.

1.4 Survey area

The survey area comprised the existing bungalow and its immediate surrounds. The survey extended to all areas of the building for completeness. This included the proposed zone of impact on the northern elevation and roof face.

1.5 Limitations

During the survey it was not possible to view the entirety of the roof void due to the limited space along the southern and western side eaves. No other limitations were encountered throughout the survey's completion. Despite this limitation it is still considered that a robust assessment of the building's suitability for supporting roosting bats has been undertaken.

1.6 Relevant documents

The relevant proposal plan used to inform this assessment is presented in Appendix 1.

2. Survey Methodology

2.1 Surveyor/s

The survey was carried out by Connor Hill of Phillips Ecology.

2.2 Survey area

The survey area extended to all areas of the bungalow that will be modified by the proposed works in such a way that bats, or their roosts could be impacted (directly or indirectly). Therefore, the survey included the northern roof face, the existing northern extension and dormer window. The remaining elevations, roof faces and the roof void were also included for completeness.

2.3 Survey date

The survey was carried out during the daytime on the 14th August 2023.

2.4 Survey description

The survey did not depart from the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition) which states that "A preliminary roost inspection survey is a detailed inspection of the exterior and interior of a structure to look for features that bats could use for entry/exit and roosting and to search for signs of bats".

The external features of the structure which will be modified by the proposed works in such a way that bats or their roosts could be impacted (directly or indirectly) if present, were systematically inspected in detail to compile information on potential and actual bat access points and roosting places such as lifted or broken roof materials, loose brickwork and open eaves. This included a thorough search for evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings, urine splashes and fur staining.

The interior of the building was inspected in order to identify potential or actual access points and roosting places and to record any evidence of bat activity or bats themselves.

2.5 Survey equipment

Survey equipment comprised:

- High-powered torch
- Camera
- Binoculars

2.6 Weather conditions

Weather during the survey can be described as: Light rain, 100% cloud cover, breezy and 17°C. The weather conditions did not hinder the ecologist's ability to carry out the survey effectively.

2.7 Assessment methodology

The suitability of the building for supporting bat roosts will be assessed against the guidelines within Table 1 which have been adapted from the BCT Good Practice Guidelines.

Table 1 *Suitability assessment guidelines*

Suitability ***Description of Roosting Habitats***

<i>Negligible</i>	Structure has no reasonable likelihood of supporting roosting bats i.e. no suitable roosting features present.
<i>Low</i>	A structure which could be used opportunistically by individual bats i.e. one or more potential roost sites which do not provide sufficient space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions (e.g. temperature, light, humidity) and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats.
<i>Moderate</i>	A structure which could be used by bats but is not likely to support a roost of high conservation status (e.g. maternity roost). This structure would support features which exhibit suitable size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat for roosting bats.
<i>High</i>	A structure which is obviously suitable for supporting larger numbers of bats, on a regular basis and for longer periods of time.

3. Survey results

3.1 Building description relevant to bats and their roosts

The structure comprises a brick-built bungalow which rises to a pitched and hipped roof design clad with concrete interlocking roof, ridge and hip tiles (Figures 1 and 2). The building is oriented south to north. Two extensions protrude from the southern elevation of the structure, the first features a pitched and hipped roof and the second a pitched roof with a gable end. Both extensions are clad with the same concrete roof tiles as the main building (Figure 3). A flat roofed single-storey extension protrudes from the northern elevation of the bungalow lined with roofing felt. The eaves extend beyond their wall plates and are enclosed in uPVC fascia, underboards and barge boards with closely adjoining uPVC guttering. A flat roofed dormer window clad with roofing felt is located on the northern roof face (Figure 4). A brick-built chimney extends from the southern roof face and two Velux windows are located on the eastern and western hipped roof faces. All windows and doors are set in uPVC frames which are tight fitting to the surrounding brickwork.

Internally, the structure supports a single roof void which runs along the full length of the southern hipped extension and wraps around the southern and western side eaves of the main roof (Figures 5 and 6). The void comprises heavy-duty bitumen felt lining under the roof, and fibreglass insulation on the floor. The void is partly boarded and used for storage with light cobwebbing throughout.

The zone of impact on the bungalow comprises the entire northern elevation, roof face, northern flat roofed extension and dormer window.



Figure 1 – south-eastern corner of the bungalow



Figure 2 – northern elevations of the bungalow



Figure 3 – southern gable end porch extension



Figure 4 – interior roof void with piping and insulation



Figure 5 – roof void in southern hipped extension



Figure 6 – roof void extending along the side eaves.

An account of suitable access/egress features and recorded evidence of bat activity is given in table 2.

Table 2 – Recorded features and activity

Suitability	Evidence
Exterior The following suitable access/egress and roosting features were recorded externally during the survey: Inside ZOI: - N/A Outside ZOI: - Gaps under lifted tiles (Figure 7). - Lifted lead flashing around the southern chimney (Figure 8).	No evidence of roosting activity was recorded externally during the survey.
Interior The following suitable access/egress and roosting features were recorded internally during the survey: - The central ridge beam is suitable for roosting, however, it is heavily cobwebbed.	No evidence of roosting activity was recorded internally during the survey.



Figure 7 – lifted concrete tiles



Figure 8 – sections of lifted lead flashing around chimney

3.2 Site grounds

The immediate surrounds of the building comprise managed lawn, ornamental planting and bare ground. The surrounding landscape is characterised by permanent pasture, arable farmland, compartments of woodland, mature hedgerows, scattered trees, and the Itchen Valley Country Park. Additionally, the River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is located 600m northwest of the property. In this context, the habitats within the footprint of the proposal are considered unexceptional for foraging and commuting bats, however, given their location within a landscape which is suitable for commuting and foraging bats, it is highly likely that bats will commute and forage past the site.

3.3 Other protected species

During the course of the survey, no evidence of breeding birds was recorded.

4. Discussion and Assessment of Impacts

4.1 Preliminary assessment of suitability and potential impacts

When considered in view of the criteria set out in Table 1, the sections of bungalow within the ZOI of the proposals are considered to support negligible roost suitability - i.e. the structure has no reasonable likelihood of supporting roosting bats. While certain roosting features were recorded, these were located outside of the ZOI of the proposed works and the existing roof void will be left intact throughout the construction works.

On the basis that the areas within the bungalow's ZOI are considered to support negligible suitability for roosting bats, there is considered to be no reasonable likelihood of impacts on bats associated with the proposed extension works.

Though the site itself is considered to support low suitability for foraging and commuting bats, its immediate surrounds do support suitable features. Therefore, increasing light spill on surrounding habitats could impact foraging and commuting bats.

4.2 Relevant legislation and policy

Circular 06/2005 identifies that applicants should not be required to provide information on protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood that they will be present and affected by the proposed development. The site is considered to support habitats with suitability and potential for protected species and these may be affected by the proposed development. Therefore, the proposal triggers 'reasonable likelihood' under the Circular.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (commonly referred to as the Habitats Regulations) may apply should protected species be confirmed on site.

In the case that a European protected species is found to be present and impacted by the proposal, the local planning authority will be required to engage with the Habitat Regulations. Permission will be granted unless:

- a) the development is likely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations, and
- b) is unlikely to be granted an EPS licence from Natural England to allow the development to proceed under a derogation from the law (under licence).

When considering whether Natural England would not be unlikely to grant a licence for the identified impact, the local planning authority must consider the three tests which are set out in the Habitat Regulations:

1. the consented operation must be for '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'; (Regulation 53(2)(e))
2. there must be 'no satisfactory alternative' (Regulation 53(9)(a)); and

3. 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' (Regulation 53(9)(b)).

Case-law (Morge vs. Hampshire County Council) has clarified that planning authorities are able to grant permission for developments that would cause a breach of the Regulations is likely (i.e. in the case of this proposal, destruction of a bat roost), provided that sufficient information is provided to give the planning authority assurance that the relevant EPSM licence is not unlikely to be granted - i.e. planning authorities also have a duty to assess planning applications against these tests.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Requirement for further surveys

Where there is a reasonable likelihood that a protected species will be present and impacted by the proposed development, planning authorities require further surveys to properly assess development proposals against relevant planning policy. An assessment into the requirement for further surveys is presented below, however in summary, no further surveys are considered necessary.

It is important that planning decisions are informed by current ecological survey data. Due to this, there is a limited time frame that phase 1 surveys are valid before becoming outdated. This time frame can vary depending on any changes in project circumstances or plans but it is generally considered that phase 1 ecological surveys are valid for a period of 18 months (CIEEM, 2019). Projects that take place over longer periods than 18 months might be required to carry out further ecological surveys to ensure planning authorities have the necessary up-to-date information to make well informed, evidence-based decisions.

5.1.1 *Bats*

Given that the bungalow is considered to support negligible suitability for roosting bats, no further survey work in respect of bats is considered necessary.

5.2 Mitigation strategy

5.2.1 *Bats*

In order to limit any effects on foraging and commuting bats, external lighting should be limited to only that which is absolutely necessary for safety purposes, both during the construction phase and once the proposals are complete. The following lighting measures are required:

- Construction works between March and October should be undertaken during daylight hours only to avoid disturbance to bats that may forage and commute through or near the site.
- Lighting to the completed development should be as low brightness as possible, kept at a low level and directed away from all boundaries. Lighting on sensors should not be so sensitive that foraging bats trigger them.

All lighting must follow the Bat Conservation Trusts and Institute of Lighting Professionals guidance on bats and artificial lighting (BCT, 2018).

5.3 Enhancements

The delivery of biodiversity enhancement on development sites is promoted by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Where opportunities exist it is best practice to provide enhancement features which encourage greater biodiversity within development sites in accordance with the NPPF and the Local Planning Authority's responsibilities under the NERC Act.

Opportunities for enhancement which are proportionate to the scale of the development include:

- The provision of new bat roosting opportunities in the form of one bat box within the site. This should be installed as high as possible, at least 3m above ground, in a sheltered position.
- The provision of bird nesting opportunities in the form of one bird box comprising an open fronted box, installed on the bungalow or within the trees in the garden.

6. Conclusion

The preliminary roost assessment has confirmed that the bungalow supports negligible suitability for roosting bats within the zone of impact for the proposed works. As such, no adverse impacts on bats or their roosts are anticipated.

Precautionary measures have been provided to ensure impacts on designated sites are avoided. Opportunities for ecological enhancement have been suggested for the site.

7. References

- **Altringham J D, 2003**, British Bats, Collins New Naturalist
- **Bat Conservation Trust, 2016**, BCT Bat Survey Guidelines Third edition
- **Bat Conservation Trust, 2018**, Guidance Note 08/18, Bats and artificial lighting in the UK, Bats and the Built Environment Series. BCT, London.
- **Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 2017**, *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*. CIEEM, Winchester
- **Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 2019**, *On the lifespan of ecological reports & surveys*. CIEEM, Winchester
- **ILP and BCT, 2018** *Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK: Guidance Note 08/18*. ILP, Warwickshire.
- **MHCLG, 2018**. *National Planning Policy Framework*. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government; London.
- **Mitchell Jones AJ, 2004**, *Bat Mitigation guidelines*, English Nature
- **Mitchell Jones AJ and McLeish A P, The Bat Workers Manual**, JNCC
- **Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006**, Ch 3, s. 40
- **Natural England, 2011** Frequently asked wildlife questions: Bats. Natural England

SITE LOCATION PLAN
AREA 2 HA
SCALE: 1:1250 on A4
CENTRE COORDINATES: 446389, 115735

Supplied by Streetwise Maps Ltd
www.streetwise.net
Licence No: 100047474
16:09:38 20/04/2023

GROUND FLOOR PLAN

FIRST FLOOR PLAN

NORTH ELEVATION

SOUTH ELEVATION

EAST ELEVATION

WEST ELEVATION

Legend

Symbol	Description
[Symbol]	Proposed new building
[Symbol]	Existing building
[Symbol]	Proposed new driveway
[Symbol]	Existing driveway
[Symbol]	Proposed new fence
[Symbol]	Existing fence
[Symbol]	Proposed new gate
[Symbol]	Existing gate
[Symbol]	Proposed new path
[Symbol]	Existing path
[Symbol]	Proposed new wall
[Symbol]	Existing wall
[Symbol]	Proposed new roof
[Symbol]	Existing roof
[Symbol]	Proposed new garden
[Symbol]	Existing garden
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawn
[Symbol]	Existing lawn
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees
[Symbol]	Existing trees
[Symbol]	Proposed new shrubs
[Symbol]	Existing shrubs
[Symbol]	Proposed new hedges
[Symbol]	Existing hedges
[Symbol]	Proposed new fences
[Symbol]	Existing fences
[Symbol]	Proposed new gates
[Symbol]	Existing gates
[Symbol]	Proposed new paths
[Symbol]	Existing paths
[Symbol]	Proposed new walls
[Symbol]	Existing walls
[Symbol]	Proposed new roofs
[Symbol]	Existing roofs
[Symbol]	Proposed new gardens
[Symbol]	Existing gardens
[Symbol]	Proposed new lawns
[Symbol]	Existing lawns
[Symbol]	Proposed new trees



07760 208562

info@phillipsecology.co.uk

www.phillipsecology.co.uk

Hampshire office:
Clifton Cottage
Bucks Head Hill
Meonstoke
Hampshire
SO323NA