

92 Pine Road, Chandler's Ford

Preliminary Roost Assessment



18th March 2026

Document control

Project title	92 Pine Road, Chandler's Ford – PRA	
Client	Vicki Simpson	
Project number	5989	
Version number	5989.1	
Date of issue	18th March 2026	
Field personnel	Chris Fry	
Prepared by	Wessex Ecology Ltd Home Farm House, Tidworth, SP9 7BE Email: info@wessexecology.co.uk Telephone: 01980 842709	
Declaration	I confirm that the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.	
	Report author	Ashleigh Cairns MRes, BSc [REDACTED]
	Report reviewer	Daniel Ahern CEnv, MCIEEM, FLS [REDACTED]
Copyright	This report is intended for the commissioning party only and should not be copied or reproduced in any way without prior written permission from Wessex Ecology Ltd. This report has been prepared for the sole use of the client. Any third party referring to this report or relying on the information contained herein, does so entirely at their own risk. Whilst every effort has been made to guarantee the accuracy of this report, it should be noted that living creatures are capable of migration and whilst protected species may not have been located during the survey duration, their presence may be found on site at a later date. The views and opinions contained within the document are based on a reasonable timeframe between the completion of the survey and the commencement of any works. If there is any delay between the commencement of works that may conflict with timeframes laid out within this document or have the potential to allow the ingress of protected species, a suitably qualified ecologist should be consulted. It is the duty of care of the landowner/developer to act responsibly and comply with current environmental legislation if protected species are suspected or found prior to works.	

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Personnel	7
3. Planning and Legislation	7
4. Methodology.....	8
5. Results.....	11
6. Requirements.....	13
7. References.....	14
8. Appendices	15
Appendix 1 – Site photographs	15
Appendix 2 – Relevant legislation	16

Executive summary			
Purpose of report	- To evaluate the Site for the bat suitability based on the desk study and field survey. - To confirm the presence of bats or signs of bats within the Site boundary. - To assess the Site for bat roost potential, present reasoning for assessment and provide requirements for the Site.		
Context of report	The Site is comprised of a detached two storey dormer style family home. To the front of the property, a cobbled brick driveway provides access to the detached garage, which is slightly set back on the eastern side of the site, as well as to the main building's front entrance. An area of lawn is present to the northern section of the Site. To the rear there is a large, fenced garden laid to lawn. The proposed development and alterations to the site are as follows: - Demolish and replace the existing garage. - Construction of a single-storey, flat-roofed rear extension to the main building, adjoining the rebuilt garage.		
Methodology	- The Site was assessed in line with the Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines (fourth edition) (Collins; 2023). - A desk study was carried out, identifying bat EPSL's within 2km of the Site and SAC's within 7.5km of the Site. - Recommendations for general mitigation, enhancement and further surveys were made.		
Ecological constraints	Building reference	Potential	Further surveys
	1	NEGLIGIBLE	No further survey work required.
	2	NEGLIGIBLE	No further survey work required.
Mitigation	N/A		

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

1.1.1. In March 2026, Wessex Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Vicki Simpson to undertake a preliminary roost assessment of 92 Pine Road, a detached dormer style family home with detached garage located in the northern sector of Chandler's Ford.

1.1.2. The purpose of this report was to:

- Assess the buildings within the survey area for bat roosting potential
- Present the reasons for the assessment based on best practice guidelines
- Provide requirements for the Site, including further surveys to ensure the proposed works are carried out in accordance with current legislation.

1.2. Site Description

1.2.1. Site name and its grounds, hereafter referred to as 'the Site', measured approximately 817 m² and was situated on Pine Road, which ran along the southern boundary of the Site (approximate OS grid reference: SU 43060 22107), see Figures 1 & 2 below.

1.2.2. The planning reference for this project is **N/K**.

1.2.3. The Site comprised a roadside entrance with a cobbled brick driveway leading to the main building, which was slightly set back and positioned towards the south-western boundary. A lawned area was located within the corner of this boundary. To the rear of the building, there was a brick path which runs along the eastern side of the Site, with the remainder laid to lawn. The rear area extends to the north of the main building and was bordered by a wooden fence.

1.2.4. The buildings on Site were a detached two storey dormer style family home and a detached single storey garage.

1.2.5. At the time of writing, the proposed developments and alterations to the Site were as follows:

- Demolish and replace the existing garage.
- Construction of a single-storey, flat-roofed rear extension to the main building, adjoining the rebuilt garage.

1.2.6. All ecological surveys are led by Ecologists who are members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) at the appropriate level. By joining the CIEEM staff sign up to a professional code of conduct.

Figure 1. Site location with red line boundary



Figure 2. Landscape surrounding site of proposed development



2. Personnel

2.1. Desk study and report writing

- 2.1.1. Ashleigh Cairns is an ecologist who leads preliminary roost assessments, supports bat emergence surveys and has experience with a range of field survey techniques. She is an experienced bat surveyor who works as an accredited agent under the Natural England Class 2 Licence 2025-86241-CL18-BAT.
- 2.1.2. Daniel Ahern is an experienced ecologist with a wide skills base gained in both the private and public sectors. He has been technical lead on large capital projects for regulators, government and utilities. Daniel has led freshwater & terrestrial ecology teams and has a robust understanding of current legislation and monitoring requirements. He currently holds NE licences for bats (Natural England Class 2 Licence 2025-86241-CL18-BAT), white-clawed crayfish & GCN. Daniel has held SNH and NPWS licences for fresh-water pearl mussel and white-clawed crayfish in addition to NE licences for *Lurionium natans*.

2.2. Field survey

- 2.2.1. Chris Fry is an experienced bat surveyor who works as an accredited agent under the Natural England Class 2 Licence 2025-86241-CL18-BAT. He supports bat emergence surveys and leads on Preliminary Roost Assessments.

3. Planning and Legislation

3.1. Planning policies

- 3.1.1. This report is prepared with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

3.2. Legislation

- 3.2.1. The following legislation informed the survey approach and considerations. Further details regarding specific legislation relevant to this project can be found in Appendix 3.
- European Habitats Directive
 - Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
 - The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)
 - The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
 - Wild mammals (protection) Act 1996

4. Methodology

4.1. Desk study

4.1.1. The following publicly accessible websites were searched for relevant ecological information:

- <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>
- <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-1376> - summary of nature conservation legislation
- www.ukbap.org.uk (archived 2012)
- www.gridreferencefinder.com and www.google.com for aerial photography
- The Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside-
<https://magic.defra.gov.uk/magicmap.aspx>

4.1.2. The following data was collected from the MAGIC website:

- Records of bat European Protected Species Licences (EPSL's) within 2km of the Site boundary
- Special areas of Conservation within 7.5km of the Site boundary

4.2. Field survey

4.2.1. An internal and external bat inspection was undertaken on the 16th of March 2026 by Chris Fry (Accredited Agents under Natural England licence: 2025-86241-CL18-BAT). The inspection followed methods described in the Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines (fourth edition) (Collins; 2023).

4.3. External inspection

4.3.1. The exterior walls and roof of the building were viewed from ground level and features that provide potential bat access points or roosting places were noted and referred to as potential roost features (PRF). Features that were looked for include but not limited to:

- cracks/holes in mortar;
- gaps between ridge tiles and ridge and roof tiles;
- gaps in soffit boxes;
- gaps under wooden cladding; and
- gaps around the eaves.

4.3.2. Areas where bat droppings may accumulate, such as on the ground, ledges, window sills and walls, were also inspected.

4.3.3. Any features that may potentially be used by bats were identified and any evidence of bat activity, as listed above, were noted.

4.4. Internal inspection

4.4.1. The internal inspection comprised a thorough search of the roof void within the building for evidence indicative of past or current use by roosting bats. Direct evidence of bat presence may include:

- live bats or bat corpses;
- droppings;
- bat sounds;
- scratch marks;
- urine stains; and
- clean, cob-web free gaps around potential entrance points.

4.4.2. Potential access points and roosting sites were also noted.

4.4.3. In any roof voids, a systematic search for evidence of bat presence was undertaken, concentrating on roof beams, ceiling joists and exposed surfaces. Any evidence was recorded.

4.5. Bat Roost Assessment

4.5.1. The findings of the internal and external surveys inform an assessment of the structure, classifying the bat roost potential it has. The different classifications are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Bat roost assessment classifications

Classification	Description
NONE	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/underground levels).
NEGLIGIBLE	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats; however, a small elements of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.
LOW	A structure with one or more potential roost sites which could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter or protection, appropriate conditions and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats, (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site but could be used by individual hibernating bats).
MODERATE	A structure with one or more potential roost sites which could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and suitable surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation space - the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of

	species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).
HIGH	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and suitable surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g. maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation site.
CONFIRMED	Evidence of bats roosting in the building or structure is recorded, bats, their droppings or feeding remains.

4.6. Equipment

4.6.1. The following equipment was available to use during the survey:

- Close-focusing binoculars
- Torch
- Camera

4.7. Limitations

4.7.1. The data provided by the online resources were not exhaustive. It is possible that bat species not included in the data search occur within the vicinity of the proposed development site.

4.7.2. The internal and external inspection survey provides a snapshot of conditions at the time of survey. Bats are mobile creatures that will move into and out of areas.

4.7.3. The details within this report will remain valid for a period of 12 months from the date of issue.

4.7.4. Limitations for the field survey (None)

5. Results

5.1. Desk study

5.1.1. The MAGIC data search confirmed that there were no Special Area of Conservation (SAC) relevant to Annex II bat species recorded within 7.5km of the Site boundary. The details of which are in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Special Areas of Conservation relevant to Annex II bat species within 7.5km of the Site boundary

Name	Area (ha)	Designation	Description	Distance & direction from the Site
None	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

5.1.2. The MAGIC data search confirmed that there was seven bat European Protected Species Licences (EPSL's) within 2km of the Site boundary. The details of which are in Table 3 below.

5.1.3. It is not believed the proposed development will have a significant impact on the status of the known local roosts.

Table 3. Bat EPSL records within 2km of the Site boundary

EPSL Reference	Species named	Distance & direction from the Site
2018-33643-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared & common pipistrelle	1807m north
2017-27981-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared, common pipistrelle, serotine & soprano pipistrelle	924m southeast
2017-27981-EPS-MIT-1	Brown long eared, common pipistrelle, serotine & soprano pipistrelle	924m southeast
2020-49783-EPS-MIT	Soprano pipistrelle	901m east
2016-21370-EPS-MIT	common pipistrelle & soprano pipistrelle	1633m east
2016-27039-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared & common pipistrelle	1807m north
2018-34234-EPS-MIT	Brown long eared	958m north

5.2. Building inspection

5.2.1. The results of the internal and external bat inspection are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Building inspection results

Building	External description	Internal description
Building 1 – 92 Pine Road	The building roof was of a gable-ended, dual-pitched design, with flat-roofed dormer	The eaves section to the rear of the building closest to where

	windows to the front and rear elevations. A cross-hipped roof was present over the single-storey front porch, which also incorporated a small flat-roofed extension to the side. The pitched roof sections were clad in machine made interlocking concrete tiles incorporating tight fitting verge tiles. The eaves were enclosed with close fitting uPVC soffits and fascias, and the Dorner windows clad in a heavy-duty bitumen type felt. The walls of the building were constructed from brick with machine made concrete tile cladding on the walls of the dormer sections and down to roof line level at each gable end. No PRF were recorded. No evidence of bats was recorded externally.	works are planned were not internally accessible. No PRF were recorded & no evidence of bats was recorded internally.
Building 2 – 92 Pine Road Garage	The building roof was of a gable-ended, dual-pitched design The pitched roof sections were clad in machine made interlocking concrete tiles The walls of the building were constructed from brick with horizontal wooden cladding down to roof line level at each gable end. No PRF were recorded. No evidence of bats was recorded externally.	The underside of the roof was open, fully visible, and well maintained. The roof was constructed using breathable roofing membrane over wooden beams and rafters, and the fabric was found to be in good condition with no PRF recorded. The building was primarily used for storage, including the rafters. No evidence of bats was found inside the building.

5.3. Preliminary roost assessment

5.3.1. The bat results of the bat roost assessment with potential, reasons and requirements for each building are set out in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Bat roost assessment

Building	Bat Roost Potential	Reason	Requirements
----------	---------------------	--------	--------------

Building 1 – 92 Pine Road	NEGLIGIBLE	- No PRF recorded in the roof and wall cladding - No evidence of bats recorded externally or internally	No further survey work required.
Building 1 – 92 Pine Road Garage.	NEGLIGIBLE	- No PRF recorded in the roof and wall cladding - No evidence of bats recorded externally or internally	No further survey work required.

6. Requirements

6.1. Further surveys

6.1.1. Building 1 & 2 – None Required.

6.2. Recommendations

- 6.2.1. One Harlech bat box - https://www.birdfood.co.uk/harlech-woodstone-bat-box-black?gclid=EAlalQobChMIwlbT2pqD_glVYz7tCh1AoAVbEAAYAiAAEgLxGfD_BwE. Installed at a height of at least 3m above the ground on a west facing tree or building elevation.
- 6.2.2. One Woodstone bird box - https://www.birdfood.co.uk/national-trust-woodstone-32mm-nest-box-green?utm_source=google_shopping&gclid=EAlalQobChMI-ef86JqD_glVjdPtCh21_QonEAQYASABEgLZcPD_BwE. Installed at a height of at least 3m above the ground on a west facing tree or building elevation.
- 6.2.3. One insect block - https://www.birdfood.co.uk/woodstone-insect-block-grey?utm_source=google_shopping&gclid=EAlalQobChMIrZm8-ZqD_glVEmHmCh2g5g_FEAQYAiABEgJu4fD_BwE. Installed at a height of 1.5m above the ground on a south facing tree or building elevation.

7. References

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn.) The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Gunnell, K., et al (2010) Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings. (2nd edn). RIBA.

Mitchell-Jones, A. J. (ed.) (2004) Bat Workers' Manual (3rd edn). JNCC.

8. Appendices

Appendix 1 – Site photographs

Photo 1 – Building 1 rear view where works are proposed.



Photo 2 – Building 1 external view of close-fitting soffits & verge tiles.



Photo 3 – Building 2 external view of detached garage.



Photo 4 – Building 2 internal view of garage, roof underside.



Appendix 2 – Relevant legislation

Bats

All bats in the UK are protected by law. They are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and European law under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

This means it is an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat
- Deliberately disturb a bat
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat
- Possess or control a bat
- Transport a bat
- Sell or exchange a bat
- Offer for sale or exchange any bat, alive or dead, or any part of a bat.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat occupying a structure or place used for shelter or protection,
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection by bats.

Disturbance of animals includes disturbance which is likely to impair their ability to survive, breed or reproduce, rear or nurture their young, migrate or hibernate. It also includes any disturbance likely to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species. Consequently, attention should be given to dealing with the modification or development of an area if aspects of it are deemed important to bats, such as flight corridors and foraging areas.

Subject to receiving planning approval, it may be necessary to apply for and obtain a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) from Natural England under the conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) (Amendments) 2017 Regulations, to legally allow the proposed works to take place.

If a licence is required, no building works on the building must take place until an EPSL has been issued.

Relevant link:

[Bats and the law - Advice - Bat Conservation Trust](#)

Birds

All wild birds, their nests and eggs are protected by law under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

This means it is an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take wild birds
- Intentionally take, damage or destroy a wild bird's nest while it is being used or built
- Intentionally take or destroy a wild bird's egg
- Possess, control or transport live or dead wild birds, or parts of them, or their eggs
- Sell wild birds or put them on display for sale
- Use prohibited methods to kill or take wild birds

Birds under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) have extra legal protection and it is an offence to:

- Disturb them while they are nesting, building a nest, in or near a nest that contains their young
- Disturb their dependent young

Relevant link:

[Wild birds: protection and licences - GOV.UK](#)