



Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:

13 Market Street, Eastleigh SO50 5RH

Client:

Swan Local Ltd (15142546)

Survey date:

05/05/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Eastleigh Borough Council. This proposal can be described as the erection of a single front and two rear dormers with internal alterations.

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion

Executive Summary

The following is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission and to comply with legislation. Further information, along with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, are outlined in Tables 1, 3 & 4 of this report.

Key Findings
Bats & Birds Precautionary working methods. Please see relevant sections for details.

Contents

Introduction and Context.....	3
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Limitations	3
Results, Impacts and Recommendations	4
Site Location and Landscape Context.....	4
Fauna.....	6
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan.....	14
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan	16
Appendix 3: PRA Plan	17
Appendix 4: Site Photographs	18
Limitations and Copyright.....	20
Version Control	20

Introduction and Context

Introduction

The aim of the PRA was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how bats could use the site for roosting, foraging or commuting.

No previous ecology reports have been produced for this site by Arbtech Consulting Ltd or, to the author's knowledge, by any other consultancy.

Methodology

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

Limitations

Whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report is a preliminary assessment and does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. Nor does it represent a full botanical assessment. It assesses the likelihood of protected, notable and important habitats and species being present, based on a site and landscape level habitat value-based risk assessment. This is based upon the ecology, biology and known distribution of species as currently understood.

A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.

The internal space of B1 was inaccessible at the time of the survey; however, a cursory inspection was undertaken to assess its suitability for void-dwelling bats.

Results, Impacts and Recommendations

Site Location and Landscape Context

Table 1: Site location and landscape context

Site Location					
The site is located at National Grid Reference SU 45587 18993 and has an area of approximately 0.01ha comprising one building. The site is located on a high street within a highly urbanised setting and is immediately surrounded by dense residential and commercial development on all sides. Aerial imagery shows that the local environment remains predominantly urban in all directions, with dense developments and limited vegetation. However, it should be noted that there is an increase in agricultural fields, grassland, and small woodland copses within the wider landscape to the east, on the opposite side of an industrial estate and railway line.					
Priority Habitats and Designated Sites					
Summary of Survey Findings <u>Priority Habitats</u> There are 8 priority habitats located within 2 km of the site. These comprise coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, deciduous woodland, lowland meadows, traditional orchard, purple moor grass and rush pastures, ancient & semi-natural woodland, ancient replanted woodland and wood pasture and parkland. The closest priority habitat comprises coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, located ~0.56km east of the site. The development site is not considered to be suitably connected to the identified priority habitats, owing to the heavily urbanised nature of the surrounding environment and the distance separating the site from these notable habitats. <u>Designated Sites</u> There are 2 statutory sites within 2 km of the site. These are listed below: <i>Table 1a: Statutory sites within 2km of the site.</i> <table> <tr> <th>Designation</th><th>Reason for designation</th><th>Distance from site</th></tr> </table>			Designation	Reason for designation	Distance from site
Designation	Reason for designation	Distance from site			

River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest and Special Area of Conservation SSSI & SAC	Two Annex II species are considered primary reasons for the SAC designation: bullhead fish and southern damselfly. White-clawed crayfish, brook lamprey, Atlantic salmon, and otter are also Annex II species present within the SAC, although they are not regarded as primary qualifying features of the designation. Furthermore, the River Itchen is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) not only for the species listed above, but also for the presence of valuable habitats such as chalk streams, fen meadow, flood pasture, and swamp.	~0.58km Northeast
The site falls within the impact risk zone for River Itchen SSSI however, the proposed development type is not listed as possible high risk with regard to this designation. The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the local records centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environs of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designable quality. Impacts No direct impacts to any designated sites will occur as a result of the proposed development, due to the small scale and low overall impact of the development from such sites (where known), alongside additional factors such as distance in combination with connectivity disrupting barriers. Recommendations No recommendations.		

Fauna

The site survey was undertaken by Abby Pidgen BSc (Hons) MSc, Senior Ecologist, accredited agent on Natural England Bat Licence and Holder of Natural England CL08 Licence. Licence numbers available upon request.

Table 2: Survey weather conditions

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
05/05/2026	13.3	66	100	18.1	None

Table 3: Fauna

Fauna: Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations <i>This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.</i>			
Roosting Bats			
Summary of Survey Findings A review of the MAGIC database for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) for bats within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. 9 EPSL were identified, as detailed below: <i>Table 3a: EPSL records within 2km of the site - bats</i>			
EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence
2018-37589-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~0.27km northwest	Destruction of a resting place.
2018-37589-EPS-MIT-1	Common pipistrelle	~0.27km northwest	Destruction of a resting place.
2018-37589-EPS-MIT-2	Common pipistrelle	~0.27km northwest	Destruction of a resting place.

2019-43153-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle and Brown long-eared	~1.29km northeast	Damage to a breeding and resting place, affecting breeding.
EPSM2012-4025	Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared and Soprano pipistrelle.	~1.35km northeast	Destruction of a resting place.
2015-13185-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared and Soprano pipistrelle.	~1.43km northeast	Destruction of a resting place.
2014-5470-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared and Soprano pipistrelle.	~1.64km southwest	Destruction of a resting place.
2014-5470-EPS-MIT-1	Common pipistrelle, Brown long-eared and Soprano pipistrelle.	~1.64km southwest	Destruction of a resting place.
EPSM2009-1058	Common pipistrelle	~1.97km west	Destruction of a resting place.

Buildings

Building B1 Description

B1 is a two-storey, terraced, brick-built commercial building. The main roof is gabled and clad in slate tiles, with a small single-storey flat-roofed extension to the west. The brickwork was assessed as being in good condition throughout with minor defects such as occasional small cracks and areas of missing mortar. Upon inspection, these defects were considered shallow and superficial and therefore not assessed as suitable bat roosting features.

An internal space was recorded within the building; however, it was not fully accessible during the survey. It should be noted that the space was subject to an inspection via the holes in the roof in order to assess its suitability for void-dwelling bats. No evidence of bats was identified during the survey.

In line with the Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J. (Ed.), 2023), B1 is assessed as having negligible habitat value for roosting bats due to the absence of suitable roosting opportunities both internally and externally, in addition to the dense surrounding urban environment. It should be noted that access to the western flat-roof extension was possible, allowing the slate tiles on the western roof elevation to be thoroughly inspected. No evidence of bats was identified beneath or around the tiles, or within the large openings present. Furthermore, the site is located within a heavily urbanised area characterised by dense development, high levels of artificial lighting, and a lack of suitably connected vegetation, all of which contribute to the suboptimal nature of the site for bats.



Eastern elevation of B1.



Western elevation of B1.

Feature

Materials


Condition/Suitability

Photographs

	Roof	Slate tiles	The roof is clad in slate tiles and features open gaps and lifted tiles. Two notable areas of damage were identified on the western roof elevation. One opening, associated with displaced and damaged tiles, is located below the ridge line, while a second is situated above the guttering. These features may provide access points for void-dwelling bats; however, due to their exposed nature, they are unlikely to offer suitable roosting opportunities for crevice-dwelling species. It should also be noted that the lifted ridge tiles connected to the larger opening are considered suboptimal roosting features due to high levels of exposure and external light with no unexposed crevices beneath or around the tiles.	 <i>Hole in the roof below the lifted ridge tiles on the western elevation.</i>  <i>Hole in the roof above the guttering on the western elevation.</i>	
--	------	-------------	---	---	--

				 <i>Close up of the opening above the guttering.</i>	
	Voids	Bitumen felt lining, Timber rafters & Timber collars.	An internal space is present within B1. The space was only partially accessible via holes in the roofing, however due to high levels of light exposure in the void, internal features were rendered unsuitable for void-dwelling bats. Features that may be of interest to crevice dwelling bats, such as lining behind tiles were accessed externally and thoroughly searched for evidence of bat use and suitability, to which none was found. No other internal features were noted (such as gaps in gable walls or between support	 <i>Internal southern gable end of B1.</i>	

beams) that are capable of supporting roosting bats...



Internal northern end of B1.

Impacts

No impacts on roosting bats are anticipated as a result of the proposed development. However, the works may result in disturbance to bats roosting within neighbouring buildings, or, in the unlikely event that a bat is present within the building at the time of works, through increased noise, vibration, or artificial lighting.

Recommendations

Due to the potential for disturbance impacts to bats during the proposed works, the following precautionary working methods will be required:

- The works will be timed to take place when bats are least likely to be present; November to March. As the building is unsuitable for hibernation due to unstable temperature and humidity regimes and open eaves, this means that the likelihood of disturbing a bat is extremely low.
- The removal of any roof tiles will be supervised by a bat licenced ecologist.
- Prior to the start of work, the contractors will be given a toolbox talk by a bat licenced ecologist, who will be present for that first day of works. The ecologist will inspect the building prior to the start of work to ensure there are no bats present that could be affected. This will involve a search of the loft and endoscope search of the eaves and any roof tiles to be affected.
- The works will be scheduled in such a way that this element of the works (any roof tile removal) will be completed first to avoid multiple supervision visits.
- There must be no use of scaffolding that touches or obstructs the eaves of the building.
- No external artificial lighting will be used.
- Any use of power tools and high levels of noise and vibration will be carried out at least 10m from the development building and the main house where possible.
- There will be no radios or music played on the scaffolding or around the roof structures to keep disturbance to a minimum. Best practice measures will be employed to reduce noise and vibration to an absolute minimum.
- ALL WORKS MUST STOP IF A BAT, OR EVIDENCE OF BATS IS FOUND AND ADVICE SOUGHT FROM A SUITABLY QUALIFIED ECOLOGIST. If a bat is found, a license application will be made to Natural England.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

There are no suitable habitats on site which could be used for foraging bats. Furthermore, there are no strongly connected vegetated linear features present that may provide cohesive commuting routes between the site and features in the urban landscape.

Impacts

The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats.

Recommendations

None.

Birds

Summary of Survey Findings

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1, however there was a lot of evidence, such as faecal matter, to indicate that birds have been utilising the internal space. B1 is assessed to be highly accessible for nesting birds with suitable sheltering opportunities and therefore could be used by common nesting birds, such as pigeons which were seen on the roofing throughout the survey

Due to the small size of the site and the dense surrounding urban environment, the site is not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.

Impacts

B1 will be impacted as a result of the proposed development. These impacts are likely to be inconsequential to local bird populations owing to their low value. However, the proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests.

Recommendations

Any impacts to B1 should be undertaken outside the period 1 March to 31 August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of B1 should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.

Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests, depending on species present, until the young have fledged.

Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan





Appendix 2: Site Location Plan



Appendix 3: PRA Plan



Appendix 4: Site Photographs



Photo 1: Eastern elevation of B1.



Photo 2: Western elevation of B1.



Photo 3: Western flat roof extension.



Photo 4: Close up of roof tiles on the eastern elevation.



Photo 5: Superficial missing mortar on the western elevation.

Limitations and Copyright

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version Control

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Kiera Horman BSc (Hons), Graduate Ecologist	08/05/2026
Proof	0.2	Abby Pidgenson BSc (Hons) MSc, Senior Ecologist	08/05/2026
Final	1	Kiera Horman BSc (Hons), Graduate Ecologist	08/05/2026