



PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT REPORT

SITE LOCATION

Moor Barns Farm,
Pipe Lane,
Orton-on-the-Hill,
Atherstone
CV9 3NF

ISSUE DATE

24th August 2023

SEED REF

1631-PRA-V1-A

CLIENT

Peter & Keeley Grayson

ARBORICULTURAL CONSULTANCY

SEED-ARB.CO.UK

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Date	Author	Checked	Revision
24.08.2023	Katie Bird	OC	Rev A

NOTE:

Ecological Surveys & Reports provided in association with Collington Winter Environmental Ltd.



COPYRIGHT ©

This report, all plans, illustrations, and other associated material remains the property of SEED Arboriculture Ltd until paid for in full. Copyright and intellectual property rights remain with SEED Arboriculture Ltd.

LIMITATIONS

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. SEED Arboriculture Ltd shall not be liable for any use of this report other than for the purposes for which it was produced.

Any alteration to the application site or development proposals could change the current circumstances and may invalidate this report and any recommendations made.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the SEED Arboriculture Ltd Terms & Conditions, SEED Arboriculture Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Methodology	4
3. Survey Results.....	5
4. Summary	11
5. Bibliography	11

1. Introduction

Scope & Purpose

- 1.1.1. Seed Arboriculture Ltd were commissioned by Peter & Keeley Grayson to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at the site at Moor Barns Farm, Pipe Lane, Orton-on-the-Hill, CV93NF. This report has been produced to inform a planning application at the site, relating to the full demolition of three buildings to be replaced with two buildings.
- 1.1.2. The author of this report is Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM, Principal Ecologist, who holds a Level 2 Class Bat Licence.

Site Location

- 1.1.3. Please refer to Figure 1 for the site location. The site is in Orton-on-the-Hill, a village and former parish in the Hinckley and Bosworth district of Leicestershire.



Figure 1 - Site Location Plan

Objectives

- 1.1.4. The objectives of the PRA are as follows:
- Identify any areas of bat roosting potential within the building.
 - Assess the value of the building for roosting bats.

- Search for signs of bats.
- Provide recommendations on any further surveys or mitigation required for bats.

2. Methodology

Desk Study

- 2.1.1. An initial desk-based assessment of the site was undertaken to collate baseline data. The desk study included:
- Review of aerial and OS maps for habitat information.
 - Review of potential habitat links on and off site, to determine the potential zone of influence of the proposed development.
 - Locations of granted European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) within 5 km of the site.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

- 2.1.2. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the site was undertaken on 15th August 2023 by Katie Bird (2020-48950-CLS-CLS).
- 2.1.3. The survey was undertaken following guidance set out in Collins (2016). This includes undertaking a detailed internal and external inspection of any features to compile information on potential roosting features (PRFs) and potential access points. A search for field signs of bats (i.e. droppings, urine stains and feeding remains) was also completed. The use of binoculars and torches assisted with the survey. Please refer to Figure 2 for building references.



Figure 2 – Building reference plan

- 2.1.4. The building was assessed as per categories listed in Table 4.1 Collins (2016) and reproduced in Table 1.

Table 2 – Assessment criteria for bat roosting potential

Bat Roosting Potential	Description
Negligible	Negligible features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and/ or suitable surrounding habitats to be used on a regular basis by larger numbers of bats.
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats, but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status.
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and for longer periods of time.

Survey Limitations

2.1.5. No limitations were encountered during the survey period.

3. Survey Results

Desk Study

- 3.1.1. The site is located within an agricultural area, surrounded by fields on all aspects which appeared to be bound by hedgerows and treelines, based on aerial photography. Additionally, pockets of woodland are located within the landscape. It is anticipated the surrounding habitats will be of importance for commuting and foraging bats. In addition, minimal light pollution is anticipated within this area.
- 3.1.2. No EPSL's were identified within 5km of the site boundary. This does not confirm bat roosting absence but is more likely due to the site being within an agricultural area with limited development/projects that would encounter the need for EPSLs.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Building 1 (B1)

- 3.1.3. B1 comprises a two-storey residential dwelling which is currently in use. An extension was located on the southern aspect, which including two dormer windows and a balcony. Windows and doorways were present across much of the building, which were flush to the brick work. The dormer windows were sealed with plastic finishes, with no PRFs or access points. The brick work was also in good condition, with no PRFs, and no missing mortar on the northern and southern gable ends.
- 3.1.4. The roof was pitched with which had multiple lifted tiles across its extent which may provide a PRF or internal access to the loft (where felt was ripped internally). Mortar was missing at multiple ridge tiles which may provide a PRF. Gaps were observed between the brick and overhanging eaves on many aspects (minus the eastern aspect) which may provide a PRF or potential access points.
- 3.1.5. Internally, the rooms were used for residential purposes, where on the upper floor, some aspects of the ceiling were vaulted and covered in plaster board and painted. Three lofts were present, two of which were inspected. The loft height was approximately 1-1.5m tall and lined with roofing felt, with exposed supporting wooden beams.
- 3.1.6. The northern loft area was generally in good condition, with no obvious ripped areas of felt and no light gaps to indicate potential access points observed. Extensive piles of mouse and rat droppings were observed, making it difficult to identify if bat droppings were present, but none were found.
- 3.1.7. The central loft area was of similar size and specification as the northern loft area. A section of ripped roofing was identified on the western aspect of the roof which may provide a potential access point for bats into the loft area. No bat droppings were observed, however due to the number of mouse and rat, it couldn't be ruled out.
- 3.1.8. **Due to the number of PRFs and potential access points observed, the building was assessed as having moderate bat roosting potential.**

Building 2 (B2)

- 3.1.9. B2 comprised a single storey garage/ storage shed. It was approximately 2.5-3m tall and constructed of red brick with a pitched, clay tile roof. It was open on the eastern aspect which will provide open access to the internal aspect. No crevices were identified within the external brick work and no PRFs were noted. The roof was in poor condition, with multiple lifted and slipped tiles which would provide internal access.
- 3.1.10. Internally, the brick work and slate tiles were exposed, with the wooden supporting beams. No roofing felt was present across its extent. A single pigeon nest was noted. An inspection for PRFs internally was completed where no suitable crevices were observed and due to being open on the eastern aspect, the building likely provides limited cover.
- 3.1.11. **Due to no PRFs observed internally or externally, and no field signs, the building was assessed as having negligible bat roosting potential.**

Building 3 (B3)

- 3.1.12. B3 comprised a single storage stable which had partially been renovated by the previous owner, which included re-roofing works. It had a pitched roof constructed of clay tiles in which multiple were lifted which may provide a PRF or potential access point across the roof structure. Generally, the mortar at the ridge tiles appeared in good condition, with no missing sections observed from the ground and mortar was sealed on all gable ends.
- 3.1.13. The overhanging beams on the gable ends had a gap between the beams and brick work which may provide an access point or a PRF to between the tiles and internal roofing felt.
- 3.1.14. The external brick work was in good condition, with no crevices observed across its extent.
- 3.1.15. An entrance canopy was located to the north of the site. It was pitched with a tile roof, where tiles were lifted, which may provide a PRF between the cavity of the tiles and underside boarding. A gap between the brick work and canopy structure was observed which may provide a PRF.
- 3.1.16. Internally, the eastern aspect was subject to the recent renovation works where an internal breeze block wall was present providing a cavity between the external wall and the internal wall and will be suitable for bats. Insulation was observed in the cavity, but it still may provide a PRF. The supporting roof beams were mainly new, and mortar was located around the beams were placed in the walls and won't provide a PRF. However, some older beams were present, where cracks in the beams may provide a PRF. The roofing felt was exposed whilst no crevices in the brick work was identified across the internal aspect. A nesting pigeon was observed on the internal beam during the survey.
- 3.1.17. The stables on the western aspect also had recent re-roofing works and of similar structure as the eastern aspect. Multiple access points to the internal via gaps above the brick wall and the roof. Limited PRFs were identified due to mortar missing in some brick work which may provide a crevice. No cavity walls identified. Possible feeding remains were identified due to a butterfly wing, but this may relate to birds foraging.
- 3.1.18. **Due to the number of PRFs and potential access points observed, the building was assessed as having moderate bat roosting potential.**
- 3.1.19. Please refer to Table 2 for photographs.

Table 2 – Building Photographs

Feature	Photograph
Building 1 external	
Building 1 internal	

Building 2 external	
Building 2 internal	
Building 3 external	

Building 3 internal



4. Summary

Further Surveys

- 4.1.1. B1 and B3 were assessed as having moderate bat roosting potential. Therefore, in accordance with Best Practice guidance (Collins, 2016) further nocturnal emergence/ re- entry surveys should be undertaken between May-September (inclusive) to determine usage by roosting bats (depending on the extent of development works). A minimum of one survey should be undertaken between May – August to capture the maternity season.
- 4.1.2. The results of the further surveys will determine if any mitigation is required for roosting bats. If roosting bats are located within any of the buildings, a Natural England Mitigation Licence may be required for development to proceed. The Licence can only be obtained once planning permission has been granted and all wildlife conditions discharged. However, the bat emergence surveys must be undertaken prior to planning permission being applied for as they are a material consideration.
- 4.1.3. Please note, bat emergence surveys are typically valid for 12 months. If a Mitigation Licence is required, survey results from the most recent bat survey season are required.
- 4.1.4. B2 was assessed as having negligible bat roosting potential and will not require any further surveys or mitigation relating to bats.

Other Mitigation

- 4.1.5. B2 and B3 were found to support nesting birds. As such building works should be undertaken with consideration to nesting birds, It is recommended, post development bird boxes are installed on the buildings and/or trees, targeting notable species such as swifts.
- 4.1.6. Any vegetation removal and building works, should be undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (March to September, inclusive). If this is not possible, a suitably qualified ecologist should undertake a nesting bird check no more than 48 hours prior to removal. If nesting activity is observed, the nest(s) should be left in situ until the young have fledged. A suitable buffer will be maintained and determined by the ecologist.
- 4.1.7. NOTE: Pigeons will nest all year round and buildings should be checked for **nesting pigeons** prior to any works.

5. Bibliography

- Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK: Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Downs, N. C. et al (2003) The effects of illuminating the roost entrance on the emergence behaviour of *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*. Biological Conservation 111, 247-252.
- Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005). Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.
- Mitchell-Jones (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines: Working Today for Natura Tomorrow. English Nature.
- Mitchell-Jones and McLeish (2004). Third Edition Bat Workers' Manual.
- Packman, C., Zeale, M., Harris, S. & Jones, G. (2015). Management of bats in churches – a pilot. English Heritage Research Project: 6199.