



## **PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT**

**23 Rogersfield  
Langho  
Blackburn  
Lancashire**



# PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT

**23 Rogersfield  
Langho  
Blackburn  
Lancashire**

*A report for*

**Mr & Mrs Butterworth**  
23 Rogersfield  
Langho  
Blackburn  
Lancashire  
BB6 8HB

*Report authors*

**Pennine Ecological**  
1 Moss Cottage  
North Road  
Bretherton  
Nr Leyland  
Lancashire  
PR26 9AY

Tel. (01772) 600441

email: [ian@pennineecological.co.uk](mailto:ian@pennineecological.co.uk)

web: [www.pennineecological.co.uk](http://www.pennineecological.co.uk)

Ian Ryding

November 2022

# PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT

23 Rogersfield  
Langho  
Blackburn  
Lancashire

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGE NO.
<b>PART 1 INTRODUCTION:</b>	
1.1 Reasons for Survey.....	1
1.2 Site Location .....	1
1.3 Survey Methodology.....	1
1.4 Survey Constraints .....	2
<b>PART 2 SURVEY RESULTS:</b>	
2.1 Executive Summary.....	3
2.2 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.....	3
2.3 Evaluation of Other Features.....	6
<b>PART 3 SUMMARY EVALUATION &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	
3.1 Summary Evaluation of Findings.....	6
3.2 Recommendations.....	7
<b>REFERENCES:</b>	
<b>APPENDIX:</b>	
<i>Part Plans Elevations As Existing / Proposed</i>	

### **Terms of Use**

*This report has been compiled by Pennine Ecological with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the instruction and permissions granted by the client. The results, conclusions and recommendations of this report are proportionate and in line with the British Standard 42020:2013.*

*This is a technical report and does not represent legal advice/opinion.*

*The report is for the sole use of the commissioning client in connection with the development project described in the report, and must not be used for any other purpose, copied, re-produced or sent to any other party other than the Local Planning Authority without the permission of Pennine Ecological.*

*This report remains the property of Pennine Ecological and cannot be relied upon until full payment has been made. Pennine Ecological reserve the right to retract any survey reports submitted to planning where payments are outstanding.*

*Pennine Ecological will retain the right to re-publish data obtained, and to forward data collected during all its ecology surveys to the local wildlife records centre.*

## **PART 1: INTRODUCTION:**

---

### **1.1 REASONS FOR SURVEY:**

Pennine Ecological have been commissioned by Mr & Mrs Butterworth, to undertake a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PRA) of 23 Rogersfield, Langho, Blackburn, Lancashire, BB6 8HB.

The study is required in association with the proposed remodelling of the existing dormer and porch, and the addition of solar panels to the main roof.

The study also includes a full evaluation of the ecological significance of the survey and recommendations/precautions where appropriate.

The surveys were undertaken by Ian Ryding a surveyor with over 35 years' experience in a wide range of ecological survey and assessment.

### **1.2 SITE LOCATION:**

The site is located at 23 Rogersfield, Langho, Blackburn, Lancashire, BB6 8HB.

The location of the study area is shown in the Appendix.

### **1.3 SURVEY METHODOLOGY:**

The methodology applied is as follows.

#### **1.3.1 Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment:**

The Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was undertaken on the 25<sup>th</sup> October 2022. following the methodology outlined in *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn)* Collins, J. Bat Conservation Trust (2016)

The survey included the following standard non-intrusive searches for potential roosts in the building on the site.

- Searches for feeding remains, staining and bat droppings on floors around the edge of the interior/exterior walls.
- Searches for suitable entry and exit points in gaps between masonry, around eaves, soffits, ridges, flashing and/or under roof sheets etc.

The building's exterior was surveyed from ground level using close focusing Leica 8x32 binoculars.

The survey was undertaken by an experienced preliminary assessor of bat roosts.

#### **1.3.2 Other Species:**

During the survey, observations relating to the potential presence of nesting birds in the building was also made.

### **1.3.3 Surveyor Experience:**

The surveyor and author of this report, Ian Ryding, has over 35 years' experience in ecological survey and evaluation. Key skills include the following.

- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey/Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and National Vegetation Classification Survey.
- Highly proficient field botanist, including some difficult plant groups.
- Mammal surveys including surveys for badger, water vole\*, otter\*, brown hare and preliminary bat roost assessment.

\*Over 250km of river reaches surveyed in England.

- Breeding and wintering bird survey.
- Expert witness delivering proof of evidence in respect of nesting birds at public inquiry in 2018 and 2020.
- Extensive experience in great crested newt (GCN) survey, evaluation, licensing and mitigation. Natural England Class Licence WML-CL08 held.
- Ecological Evaluation and Impact Assessments in association with large scale commercial development and civil engineering.

### **1.4 SURVEY CONSTRAINTS:**

There were no significant constraints to the survey.

## **PART 2 SURVEY RESULTS:**

---

### **2.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

- There is a single detached house dating from around the 1960s-1970s on the site. The house was occupied at the time of survey.
- The house is in good condition and effectively sealed around the roof and roof line preventing bat ingress.
- The house has 'negligible' bat roost potential therefore no further survey is required.
- The building showed no sign of nesting birds and nesting potential is 'negligible'.

### **2.2 PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST ASSESSMENT:**

The preliminary bat roost assessment (PRA) was undertaken on the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2022, following the methodology outlined in *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn)* Collins, J. Bat Conservation Trust (2016)

The survey included standard non-intrusive searches for potential roosts in the house on site.

#### **Constraints:**

There were no significant constraints to the survey.

#### **General Description:**

The building affected by the proposal was occupied at the time of survey.

The house is of brick construction with a cavity wall and concrete-tiled roof with matching ridge tiles.

There is a dormer above an integrated garage, and a small, attached porch projecting off the front elevation.

A conservatory extends off the south elevation which has a composite slate roof with matching ridge. The roof is in good condition with no gaps where bats might gain access.

The roof of the house is in good condition with no missing or slipped tiles and the ridge tiles are mortared into place and neatly pointed. There are no gaps that might potentially allow bat ingress into the roof space.

There are UPVC soffits throughout the property that fit tight to the wall with no gaps to allow bat ingress.

The roof verges have a dry verge system that also prevents bat ingress at the verge.

The lead flashing is in good condition as is the pointing on the walls of the property.

Overall, the roof and roofline has been well maintained and is effectively sealed, thus preventing bat ingress.

A small area of decorative rendering on the south elevation has 'blown', creating a small gap where the thin outer layer of render has lifted from the base coat. However, the raised skin of blown render is cracked and fragile and is of no significance to roosting bats.

There are no deeper recesses.

Based on the features present, the building has 'negligible' bat roost potential.

### **Foraging Areas:**

There is a wooded clough abutting the back garden of the property that has potentially 'high' foraging value along its edges for bats locally.

These foraging areas are not adversely affected by the proposals.

### **Conclusions:**

The building is in good, well-maintained condition and effectively sealed from bat ingress.

Based on the absence of any feature that might possibly be used by roosting bats, roost potential is evaluated as 'negligible'.

As the building affected has 'negligible' bat roost potential, in line with the BCT guidance no further survey is required.

The proposals and location of the property surveyed is provided on the plan in the appendix. The plans submitted with the planning application should be referred to in respect of the detailed proposals.

The photographs below show the general conditions in the building surveyed.

### **Site Photographs: Bats:**



**Photograph 1: Front (east) elevation.**





**Photograph 2: Typical view of the tight-fitting UPVC soffits on the north gable. Dry verge visible.**



**Photograph 3: South elevation – conservatory with composite slate roof. Blown render visible above.**



**Photograph 4: General view of the dry verge and UPVC soffits with no means of bat ingress.**



**Photograph 5: Typical view of the rear (west) and south gable elevations.**



**Photograph 6: Typical view of the roof which is in good condition with no gaps.**

## **2.3 EVALUATION OF OTHER FEATURES:**

### **2.3.1 Breeding Birds:**

The survey found no evidence historic nesting by any bird species.

Overall nesting potential in the property is 'negligible'.

## **PART 3 SUMMARY EVALUATION & RECOMMENDATIONS:**

---

### **3.1 SUMMARY EVALUATION OF FINDINGS:**

The field survey and evaluation of the site revealed the following information.

#### **3.1.1 Bats:**

The proposal affects a building with 'negligible' value for roosting bats, therefore, no adverse effects are predicted as result of the proposed development of the property.

#### **3.1.2 Birds:**

The survey found no evidence historic nesting by any bird species and potential is 'negligible'.

### **3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The following section outlines any mitigation or precautions required in respect of the survey findings.

#### **3.2.1 Bats:**

The building has 'negligible' bat roost potential, therefore, in line with the recommendations provided in the BCT Good Practice Guidelines (2016)\*, **no further bat surveys are required to determine the level of use by bats.**

*\*Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn) Collins, J. Bat Conservation Trust (2016).*

As an absolute precaution, if bats or any sign of bats is found or suspected to be present during construction, work must stop, and a suitable licenced ecologist contacted on how to proceed in respect of the Regulations.

#### **3.2.2 Birds:**

No recommendations provided.

## REFERENCES:

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

DEFRA (2006) Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 – Habitats and Species of Principal Importance in England. DEFRA/Natural England

English Nature (2004) *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*, English Nature.

Gilbert G, Gibbons D.W. & Evans J. (1998) *Bird Monitoring Methods*. RSPB et al.

Lancashire County Planning Department, (1998) *Biological Heritage Sites. Guidelines for Selection*. Lancashire County Council

Nature Conservancy Council (1990) *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – A Technique for Environmental Audit*. Nature Conservancy Council.

Pyefinch, R. & Golborn, P. (2001) *Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Lancashire and North Merseyside 1997-2000*. Lancashire Bird Club/Lancashire and Cheshire Fauna Society.

## **Appendix:**

*Part Plans Elevations As Existing / Proposed*

