



# **Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment & breeding birds survey**

## **Site: 144, Ribchester Rd, Salesbury**

30<sup>th</sup> November 2024

**CLIENT:**

Mr & Mrs Fish  
144 Ribchester Rd  
Salesbury

**Prepared By:**

Carol Edmondson MSc MRSB  
Ark Ecology  
Whalley  
BB7 9JQ

**Date checked & released:**

30<sup>th</sup> November 2024

**Valid Until**

1<sup>st</sup> May 2026

**Ark Ecology: Lower White Carr Farm, Moor Lane, Whalley, Lancs. BB7 9JQ**

## **Summary**

This report presents the results of a daylight preliminary bat roost assessment (PRA) undertaken on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2024, at 144 Ribchester Rd, Salesbury, Lancashire. The work has been commissioned in connection with a roof extension to the rear of the above property.

The scope of the survey has primarily considered roosting and hibernating bats, breeding birds and barn owls.

**The survey** has identified that there is **negligible** roosting habitat for bats in the building, and therefore no further surveys are recommended. No evidence of nesting birds was found in the building, but the surrounding garden has good quality habitat for birds and therefore some mitigation will be required for habitat loss.

### **Further surveys and recommendations:**

<b>Bats</b>
<p><b>No further surveys.</b> However, if bats are found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately, and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice.</p> <p>Should work be required on the roof or other areas of the existing building further survey will be required.</p> <p>Enhancements as recommended at 4.2</p>
<b>Birds</b>
<p>Any building or tree and scrub removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the building and scrub to be removed should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist, immediately prior to clearance. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged. Clearing the Site outside this timeframe avoids delays and further costs.</p> <p>Enhancements as recommended at 4.2</p>

For full justification of these recommendations, please go straight to section [4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations](#). Otherwise, the full report starts below.

## Contents

1.0 Introduction and Context.....	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 Context.....	4
1.3 Scope of the report .....	4
2.0 Methodology.....	5
2.2 Site Survey methodology .....	5
2.3 Breeding birds and other incidental observations .....	5
2.4 Suitability Assessment.....	5
2.5 Limitations – evaluation of the methodology .....	6
3.0 Results and Evaluation.....	6
3.1 Desk Study Results.....	6
3.1.1 Designated sites & Priority habitats .....	7
3.1.2 Landscape .....	7
3.1.3 Historical records.....	7
3.2 Field Survey Results .....	8
3.2.1 Site Feature descriptions and photos .....	9
4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations.....	11
4.1 Informative guidelines .....	11
4.2 Evaluation.....	11
5.0 Bibliography .....	13
Appendix 1: Survey Plan .....	14
Appendix 2: Proposed Site Plan .....	14

## 1.0 Introduction and Context

### 1.1 Background

Carol Edmondson of Ark Ecology was commissioned by Mr Paul Lomax on behalf of his client to carry out a Potential Bat Roost Survey (PRA) at 144 Ribchester Rd, Lancashire in November 2024.

The survey building was a two-storey detached residential dwelling, which is undergoing building works to extend the roof over a rear extension.

From this point forward, the land encompassed by the red-line boundary of the survey map (appendix 1) is termed 'the Site'.

### 1.2 Context

A bat survey has been deemed necessary to support a planning application due to the nature of the proposed building and location of the Site. In addition, the presence or absence of barn owl *Tyto alba* and nesting birds has been taken into consideration, along with other local wildlife.

### 1.3 Scope of the report

This report provides a description of all features suitable for roosting bats and evaluates those features in the context of the Site and wider environment. It further documents any physical evidence collected or recorded during the Site survey that establishes the presence of roosting bats. It provides information on constraints to the proposals as a result of roosting bats, and summarises the requirements for any further surveys, to inform subsequent mitigation proposals, achieve planning or other statutory consent, and to comply with current wildlife legislation.

The aim of the assessment was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how they could use the Site. Due to the transient nature of bats, this report is not able to definitively ascertain the absence of bats, rather the absence of *evidence* of use by bats either prior to or at the time of the survey.

To achieve this, the following steps have been taken:

- A desk study has been carried out, including information from MAGiC website
- A field survey has been undertaken, including an external survey and internal inspection where possible.
- An outline of likely impacts on any known roosts has been provided, based on current development proposals.
- Recommendations for further survey and assessment have been made, along with advice on European Protected Species Mitigation Licensing where appropriate.

A survey plan is presented in Appendix 1, the proposed Project Plan is included in Appendix 2 (where available).

The assessment is informed by the Bat Conservation Trust publication *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines* (Collins, J. (Ed) 2023).

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 Desk Study methodology

Desk and internet-based resources were used to obtain background information about known bat habitat and occurrences in an approx. 2km surrounding radius.

The resources used for the desk study were as follows:

- Google Earth Pro (<http://earth.google.co.uk>) for aerial photographs
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) collaborative database website (<http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>), for information on statutory designations.

### 2.2 Site Survey methodology

All features that will be impacted by the project proposals were assessed for their bat roosting and/or commuting habitat. The surveyor systematically surveyed all features suitable for signs of bat activity by non-intrusive visual appraisal from the ground using binoculars, inspecting the external features of the building for potential access/egress points, and for signs of bat use. An internal inspection of the building was also made where possible, including areas of derelict or abandoned buildings and the accessible roof spaces of all buildings, using an endoscope & torch. The surveyor paid particular attention to the floor and flat surfaces, window shutters and frames, lintels above doors and windows, and carried out a detailed search of numerous features within the roof space.

### 2.3 Breeding birds and other incidental observations

The surveyor also made note of any other ecological constraints observed during the survey, notably the likelihood of presence or signs of breeding birds, and the suitability of the site for barn owls.

### 2.4 Suitability Assessment

All affected survey features on site were categorised according to the likelihood of bats being present, in line with best practice guidelines (Collins, J. (ed) 2023). The features that dictate the likelihood of roosting bats are summarised in Table 1 below. Roost suitability is classified as high, moderate, low and negligible and dictates any further surveys required before works can proceed.

Table 1: Features of a building that are correlated with use by bats

Likelihood of bats being present	Feature of building and its context
Higher	<p>Buildings/structures with features of particular significance for roosting bats e.g., mines, caves, tunnels, icehouses and cellars.</p> <p>Habitat on site and surrounding landscape of high quality for foraging bats e.g., broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland.</p> <p>Site is connected with the wider landscape by strong linear features that would be used by commuting bats e.g., river and or stream valleys and hedgerows.</p> <p>Site is proximate to known or likely roosts (based on historical data).</p>
Lower	<p>A small number of possible roost sites/features, used sporadically by more widespread species.</p> <p>Habitat suitable for foraging in close proximity but isolated in the landscape. Or an isolated site not connected by prominent linear features.</p> <p>Few features suitable for roosting, minor foraging or commuting.</p>

## 2.5 Limitations – evaluation of the methodology

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the features on site in the context of their suitability for roosting bats, this does not provide a complete description of the site. This survey provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of bats being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the local area, the ecology and biology of bats as currently understood, and the known distribution of bats as recovered during the desk study.

- There were no limitations to the survey.

## 3.0 Results and Evaluation

### 3.1 Desk Study Results

- The desk study included a 2km buffer zone surrounding the Site.
- The Site is located at National Grid Reference SD 67480 33065

### 3.1.1 Designated sites & Priority habitats

- There are no designated sites within the 2km study area.

Priority habitats:

- Small areas of Ancient and Semi-Natural Woodland, & deciduous woodland within the study area, the closest at 430m to the north.

### 3.1.2 Landscape

A review of the designated sites, aerial photographs (Figure 1), the Magic database (App. 3) and OS maps has been carried out. The Site and its surrounding landscapes' relevance to bat habitat is described as being located in the residential village of Salesbury, with hedgerows connecting the site through the surrounding farmland to the woodland pockets in the wider landscape. These features along with the wider rural landscape of pasture and meadows with hedges, and small areas of deciduous woodland form suitable commuting and foraging habitat for bats.



Figure 1: Aerial photo of site, showing surrounding landscape structure.

### 3.1.3 Historical records

A search of the magic database returned two granted European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSMLs) records for bats within a 2km radius of the survey site. These are located >700m to the north of the site and include the destruction of a breeding site for common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and a resting place for natterers (*Myotis nattereri*) bats.

The absence of licenced records does not confirm the absence of bats in the area.

### 3.2 Field Survey Results

The survey was undertaken on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2024 by Carol Edmondson (Natural England bat licence number: **2015-12195** CLS-CLS), an MSc qualified ecologist with 12 years' experience in bat and ecology surveys.

The survey was carried out using a high-powered torch, binoculars and endoscope where necessary. The proposals include for the building of an extension to the north elevation of the building. The entire exterior & interior of the dwelling was surveyed for potential bat roosting features, to ensure no disturbance will be caused to bats by the proposed works.



There is one survey building on the site which is illustrated in the map in Appendix 1. The environmental variables recorded at the time of the survey are shown in Table 2.

*Table 2: Environmental variables during the survey*

Date: 19/11/2024	
Temperature	8°C
Cloud Cover	20%
Wind	6 km/h
Rain	none



### 3.2.1 Site Feature descriptions and photos

<p><b>Building Description</b></p> <p>The survey building is a detached residential dwelling, set in a large garden plot.</p> <p>Constructed of brick with the majority of walls rendered. The property appears to have had the roofing materials renewed more recently, with various alterations and additions to the original building since it was first built, creating various roof pitches and types.</p>	 <p>Photo 1: Overview of the site with the structure to be demolished outlined.</p>
<p><b>Potential roosting features:</b></p> <p>All roofline materials, windows and doors were uPVC and in an excellent state of repair, with no gaps to the wall or cracks that could be used by bats for roosting.</p>	 <p>Photo 2: North elevations of the house, showing the area where the single storey extension is to be added.</p>

Roofing materials were all in an excellent state of repair, with no lifted or cracked tiles forming potential gaps for crevice dwelling bats.



Photo 3: South elevation of the building, showing roof tiles and ridge and roofline materials in good order.

Overall, there were no gaps or crevices that could be used by bats for roosting in the building.

No potential bat roosting features (PRF's).



Photo 4: North elevation showing close-up of area where the extension will be constructed. The corner section of the gutter box is shown removed for inspection.

**Internally:**

There were areas of the roof space along the eaves on all elevations, accessible for survey.

There were no signs of these spaces having been used by bats. The roofing felt appears to be recent (breathable roof membrane), with no daylight gaps visible.



Photo 5: Example of the new roof materials.

***Evidence of bats***

There was no evidence of bats historically or currently using this building as roosting habitat i.e. no droppings, urine stains or grease smudge marks either internally or externally.

***Breeding birds and other incidental observations***

The garden provides some good quality nesting habitat for birds in the surrounding hedges and shrubs, and mature trees on-site.

## 4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations

### 4.1 Informative guidelines

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act and Conservation Regulations. Legislation protects all wild birds whilst they are breeding, and prohibits the killing, injuring or taking of any wild bird or their nests and eggs. Certain species of bird, including the barn owl, are subject to special provisions; it is an offence to disturb any bird or their young during the breeding season.

### 4.2 Evaluation

Taking the desk-based assessment and site survey results into account, the following value for roosting bats has been placed on The Site.

*Table 3: Evaluation Summary for presence of bats*



<b>Survey assessment conclusions</b>	There is suitable bat foraging habitat in the proximity of this site, and records of EPSML's in the 2km study area. However, taking into account the nature and condition of this small extension, and the lack of potential roosting features as described above, the surveyor considers that the building has a <b>negligible</b> likelihood of supporting roosting bats. The removal of this extension is not considered likely to cause disturbance to any bat roosts potentially present in the surrounding area.
<b>Foreseen impacts</b>	There is a negligible risk that bats could be injured or killed during the building process.
<b>Recommendations</b>	No further surveys. However, if bats are found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately, and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice.
<b>Enhancements</b> <i>The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF and circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. Para.99</i>	<p>The installation of a bat box on the building when finished will provide additional roosting habitat for bats in the area e.g. Local supplier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenwoods Ecohabitats</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.greenwoodsecohabitats.co.uk/bats">https://www.greenwoodsecohabitats.co.uk/bats</a></li> <li>• Kent Bat Box (timber).</li> </ul> <p>Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south/south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cavity bat boxes are also a good option in new construction for example available from:  <a href="https://www.nhbs.com/ib-vl-05-vivara-pro-build-in-woodstone-batbox?bkfno=252213">https://www.nhbs.com/ib-vl-05-vivara-pro-build-in-woodstone-batbox?bkfno=252213</a></li> </ul> <p>The use of "Bat tiles are not recommended in this instance due to the presence of the breathable roof membrane, which can entrap bats in the fibres.</p>

Table 4: Evaluation Summary for presence of breeding birds

<b>Survey assessment conclusions</b>	The site surroundings include suitable habitat for nesting birds, but none within the impacted building.
<b>Foreseen impacts</b>	Active nests could be destroyed during building/vegetation removal. Any works which affect The Site could have an impact on nesting birds.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Any building/tree and scrub removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close

	inspection of the building and scrub to be removed should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist, immediately prior to clearance. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged. Clearing the Site outside this timeframe avoids delays and further costs.
<b>Enhancements</b>  <i>The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF and circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. Para.99</i>	<p>Install a minimum of 2 bird boxes on site, on an existing tree or building e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good quality timber nesting box with hole protection</li> <li>• Schwegler 1B nest box</li> <li>• Schwegler 2H Robin box</li> </ul> <p>Regular nest boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight.</p> <p>House martin/swallow/swift boxes should be placed under the eaves with clear entrance/exit paths, ideally on the west elevation.</p>

## 5.0 Bibliography

- Andrews H and Gardener M 2016, *Bat Tree Habitat Key – Database Report 2016*. Bridgewater:AEcol.
- Andrews H *et al.* 2016. *Bat Tree Habitat Key*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Bridgewater: AEcol
- Bat Conservation Trust: <http://www.bats.org.uk/>
- British Trust for Ornithology (2016) [www.bto.org/about-birds/nbnw/putting-up-a-nest-box](http://www.bto.org/about-birds/nbnw/putting-up-a-nest-box)
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists —Good Practice Guidelines*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Garland & Markham (2008) Is important bat foraging and commuting habitat legally protected?
- Google Earth Pro (2024)
- Magic database (2024) <http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>
- Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2023). *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

### Appendix 1: Survey Plan



### Appendix 2: Proposed Site Plan

Not provided