Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) Report

122, Castelnau, Barnes SW13 9EU

tsa.ecology

Author: Tony Stones BSc (Hons) MSc, MCIEEM, CEnV

Table of Contents

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document Title:	Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) Report June 2024
The Client:	Mr and Mrs Thornton

	Status **ISSUE**	**Date of issue** **24/06/2024**
Author	Tony Stones BSc, MSc, MCIEEM Ecologist	A J Stones.

Biological Records of species identified during this survey, the date, their location and a brief description of the circumstances of their identification, may be passed on to Biological Records Centres, local wildlife groups, the Wildlife Trust, Natural England and other interested parties unless written instructions not to do so are received within 30 days of receipt of this.

1. Summary

TSA Ecology was commissioned to undertake a Preliminary Bat Roost Appraisal (PBRA) at the property known as 122, Castelnau, Barnes, London SW13 9EU. An internal / external examination update undertaken on 7th June 2024 indicated a lack of a roof void within the main property for bats to utilise, but a number of internal cupboards were checked to determine if bats were accessing these externally.

The conclusion therefore is that **there are unlikely to be bats present at the site, the proposed works have negligible potential to affect these species, and no further surveys are necessary.**

However, it is to be noted that bats are mobile species, fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Should roosting bats be suspected or encountered during demolition, then works should cease immediately, and an ecologist consulted for advice on how to proceed. For full details of relevant legislation, see Appendix A.

The PBRA findings are valid for 12 months. If no works have been undertaken in respect of the roof of the property by 30 June 2025, it is recommended that the structure is re-assessed for its potential to support bats.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background

The client is proposing to remove the existing roof to the coach house at the north-east of the property, and replace this with an extension, which will fall short of reaching the eaves of the main property.

2.2 The Site

The site is located adjacent to the A306 (Castelnau) in Barnes, approximate OS grid reference TQ 2262 7746 under the jurisdiction of the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames. It comprises a three-storey main house with attached two-storey coach house, a gravel driveway with shrubs at the perimeter and a rear, lawned garden with shrubs and trees at the periphery. The property is occupied.

The site sits adjacent to a busy road, and has the River Thames on three sides, being c. 400 m distant, to the east, at its closest point. Between the property and the river, lie the wetland habitats (standing open water, grazing marsh and reedbeds) of the London (Barnes) Wetland Centre, c. 170 m to the east, at its closest point. Immediately to the east, between the property and the Wetlands Centre, lie allotments, and there are large residential properties with gardens along Castelnau which runs north to south, and also similar properties to the west.

2.3 Purpose of the Assessment and Report

- Assess the potential presence / absence of bats through an internal and external building inspection;
- Determine if the development would result in unlawful impacts to bats, or their roosts; and,
- Advise of any mitigation measures and proportional enhancement measures to ensure the proposed works proceed lawfully.

3. Desk Study

3.1 Methodology

A data search has previously been undertaken, to assess the bat species known to have been present within the locality, and those that could potentially be impacted by the proposed development. The consultees were:

- London Bat Group (Bat records for a 2 km radius of the site for 2012-2022).
- MAGIC (Granted European Protected Species licences (EPSL) pertaining to bats, within a 5 km radius of the site, from 2012-2022).

3.2 Results

The London Bat Group (LBG) returned 216 records for nine species commonly found on the urban fringe of London during the past 10 years (see Table 1). Most records are from a small number of sites including London Wetlands Centre, Ravenscourt Park, Barnes Common and the Leg O' Mutton Reservoir.

Species	No. of Records	Location of Closest Record	Date of Most Recent Closest Record	Most Recent Record
Brown long-eared	2	Churchyard W4 2PH, c. 1260 m W	05/08/2014	25/09/2019
Common pipistrelle	56	London Wetland Centre, c. 680 m SE	20/09/2017	24/07/2020
Daubentons	12	London Wetland Centre, c. 680 m SE	20/09/2017	05/10/2019
Leislers	7	Leg o' Mutton Reservoir, c. 900m W	11/04/2017	25/09/2019
Nathusius' pipistrelle	14	London Wetland Centre, c. 680 m SE	28/08/2017	27/09/2019
Natterers	1	Barn Elms Playing Fields, c. 1050 m S	13/09/2016	13/09/2016
Noctule	14	London Wetland Centre, c. 680 m SE	28/08/2017	01/10/2019
Serotine	2	Barnes Common, c. 1550 m SSW	26/05/2016	16/08/2017
Soprano pipistrelle	61	London Wetland Centre, c. 680 m SE	20/09/2017	24/07/2020

Table 1: Bat Species Recorded and Proximity of Records within Past Decade

The London Wetland Centre is one of the best locations in London for bats, and subject to a number of surveys and many bat walks.

Five roosts at three locations, were recorded within 2 km of the proposed development site. A roost of pipistrelle species was present at Dukes Meadow, Chiswick in July 2017; a roost of Natterer's bats was located at Barn Elms Playing Fields in September 2016, and roosts of both common and Soprano pipistrelles were located at Hogarth House on Hogarth Lane in both September 2015 and 2016.

There have been five consented European Protected Species Licences (EPSLs) within 5 km of the site (MAGIC 2022), the closest being 1.8 km WNW, for the destruction of the resting place of Soprano pipistrelle in 2017.

Four more licences were granted between 3-5 km of the site for works affecting common and Soprano pipistrelles.

4. Survey

4.1 Methodology

Preliminary Bat Roost Appraisal

An external and internal survey of the property, including the roof structures, was carried out on 7th June 2024. The survey was undertaken by Tony Stones MSc, MCIEEM, CEnV of TSA Ecology. Tony is an experienced bat surveyor with over 25 years of experience in the ecological sector. Tony has undertaken various preliminary ecological assessments, preliminary roost assessments (bats) and surveys for protected species; and prepared subsequent reports with appropriate recommendations. Binoculars, a step ladder, and a high-powered torch were used as required.

Date	Approximate Start Time	Weather Conditions
07.06.2024	11.30	Cloudy but with sunny intervals. Cloud cover 91%. Wind W 14 km/h. Visibility was good, and the air temperature was 16 degrees centigrade.

Table 1: Time and Weather Conditions During Survey

The property was assessed for its potential to support bat roosts. This involved a consideration of various factors including:

- Light levels;
- Temperature regime and protection from weather;
- Access to the interior of the building or to other suitable roost sites;
- Potential roost sites;
- Building construction; and

- Habitat context.

Based on these factors, an assessment was made as to whether or not the building could potentially support bats, and the type and number of roosts that might be present.

External Inspection for Signs of Bats

An external inspection was made of the building for any evidence of bat use, such as live or dead bats, droppings, scratch-marks, staining and prey remains, and in some cases the absence of cobwebs, where access permitted. A pair of 8 x 30 binoculars was used to scan potential ingress / egress points, and other areas of interest from ground level.

Features identified as possible bat access points or potential roosting locations were thoroughly searched where possible, using a powerful torch and binoculars to facilitate the process. Large quantities of cobwebs in roof voids or in access points tend to be suggestive of no bat use, although this evidence is not conclusive.

The survey commenced at the front (western face) of the property and proceeded in a clockwise direction around the property.

Internal Roof Void Inspection

The main built structure has no internal roof void. There are four small storage cupboards which directly abut the roof. These were searched for evidence of any evidence of bat use, in particular signs such as ingress / egress points, live or dead bats and droppings, where access permitted. The adjacent former coach house building appears to have a void but this was not accessible internally.

Constraints and limitations

The survey was undertaken at a suitable time of year to conduct a preliminary bat roost assessment. What appeared to be the roof void of the former coach house was not accessible as there was no access point into it.

4.2 Results

Bats: Assessment of Habitats

In addition to the built structure, vegetation within the site boundary comprises a gravel driveway, with associated beds of introduced shrubs to the front of the property (Photo 1, Appendix B). The rear garden is lawned with introduced shrubs and some semi-mature trees along the periphery (Photo 2, Appendix B). The property itself is located along, but slightly set back from the A306 (Castelnau), and there are habitat linkages to allotments and open space at the rear of the property.

Internal / External Building Inspection

Building description

The main property is brick-built, grade 2-listed and dates from the 1830s-1840s (Photo 3, Appendix B). The roof of the main property, which we understand will not be disturbed under current proposal is flat-roofed, and comprised of stripped lead (Photo 4, Appendix B). There is no internal roof space. The chimneys on the main roof are in good condition (Photo 5, Appendix B). An inspection was made of internal airing cupboards (Photos 6 and 7, Appendix B) where these abutted the existing roof to seek evidence of the presence of bats (droppings, remains, evidence of internal ingress / egress etc.). No such evidence was forthcoming.

The former coach house is brick-built with wooden bargeboards, and slate-tiled roof and a brick-tiled ridge. The rear part of the former coach house roof is a glass-roofed conservatory. The former coach house was observed externally from the ground (Photos 8 and 9, Appendix B), and also accessed for closer inspection from a second-floor window (Photos 10 and 11, Appendix B). There were no missing or slipped tiles and the ridge was intact save for a concrete plug which had come loose from within the ridge tile at the SW corner of the building (Photos 12 and 13, Appendix B). However, this was checked with a torch and it was confirmed that there was no access point further into the ridge for bats to enter (Photo 14, Appendix B). Gaps along the bargeboard along the NE frontage of the extension were cobwebbed, and not considered suitable for access.

Whilst the roof would appear to contain a void within, this could not be confirmed as there is no longer any access into this space internally from the property, presumably due to a false ceiling being installed at some point in time (Photo 15, Appendix B).

Overall the former coach house roof appears to be in very good condition externally, and there do not appear to be any ingress / egress points which bats could make use of, e.g. under tiles, into the ridge, or indeed into the void itself (assuming there is a void within the current roof).

Therefore, overall it is considered that the roof has 'negligible' potential to support roosting bats and it is not recommended that it requires any further survey with respect to bats. It is recommended that should a bat / bats be discovered to be present during demolition works, then all works should cease, and a licenced bat worker be asked to attend and provide advice in respect of licencing etc.

5. Conclusions

The results of the assessment indicate that roosting bats are considered likely to be absent.

The roof where the works are proposed appeared to support no features to support roosting bats. Taking into account the lack of suitable features, it is considered that **the proposed development has negligible potential to disturb or harm roosting or foraging bats.**

However, it is to be noted that they are mobile species, fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Should roosting bats be suspected or encountered during demolition, then works should cease immediately, and an ecologist consulted for advice on how to proceed.

6. References

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

MAGIC (2022) https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx [Accessed 14/06/2024].

APPENDIX A

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Species listed under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) are afforded protection subject to the provisions of Section 9.

A person will be guilty of an offence if they:
(1) intentionally kill, injurer or take any wild animal included in Schedule 5, have in their possession or control any live or dead wild animal included in Schedule 5 or any part of, or anything derived from, such an animal;
(2) intentionally or recklessly—
(a) damage or destroy any structure or place which any wild animal specified in Schedule 5 uses for shelter or protection;
(b) disturb any such animal while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection; or
(c) obstruct access to any structure or place which any such animal uses for shelter or protection.

(5) Subject to the provisions of this Part, (a) sell, offer or expose for sale, or have in his possession or transports for the purpose of sale, any live or dead wild animal included in Schedule 5, or any part of, or anything derived from, such an animal; or (b) publish or cause to be published any advertisement likely to be understood as conveying that they buy or sell, or intends to buy or sell, any of those things, (6) In any proceedings for an offence under subsection (1), (2) or (5)(a) relating to an act which is mentioned in subsection (1), (2) or (5)(a), the animal in question shall be presumed to have been a wild animal unless the contrary is shown. Species listed on Annex II and Annex IV of The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (the Habitats Regulations) which transpose into UK law Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21st May 1992 on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (often referred to as the 'Habitats [and Species] Directive.') are afforded further protection. The former Annex relates to the designation of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) for some species. Inclusion on Annex IV ('European protected species') means that member states are required to put in place a system of strict protection as outlined in Article 12, and this is done through inclusion on Schedule 2 of the Regulations. Regulation

39 makes it an offence to: Deliberately capture or kill an animal listed on Schedule 2 [Regulation 39(1)(a)] Deliberately disturb an animal listed on Schedule 2[Regulation 39(1)(b)]

APPENDIX B

Photographs

Photo 1: Front elevation of property showing gravel driveway and introduced shrub bed

Photo 2: Lawned rear garden with beds of introduced shrub

Photo 3: Main property with adjacent former coach house extension

Photo 4: Flat roof of main building

Photo 5: Chimnies on roof of main house

Photo 6: Internal storage cupboard abutting main roof

Photo 7: Disused boiler in cupboard abutting main roof

Photo 8: Front façade of former coach house

Photo 9: Northern elevation of former coach house

Photo 10: View of former coach house roof with glass conservatory roof to the rear

Photo 11: Sealed brick tile ridge and slate tile roof of former coach house

Photo 12: Southern face of former coach house roof with conservatory roof adjacent

	
Photo 13: SW corner of roof showing concrete plug	**Photo 14:** View into circular ridge tile showing lack of access beyond concrete plug
	
Photo 15: Kitchen ceiling within the ground floor of the former coach house within no access to roof void via the ceiling	