Urban Tree Experts
BS5837 – Tree Surveys – Ecological Consulting

ECOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT (BATS) OF BUILDING ON LAND SOUTH OF TUDOR COTTAGE CHERHILL, CALNE



Prepared for:
Bradfield Properties Ltd
Ridgemoor Cottage
West Street
Burghclere
RG20 9LB

2 August 2023

Ref: SPH/ESR-23/14.07

Offices in Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Worcestershire
Tel: 0118 976 2902

Bramley House
Newnham Bridge
Tenbury Wells
WR15 8NX
Tel: 0118 976 2902
Mobile: 07557 982091
Email: info@batsurveys-uk.com

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

1 Introduction 5
1.1 Instruction 5
1.2 Aims and Objectives 5
1.3 Proposed Works 5
1.4 Surveyor Background and Experience 5

2 Survey Methodology 5
2.1 Constructions/Limitations 5
2.2 Dusk and Dawn Surveys 6

3 Survey Findings 7
3.1 Dusk and Dawn Surveys 7
3.2 Static Detector and Remote Camera 7

4 Conclusions/Interpretation 9

5 Method Statement for Planning 10

6 References 12

7 Queries 12

Appendix 1
Appendix 2

©2023 Urban Tree Experts
All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced, edited or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of Bradfield Properties Ltd and their agents in dealing with this site. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this site without the written consent of Urban Tree Experts. It may be reproduced as part of a planning application.

The validity of this report ceases at the prescribed time limit or after one year from the survey, or if the site conditions change due to unspecified works that affect the site whichever is the sooner.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Urban Tree Experts were initially commissioned by Mr P Cobb of Bradfield Properties Ltd to carry out two dusk emergence surveys and a dawn, return to roost survey on a building on land south of Tudor Cottage, 4 Park Lane, Cherhill, Calne SN11 8XN.

The surveys were undertaken at the property to provide further evidence to support the initial findings and conclusions from the preliminary ecological appraisal report conducted by Ethos Environmental Planning, Ref ETH23-058, and to inform appropriate mitigation for the proposed works, if required. This report has been prepared to support a current planning application to Wiltshire Council (ref PL/2023/05905).

The application site comprises a detached, brick build 3 bay, single storey garage. The remainder of the site comprises a gravel driveway and a wraparound lawn with a number of mature trees on the boundaries. The site itself offers good foraging and commuting habitat for bats.

A desk top study was conducted prior to the survey to review existing information about the site and its surroundings and to inform the design of subsequent bat surveys, if required. The desk top study was conducted based upon a 2km search radius and it revealed that one statutory designated site is located within (Calstone and Cherhill Down Site of Special Scientific Interest), and 1 historical European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) for bats has been granted within the search radius of the proposed development site.

A search of the Wiltshire & Swindon Biological Record Centre records confirmed 6 different species within the 2-kilometer search radius, including Myotis *sp.* bats.

The initial site visit was carried out by Becky Morris Ethos Environmental Planning in March 2023. An internal and external inspection of the building took place to look for signs of bats.

Externally the building is in a good condition however, there were a small number of potential roosting opportunities externally on the building such as gaps between the roof of the garage and wall plate which could provide potential roosting opportunities or access into the building for bats. Approximately 100 bat droppings were located in the eastern most garage bay and DNA analysis of the droppings confirmed them to be those of the brown long-eared (BLE) bat.

In line with best practice guidelines, three dusk emergence and/or dawn return to roost surveys were recommended on the building together with static surveys, in order to assess the status of the roost currently and to inform appropriate mitigation for the proposed works.

The dusk emergence surveys were conducted on Friday 9 June and Tuesday 27 June 2023 and the dawn return to roost survey was conducted on Friday 14 July 2023.

A number of bats were heard and seen foraging in and around the site throughout the surveys and, at 21.48, during the second emergence survey, a serotine bat was seen and heard emerging from the first (western) garage bay. Upon further investigation in this bay, a number of bat droppings (approximately 15) were observed, recorded and a sample collected from the rear eastern corner of that bay. DNA analysis of the droppings by SureScreen Scientifics confirmed them to be those of the serotine bat, see Appendix 1.

This report confirms the findings of the surveys, completed by an experienced licensed bat ecologist, in accordance with current best practice guidance where possible, and outlines any ecological constraints or issues with the proposed works.

In the absence of mitigation, demolition of the building will result in the destruction of a day/summer roost of a serotine bat and a historic feeding perch for an unknown number of BLE bats. However, following works there is no reason why continued roosting provision cannot be successfully maintained with appropriate mitigation and/or enhancement. An EPSL must be obtained from Natural England before works commence to demolish the building.

An outline method statement has been included to enable the Local Planning Authority to have regards to the requirements of the Habitats Directive… "*in the exercise of their functions in considering the planning application"*. A full method statement will be prepared as part of an EPSL application to be submitted to Natural England.

1. Introduction

1.1 Instruction

Urban Tree Experts was commissioned by Mr P Cobb of Bradfield Properties Ltd to carry out two dusk emergence surveys and a dawn, return to roost survey on a building on land south of Tudor Cottage, 4 Park Lane, Cherhill, Calne SN11 8XN.

1.2 Aims and Objectives

The dusk emergence surveys, and dawn return to roost survey are designed to:

- Identify the presence/likely absence of bats using the building to roost.
- Estimate the size and status of any existing bat roosts within the building.
- Establish where the bats are accessing the building.
- Determine the potential impacts on any bat roost from the proposed development.
- Determine if an EPSL is required.

The surveys were carried out in accordance with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition).

1.3 Proposed Works

The surveys were commissioned in connection with a current planning application to Wiltshire Council (ref PL/2023/05905) that will seek the demolition of this building to facilitate the construction of 3 detached properties on the land, plan attached at Appendix 2.

1.4 Surveyor Background and Experience

The surveys were conducted by Katie Holmes and Nick Powell, and the report was compiled by Simon Holmes MSc. CEnv, a Natural England licensed bat ecologist.

Simon holds Class 3 (CL19) and 4 Bat (CL20) Licenses (Nos. 17637 and 17638) and Science and Education license (SCI64844). He has 33 years' experience of carrying out bat surveys and bat conservation work.

Katie Holmes. Katie holds a Class 2 Bat License (CLS-35124) and has been surveying bats for 11 years with various ecological consultancies and has received training in surveying techniques, bat detector use, bat biology, identification, acoustic monitoring, echolocation analysis and netting.

Nick Powell. Nick commenced surveying bats in 2022 and has received training in bat surveying techniques, bat detector use, bat biology, bat identification, acoustic monitoring and echolocation analysis.

2. Survey Methodology

2.1 Constraints/Limitations

An assessment of the building exterior was conducted on 9 June 2023, prior to the first survey being conducted and there were no material changes to the building and no constraints or limitations to the surveys. The weather conditions at the time were appropriate for bat activity surveys and bats were observed emerging, foraging and in transit during the surveys.

2.2 Dusk and Dawn Surveys

The dusk emergence surveys were conducted on the evenings of Friday 9 June and Tuesday 27 June 2023 and the dawn return to roost survey was conducted on Friday 14 July 2023. The surveys were at a time of year when active bats are most likely to be present. Weather conditions were suitable for the surveys being conducted during warm weather and when bats were likely to be active.

The surveyors were stationed (as shown in Figure 1), to ensure the features identified in the preliminary bat report could be observed.

An Anabat Express static detector and a Bushnell Trophy Cam HD infrared trail camera were stationed (as shown by the red dots in Figure 1) inside the easternmost bay, between the roof trusses.

During the surveys, bat activity was monitored using two BatLogger M bat detectors together with two Sony Handycam night shot video cameras with high intensity IR lamps. The detectors and cameras were fitted with SD cards for recording bat activity, allowing for later analysis with Kaleidoscope Pro 3 software and VLC media player and DVR Scan.

Figure 1 – Building on land at Tudor Cottage, Cherhill, surveyor locations, static detector/remote camera location and emergence direction.



At 21.48, during the emergence survey on the 26 June 2023, an individual serotine bat was seen and heard emerging from the first (western) garage bay. In total five different species were recorded and identified foraging and commuting around the site. A simple summary of the bats recorded can be seen in Table 2 commencing on page 7.

3. Survey Findings

3.1 Dusk and Dawn Surveys

The weather conditions and surveyor details from the survey can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Surveyor details and weather conditions for bat activity surveys conducted on the building on land at Tudor Cottage, Cherhill.

Date:	**9 June 2023**	**27 June 2023**	**14 July 2023**
Survey Type	Emergence survey	Emergence survey	Dawn return to roost survey
Surveyors and locations	(A) Katie Holmes (B) Nick Powell	(A) Katie Holmes (B) Nick Powell	(A) Katie Holmes (B) Nick Powell
Weather Conditions (Start)	Temperature 18.4°C, Cloud cover 35% Humidity 77.8% Dry Wind Beaufort 1-2	Temperature 19.8°C, Cloud cover 100% Humidity 83.9% Dry Wind Beaufort 0-1	Temperature 13.5°C, Cloud cover 90% Humidity 92.2% Dry Wind Beaufort 0-1
Sunset/Sunrise	21:23	21:29	05:07
Start time	21:05	21:10	03:10
Finish Time	23:00	23:00	05:22
Duration	01:55	01:50	02:12
Weather Conditions (Finish)	Temperature 14.2°C, Cloud cover 15% hazy Humidity 91.4% Dry Wind Beaufort 1	Temperature 17.9°C, Cloud cover 100% Humidity 89.9% Dry Wind Beaufort 1-2	Temperature 14.1°C, Cloud cover 100% Humidity 92% Light drizzle Wind Beaufort 2-3

Table 2**.** Summary of bat calls recorded in the vicinity of the building on land at Tudor Cottage, Cherhill.

Date	**Surveyor Position**	**Time**	**Seen**	**Heard**	**Species**	**Comments**
09/06/23	**A**	21:05 – 23:00	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, serotine and BLE	At 21.55 (37 minutes after sunset) a common pipistrelle bat was both seen and heard in transit, entering the site to the left of the surveyor and thereafter commencing sporadically foraging along the tree line to the right of the surveyor until survey end. From 22.00 until 22.47 a serotine bat was both seen and heard foraging in and around the site, and in the field to the right of the surveyor. A couple of calls from a BLE bat were heard at 22.46 and 22.56 with the bat being seen on the last occasion closely passing in front of the night vision camera.
09/06/23	**B**	21:05 – 23:00	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, noctule, serotine, BLE and barbastelle	At 21.45 (22 minutes after sunset) a faint call from a noctule bat was heard, the bat was not seen or heard again. Common pipistrelle activity commenced at 21.54 with a faint call being heard and thereafter only another 5 calls from the bat were heard with the bat being seen once foraging along the tree line to the left of the surveyor. Bat activity was dominated from 22.00 until 22.32 by a serotine bat which was seen and recorded constantly foraging in and around the site. Analysis of the data recorded revealed a call from a BLE bat and 15 calls from a barbastelle bat.

Table 2. Summary of bat calls continued:

Date	Surveyor Position	Time	Seen	Heard	Species	Comments
27/06/23	**A**	21:10 – 23:00	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, serotine and noctule	At 21.41 (12 minutes after sunset) a brief call from a common pipistrelle bat was heard and thereafter common pipistrelle foraging and transit activity dominated until survey end, with up to 2 bats being seen on a number of occasions foraging in and around the site. At 21.48 a serotine bat was both seen and heard emerging from the western most bay of the building, the bat was heard on 1 more occasion but not seen again. 23 foraging calls from a noctule were heard between 21.58 until survey end, the bat was not seen.
27/06/23	**B**	21:10 – 23:00	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, and noctule	Bat activity at this location was dominated from 21.41 to survey end by common pipistrelle foraging and transit calls with 2 bats being seen constantly foraging around the site and up and down the tree lined boundaries. A single call from a noctule was heard at 21.59, the bat was not seen.
14/07/23	**A**	03:10 – 05:22	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, BLE, noctule and serotine	Common pipistrelle foraging activity was heard and recorded from survey beginning until 04.41 when the bat was both seen and heard in transit over the building/over the head of the surveyor and out of the site. A single call from a noctule was heard at 03.20, the bat was not seen. A couple of calls from a serotine were heard at 03.27, the bat was not seen. Four calls from BLE bats were heard and recorded between 03.35 and 03.40.
14/07/23	**B**	03:10 – 05:22	Y	Y	Common pipistrelle, BLE, serotine and barbastelle	Common pipistrelle foraging activity was heard and recorded from 03.27 until 04.40, the bat was not seen. A serotine was heard on three occasions, between 03.28 and 03.39 and a BLE bat was seen (but not heard) foraging over the building. Analysis of the data revealed a call from a barbastelle bat.

3.2 Static Detector and Remote Camera Findings

Remote monitoring at the site was conducted between 09.06.2023 and 26.06.23 and again from the 27.06.23 until the 05.07.23, using an Anabat Express static detector and a Bushnell Trophy Cam HD infrared trail camera, being installed in the eastern most bay of the building, this being the bay that the BLE droppings were observed in during the preliminary bat survey.

No bats calls were recorded by the static detector or images captured by the remote camera during either recording period. The results indicate that BLE roost is not active and is therefore considered historic.

4. Conclusions/Interpretation

4.1 The DNA evidence collect by Ethos Environmental Planning confirmed the droppings observed in the eastern most bay of the building during the preliminary survey are those of the BLE bat, a common (widespread in the UK and Hampshire) species and there was no evidence to indicate maternity use or hibernation. The evidence indicates that the roost is historic, as there were no fresh droppings, or bats and no bats emerged or re-entered the building.

The evidence collated from bat activity surveys provides a high level of confidence in support of the opinions set out in this report. During the second survey (27.06.23), a serotine bat was confirmed to be roosting as it emerged from the western most bay of the building and by DNA analysis of the droppings found in that bay. There were no further emergences or re-entries by bats and there is no evidence of maternity roosting at the site.

The combined evidence indicates that the building hosts a historic day/summer roost of a low number of brown long-eared bats, a common (widespread in the UK and Hampshire) species (that is not a hibernation site). The roost is considered to be of low conservation significance that is important at a site level only.

The serotine droppings and serotine emergence indicate that the building has been used as a non-breeding day/summer roost by a solitary serotine bat, most probably a male. Serotine bats are known to be one of the only British bats almost entirely dependent upon buildings for roosting and are particularly vulnerable to disturbance. The roost is considered to be of moderate conservation significance (Natural England 2004).

4.2 The Wiltshire & Swindon Biological Record Centre records, surveyor observations and recordings provide a high level of confidence in the species detected during the surveys on the building on land south of Tudor Cottage.

4.3 The calls detected and recorded from the survey provided identification of common pipistrelle, *Pipistrellus pipistrellus,* brown long-eared, *Plecotus auritus*, noctule, *Nyctalus noctula,* serotine, *Eptesicus serotinus*, and barbastelle, *Barbastella barbastellus*, all foraging and/or transiting across the site. The longest and most frequently recorded calls and observations were from common pipistrelle bats.

4.4 The building has features suitable for crevice dwelling bats, for example pipistrelle *sp.* and BLE and serotine bats to roost and the surrounding land with tree lined hedgerows and copses provides excellent foraging and roosting opportunities for a wider range of bat species.

4.5 The bat activity was dominated by common pipistrelles, with calls and visual observations indicating a low number of individuals across the surveys. With the good foraging conditions this season (2023) the bat activity encountered during the surveys is considered low. All activity surveys in the county this season have resulted in low levels of bat activity despite favorable foraging conditions.

4.6 Whilst a limited number of calls from BLE bats were heard by the surveyors, this is not unusual as the BLE bat is commonly referred to as the ‘silent’ bat as the calls are very quiet and difficult to detect as they prefer to hunt using their hearing and sight.

4.7 The proposed work will lead to the destruction of non-breeding day/summer roost of a serotine bat and, if unsupervised, bats may be killed resulting in a moderate negative impact at a local level. The cumulative evidence leads me to conclude that an EPSL is required. Mitigation measures (against the risk of disturbance, killing or injuring bats during the work), and compensation measures (to provide continued bat roosting provision at the site) are slightly higher given the rarer status of this bat, "Provision of new roost facilities where possible. Need not be exactly like-for-like but should be suitable, based on species' requirements. Minimal timing constraints or monitoring requirements" (Natural England 2004). Full mitigation and enhancement proposals will be confirmed in the EPSL.

4.8 An outline method statement has been included to enable the Local Planning Authority to have regards to the requirements of the Habitats Directive… *in the exercise of their functions in considering the planning application*.

4.9 All bats and their roosts are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). The provisions in the Method Statement must be implemented in order for the works to be legally undertaken and must form part of any planning conditions.

5. Method Statement for Planning

5.1 This method statement aims to address:

- Timing and methods of activities
- Provision of new bat roosts
- Impact on and replacement of existing roosts
- Lighting and habitat provisions as applicable

5.1 Pre-commencement

5.1.1 An ecological clerk of works must be engaged prior to work commencing on any roof works to provide advice should it be required. This ecological method statement must be adhered to, it provides project supervision and guidance to ensure that best practice and compliance is adhered to and may prevent a criminal offence being committed. If there is a delay of greater than one year from the date of this report, further survey effort will be required. Bats are highly mobile wild animals and may be encountered within a building following negative survey results.

5.1.2 The mitigation strategy must include the erection/construction of alternative roosting provision before work commences at the site. This may take the form of, but is not restricted to bat boxes, for example the Schwegler type FTH and 2FR woodcrete boxes (see www.NHBS.com), at least one of each type will be suitably on a mature tree on the site at a minimum height of 4.5 metres. The exact siting to be agreed with the Natural England bat license holder. This type of bat box provides alternative roosting habitat for the species roosting on this site, should it be required. The box must remain in situ once all work has been completed and will contribute to a net biodiversity gain for the site.

5.2 Method

5.2.1 **Prevention of injury**
A toolbox talk will be given to contractors prior to commencement of the demolition works, which will include: background legislation in relation to bats; the most likely areas to expect bats (behind roofing tiles and tile verges), good working practice and, details of what to do if a bat or additional evidence of bats is discovered. In the unlikely event that bats, or evidence of other roost locations are found, works must stop and the project ecologist contacted, and any license modification obtained.

5.3 Ecological supervision

5.3.1 Records of any site visits must be made by the project ecologist, and photographs must be taken as required in order to ensure compliance with this method statement.

5.3.2 Prior to work on the roof the building is to be inspected for any new evidence of bats and the ecological clerk of work/licenced bat worker must be available (on-call) to provide advice.

5.3.3 If, during the work, when the licenced bat worker is not on-site, and a bat is discovered that appears to be injured or distressed, then the animal should be carefully placed in a small box (e.g. shoe box) by either handling the bat with thick gloved hands or covering the bat with the box and sliding a thin piece of cardboard under to create a floor to the box. A clean piece of cloth loosely crumpled will be placed in one corner of the box (to allow the bat to crawl under and hide), a few small air holes will be put into the lid of the box, and a very shallow container (e.g. foil milk bottle top) of water will be placed in one corner of the box. The licensed bat worker must then be called without delay and all work must stop until the licensed bat worker has been consulted.

5.3.4 High risk works (deconstruction of the roof) must be directly supervised by a licenced bat ecologist/ecological clerk of works and shall follow a ‘soft-strip’ method using hand tools. This will involve hand removal of material along the ridge and wall plates exposing potential roosting areas beneath. The work should progress from the ridge to wall plate as required and must be supervised by a licenced ecologist (ecological clerk of works). Stripping tiles must only be conducted when the air temperature is sufficiently high (at least 8°C) to ensure that so as to not risk harming bats which may be found. Any bats in poor or an injured condition will be assessed by either a bat care worker or taken to a veterinary practice and where rehabilitated will be released when deemed fit and translocated to one of the bat boxes located on the site.

5.4 Timing of work

5.4.1 Any work to the existing roof has the potential to disturb bats during the bat activity period (1 May to 31 August) and therefore roofing works must be conducted outside this period. If the works cannot be undertaken during the period 1 September to 1 May and should bats be encountered during this period or at any time during the work, then all work must stop and the ecological clerk of works called for advice.

5.4.2 All work must be undertaken in normal working, daylight, hours, which is in accordance with best working practice and allows the ecological clerk of work/licenced bat worker to address any issues if bat(s) are found during the demolition work.

5.4.3 Stripping roof/hanging tiles must only be conducted when the air temperature is sufficiently high (at least 8°C) so as to not risk harming bats which may be found. If bats are located during any aspect of the building work all work must stop and the ecological clerk of works must be contacted immediately for advice.

5.5 Incorporation of bat roosting

5.5.1 Maintaining bat roost provision: Permanent roost provision for serotine bats must be created as part of the proposed scheme. This should take the form of but is not restricted to like for like features and therefore will require a building with similar features to the existing open fronted garage. The proposed garage for Plot 3 (P3), (see plan at Appendix 2) could be designed with an open front and would be the nearest building to the original roost location, the final design and mitigation will be provided in the EPSL method statement and agreed with Natural England.

5.6 Lighting proposals

5.6.1 Lighting: The exact lighting proposals are not known at this stage but where new external lighting is provided the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) guide must be followed.

For example; all external lighting must be Light Emitting Diode (LED) and directed downward or be located at a low level. LED bulbs produce the least amount of heat and no UV light minimising the attraction effect of impact on insects and foraging bats. By carefully directing light downwards and using a PIR with short illumination sensor the impact of external lighting on any foraging bats will be minimal.

5.7 Post construction work

5.7.1 Monitoring: A minimum of one monitoring visit is required on completion + 1 Year, this should take the form of an internal inspection and may also include an external inspection of roost features, as only low numbers of bats of a common species are present, no detailed monitoring is proposed (Mitchell-Jones, 2004 – Figure 4, page 39).

6. References

Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition).
Bat Workers Manual – Mitchell-Jones & McLeish 2004.
Bat Mitigation Guidelines – Natural England 2006.
The Conservation and Habitat Regulations – 2017.

7. Queries

Any queries regarding this report should be addressed, in the first instance, to Urban Tree Experts:

Telephone: 01189 762902
Email: info@batsurveys-uk.com

Urban Tree Experts
Bramley House
Newnham Bridge
Tenbury Wells WR15 8NX

Simon Holmes, MSc
Consultant, Urban Tree Experts
Bat License CLS-CLS- 17637 & 17638

APPENDIX 1

SureScreen Scientifics

Folio No: E18510
Report No: 1
Purchase Order: KH202305
Client: URBAN TREE EXPERTS
Contact: Simon Holmes

TECHNICAL REPORT

ANALYSIS OF BAT DROPPINGS FOR SPECIES OF ORIGIN IDENTIFICATION

SUMMARY

The droppings of bats contain small amounts of DNA belonging to the organism from which they originated. By analysing droppings collected from a bat roost or colony for the presence of DNA, a robust identification of the species present can be made. Recent advancements in molecular methods including PCR (polymerase chain reaction) and DNA sequencing mean that 92% of bat species worldwide can be identified including all 17 UK resident bat species.

RESULTS

Date sample received at Laboratory: 30/06/2023
Date Reported: 10/07/2023
Matters Affecting Results: None

Lab Sample ID.	Site Name	O/S Reference	Genetic Sequence	Common Name	Result	Sequence Simliarity
B1999	Building on land at Tudor Cottage - Bay 1	-	TGGGGGCTTTGGAATTGATT AGTGCCTTTAATAATCGGAG CTCCTGATATAGCATTCCCA CGAATGAACAATATAAGCTT CTGACTCCTTCCTCCCTCTT TCCTACTTCTTCTAGCATCAT CTATGGTAGAGGCCGGGGCT GGCACTGGTTGGACAGTCTA CCCCCCTTTGGCAGGAAACC TAGCCCATGC	Serotine	*Eptesicus serotinus*	98.94%

If you have any questions regarding results, please contact us: ForensicEcology@surescreen.com

Reported by: Chelsea Warner **Approved by:** Gabriela Danickova

METHODOLOGY

Once samples have arrived in the laboratory, a single bat dropping is selected for its suitability (freshness and size). The DNA is then isolated using a commercial DNA extraction kit. Using PCR, bat DNA (if present within the sample) is amplified using bat DNA-specific molecular markers designed to amplify a short fragment of the mitochondrial gene. If amplification is successful, the resulting DNA sequence is revealed using a process known as Sanger Sequencing in order to obtain the genetic sequence. The sequence results are aligned against a library of known bat reference sequences using bioinformatics software, which enables us to determine which species the extracted DNA matches with, informing the species identity and sequence similarity (%).

If the initial analysis is unsuccessful, the entire process is repeated up to two additional times with fresh reserve droppings. If no DNA is detected after three attempts, we can be confident that any further analysis of the sample will likely also fail to result in species identification.

INTERPRETATION

Genetic Sequence: The unique DNA sequence obtained from the sample.

Sequence Similarity: How closely matched the DNA sequence from your sample is to the sequences within our reference database. This can be interpreted as a score of result accuracy, with the maximum score of 100% indicating an exact match of dropping to the indicated species' reference sequence. Lower scores (80-99%) indicate some variation between the sample and reference sequence, likely due to natural variation between individual genetic sequences and/or systematic variations generated through the sequencing process. Scores below 80% similarity should be interpreted with care and can indicate part degraded or part contaminated samples.

Inconclusive Result:

Degraded sample:
DNA degraded, unable to determine species identification due to degradation of sample DNA. This can happen either before sample collection (old droppings, exposure to UV etc.) or after sample collection if stored for long periods before analysis or not handled correctly.

Inhibited/contaminated sample:
Unable to determine species identity due to contamination or the suspected presence of large quantities of PCR inhibitors. Contamination sources can come from other species which come into contact with droppings, human contamination during sample collection.

Alternative Result: Sometimes, other mammalian species such as rodents are detected. We find this to be a common occurrence as some bat droppings can be similar in appearance to rodent droppings. Although sometimes unexpected, repeat analyses in these cases would likely return the same results.

APPENDIX 2

Park Lane, Cherhill

This drawing is copyright and is not to be reproduced. The contractor will be held responsible for the accuracy of works involving the setting out and checking of all dimensions on the drawing and on site. Dimensions must not be scaled from this drawing.



A 09.05.2023 - Amended to Arboriculturalist comments
B 12.05.2023 - Plots 2 & 3 changed to 4 beds
C 12.05.2023 - Plot 2 changed back to a 5 bed

barclay phillips architects
a: The Studio, 5 Oakridge Office Park, Southampton Road, Whaddon, Salisbury, SP5 3HT
e: enquiries@barclay-phillips.co.uk
t: +44 (0) 1722 711177
www.barclay-phillips.co.uk

PROJECT:
Proposed redevelopment at: Land at Tudor Cottage, 4 Park Lane, Cherhill, Calne, Wiltshire, SN11 8XN

CLIENT:
Bradfields Properties Ltd

DRAWING TITLE:
Proposed Site Plan

1:250 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

SCALE: 1:250 @ A3
DATE: Apr 2023
DRAWING No. P22-093 02-02-002C
DRAWN BY: DW
CHECKED BY: DW