

Alcock Crest, Warminster

Bat Survey Report Final

1643a/Version 1.0

Client: Selwood Housing

Date: 26 June 2025

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Report prepared for:

Selwood Housing

Main contributors:

Alice Wynne-Griffiths BSc (Hons)

Consultant Ecologist

Reviewed by:

Tessa Pepler BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM

Principal Ecologist

Issued by:

Tessa Pepler BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM

Principal Ecologist

Green Tree House, 11 St Margaret's St, Bradford on Avon, Wiltshire, BA15 1DA
T: 01225 723652 | E: info@johnsassociates.co.uk | W: www.johnsassociates.co.uk

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Details	Date
1.0 Draft	Final Bat Survey Report issued to Client for review	20 June 2025
2.0 Final	Final Bat Survey Report issued	26 June 2025

Third party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Johns Associates at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Johns Associates excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Background.....	5
1.2	Summary of Proposals	5
1.3	Purpose of this Report	5
1.4	Site Description and Location	5
2	LEGISLATION AND POLICY	7
2.1	Bat Legislation	7
2.2	National Planning Policy	7
2.3	Local Planning Policy	8
3	METHODOLOGY	10
3.1	Desk Study	10
3.2	Data Search.....	10
3.3	Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)	10
3.4	Phase 2 Bat Surveys.....	12
3.4.1	Emergence/Re-entry Bat Surveys	12
3.4.2	Evaluating Bat Roosts	12
3.5	Limitations.....	15
4	RESULTS	16
4.1	Designated Sites	16
4.2	European Protected Species LICENCES.....	16
4.3	Local species records.....	16
4.4	Potential Roost ASsessment (PRA) Results	16
4.4.1	External Assessment	16
4.4.2	Internal Assessment	17
4.5	Bat Emergence/Re-entry Surveys	18
4.5.1	Survey 1 – Emergence 13 May 2025	18
4.5.2	Survey 2 – Emergence 3 June 2025.....	19
5	DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION	20
5.1	Evaluation of Survey Results.....	20
5.2	Impact of works	20
5.3	Mitigation and Compensation	20
5.4	Enhancement.....	20
5.5	Nesting Birds	20
6	REFERENCES	21

APPENDIX A SURVEYOR AND CAMERA LOCATIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Johns Associates Ltd were commissioned by Selwood Housing to undertake a Potential Roost Assessment (PRA) and two bat emergence surveys at Alcock Crest, Warminster, to support a planning application for the site. The site is located at post code BA12 8ND (central Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference ST 86624 44512). The Site currently consists of a block of flats and associated gardens, grassland and individual trees.

1.2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

The existing blocks of flats at 43-60, 61-78 Alcock Crest are in need of renovation and are proposed to be demolished and replaced by new buildings on the same footprint as the existing structures.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to inform a planning application for the proposals outlined above. The aim of this report is to:

- Determine the presence/absence of bats in the building(s) within the site.
- Classify the roost type identified (e.g. day roost, maternity roost etc.).
- Carry out an impact assessment of the proposed works and how they will directly/indirectly affect the identified bat roosts.
- Outline the relevant legislation and protection afforded to bats.
- Provide an indication of the avoidance, compensation, mitigation and enhancement measures likely to be required to avoid harm/injury to roosting bats to be included within a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) application for the site following planning permission being granted.

1.4 SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

Alcock Crest, which hereafter is referred to as the 'Site', comprise residential blocks of flats and gardens located to the east of Warminster in Wiltshire. The area of the Site measures 0.4 ha. The Site is bordered to the north, east and west by residential buildings, gardens and hardstanding and to the south by parkland, scrub and woodland.

At the landscape level, the Site is surrounded mostly by residential buildings, gardens, with playing fields, areas of suburban woodland and parkland in close proximity. The A36 runs to the north, west and south of the Site, approximately 650 m southwest of the Site at its closest point. A railway line is situated 1.3 km northeast of the Site at its closest point.

The Site is located in an urban setting; connectivity to the wider landscape is suboptimal for mobile species due to lack of connectivity through linear features such as hedgerows, railway lines or waterways. Although small areas of woodland exist, these are typically isolated from the wider landscape, and walls and road present a barrier to dispersal for some mobile species, such as amphibians, small mammals, and reptiles.

A plan showing the red line boundary of the current application is provided as Figure 1.

Figure 1: Site location plan



2 LEGISLATION AND POLICY

2.1 BAT LEGISLATION

In England and Wales, all bat species and their roosts are legally protected under the European Habitats Directive (1992), (which was transposed into UK law as the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017 [as amended]); the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); the Countryside & Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000; and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Barbastelle, Bechstein's (*Myotis bechsteinii*), greater horseshoe (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*), lesser horseshoe, brown long-eared, soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), and noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*) bats are all listed as Species of Principal Importance in England under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

It is a legal offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturb a group of bats.
- Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time).
- Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat; or
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.

The government's statutory conservation advisory organisation in England (Natural England) is the body responsible for administering protected species licenses that permit activities that would otherwise result in an offence being committed.

There are currently a number of licensing options available, depending on the size and nature of the roost(s) present and the species using them.

A licence can be obtained if the following three tests have been met:

- Regulation 53(9)(a) - there is "no satisfactory alternative" to the derogation, and
- Regulation 53(9)(b) - the derogation "will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range" and
- Regulation 53(2)(e) - the derogation is for the purposes of "preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment."

2.2 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

There are numerous national and local planning policies associated with flora and fauna (also referred to as biodiversity) that need to be addressed as part of the planning process. The Government has issued its National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2024, which requires impacts to biodiversity to be minimised. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF applies the same protection to Ramsar sites as that conferred by the Habitats Regulations

to SACs and SPAs, it also applies the same protection to sites identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitat sites.

To protect and enhance biodiversity plans should:

- 192a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation;
- 192b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

The NPPF requires development to apply the following principles (Paragraph 193):

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Planning authorities should follow key principles to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decisions on biodiversity conservation are considered. Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation provides guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation and complements the NPPF.

2.3 LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

As well as national policy, there is relevant biodiversity policy contained within Wiltshire Core Strategy adopted in January 2015. Core Policy 50 is relevant to the proposed application and is summarised below.

Core Policy 50 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Protection

Development proposals must demonstrate how they protect features of nature conservation and geological value as part of the design rationale. There is an expectation that such features shall be retained, buffered, and managed favourably in order to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. Where it has been demonstrated that such features cannot be retained, removal or damage shall only be acceptable in circumstances where the anticipated ecological impacts have been mitigated as far as possible and appropriate

compensatory measures can be secured to ensure no net loss of the local biodiversity resource and secure the integrity of local ecological networks and provision of ecosystem services.

All development proposals shall incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and reduce disturbance of sensitive wildlife species and habitats throughout the lifetime of the development.

Any development potentially affecting a Natura 2000 site must provide avoidance measures in accordance with the strategic plans or guidance set out in paragraphs 6.75-6.77 above where possible, otherwise bespoke measures must be provided to demonstrate that the proposals would have no adverse effect upon the Natura 2000 network. Any development that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European nature conservation site will not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.

Biodiversity enhancement

All development should seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Major development in particular must include measures to deliver biodiversity gains through opportunities to restore, enhance and create valuable habitats, ecological networks and ecosystem services. Such enhancement measures will contribute to the objectives and targets of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) or River Basin/Catchment Management Plan, particularly through landscape scale projects, and be relevant to the local landscape character.

Local sites

Sustainable development will avoid direct and indirect impacts upon local sites through sensitive site location and layout, and by maintaining sufficient buffers and ecological connectivity with the wider environment. Damage or disturbance to local sites will generally be unacceptable, other than in exceptional circumstances where it has been demonstrated that such impacts:

- cannot reasonably be avoided
- are reduced as far as possible
- are outweighed by other planning considerations in the public interest
- where appropriate compensation measures can be secured through planning obligations or agreements.

Development proposals affecting local sites must make a reasonable contribution to their favourable management in the long-term

Local Biodiversity Action Plans

The "England Biodiversity List" satisfies the requirements of Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and includes those habitat and species considered to be of Principal Importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England and Wales. This list replaces the UK BAP Priority Habitats and Species.

However, many local authorities/counties still maintain a Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) document which includes those habitats and species considered to be a priority within the local area in terms of their biodiversity importance.

The Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan produced in 2008 has a separate action plan for the 15 species of bats found in the county. The county is a stronghold for bats, and they utilise a wide range of habitats. Existing roosts, hibernation sites and key flight lines are protected, and more potential hibernation and roost sites should be created.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 DESK STUDY

As part of the Ecological Impact Assessment Report, 9 April 2025, Johns Associates Ltd, a desk study was undertaken to collate all relevant existing information relating to the Site and the surrounding area. The data was used to inform the scope of the subsequent Site survey and to enable a full assessment of the likely effects of the proposed activities on any sites, habitats or species of conservation interest to be carried out. The following sources were consulted on 12 February 2025:

- Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website.
- Records and citations to a 2 km radius for national statutory designated sites for bats and 10 km for European sites designated for bats (www.gov.uk, www.designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk),
- Priority habitats within 500 m of the Site.
- EPS licences for bat species to 2 km.

3.2 DATA SEARCH

A data search for bats and roosting bats within 2 km of the Site was conducted on 4 March 2024 through the Wiltshire & Swindon Biological Records Centre.

3.3 PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA)

A detailed external and internal survey of the buildings was carried out on 25 February 2025 by Tessa Pepler (class licence registration number: 2019-40584-CLS-CLS-1 replacing 2016-25380-CLS-CLS). The inspection followed the professional survey guidance as detailed in Bat Survey Guidelines for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J. 2023).

The survey entailed a direct search for evidence of bats on both internal and external features of the buildings. The external inspection of the buildings was carried out from the ground. Other supporting equipment included close focusing binoculars and a high-powered torch, as required. The buildings were examined externally for features that could support roosting bats and features that could lead to internal potential roost features (PRFs).

The presence of roosting bats can be observed through signs such as accumulations of moth or butterfly wings or bat droppings and staining and/or scratch marks around potential entrance and exit points. However, the absence of droppings/evidence cannot be treated as conclusive proof that bats are not present, and therefore an assessment was also made of the potential of the building to support bats based on the criteria detailed by the Bat Conservation Trust (2023) and provided in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of proposed development sites for bats, based on the presence of habitat features within the landscape, to be applied using professional judgement (Bat Conservation Trust, 2023)

Suitability	Description Roosting Habitats	Commuting and Foraging Habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/underground levels).	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight-lines or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible ^a	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flightpaths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions ^b and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site but could be used by individual hibernating bats ^c).	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flightpaths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation – the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flightpaths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland, or water.
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 potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g. maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation site.	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flightpaths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses, and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

a. Negligible is defined as 'so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant'. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute).

b. For example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.

c. Evidence from the Netherlands shows mass swarming events of common pipistrelle bats in the autumn followed by mass hibernation in a diverse range of building types in urban environments (Korsten et al., 2016 and Jansen et al., 2022). Common pipistrelle swarming has been observed in the UK (Bell, 2022 and Tomlison, 2020) and winter hibernation of numbers of this species has been detected at Seaton Delaval Hall in Northumberland (National Trust, 2018). This phenomenon requires some research in the UK, but ecologists should be aware of the potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in prominent buildings in the landscape, urban or otherwise.

3.4 PHASE 2 BAT SURVEYS

Surveys were undertaken in line with Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Survey Guidelines (2023), with any limitations outlined below.

3.4.1 Emergence/Re-entry Bat Surveys

Two dusk emergence surveys were conducted during the 2025 survey season.

The surveys were carried out using Night Vision Aids (NVAs); infra-red lighting and cameras and thermal cameras to enable all features of the building to be covered by both surveyors and. Surveyors focused on any features identified during the Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) as having potential to be used as bat access points. The dusk emergence surveys started 15 minutes before sunset and finished 1.5 hours after sunset. Surveyors recorded bat activity using handheld Echometer Touch 2 and/or Batlogger M detectors. Analysis of recordings was undertaken after the surveys to confirm species identification. Observations recorded during surveys included bat access points, bat species, time, and type of activity (e.g. emergence, re-entry, commuting, foraging, etc.). Incidental records of bats within the vicinity of the building (but not necessarily roosting) were also recorded.

Three Nightfox Red infra-red cameras with a Nightfox XB5 infra-red torches and two thermal cameras were used to film bat activity on parts of the buildings with low to moderate suitability PRFs on the first emergence survey. Two experienced surveyors were present. The second survey focused on the eastern apartment block which had PRFs with a moderate suitability on the southern roof face and low suitability PRFs on the north faces. Two Nightfox Red infra-red cameras with a Nightfox XB5 infra-red torches and two thermal cameras were used. Two experienced surveyors and an assistant surveyor were present for the survey.

The video footage was reviewed following the survey to identify any bat activity captured and any significant activity patterns and access points were identified and recorded.

The survey timings and weather conditions of the emergence surveys are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Emergence survey dates and weather conditions

Date	Survey Type	Sunset Time	Start Weather Conditions	End Weather Conditions	Surveyors
13/05/25	Emergence	Sunset: 20:50	Temp: 16°C Rain: 0 Wind: 0 Cloud: 5/8 Okta	Temp: 13°C Rain: 0 Wind: 0 Cloud: 2/8 Okta	Tessa Pepler Eric Palmer
03/06/25	Emergence	Sunset: 21:18	Temp: 13°C Rain: 0 Wind: 3 Cloud: 5/8 Okta	Temp: 11°C Rain: 0 Wind: 2 Cloud: 3/8 Okta	Nicole Evans Eric Palmer Jess Seager

3.4.2 Evaluating Bat Roosts

The value of the bat roosts on site was assessed in accordance with UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines, Reason and Wray (2023), Table 3 Rarity category for the South-West of England and South Wales.

Roosts are assigned a relative ecological value based on the rarity of the species (Table 3) and categorisation of roost type (Table 4), informed by survey results. Once a value has been calculated, robust mitigation for any impacts identified from the proposed development can be determined.

Table 3: Rarity category

Rarest Annex II species and very rare	Rarer or restricted distribution	Widespread in many geographies, but not as abundant in all	Widespread
Greater horseshoe Bechstein's Barbastelle Greater mouse-eared	Lesser horseshoe Serotine Leisler's Natterer's	Whiskered Brandt's Daubenton's Nathusius' pipistrelle Noctule	Common Pipistrelle Soprano pipistrelle Brown long-eared

Table 4: Assessing importance of roosts

Roost category: note this table relates to VALUATION and does not mean that all such sites are 'places of shelter' as referenced in the W&CA or Habitats Regulations. Inclusion in this table does not indicate that a licence would be required; this would be driven by roost status, any impacts and the likelihood of an offence.							
Conservation status/ distribution	Feeding perches; night-roosts; Individual or very small occasional/ transitional/ opportunistic roosts	Non-breeding day roosts (small numbers of species)	Mating sites (excluding individual trees and larger swarming sites); small numbers of hibernating bats	Larger transitional roosts	Hibernation sites ^d	Autumn swarming sites [largely, vesper species which hibernate underground	Maternity sites ^e
Widespread all geographies	Site	Site	Site	Site/Local	District/County [Larger hibernation sites rare in the UK]	District/County [Very large pipistrelle swarming sites as yet unknown in the UK91, but see Section 6.7	Unlikely to exceed District importance unless colonies are atypically large; importance increased for assemblages.
Widespread in many geographies, but not as abundant in all	Site	Site	Site, dependent on local distribution [For <i>Myotis</i> , see swarming site column]	District	District/County importance dependent on size ^b and number of species	County/Regional importance dependent on size ^b ; importance increased for larger sites that serve larger numbers/species	Unlikely to exceed County importance unless colonies are atypically large; importance increased for assemblages.
Rarer or restricted distribution	Site (very well-used night roosts may be of District importance for some species)	Site/Local/District, dependent on local distribution	Site/Local/District, dependent on local distribution	District	District/County importance dependent on size ^b and local distribution; increased value for assemblages.	County/Regional importance on size ^b and local distribution; increased value for assemblages.	County/Regional importance on size ^b and local distribution; increased value for assemblages.
Rarest Annex II species and very rare	Site (very well-used night roosts may be of District importance for some species)	Site/Local/District, dependent on local distribution	Site/Local/District, dependent on local distribution	District	County/Regional importance on size ^b and local distribution; increased value for assemblages	County/Regional importance on size ^b and local distribution; increased value for assemblages.	County/Regional importance on size ^b and local distribution' increased value for assemblages.

3.5 LIMITATIONS

The emergence/re-entry surveys were undertaken in accordance with the best practice guidelines within the peak bat activity period (May to September inclusive) and covered the maternity period (May to June). The results are therefore considered to be an accurate representation of the general use of the buildings by roosting bats.

Nevertheless, bats may use roosting features intermittently throughout the year and may be present in larger or smaller numbers depending on their breeding cycle, weather conditions and in response to disturbance. Bats may be present at other times of the year and the results in this report should therefore be viewed in the context intended.

One bat detector failed during the first survey, however due to there being no emergences and the other four detectors during the survey working; it is not considered that this is a limitation to the survey results.

Some flats were inaccessible at the time of survey; however, loft voids were surveyed in a variety of locations and were of similar build and condition throughout, with negligible bat potential. The surveyed loft voids are therefore considered to be representative of the buildings as a whole. Most had gaps sealed for fire safety purposes which minimised the opportunity for bat to access the roof voids.

4 RESULTS

4.1 DESIGNATED SITES

There were no Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) specially designated for bats identified within 10 km of the Site.

4.2 EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES LICENCES

No European Protected Species (EPS) licences issued by Natural England were identified within 2 km of the Site.

4.3 LOCAL SPECIES RECORDS

The following roost records were returned from the data search.

Table 5: Bat species recorded returned from WSBRC

Species	Date	Abundance	Comments
Long-eared species <i>Plecotus</i>	2021	500+ count of droppings Bat site: Roost	Over 500 droppings recorded in roof void. Suggestive of long-eared species. Feeding remains and grease marks also recorded (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Common pipistrelle	2021	3 Count; Bat site: Roost	Day roost (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Soprano pipistrelle	2021	2 Count; Bat site: Roost	Day roost (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Whiskered bat	2021	1 Count; Bat site: Roost	Day roost (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Common pipistrelle	2018	1 Count of Male; Bat site: Roost	GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6)
Soprano pipistrelle	2018	1 Count of Male; Bat site: Roost	GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6)
Noctule bat	2015	Bat site: Roost	Magenta Bat 5 (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Soprano pipistrelle	2015	Bat site: Roost	Magenta Bat 5 (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))
Bat	2015	Bat site: Roost	Daytime sighting roost site observed (GR reduced due to sensitivity (R6))

4.4 POTENTIAL ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA) RESULTS

4.4.1 External Assessment

The roof is constructed with a wet ridge and interlocking concrete tiles, featuring a 150mm overlap. (Plate 1). There was a line of raised tiles at the east and western gable ends of each building on the southern faces. There were also small gaps in the lead flashing at the base of several of the gas chimney flues and chimney breasts on both faces of the roofs on both buildings. The brick work of the walls was in good condition, well sealed, with no PRFs.

The eaves and soffits were constructed from plastic and were well sealed with no PRFs or access points recorded.

The external roofs and particularly the southern faces which overlook areas of other broadleaved woodland patches within the park to the south have a low to moderate suitability for roosting bats.

A bat box was located on the southern face of a building opposite the Site within Alcock Crest.

Plate 1–Alcock Cresst Roof Aspect



Plate 2 –East Gable of Eastern Building



4.4.2 Internal Assessment

In summary, there was no evidence of bats found within the roof voids and no access for bats. The gable walls on the outside had all been filled for fire safety. The internal roofs were well sealed with no access for roosting bats present and were constructed from either concrete breeze blocks or red bricks. The roofs were lined with Breathable Roof Membrane (BRM).

Plate 3 - Internal Roof Void



Plate 4: Filled Gable Walls and Internal Roof Void Walls



Table 6: Internal Building Assessment

Flat number	Internal roof description
Number 52	The roof is cross-hipped and BRM-lined, with one chimney. The west-facing gable wall is brick, while the adjoining roof void at Number 51 is made of concrete breeze blocks. The roof structure includes wooden trusses, rafters, and a ridge beam, with a wooden beam along the edge about 1 m from the ground. There is one A-frame truss. No droppings were observed, though a few rat droppings were found. The floor is lined with fiberglass.
Number 53	Two separation brick walls with BRM lining. One king post and a fink truss are present. The floor is lined with fiberglass. The tops of the wall plates have gaps filled with fire proof mortar or a similar material. A

	small piece of BRM is hanging down, providing some access into the void; however, the interlocking roof tiles offer limited access points. Heavy cobwebs are present, but no droppings were found.
Number 54	Similar to Number 53, but with two fink trusses and a king post. No droppings observed.
Number 55	Same as Number 54, with a chimney present. The gaps on the gable wall plate have been sealed for fire safety. There are heavy cobwebs on the ridge beam.
Number 57	A tile has been removed for a gas flue. The brick walls are sealed with fire sealant around the top, leaving no gaps. There are two fink trusses, and no evidence of bats being found
Number 58	Two fink trusses. The west-facing gable wall is brick, while the east wall is breeze block. The chimney is very cobwebby, but otherwise, the situation remains unchanged.
Number 59	Cross gabled roof with a chimney. One half fink truss and one fink truss are present. All other conditions are as before.
Number 60	Wooden chipboard flooring on fiberglass with concrete breeze block walls. This is similar to Number 55, with no evidence of bats. Fewer cobwebs are present, and the chimney has moisture at the bottom of the chipboard, which is wrapped in plastic to prevent leaks. The concrete breeze block walls do not have fire sealant applied.
Number 69	The north wall is made of unsealed breeze blocks, and the south wall is brick, also unsealed. The roof structure has three fink trusses, and the chimney has been cut off at the top to prevent it from protruding through the roof.
Number 70	No access.
Number 71	There is a wet hole where the roof truss connects to the neighboring property. The chimney is present, and two fink trusses are in place. The brick separating walls are not sealed, and heavy cobwebs cover the ridge beam.
Number 72	As Number 71, but with fewer cobwebs.
Number 73	At the end of this half of the building, there are two brick walls, both sealed with fire sealant on top. A chimney is present, and the ridge beam has thick cobwebs. The storage space below has no evidence of bats.
Number 76	As before, with two fink trusses and no evidence of bats.
Number 77	The cross-gabled roof void is very dusty, with no significant changes. The breeze block wall is not filled, but two brick walls are sealed.
Number 78	Located on the far eastern flat. The roof has Type 1 crumble paper-like lining on top of the BRM. Three fink trusses are present, with the north gable wall made of breeze blocks and the south wall made of brick, both unsealed.
Storage areas	As before, there is no evidence of bats. The buildings are now cleared, making it easier to detect bat droppings. No internal cracks or crevices were found.

4.5 BAT EMERGENCE/RE-ENTRY SURVEYS

4.5.1 Survey 1 – Emergence 13 May 2025

No bats were recorded emerging from the buildings during the survey by the surveyors or on the cameras. There was street lighting between the two buildings, lighting over the access doors on the buildings on both the ground and first floor and street lighting to the north of the centre of the two buildings.

Foraging activity was recorded in the trees and scrub to the south of the eastern building and within the garden area to the south of the building. Species recorded during the survey included soprano pipistrelle and common pipistrelle

(both common and widespread) and *Nyctalus* sp. (more restricted distribution). The species recorded are all light tolerant. Overall bat activity was low.

4.5.2 Survey 2 – Emergence 3 June 2025

No bats were recorded emerging from the buildings during the survey by the surveyors or on the cameras.

High levels of serotine foraging activity was recorded in the tree line to the south of the eastern building. Serotine is of rarer distribution. Common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle were recorded commuting between the two buildings. Brown long-eared bat was also recorded during the survey which is common and widespread and a light sensitive species.

5 DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION

5.1 EVALUATION OF SURVEY RESULTS

No bats were recorded during the bat emergence surveys on the two buildings and it is considered that bats are not roosting within the buildings at the Site.

5.2 IMPACT OF WORKS

The works will not impact upon bat roosts.

5.3 MITIGATION AND COMPENSATION

No mitigation or compensation is required for roosting bats.

5.4 ENHANCEMENT

One roof tile bat roosting feature will be installed on each roof of the building on a south/south-west face.

5.5 NESTING BIRDS

The EcIA included the specification for 4No. 1SP sparrow nest boxes. An email from Salisbury and Wilton Swifts (SAWS) was received on 6 May 2025 which requested that Swift bricks also be included within the walls of the new buildings. One swift brick will be included within each new property.

6 REFERENCES

CIEEM (2017) Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. *Technical Guidance Series*.

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

Hargreaves, D. (pers. comm., 2023) Horseshoe bats, their roosts and conservation. Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury.

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Schofield, H. W. & Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). *The Bats of Britain and Ireland*. Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury.

UK Government's Countryside Geographic Information Website [online] www.magic.gov.uk [December 2021].

Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury (2008) *The Lesser Horseshoe Bat Conservation Handbook*.

APPENDIX A SURVEYOR AND CAMERA LOCATIONS



-  Site Boundary
-  Surveyor
-  Camera

CLIENT Selwood Housing

PROJECT Alcock Crest

TITLE Camera and Surveyor Locations

SCALE @ A3 1:1,000	CREATED BY AE	CHECKED BY TP
REFERENCE J01643-004	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE 26/6/2025



JOHNS
ASSOCIATES

- ▭ Site Boundary
- Surveyor
- ▲ Camera

CLIENT Selwood Housing

PROJECT Alcock Crest

TITLE Camera and Surveyor Locations

SCALE @ A3 1:1,000	CREATED BY AE	CHECKED BY TP
REFERENCE J01643-004a	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE 26/6/2025

This drawing is subject to copyright and is not to be reproduced, retained nor disclosed to any unauthorized person either wholly or in part without the consent of Johns Associates. Do not scale from this drawing.