



FAO Daniel Lewis
Director
Morningwood Ltd

26th October 2015

Our Ref: RT-MME-120902

Dear Daniel,

Endoscope Survey – 51 Cressingham Road, Reading

Further to the Endoscope Survey undertaken on 23rd October 2015, I write to confirm our findings. This report should be read in conjunction with Middlemarch Environmental Ltd Daytime and Nocturnal Emergence Bat Survey Report RT-MME-120787.

Introduction

In October 2015 Morningwood Developments Ltd commissioned Middlemarch Environmental Ltd to undertake an endoscope survey of the building at 51 Cressingham Road in Reading. The proposed works are currently at the feasibility stage and it is unknown whether the existing building will be demolished or refurbished.

This report details the results of the endoscope survey undertaken on 23rd October 2015 by Maral Miri (Senior Ecological Consultant, Licence Number WML CL17).

Project Background

In September 2015, Morningwood Developments Ltd commissioned Middlemarch Environmental Ltd to undertake a Daytime Bat Survey and one¹ Nocturnal Emergence Bat Survey at 51 Cressingham Road in Reading.

The external inspection of the building confirmed the presence of a number of features around the building which could be utilised by bats to gain entry into the building and potential roost locations such as missing/broken tiles, gaps under the ridge tiles and a vent feature. No evidence of bats was recorded during the external assessment, however it was not possible to inspect these features due to the height at which they occurred. No internal access was provided at the time of survey.

Two species of bats were recorded during the nocturnal survey; common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and noctule *Nyctalus noctula*. No bats were observed emerging from the building and the activities recorded belonged to commuting and foraging bats.

The reader is referred to the Daytime and Nocturnal Emergence Bat Survey Report RT-MME-120787 for further details.

¹ Due to seasonal constraints only one nocturnal emergence survey could be carried out in September 2015. Peak bat activity season runs from mid-May to August.

Methodology

A Mobile Elevated Working Platform (MEWP) was used to access and inspect features which could not be inspected during the daytime bat survey. All accessible features were inspected with a torch and endoscope.

Results

Internal Assessment

Access was provided to complete an internal inspection of the building. The roof space of 51 Cressingham Road had been converted to a number of loft bedrooms, with only two small unconverted loft spaces present (Plate 1). The larger loft space was approximately 7 m long and 1 m wide. The roof tiles were fitted directly onto the timber rafters and beams (Plate 2). A ridge beam was present and the apex height was <1 m. Old loft insulation was present in some areas. The smaller loft space was similar in structure but lacked a ridge beam. No potential access points for bats into the building were recorded. No suitable holes or crevices were found in the roof void which could be used by roosting bats. Therefore, these roof voids are considered to be of negligible potential to bats. No evidence of bats, e.g. droppings, urine staining, feeding remains or scratch marks, was recorded during the internal inspection of the building and all areas of the loft could be fully surveyed.

Old wasp nests were present in one of the roof voids. Rodent droppings were also present in small numbers on the floor of these loft spaces.



Plate 1: Internal view of the unconverted loft spaces



Plate 2: View of the clay roof tiles fitted directly onto the wooden rafters

Endoscope Survey

All potentially suitable features for bats could be fully inspected within the building with the use of the MEWP and an endoscope. These included:

- Missing/broken roof tiles (Plate 3) – All areas of missing, broken or gappy roof tiles were fully inspected. These features did not provide roosting opportunities or ingress points into the roof space for bats and therefore were considered to be of negligible potential to bats.



Plate 3: Missing/gappy roof tiles

- Gaps under the ridge tiles where the mortar was missing – The majority of these gaps were too tight and not suitable for bats (Plates 4 & 5). Of those considered suitable (Plate 6), no evidence of roosting bats, e.g. droppings, urine staining, feeding remains or scratch marks, was recorded and these features could be fully inspected during the survey (Plate 5).



Plate 4: Mortar missing under the ridge tile but no suitable gaps present



Plate 5: Gap under the ridge tile with limited suitability for bats



Plate 6: Gap under the ridge tile suitable for bats

- Broken tiles around the dormer windows (Plate 7) – Closer inspection of these features confirmed that they do not provide roosting opportunities or ingress points into the roof space for bats and therefore are considered to be of negligible potential to bats.



Plate 7: Broken tiles around the dormer windows

- Vent feature (Plate 8) – A vent feature was recorded in the northern gable-end of the building. This led to a horizontal cavity extending approximately 1 m. The western section of the cavity was filled with an old birds' nest. No roosting bats or their evidence was recorded within the eastern section of the cavity but it was considered to be suitable for roosting bats with access to this section provided through the slats of the vent.



Plate 8: Vent feature providing access into a wall cavity

- Dormer window (Plate 9) – A cavity was recorded where the mortar between the roof tile and the dormer window was missing. This feature was considered to be suitable for roosting bats; however no signs of bats were recorded around and within this feature at the time of the inspection.



Plate 9: Suitable cavity for bats under the dormer window roof tile

Conclusions

During the external inspection of the building in September 2015, the presence of a number of potential access points and roosting features was confirmed at 51 Cressingham Road. Closer inspection of these features with the aid of a MEWP and an endoscope confirmed that they were mainly of negligible potential to bats. Of the inspected features, the following were considered to be of value to crevice dwelling bats:

- The cavity in the northern gable end (Plate 8);
- The gap under the tiles covering the dormer window located along the western elevation (Plate 9); and,

- Two of the ridge tiles along the southern elevation (Plate 6).

No evidence of bats (e.g. droppings, feeding remains, scratch marks or urine staining) was found during the endoscope surveys and all the features considered suitable for bats were fully inspected. As such, it is concluded that no bat roosts were present within the building at the time of survey.

Recommendations

51 Cressingham Road was fully inspected with the aid of a MEWP and an endoscope and no bat roosts were identified. The survey data obtained for the site is valid until September 2016. If the development works to the surveyed building have not commenced until September 2016, due to the presence of a number of suitable features, it will be essential to update the survey effort to establish if bats have colonised the buildings in the interim. This should be in the form of bat activity surveys. As one nocturnal survey was carried out in September 2015, at least one survey (consisting of a nocturnal emergence survey followed by a dawn re-entry survey within a 24 hour period) should be undertaken during the bat activity season to determine the presence/absence of roosting bats within the building. The bat activity season extends from May to September, with mid-May to August being the optimum survey period.

In the unlikely event that a bat is found during demolition works all works must immediately cease and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted.

I trust you find the above level of information sufficient and please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Maral Miri
Senior Ecological Consultant

Checked by:

Colin Bundy
Associate Director