

10 January 2017

Jessica Gavin
44 Westbourne Terrace
Tilehurst
Reading
RG30 2RP

Unit 3
Hampden House
Monument Park
Chalgrove
Oxfordshire
OX44 7RW

Tel: 01865 893347

www.ecologybydesign.co.uk

Dear Jessica,

44 Westbourne Terrace Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment

I write to you in regards to the bat preliminary roost assessment we conducted of the above building on Tuesday 10th January 2017.

Methodology

Jessica Gavin commissioned Ecology by Design to conduct a bat preliminary roost assessment of the property at 44 Westbourne Terrace, Tilehurst, Reading, RG30 2RP.

The survey was conducted by Principal Ecologist Ben Gardner and Senior Ecologist Jo Greetham of Ecology by Design in sunny, dry conditions. The assessment was based on the guidance included in the Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn) (Collins. J, 2016)¹ and Bat Workers Manual (JNCC 2004)².

The building was inspected for potential bat use by examining the internal structure for active roosts or roosting sites and suitable entry and exit points on the outside of the building, and by searching for other evidence of bat activity such as droppings, smells, sounds, carcasses or food remains. A torch was used to illuminate the dark recesses inside the building to carefully inspect any features of potential value to roosting bats and a thermal camera used to identify any 'hotspots' that may indicate roosting bats.

Equipment used included:

- LEDLenser Lamp
- Nikon 10x42mm close focusing binoculars
- FLIR C2 Thermal Camera

¹ Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

² Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. Ed., (2004), 3rd Edition Bat Workers' Manual, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough
Ecology by Design Limited. Registered in England and Wales No. 9318075. Address: Hampden House, Monument Park, Chalgrove, Oxfordshire, OX44 7RW

During the survey the building was thoroughly inspected including:

- Roof structure - gaps in tiles, under and over wall plates where accessible, gaps in wooden beam structure, between tile roof and beams. Internally through tears in roofing felt.
- Walls - Gaps in walls, between beams and the walls.

Evidence searched for included:

- The presence of free hanging bats and bats within gaps, crevices.
- Bat droppings, urine stains, rub marks, scratch marks, in wall holes, exposed battens and across the ceiling.
- Feeding remains scattered around the building, along the ridgeline and on top of stored materials.

Results

The building was located along Westbourne Terrace, in an urban area of Reading. Terraced properties were located to the south, west and east; however, a playing field with boundary trees was situated immediately north of the property.

The property was brick built with pebbledash render and a shallow pitched slate roof. A flat roofed garage was to the east of the property. The loft was fully accessible and the property was fully inspected externally.

Externally the fascia and soffit boards were all in good condition with no gaps or holes. On the northern elevation there were a few lifted slates where the property joined the neighbouring property, however the gap underneath the tiles could be fully viewed and did not lead into the loft space or a cavity. The ridge tiles were all intact. The design of the eastern elevation soffit board included a gap along the length of the central part of the soffit board, however the gap was covered in both cobwebs and ivy growth. There was no evidence of bats on any of the elevations such as scratches, staining or droppings on the tiles or soffit/fascia boards and overall the roof was in good condition. Internally, the roof was also in a good condition and the bitumen felt was intact. It was quite dark in the loft space although there was a small amount of light from the southern elevation. There was evidence of multiple wasp nests along the southern elevation. There was no evidence of bats such as droppings within the loft space.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The preliminary roost assessment did not identify any bat droppings or evidence of bats within the property, furthermore the property was in a good condition internally and externally. There was a narrow gap along the central length of the eastern elevation soffit board which could be potentially suitable for bats, however no scratches, staining, rub marks or droppings were identified on the soffit board or on the ground under the soffit board. Furthermore, cobwebs and ivy growth limited access to the soffit gap. The property was located in an urban area with parkland to the north and residential properties to the south, west and east. The close nature of the adjacent

eastern property limited the flight lines from the soffit board and therefore, along with the lack of bat evidence it is very unlikely bats are using this small feature. Bats pose no constraint to the extension of the property.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Greetham', written in a cursive style.

Joanna Greetham
Senior Ecologist

Appended:

- Site Photos

Appendix 1 – Photographs



Photo 1 – Loft



Photo 2 – Loft



Photo 3 – Northern elevation



Photo 4 – Eastern elevation



Photo 5 – Southern elevation



Photo 6 – Inside garage