



PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT

5 Ivy Cottages, Billingshurst

On behalf of: Jilana and Terry Fallows

Client:	Jilana and Terry Fallows			
Project:	5 Ivy Cottages, Billingshurst			
Reference:	LLD3864-ECO-REP-001-02-PRA			
Revision:	Date:	Author	Proof	Approved
00	12/06/2026	Hayley Swann ACIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM
01	15/06/2026	Hayley Swann ACIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM
02	14/08/2026	Hayley Swann ACIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM	Catherine O'Reilly MCIEEM

Disclaimer:

The information provided within this report has been prepared and provided in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions.

This report is intended for the sole use of the Client and their agents in accordance with the agreement under which our services were performed. Unauthorised communication, reproduction or usage of this report by any party other than the aforementioned is prohibited. No liability is accepted by Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. This report does not constitute legal advice. No warranty, express or implied, is made as to the advice in this report or any other service provided by us.

Validity:

This report is valid for 18 months from the date of the site visit. If works have not commenced by this date, an updated site visit should be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist to assess any changes in the habitats present on site, and to inform a review of the conclusions and recommendations made.



LIZARD

Landscape Design and Ecology

Top Floor - Caravelle House, 17-19 Goring Road, Worthing, BN12 4AP
01903 216033 office@lizardlandscape.co.uk lizardlandscapeecology.com

Contents

	Page No.
SUMMARY	01
1.0 Introduction	03
2.0 Methodology	05
3.0 Results	08
4.0 Evaluation and Recommendations	11
5.0 Opportunities for Ecological Enhancement	13
6.0 Conclusions	14
7.0 References	15

FIGURES

Figure No. 01 – Site Location Plan



SUMMARY

Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology has been commissioned by Jilana and Terry Fallows to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of 5 Ivy Cottages, Billingshurst (located around central grid reference: *TQ 08760 30535* – hereafter referred to as ‘the site’). A site visit was completed on the 19th of May 2026 to allow the presence or potential presence of a bat roost to be identified, and to identify the need for further assessment prior to application, where required.

The survey area covered a c. 120 metre square building (B01) with clay roof tiles and hanging tile surrounding part of the dwelling. There was a parking area to the eastern elevation of the site, and grassland and trees surrounded the northern, southern and western elevations. A short non-native *Leylandii*, and beach hedgerow were also included within this assessment.

Building B01 has been assessed as offering **moderate** bat roost suitability due to missing pieces of tile, gaps between tiles and gaps around the flashing. Building B01 shall require 2no. bat emergence surveys to be undertaken during the optimal survey season of May to September, with at least 50% of visits completed in the peak months of May to August. Where an active bat roost is found, a European Protected Species Derogation Licence shall be required from Natural England to allow works to progress. Any mitigation measures required as part of any such licence would be determined by the results of the survey work.

The site lies within the 6.5km key conservation area of The Mens SAC and the 12km Wider Conservation Zone of Ebernoe Common SAC, therefore no additional lighting, above baseline level, is to be used during construction and development.

Overall, no constraints were identified which would preclude the provision of a scheme which is well designed, and sensitive to the presence, or potential presence of ecological receptors.

Table No. 01 - Summary of Recommendations

Ecological Receptor	Recommendations / Requirements	Time Constraint
Bats	• Building B01 assessed as moderate suitability and will require 2x survey visits to confirm presence / likely absence of a bat roost. • All artificial lighting to conform to ILP Guidance Note 08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night.	Surveys undertaken May – August / September
Breeding Birds	Works to the hedgerow should be subject to a nesting bird check if removed within nesting bird season.	If undertaken between March to August (inclusive)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology has been commissioned by Jilana and Terry Fallows to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of 5 Ivy Cottages, Billingshurst (located around central grid reference: TQ 08760 30535 – hereafter referred to as ‘the site’).
- 1.2 The purpose of this report has been to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats on site and to determine the need for further bat surveys prior to application. This assessment has been undertaken with due consideration to existing best practice guidelines *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (Collins, 2023).

Site Information

- 1.3 The survey area covered a c. 120 metre square building (B01) with clay roof tiles and hanging tile surrounding part of the dwelling. There was a parking area to the eastern elevation of the site, and grassland and trees surrounded the northern, southern and western elevations. A short non-native Leylandii *Cupressus × leylandii* (blue line below), and beach *Fagus sylvatica* (yellow line below) hedgerow were also included within this assessment, near the entrance to the site.



Figure 01 – Site Location Plan

Surrounding Landscape

- 1.4 The surrounding landscape is rural and includes areas of grassland, woodland, hedgerows and tree lines; it is considered to be suitable for a range of UK bat species.

Development Proposals

- 1.5 It is understood that the proposals are for an extension along the western elevation, which will impact the roof.

Scope of the Assessment

- 1.6 The aim of the Preliminary Roost Assessment has been to:
- Identify features that bats could use for access and roosting;
 - Assess the building for signs of current or previous bat presence, such as droppings or feeding remains;
 - Determine the actual or potential presence of bats in accordance with best practice criteria; and
 - Identify the need for further survey required to assess the potential impact of proposals and / or develop and appropriate mitigation strategy.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Desk Study

2.1.1 The Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (*MAGIC*) was consulted for all designated sites within a practicable zone of influence of the site. This included Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), National Nature reserves (NNR) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within a 2.0km radius of the site, and international statutory designated sites including SAC's designated for their bat interest are present within 12.0km of the site, in accordance with recent guidance (SDNP, 2021).

2.1.2 MAGIC was also used to provide information on all Priority Habitats within a 2.0km radius of the site, and all records of granted European Protected Species Mitigation licences within a 1.0km radius of the site.

2.1.3 Given the quantum of development proposed, a local biological records centre search has not been provided. This is an approach in line with current guidance (CIEEM, 2020). This is appropriate for low impact proposals, low value habitats and very small sites.

2.2 Field Survey

2.2.1 A Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW) survey was undertaken on the 19th of May 2026 by a suitably experienced surveyor (Hayley Swann ACIEEM accredited agent under 2016-20460-CLS-CLS). Weather conditions were mild (c.15°C), with a moderate south-westerly wind (Beaufort Scale 2), 100% cloud cover and persistent, light rain.

2.2.2 The Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW) survey entailed a slow walkover of the site, during which time the surveyor identified any structures, trees and other features that could be suitable for bats to roost in, and any habitats which could be suitable for bats to commute, forage or swarm in.

- 2.2.3 During this survey any direct evidence of bats was searched for and recorded, such as grease marks, urine stains, bat droppings, feeding remains and dead / live bats. Furthermore, any structures or trees which offered features with the potential to support bats were noted. For trees this included the identification of features such as, but not limited to, cracks, crevices and holes naturally formed by trees. For structures this included the identification of features such as, but not limited to, slipped, missing or uneven tiles, gaps around the soffit / barge board, raised flashing.

2.3 Evaluation Criteria

- 2.3.1 All suitable bat habitat was assessed in accordance best practice criteria (Collins, 2023), which is outlined herein.
- 2.3.2 All structures were assessed externally, and internally wherever possible for their potential to support bats, using the following criteria:

Table No. 02 – Criteria for Assessing the Bat Roosting Suitability of Structures

Potential Suitability	Description
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of year.
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats. However, some small uncertainty remains, as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features occasionally.
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 do not provide enough shelter, space, protection, appropriate conditions or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats.
Moderate	A structure with one of more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat, but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status, irrespective of species conservation status.
High	A structure 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 and surrounding habitat, with the potential to support high conservation status roosts irrespective of species conservation status.

Confirmed	Direct evidence of bats identified.
------------------	-------------------------------------

- 2.3.3 An assessment of the winter hibernation potential of the structures was made, in accordance with the following criteria:

Table No. 03 – Criteria for Assessing the Winter Bat Roosting Suitability of Structures and Trees

Potential Suitability	Description
Low	No or very limited potential winter roosting habitat
Moderate	Non classic site
High	'Classic sites', which offer stable humidity and consistent temperatures throughout the winter period, such as underground sites, cellars, tunnels etc.

2.4 Constraints and Limitations

- 2.4.1 There were no constraints or limitations noted during the preliminary roost assessment.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Desk Study

- 3.1.1 The following designated sites are not necessarily representative of the existing site's ecology but are indicative of the ecological context of the surrounding area; a factor that may be important when assessing the presence / absence potential of certain species groups. Statutory Designated Sites identified within a potential zone of influence of the site include:

Table No. 04 – Statutory Designated Sites

Site	Description	Location
International Statutory Designated Sites within 12.0km		
The Mens SAC	The site is designated under article 4(4) of the Directive (92/43/EEC) as it hosts the following habitats listed in Annex I: Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrub layer <i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Illici-Fagenion</i>. The site is designated under article 4(4) of the Directive (92/43/EEC) as it hosts the following species listed in Annex II: Barbastelle bat <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	c. 6.5km SW
Ebernoe Common SAC	The site is designated under article 4(4) of the Directive (92/43/EEC) as it hosts the following habitats listed in Annex I: - Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex and sometimes also Taxus in the shrub layer <i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Illici-Fagenion</i>. The site is designated under article 4(4) of the Directive (92/43/EEC) as it hosts the following species listed in Annex II: - Barbastelle bat <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i> Bechstein's bat <i>Myotis bechsteinii</i>	c. 11km SW

- 3.1.2 The site lies within the 6.5km key conservation area of The Mens SAC and the 12km Wider Conservation Zone of Ebernoe Common SAC and as such all impacts upon bats must be avoided.

Priority Habitats

- 3.1.3 In accordance with the MAGIC dataset, within 2.0km of the site there are priority habitats (NERC, 2006) which include, *Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland*, *Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh* and *Traditional Orchard*. Much of the woodland in the surrounding area is classified as *Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland*.

Protected / Notable Species Records

- 3.1.4 Common Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, Soprano Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, Natterer's *Myotis nattereri* and brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* bats have been recorded within 2.0km of the site area.

European Protected Species Mitigation Licences Records

- 3.1.5 There were no mitigation licences in relation to bats issued within 1.0km of the site.

3.2 Survey Results

Building

- 3.2.1 There was one building (B01) onsite. There was no internal loft space to access within B01. Externally, there were missing pieces of tile, gaps between tile and gaps around the flashing throughout the roof space. The north-western elevation included hanging tile. The building was classified as being of moderate bat roost suitability.



Photographs 01 and 02 – Gaps around flashing along eastern elevation and gaps between tiles / missing tiles along western elevation.

Trees

- 3.2.2 A single tree is proposed for removal to facilitate the proposals. This tree had been removed prior to assessment of the trees and hedgerow and as such could not be inspected. Review of photographs however show this to be a small apple tree which did not appear to support any major cavities.
- 3.2.3 The section of hedgerow to the frontage of the building is c. 2-2.5m in height but did not contain any sizable trees nor any potential roost features.

Foraging and Commuting Suitability

- 3.2.4 The site is formed of a single dwelling; however, the wider surrounding habitat provides suitable habitat for the majority of UK bat species.
- 3.2.5 There was a short, c. 8 metres (m), ornamental hedgerow near the entrance of the site formed of beech *Fagus sylvatica* and Leylandii *Cupressus × leylandii*. The western end of this hedgerow terminates at the dwelling, with the other end heavily fragmented by fences and driveways along the adjacent roadside. The remainder of the proposed construction zone is formed of short amenity lawn and hardstanding which are of negligible value.

4.0 EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.0.1 The following section provides recommendations to avoid, mitigate or compensate potential impacts to protected or notable species, in line with the 'Mitigation Hierarchy' (BSI, 2013) (CIEEM, 2018). If potential impacts are anticipated, recommendations for further assessment and or mitigation are provided, to ensure that the presence, or potential presence of these species are adequately considered in the scheme design.

4.1 Potential Impacts

- 4.1.1 Building B01 has been assessed as offering moderate bat roost suitability due to missing pieces of tile, gaps between tiles and gaps around the flashing. As this building will be impacted during the development, it is not possible to scope out the potential that works could result in the killing or injuring of individual bats and permanent loss of the roost which would constitute an offence under the *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended)* and the *Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended)*. Resulting to adverse impacts to bats significant at the **site** level.
- 4.1.2 The short ornamental hedgerow to the west of the driveway is due to be removed. However, this section of hedgerow is only short in length and provides no connectivity between suitable habitats. All boundary habitat which surrounds the site shall be retained, as such there shall be no adverse impacts upon flightlines or commuting routes.



Photographs 03 and 04 – Beech and Leylandii hedgerow near entrance of the site.

- 4.1.3 In the absence of mitigation however, likely impacts could include disruption of commuting corridors and foraging habitat through inappropriate lighting upon the wider surrounding landscape.

4.2 Recommendations

- 4.2.1 Building B01 shall require 2no. bat emergence surveys to be undertaken during the optimal survey season of May to September, with at least 50% of visits completed in the peak months of May to August, using night vision aids in time aids in line with current guidance (Collins, 2023). This shall allow the presence or likely absence of a bat roost to be established. Where an active bat roost is found, a European Protected Species Derogation Licence shall be required from Natural England to allow works to progress. Any mitigation measures required as part of any such licence would be determined by the results of the survey work.
- 4.2.2 Proposals should be mindful of the potential for bats to occur in the area by ensuring that boundary vegetation is protected from inappropriate nocturnal lighting above existing baseline levels. Any lighting plans should be assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist to advise on their accordance with best practice standards in regard to lighting and bats (BCT & ILP, 2023).

5.0 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENT

5.1 Opportunities for ecological enhancements which could be incorporated into the scheme design are provided below:

- The use of seed and fruit bearing species of tree such as cherry, rowan, birch, hawthorn and crab apple to provide a foraging resource for birds and insects.
- Installation of integrated bird boxes (northern elevation) and bat boxes (southern elevation).
- Installation of bat boxes to the southern aspect of mature trees.
- Pale and night-scented species to be used within the scheme to increase the bat foraging resource, such as lavender, white Jasmin as well as herbs such as chives and sweet rocket and climbers could include honeysuckle and dog rose.
- The use of flowering lawn in areas which require regular mowing rather than a standard amenity mix.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The survey area covered a c. 120 metre square building (B01) with clay roof tiles and hanging tile surrounding part of the dwelling. There was a parking area to the eastern elevation of the site, and grassland and trees surrounded the northern, southern and western elevations.
- 6.2 Building B01 has been assessed as offering moderate bat roost suitability due to missing pieces of tile, gaps between tiles and gaps around the flashing. Building B01 shall require 2no. bat emergence surveys.
- 6.3 All surveys need to be conducted between May and September inclusive, with at least 50% of the surveys between May and August inclusive, each separated by a period of no less than 3 weeks, and undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance.
- 6.4 The site lies within the 6.5km key conservation area of The Mens SAC and the 12km Wider Conservation Zone of Ebernoe Common SAC. Provided the above mitigation measures are followed the scheme shall have no significant adverse effect upon these designated areas or their qualifying features.
- 6.5 Overall, no constraints were identified which would preclude the provision of a scheme which is well designed, and sensitive to the presence, or potential presence of ecological receptors.

7.0 REFERENCES

Altringham, J (2003). *British Bats*. New Naturalist. HarperCollins.

BCT & ILP. (2023). *Guidance Note 08/23. Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night. Bats and the Built Environment series*. Bat Conservation Trust and the Institute of Lighting Professionals. Regent House, Regent Place, Rugby, Warwickshire

BSI. (2013). *BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development*. London: BSI - British Standards Institution

Collins., J. (ed.) (2023). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (4th ed.) The Bat Conservation Trust, London. ISBN 978 1 7395126 0 26

English Nature (2004). *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

Jones, K and Walsh, A (2006). *A Guide to British Bats*. The Mammal Society, London.

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. (2021). *National Planning Policy Framework*. Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London. This publication is available [online] at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. (2004). *The Bat Workers' Manual* (3rd Ed.). JNCC, Peterborough.

Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC). (2023). Interactive Map. [online]. Available at <http://www.magic.gov.uk/Magicmap.aspx>

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