BAT SURVEY REPORT

MR SULLIVAN

WOODSIDE
STALL HOUSE LANE
PULBOROUGH
WEST SUSSEX

07TH AUGUST 2026

REF: 25002

CT Ecology Limited (Registered Office), 2 Hillside Crescent, Angmering, West Sussex, BN16 4AA
M: 07577 526525 E: carly@ctecology.co.uk W: www.ctecology.co.uk
Registered in England and Wales No.: 10836632

CONTENTS **PAGE NO**

Executive Summary 3

1. Introduction 5

2. Methodology 6

3. Results 8

4. Conclusions, Evaluation and Impact Assessment 13

5. Recommendations 14

6. References 17

Appendix A – Site Plan

Appendix B - Legislation

Revision	Date	Author	Reviewer
	07/08/2026	Carly Teague BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM	Jack Kellett BSc (Hons) MCIEEM

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the commissioning party and may not be reproduced without prior written permission from CT Ecology Limited.
No liability is accepted by CT Ecology Limited for the accuracy of data or opinions provided by others in the preparation of this report, or for any use of this report other than for the purpose for which it was produced.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A preliminary roost assessment (PRA) in relation to bats and subsequent emergence and activity survey were carried out at Woodside in Pulborough, West Sussex, in May and July 2026 in order to determine whether roosting bats could pose constraints to the proposed works at the site. The bat assessment follows on from a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal undertaken in 2025 (CT Ecology 2025) which identified potential for the house and garage to support roosting bats. Proposals are for an extension to Woodside; a residential property, together with the demolition of the detached garage to facilitate construction of a new garage.

The main findings of the bat assessment are as follows:

* The survey site is located within a rural location within the northern extent of Pulborough, in West Sussex. The surveyed buildings are located in the eastern extent of the wider estate.
* The landscape largely comprises agricultural farmland with grazed fields extending in all directions together with scattered residential properties. The network of agricultural fields together with areas of woodland in the wider landscape provide a network of habitats and habitat features of value to commuting, foraging and roosting bats.
* Overall Woodside has been assessed as providing negligible potential for roosting bats. No roosting bats or secondary evidence was found anywhere within or external to the building during the preliminary roost assessment. This building was scoped out for further assessment due to an absence of any suitable roosting features.
* The garage was assessed as having **low** potential for roosting bats. This building supported a small number of construction-related features that could be utilised by roosting bats; predominantly associated with areas of weather-boarding. The features may provide potential for use by crevice dwelling bats which may tuck up between the boarding and gaps associated with the weatherboarding may provide ingress for both crevice dwelling and void-loving species. No roosting bats or secondary evidence was found anywhere within or external to the building during the preliminary roost assessment.
* Based on the results of the PRA, a single emergence and activity survey was undertaken in relation to the garage in accordance with current guidelines in order to confirm the presence/likely absence of roosting bats.
* No bats emerged from the garage and so the likely absence of any high conservation value roosts such as maternity roosts have been confirmed. Overall a low level of activity was recorded during the emergence and activity survey with a total of two species recorded within or in proximity to the site during the survey.
* Based on the results of the current assessment, no further survey or mitigation is required in relation to either building and works can be undertaken without any significant constraints posed by bats.

* Owing to the potential roosting features identified at the garage and the high mobility of bats, there remains some, albeit limited, potential for a transient bat to utilise the building. In turn, precautionary measures are detailed in section 5 in order to fully safeguard and prevent any detrimental impacts to bats or their roosts.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 CT Ecology Limited was commissioned by Mr Sullivan to carry out a preliminary roost assessment in regard to bats and subsequent bat emergence and activity survey at Woodside, in Pulborough, West Sussex (hereafter referred to as "the site") prior to works.

1.2 A series of two buildings subject to the current proposals have been included in the assessment. These are shown on Figure 1 in Appendix A. The bat assessment follows on from a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal undertaken in 2025 (CT Ecology 2025) which identified potential for the house and garage to support roosting bats.

1.3 This report provides an assessment of the status of bats, providing information on their presence/ likely absence and distribution. Potential impacts of the proposed development are identified and measures to mitigate the effects of the development on this species group is discussed in outline.

1.4 The site is within a rural location in the northern extent of Pulborough, in West Sussex, accessed from Stall House Lane to the south-east. The site, located at British National Grid reference TQ070 214, comprises a residential dwelling and garage with associated garden together with a series of outbuildings, grassland fields, pond and associated drainage ditch together with mature boundary vegetation. A railway line bounds the wider site to the west with grazed fields extending to the north and south. Residential properties and grazed fields are beyond Stall House Lane to the east.

1.5 The wider landscape largely comprises agricultural farmland with grazed fields extending beyond the site in all directions together with scattered residential properties. Habitats in the wider landscape provide high value commuting, foraging and roosting habitat for a range of bat species.

1.6 This report has been compiled in accordance with current guidelines: British Standard 42020:2013 Biodiversity. Code of Practice for Planning and Development, 2013; CIEEM, 2013 & 2016; Mitchell-Jones and McLeish, 2004; and Collins, 2023.

Proposed Works

1.7 Proposals are for the extension to Woodside; a residential property, together with the demolition of the detached garage to facilitate construction of a new garage. Access will remain as existing. No trees or boundary features will require removal to facilitate the works.

2. METHODOLOGY

Desktop Study

2.1 A data search was commissioned as part of the original PEA (CT Ecology 2024) and this should be referred to.

Bats

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

2.2 The building inspection was carried out by Jack Kellett BSc (Hons), a suitably qualified ecologist with over 16 years' experience as an ecological consultant with Level 2 Class Licence for bats (WML-CL18). Jack has extensive experience in undertaking bat surveys and implementing bat mitigation measures as part of Protected Species Mitigation Licences.

2.3 The inspection of the structure was carried out on 28th May 2025. The survey and report have been undertaken in accordance with good practice guidelines (Collins, 2023).

2.4 The interior and exterior of the structures were inspected closely with the aim of identifying the presence of bats and any secondary evidence together with any potential roost sites. Secondary evidence includes droppings, feeding remains, scratch marks and oil and urine staining.

2.5 The external inspection comprised a detailed search of all accessible architectural features for bat droppings, urine staining, scratch marks, staining around suitable crevices and feeding remains. A high-powered torch was used to illuminate internal features at height, for instance the apex of the roof and associated supporting beams, and these were inspected using close focusing binoculars when required.

Bat Activity/Emergence Survey

2.6 A dusk emergence/activity survey was carried out on the 14th July 2026. A total of one surveyor using an Anabat Scout and two infra-red video cameras were used to identify the presence of possible roosts associated with the garage and to record general bat activity in proximity to the building.

2.7 The surveyor was located to the south of the building with a view of the southern and eastern elevations. An infra-red camera was located with the surveyor. An unattended camera was located to the north-west of the garage, covering the western and northern elevations. Cameras were checked throughout by the surveyor to ensure they were functioning correctly.

2.8 All potential roosting features identified during the PRA were covered by the surveyor and cameras.

2.9 The time of any bat pass, the species, and information regarding behaviour and flight direction, were recorded during the survey.

Constraints

Bat Survey Constraints

2.10 Bats are mobile animals and can move roost sites throughout the year. It is possible that the PRA carried out in May could miss roosts occupied earlier or later in the year. However, where undisturbed, it is possible to find secondary evidence of bats inside a building throughout the year, although secondary signs may be missed where they are within an area that can't be fully accessed.

2.11 The emergence survey was undertaken within the peak survey period and it is considered that the survey was suitably robust to be able to ascertain presence/likely absence of roosts together with general activity at the site.

3. RESULTS

Desk Top Study

Baseline Conditions

3.1 The site is within a rural location dominated by agricultural land and associated hedgerows, tree lines and woodland blocks, together with scattered residential properties.

Protected Species Mitigation Licences (PSML's)

3.2 No granted PSML's or associated licence returns were present within 1km of the site in relation to bats.

Data Search

3.3 The data search returned at least six species of bat within a 2.5km radius, recorded since 2000. Species included pipistrelle species (*Pipistrellus* sp.); common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus)*; soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*); natterer's bat (*Myotis nattereri*); serotine (*Eptesicus serotinus*); noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*); long-eared species (*Plecotus* sp.); and brown long-eared (*P. auritus*). The most frequently recorded bat species was brown long-eared with a total of six records (totalling a count of 27 individuals).

3.4 No records were returned from within the survey site. A total of 25 recent (post 2000) bat records were recorded, with a further nine historic records also returned.

3.5 The closest roost records were from 2003, for unspecified roost types pertaining to natterer's bat, pipistrelle and long-eared; all approximately 1km to the north-east of the site. The closest record for a known maternity roost was for brown long-eared, recorded over 2km from the survey site, from 2009.

Survey Overview

3.6 A series of two structures were included in the current assessment. These were in use and well-maintained at the time of the assessment.

3.7 No roosting bats or secondary evidence were found anywhere within or external to either building during the preliminary roost assessment.

3.8 Overall, based on the results of the assessment, the house; Woodside has been assessed as providing **negligible** potential for roosting bats due to an absence of any suitable roosting features. The garage has been assessed as providing **low** potential for roosting bats. This building supported a small number of construction-related features that could be utilised by roosting bats; predominantly associated with areas of weatherboarding.

3.9 A subsequent emergence and activity survey was undertaken in relation to the garage. A low level of bat activity was recorded at the site. No bats emerged from the garage during the assessment.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

3.10 The building inspection was undertaken on the 28th May 2026. The, weather conditions were dry and clear. The temperature was 20˚C at the start of the survey.

3.11 The surveyed buildings are detailed below and a map showing the building locations is provided in Appendix A.

Table 3.1: Building Description

Building Reference	Description	Potential Roosting Features	Summary of Findings
1	Woodside: a residential house covering a footprint of approximately 90m^2 on a broadly north to south orientation with double-pitched, slate roof. A single-storied extension was on the northern elevation extending east. Open gables were present on the northern and southern aspects of the main section with a large dormer present on the eastern roof elevation that comprised three pitched roof sections with connecting flat-roofed features, all areas were slate tile hung. A further double-pitched cross gable was present on the western roof elevation. Boxed soffits were noted on all roof edge areas, including dormer features. The single storied extension had a double pitched slate roof with PVC facia boards on all roof edge sections. Outer walls were all of brick construction. No loft areas were present. Overall good condition, no significant features present that could be utilised by roosting bats. Internally no void areas were present.	None supported.	No bats or secondary evidence of bats were noted within or adjacent to the survey structure. Overall the building is considered to provide **negligible** potential for roosting bats throughout the year.
2	A detached garage covering a footprint of approximately 20m^2 in area and used for storage at the time of the survey. The structure was in good condition and generally well-maintained. The garage had a double pitched, clay-tiled roof with open gables on the northern and southern aspects which overhung the lower levels of the northern and southern aspects slightly. The southern aspect was formed of double timber doors which provided the main access point with all other aspects having a brick built base and timber weatherboarded upper sections which extended to cover both gable faces. Timber barge boards were present on both gable faces with open eaves on the eastern and western roof edge areas. Internally the structure was timber framed with an enclosed loft space. The roof comprised a single ridge beam and associated rafters with bitumen felt lining throughout. Overall, in good condition with no signs of damage or degradation but construction related features were present that could be utilised by roosting bats, associated mainly with weatherboarded areas.	Gaps associated with the timber weatherboarding and barge boards enable potential for ingress into the roof void by crevice dwelling bats and void-loving species. Gaps between sheets of timber weatherboarding also provide opportunities for crevice dwelling bats to tuck between the timbers.	No bats or secondary evidence of bats were noted within or adjacent to the survey structure. Overall the building is considered to provide **low** potential for roosting bats. The building was a non classic hibernation site, overall, the building was assessed as providing **negligible** potential for hibernation.



Photograph 1: Looking towards the eastern elevation of Woodside. The building was well-sealed externally.



Photograph 2: A view of the single storey rear extension on Woodside.



Photograph 3: Looking towards the southern gable end of the garage. Potential bat roosting/ingress features include the timber weather boarding/barge boards.



Photograph 4: Looking towards the northern gable end of the garage.



Photograph 5: A view within the garage.



Photograph 6: Looking south within the roof void within the garage.

Dusk Emergence and Activity Survey

3.12 Based on the results of the PRA, Woodside was scoped out for further survey. A single dusk emergence survey was subsequently undertaken on the garage.

14th July 2026

3.13 The survey began at 20:56 and ended at 22:45, sunset was at 21:11. There was no precipitation, still air throughout the survey and the temperature ranged from 24.1˚C to 22˚C.

3.14 No bats emerged from the building during the survey.

3.15 At least two species were recorded foraging and/or commuting in the wider site during the survey. These included common pipistrelle, and soprano pipistrelle. Overall there was a low level of bat activity although all passes were associated with the wider garden and associated boundary features to the east of the building.

3.16 The first pass was from common pipistrelle at 21:32. The bat was heard and not seen; suspected to be flying along the eastern site boundary.

3.17 Infrequent foraging by soprano pipistrelle and common pipistrelle was then recorded between 21:40 and 21:58; all associated with the tree line to the east of the garage. The last pass of the survey was by soprano pipistrelle heard and not seen, foraging in the wider site at 22.25.

4. CONCLUSIONS, EVALUATION AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 The site at Woodside is within a rural location, in Pulborough, West Sussex, with land-use dominated by agricultural land and associated hedgerows, tree lines and woodland blocks, together with scattered residential properties.

4.2 Woodside does not include any potential bat roosting features or ingress points. No bats or secondary evidence to suggest any recent bat presence or activity was found at Woodside. Overall, Woodside is assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats. The proposed extension works are not anticipated to impact upon any bat roosts and so may proceed without the need for any additional bat surveys and there are no significant constraints in regards to bats.

4.3 The garage was assessed as providing **low** potential for roosting bats. This building supported a small number of features associated with gaps between the timber weatherboarding and barge boards. The features may provide ingress for both crevice dwelling bats and void-loving bats into the associated void area as well as providing potential for use by crevice dwelling bats that may tuck up between the timber boarding. No roosting bats or secondary evidence was found anywhere within or external to the building during the preliminary roost assessment.

4.4 A single emergence and activity survey was undertaken in relation to the garage building in accordance with current guidelines in order to confirm the presence/likely absence of roosting bats. No bats emerged from the building and so the likely absence of any high conservation value roosts such as maternity roosts is confirmed. Overall a low level of activity was recorded during the emergence and activity survey with a total of two species recorded foraging at the site.

4.5 Based on the results of the current assessment, no further surveys are required and works to demolish the garage can proceed without any significant constraints posed by bats.

Impact Assessment

4.6 The garage will be subject to demolition to facilitate construction of a new garage. No bat roosts have been located at the building and the likely absence of bat roosts is confirmed; in turn the proposed works are not anticipated to impact upon any bat roosts and a protected species mitigation licence (PSML) is not necessary in order to proceed with the works. The proposed works are not anticipated to cause any negative impacts upon the local bat population.

4.7 Owing to the potential roosting features identified at the building and the high mobility of bats, there remains some, albeit limited, potential for a transient bat to utilise the building. In turn, precautionary measures are detailed in section 5 in order to fully safeguard and prevent any detrimental impacts to bats or their roosts.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Recommendations are detailed below. A summary of relevant legislation is provided in Appendix B.

Bats

5.1 No further survey work is currently deemed necessary in relation to the current proposals and the proposed works may proceed without the need for a PSML.

Woodside

5.2 The proposed extension works at Woodside may proceed without the need for any further bat surveys and no constraints in regards to bats.

5.3 If bats are unexpectedly discovered during the works:

- All work must immediately stop and any machinery at the site switched off;
- A licensed bat ecologist be contacted as soon as possible;
- The bat/s must be left in-situ, if they have been uncovered, carefully replace the original covering ensuring the bat/s are not crushed. If this is not possible, the bat/s should be covered with a soft cloth or loose covering.

5.4 If a bat roost is found during the extension works, further works would need to be delayed whilst additional survey work is carried out and an appropriate licence is gained from Natural England. Appropriate compensatory measures would potentially need to be created at the site.

Garage

5.5 Owing to the presence of features associated with the garage building and the high mobility of bats, a precautionary approach must be implemented to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts to bats as a result of the works. This approach must include:

- Timber weatherboarding and barge boards as well as any associated underlying materials must be removed by hand by appropriate contractors. The reverse of all materials must be checked for any bats during removal;
- The removal of timber boarding must avoid the peak winter hibernation period and in turn these works must only proceed between April and November inclusive.
- If a bat is unexpectedly discovered during the removal of materials:

- All works must immediately stop and any machinery at the site switched off;
- A licensed bat ecologist be contacted as soon as possible;
- The bat/s must be left in-situ, if they have been uncovered, carefully replace the original covering ensuring the bat/s are not crushed. If this is not possible, the bat/s should be covered with a soft cloth or loose covering.

5.6 If bats are found during the works, further activities relating to the building would need to be delayed whilst the ecologist carries out further surveys as required and an appropriate licence obtained from Natural England. Appropriate compensatory measures would potentially need to be created/incorporated at the site and there would be time constraints associated with delays and licence conditions.

Wider Biodiversity Enhancement Measures

5.7 Re-development provides opportunities to provide biodiversity enhancement and net gain in accordance with current local and national policies regarding biodiversity.

Bats and Lighting

5.8 Different species of bat have been found to react differently to night-time lighting however research has found that generally, all species of bats are sensitive to artificial lighting and that excessive lighting can delay bats from emerging, thus shortening the time available for foraging, as well as causing individuals to move away from suitable foraging grounds or roost sites, to alternative dark areas (Jones, 2000). Bats can also become isolated from their foraging grounds if the linear features they use for commuting are suddenly illuminated, creating a light barrier (Fure, 2006).

5.9 Currently the site receives a degree of light spill from security lighting associated with the house and garage. Installation of new lighting associated with the new garage/extension works should seek to minimise light spill in order to avoid any additional levels of illumination post development. This can be achieved by following accepted best practice (Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management 2006, Institute of Lighting Engineers 2009):

* The level of artificial lighting including flood lighting should be kept to a minimum, with light spill limited on all boundary features and grassland to the rear of the dwelling;
* recent LED technology should be utilised where possible. LED lights do not emit UV radiation, towards which insects are attracted, drawing them away from bat foraging areas in the surrounding landscape. All lights should be directed at a low angle with minimal light spillage wherever possible; and

* the adjacent tree line to the east of the building should be kept dark at bat emergence (0-1 hour after sunset) and during peak bat activity periods (e.g., 1.5 hours after sunset and 1.5 hours before sunrise). Therefore, where possible, if lighting is required this should be installed with the light directed down onto the access/driveway/patio areas wherever possible and lighting should be controlled through the use of PIR and/or timers.

Bat Boxes

5.10 Additional bat roosting provision could be incorporated into new design proposals. An external bird box could be installed on the new garage. There are a range of boxes on the market and various types are suitable for the site. Greenwoods single crevice bat box is recommended. This box is suitable for small groups of crevice dwelling bats including common and soprano pipistrelle bats, recorded in the wider site during the survey. The bat box should be located at the eaves, ideally with a south-east or south-west facing aspect.

Other

5.11 It is recommended that an update assessment is undertaken if more than 18 months have elapsed between the survey and the point at which any development decisions have been made at the site.

6. REFERENCES

- British Standards Institute (2013). 24040:2013. *Biodiversity-Code of Practice for Planning and Development.* Standards Policy & Strategy Committee. Milton Keynes: BSI.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines.* 3rd edn. The Bat Conservation Trust, London
- Hill, D. Fasham, M. Tucker, G. Shewry, M. Shaw, P (2005). *Handbook of Biodiversity Methods – Survey, Evaluation and Monitoring*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ILE - Institute of Lighting Engineers. (2023). *Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night*. ILE and the Bat Conservation Trust [on-line]. Available from Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting | Institution of Lighting Professionals (theilp.org.uk) [Accessed on 03/08/2026].
- Mitchell-Jones, T. & McLeish, A.P (2004). *The Bat Workers' Manual* (3rd Ed). Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough, UK.
- Natural England (2015). *Standing advice for local planning authorities to assess impacts of development on bats: Survey and Mitigation for development projects.* [on-line]. Available from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/bats-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects [Accessed on 03/08/2026].
- CT Ecology (2025) *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal for Woodside, Pulborough, West Sussex.* Unpublished report for Mr Sullivan. CT Ecology: West Sussex.
- The British Standards Institution. (2013). *Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development BS42020:2013.* BSI Standards Limited

Appendix A
Site Plan



Figure 1: Woodside Bat Survey Map

Drawn by: CT
Date: 07/08/2026
Scale: See Map

CT Ecology

Appendix B
Legislation

LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

This section contains information pertaining to the legislation and planning policy applicable in Britain. This information is not applicable to Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland the Isle of Man or the Channel Islands. Information contained in the following appendix is provided for guidance only.

Species

The objective of the EC Habitats Directive[1] is to conserve plants and animals which are considered to be rare across Europe. The Directive is transposed into UK law by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (formerly The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and The Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2007 (as amended).

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) implements the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and also implements the obligations set out for species protection from the Council Directive 2009/147/EC (formerly 79/409/EEC) on the Conservation of Wild Birds (EC Birds Directive) in Great Britain.

Various amendments have been made since the Wildlife & Countryside Act came into force in 1981. Further details pertaining to alterations of the Act can be found on the following website: www.opsi.gov.uk. Key amendments have been made through the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act (2000) and Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.

There are a number of other legislative Acts affording protection to species and habitats. These include

* Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000
* Deer Act 1991
* Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
* [redacted]
* Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996

Bats

Bats are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This act protects individuals from:

* intentional or reckless disturbance (at any level);

[1] Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora.

- intentional or reckless obstruction of access to any place of shelter or protection; and
- selling, offering or exposing for sale, possession or transporting for purpose of sale

In addition, all species of bat are fully protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 2. Regulation 41 prohibits:

- deliberate killing, injuring or capturing of Schedule 2 species (all bats);
- deliberate disturbance of bat species as to impair their ability:
- (i) to survive, breed, or reproduce, or to rear or nurture young; and
- (ii) to hibernate or migrate.
- deliberate disturbance of bat species as to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species;
- damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place; and
- keeping, transporting, selling, exchanging or offering for sale whether live or dead or of any part thereof.

A Protected Species Mitigation Licence (PSML) issued by Natural England will be required for works liable to affect a bat roost or for operations likely to result in a level of disturbance which might impair their ability to undertake activities listed above. A licence is required to allow derogation from the relevant legislation but also to enable appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place and monitored.