

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Lytton Court, Barter Street, London Borough of Camden

The Ecology Partnership, Thorncroft Manor, Thorncroft Drive, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 8JB T +44 (0) 1372 364133 E info@ecologypartnership.com W ecologypartnership.com

Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	.3	
2.0	METHODOLOGY	.5	
3.0	RESULTS	.6	
4.0	CONCLUSION	.8	
5.0	REFERENCES	.9	
APPENDIX 1: PHOTOS			

LIABILITIES:

Whilst every effort has been made to guarantee the accuracy of this report, it should be noted that living animals and plants are capable of migration/establishing. Whilst such species may not have been located during the survey duration, their presence may be found on a site at a later date. This report provides a snap shot of the species that were present at the time of the survey only and does not consider seasonal variation. Furthermore, where access is limited or the site supports habitats which are densely vegetated, only dominant species may be recorded.

The recommendations contained within this document are based on a reasonable timeframe between the completion of the survey and the commencement of any works. If there is any delay between the commencement of works that may conflict with timeframes laid out within this document, or have the potential to allow the ingress of protected species, a suitably qualified ecologist should be consulted.

It is the duty of care of the landowner/developer to act responsibly and comply with current environmental legislation if protected species are suspected or found prior to or during works.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Background

- 1.1 The Ecology Partnership was commissioned by Maddox Planning to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the building at Lytton Court, Barter Street, Bloomsbury, London Borough of Camden, WC1A 2AH, hereafter referred to as the 'site' (Figure 1).
- 1.2 The site (TQ 30368 81535) supports a 4-storey residential block located in a dense urban environment within the city of London. The immediate surroundings of the site comprise offices as well as residential and commercial development.



Figure 1: Building subject to PRA within the red line boundary of the site.

Proposed Development

1.3 The proposals are for a proposed extension to the roof of the existing building.

Legislation

- 1.4 Under the NERC Act (2006) it is now the duty of every Government department in carrying out its functions "to have regard, so far as it is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biological diversity in accordance with the Convention".
- 1.5 Bats are covered by the following relevant legislation: the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended); the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006); and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010).

Under the WCA 1981 it is an offence to:

- intentionally, recklessly or deliberately disturb a roosting or hibernating bat (i.e. disturbing it whilst it is occupying a structure or place used for shelter or protection)
- intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost (i.e. a structure or place used for shelter or protection).

Under the CHSR 2010 it is an offence to:

- deliberately capture (or take), injure or kill a bat
- intentionally, recklessly or deliberately disturb a bat, in particular (i) any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; (ii) any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability in the case of hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or (iii) any disturbance which is likely to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong
- damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place (roost) of a bat.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

Desktop Study

2.1 A desktop study was completed using an internet-based mapping service (www.magic.gov.uk) for statutory designated sites, current and past European Protected Species mitigation (EPSM) licences for bat species within 1km and priority habitats within the surrounding area.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

- 2.2 The building was internally and externally assessed for its suitability for roosting bats. The survey was undertaken on 6th February 2025 by ecologists Edward Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc and assistant ecologist Hayley Gale BSc (Hons). The surveyors checked for evidence of roosting bat species and Potential Roosting Features (PRFs).
- 2.3 The building was assessed for its potential to support roosting bats following the assessment in Table 1, below.

Table 1. Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of proposed development sites for bats, based onthe presence of habitat features within the landscape, to be applied using professional judgement. Table 4.1within the 'Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th ed), 2023

Potential	Description of Roosting Habitats in	Potential flight paths and foraging habitats
Suitability	structures	
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	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 flight-paths 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 the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight paths 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

	(i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation).	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 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 categorization 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 commuting 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 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. 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 commuting bats such as river valleys, stream, 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.

*Potential roost features

3.0 RESULTS

Desktop Study

- 3.1 There are no international or national designated sites within 1km of the site. The closest national designated site is Camley Street Nature Park Local Nature Reserve (LNR), located approximately 1.9km north of the site.
- 3.2 There is one priority habitat type within 1km of the site (Figure 2); Deciduous woodland, the closest of which is located approximately 350m south east of the redline boundary.



Figure 2: Priority habitats within 1km of the site (Deciduous woodland –green).

3.3 There are no EPSM licences within 1km of the red line boundary. The closest EPSM licence for bats is located approximately 1.1km north west of the site and is a 2015-2020 licence for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

External and Internal

3.4 The building onsite is a red brick residential block comprising several flats. The view of the roof was limited at ground level. Therefore, drone images and Google Earth was also used to help assess the roof composition and to identify any potential roosting features. The roof supported a flat hipped roof, with a separate hipped roof towards the centre. The flat roof supported a lead top, and the hipped edge comprised slate tiles and lead flashings which appeared in good condition. The separate hipped roof towards the centre of the flat roof also supported slate tiles in good condition. There were no obvious gaps or lifted tiles, considered potential roosting features, identified at the time of the survey. Due to the tight-fitting nature of the slate tiles, they were considered unlikely to support roosting bats.

- 3.5 Externally, the building was situated in a dense urban area, and it is anticipated that the building would be exposed to high amounts of artificial light. The roof was also surrounded by taller buildings and was heavily shaded at the time of the survey, especially by a tower block to the west of the site. Therefore, the building potentially receives limited sunlight considered beneficial to roosting bats.
- 3.6 Internally, only the central hipped roof loft void of the building was assessable. This hipped roof supported a large loft void, comprising timber beams and a plastic lining. The loft void was dark, and the lining appeared new and in good condition. This loft void was fully accessible at the time of the survey and no bats or evidence of bats were observed, with no droppings or feeding remains identified. The loft void was very dusty, supporting cobwebs which were undisturbed, suggesting limited movement within the void. An air vent ran along all aspects of the void; however, this was supported by a metal mesh grate, limiting internal access for bats. No other clear entry or exit points for bat were identified throughout the survey.
- 3.7 The site is situated in a dense urban environment and there were limited roosting features suitable for bats present onsite. There are also no EPSM licences within 1km suggesting that bats are not present within the local area. Although deciduous woodland is located approximately 350m south east of the site, it is of small extent, is isolated and is separated from the site by large roads and urban development. As such, this building is considered to have **'negligible'** suitability to support roosting bats. Therefore, no further surveys are required.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 The building supports no obvious external potential roosting features. No evidence of bats or bat use was identified within the accessed loft void, and no clear access points considered suitable for bats were visible. The site is also situated in a dense urban environment and is likely exposed to artificial light considered unsuitable for bats.

- 4.2 There are no EPSM licence within the local area and the access to suitable foraging habiat is limited. As such, the building is considered to have **'negligible'** suitability for roosting bats and no further surveys are required.
- 4.3 If in the unlikely event that during works, any evidence of bats, or bats are found, then all works must cease and an ecologists consulted.

5.0 **REFERENCES**

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

Institution of Lighting Professionals., (ILP - 2018)., *Guidance Note 08/18 – Bats and artificial lighting in the UK.* ILP, Rugby.

Lintott, P., & Mathews, F. (2018). *Reviewing the evidence on mitigation strategies for bats in buildings informing best-practice for policy makers and practitioners.*

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004) Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.

Appendix 1: Photos

Photograph 1: View of loft void, showing air vent and lining in good condition.	
Photograph 2: Apex of loft void showing timber beams and plastic lining in good condition.	
Photograph 3: Air vent, which extended along each wall of the loft void. Mesh grate present on inside of vent.	





The Ecology Partnership Ltd

Thorncroft Manor

Thorncroft Drive

Leatherhead

KT22 8JB

Tel: 01372 364 133

www.ecologypartnership.com

Approved: Alexia Tamblyn MA (Oxon) MSc CEcol CEnv MCIEEM FRGS Date: 20/02/205