BAT SURVEY,

6, STREATLEY PLACE,

HAMPSTEAD,

LONDON NW3 1HP

Tel/fax 020 8974 6670
Mob.0786 750 7086
Email alison@furesfen.co.uk
Website: www.furesfen.co.uk

REPORT CONTENTS

CONTROL SHEET

Author	Alison Fure BSc, MSc C.ENV MCIEEM
Job Title.	Streatley Place
Purpose	External Use

The information provided within this report is true at the time of writing. It has been prepared in accordance with the guidance of the MCIEEM professional institution's Code of Professional Conduct. It cannot be used for any purpose other than stated above without the permission of the author. It cannot be made available to the pubic domain until all accounts have been settled.

INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 Furesfen was asked to undertake a bat survey at 6, Streatley Place, Hampstead. The investigation was necessary in order to determine if any protected or principal species, might be affected by proposals to demolish the workshops and redevelop the site.

Site Description

1.2 The site consists of four derelict workshops/sheds, which have generally been unoccupied for several years. The site is located on the side of a steep hill and is overshadowed by tall trees. For this reason, few plants grow in the shaded area below, so the site is mostly bare earth around cobbles with a few self-sown trees.

Proposals

1.3 Proposals exist to demolish the workshops and redevelop the plot. An ecology report was produced during 2013. This did not find any constraints to development on site. There was no bat activity during two emergence surveys.

Scope of this Report

1.4 This report outlines the methodology and findings of the Bat Habitat Assessment and emergence survey carried out at the site during October.

Aims of Assessment

1.5 The purpose of this assessment was to:

(a) Determine any potential impacts to bats, or their roosts; posed by the works; and,

(b) Advise of any further surveys and mitigation measures that may be required to ensure that the proposed works proceed lawfully.

1.6 Details of enhancement measures that may be required to proceed lawfully with the proposed works are provided based on the findings of the assessment.

METHODOLOGY

Desk study

2.1 A desk study was undertaken using widely available information obtained from a London Bat Group data search.

Building Inspection

2.2 The building inspection was undertaken during the evenings of 10.10.16 and repeated during 17.10.16. The survey was carried out using a torch and zoom camera as required.

2.3 An emergence survey was carried out during the same evenings, using recordable Bat Box 4 detector and an Anabat Walkabout, played through an Edirol (RO9) recorder. The survey was conducted during suitable temperature and weather conditions.

2.4 The survey methods were not in accordance with The Bat Conservation Trust's *Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines – 3rd Edition* (Collins, 2016), and *The Bat Worker's Manual* (Mitchell-Jones and McLeish, 2004). This was due to the lateness of the year but the method was a close as could possibly be obtained and the survey temperature was within recommended limits.

Surveyor Information

2.5 The surveys were undertaken by A Fure Class 2 Bat Licence (Natural England licence number 2015-10381-CLS-CLS) full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

Limitations

2.6 This is very late in the year for a bat emergence survey although it was undertaken at 12 degrees which is above the recommended ten degrees Celsius.

RESULTS

Desk study Bat Records

3.1 London Bat Group records nine bat species within 1 km of the application site. This is due to the presence of two Sites of Special Scientific Interest: Hampstead Heath and Kenwood House. Several roosts are present but are to the north of the proposal site.

Building Inspection

3.2 Little had changed since the previous visit (2013). The trees had grown taller, which had raised the canopy letting in more light to the site, although this had not changed the vegetation, which was dominated by bare earth and nettles.

3.3 The buildings were in a worse state of repair than before, with two having to be shored up by reinforcing truss work. One building had incurred a large hole in the south elevation. The buildings were generally more permeable and therefore less attractive to heat seeking animals.

3.4 There were many surfaces that would act as dropping traps for overflying animals such as mattresses, shelving and clear plastic. No evidence was found on surfaces and no droppings were found adhering to the elevations.

3.5 Occupying the northernmost portion of the site was the largest workshop/office. Buddleia was growing out of the roof of the main store and masked the elevation completely. This was a brick and wooden structure. Its exterior was part-rendered and part-clad, attesting to multiple development phases and alterations. It had a flat roof, which was metal and asphalted.

3.6 No bat droppings were found in the interior or exterior of the building. There was a felt overhang, which could be accessed by bats but this was heavily cobwebbed. The building was thought to be of low potential for bats.

3.7 Two buildings on the south-eastern boundary had pitched roofs separated by a deep valley from where broken drain pipes have allowed water ingress to the fabric of the building. The eastern elevation has been buttressed and it was from here, that ferns were growing.

3.8 Wooden cladding was used at the north facing elevations and the roof pitches were a mixture of metal, corrugated plastic and concrete asbestos sheeting. Internally there were wooden roof

trusses, although the roof was open to the elements in places, which would mean that the building would be of low potential for bats.

Table 1. Photographs –

Photograph 1. Poor quality roof materials

Photograph 2. Derelict and open nature of buildings

Photograph 3 wooden cladding is too wet and decayed to offer opportunities for heat seeking animals

Photograph 4 rubbish dumping over wall

3.9 A brick building (former paint store) with a flat roof that had shown signs of collapse and had been shored up. This structure had two jack arches at the base of the eastern elevation, possibly adding ventilation to the floor. There were no signs of bat interest within this building, which was also deemed to be of negligible-low potential for bat interest.

Emergence surveys: 10.10.16 and 17.10.16

3.10 The emergence surveys began thirty minutes before sunset, with the surveyor positioned at the southern elevation able to see the buildings. The Anabat Express was employed at the northern end of the site. The surveyor took note of all the features mentioned above.

3.11 During the emergence survey no bats were recorded emerging from the buildings on hand held or static bat detection equipment. No bats were associated with the building during the activity period. No bats were recorded in the wider environment.

ASSESSMENT

Discussion of Findings

4.1 The survey found the buildings to be of negligible- low potential for bat interest, with few features suitable for a colony, although there were features that would permit ingress for bats as a night roost or feeding perch as singles on a casual basis.

4.2 No evidence by way of droppings were found. There were no droppings on the elevations or internal materials.

4.3 No bat species were recorded on bat recording equipment.

Potential Impacts of the Development

4.4 No potential to harm bats has been identified although the following method represents Good Practice.

4.5 By working during the autumn period when bats are still active but post-breeding then impacts to colonies can be avoided.

All species of bat found in Britain, and their roosts, receive protection under Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). These legislative tools make it an offence for any person to:

- Deliberately **capture, injure or kill a bat**;
- Intentionally or recklessly **destroy a breeding or resting place (roost) of a bat**; and,
- Intentionally or recklessly **obstruct access for bats to a roost** or to otherwise significantly alter the structure of a roost to render it unsuitable to support roosting bats.

4.6 Therefore, the mitigation measures provided below could be implemented to ensure unlawful impacts to bats, or their roosts, are avoided because of the works.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Mitigation

4.7 Mitigation measures to avoid direct impacts to bats as well as features with potential to support roosting bats are provided in table 2, below.

Table 2. Mitigation Measures

Area of works	Species	Summary Mitigation
Demolition	Bat	Works should proceed during the autumn, which is the best time to undertake this type of work (breeding has finished/but before bats hibernate. This is also a good time to avoid impacts to birds which are protected at their nests.
Bat tubes		This is a very urban and well-lit area with little natural vegetation and the use of bat tubes/boxes is a matter for the LPA. Information on integrated bat boxes is however appendicised.

Precautionary Approach

4.8 In the unlikely event that bats are encountered during the proposed works then all works must cease immediately and a licensed bat ecologist must be called to site.

REFERENCES

Collins, J., Ed. (2016) Bat Surveys, Good Practice Guidelines. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Data search London Bat Group, 2016

Furesfen 2013 Streatley Place Ecology Survey

Appendix

Tables.

Bat activity (10.10.16)

Conditions: Sunset: 18.17 Cloud Cover 6/8. Temperature 12 degs. at start. Wind at Beaufort 2.

Time	**Detectors used**: Duets. Anabat Walkabout A. Fure
18.00	Start time
	No bats recorded
19.30	Ends

Bat activity (17.10.16)

Conditions: Sunset: 18.00 Cloud Cover 6/8. Temperature 12 degs. at start. Wind at Beaufort 2.

Time	**Detectors used**: Duets. Anabat Walkabout A. Fure
18.00	Start time
	No bats recorded
19.30	Ends

BAT TUBES

Bat tubes provide an access slot of dimension 100 x 15mm between the soffit and the wall at the roof apex at various locations in the new building. Note that if the dimensions are smaller the bats will not be able to access the new roost and if they are any larger birds may move in. The exterior brick or stone work will be of a rough material to assist bats to grip when landing and entering roosts.

Schwegler 2FR Bat Tube

Stockist - NHBS, Pearce Environmental

The tubes have holes in the sides which allow multiple tubes to be placed next to each other to form a much larger bat roost. Brick boxes are designed for buildings, or underneath bridges, arches or tunnels, where conditions are relatively humid. They are particularly useful for new buildings or bridges to attract bats, or to provide new roost sites where existing buildings with bats are being renovated. This long box can be installed within brick masonry, beneath plasterwork or wood panelling, or incorporated into concrete structures such as factory buildings or bridges. Inside it contains a woodcrete surface, a roughened wood board, and a metal mesh, providing a choice of roosting areas depending on the weather conditions and the bats' habits

Bats can have direct access to roof area via a “Bat Access Tile“. A Klober Small Slate Vent Tile“ (see below) provides a good access point– the back of the tile can be cut out to allow access for bats.

Schwegler woodcrete boxes have the highest rates of occupation of all box types. The 75% wood sawdust, concrete and clay mixture allows natural respiration, stable temperature, and durability. They are extremely long lasting and rot- and predator-proof. Hang from a tree branch near the trunk, or fix to a trunk with the supplied 'tree-friendly' aluminium nail. The 2F is the most popular general purpose box, particularly attractive to the smaller British bats e.g. Pipistrelles. A simple design with a narrow entrance slit on the front.

Material: Woodcrete (75% wood sawdust, concrete and clay mixture)

Diameter: 16cm. Height: 33cm, Weight: 4kg