

www.cherryfieldecology.co.uk

Report prepared for: Thorsten Lindner c/o Globe Lawn Tennis club

For the Site of: Globe Lawn Tennis Club 190A Haverstock Hill London NW3 2AL

Version:	Written by:	Checked by:	Final:
Draft	Martin O'connor		
	05/04/20222		
Final	Heather Stuckey	Tanya O'Connor	Heather Stuckey
	11/04/2022	12/04/2022	20/04/2022

Cherryfield Ecology has prepared this report for the named clients use only.

Ecological reports are limited in shelf life, Natural England usually expect reports for licenses to be from the most recent or current season. Therefore, should the project not proceed within 12 months of this report an updated survey should be undertaken in order to check for changes that may have occurred on site. Information is believed to be accurate at the time of survey; recommendations are made without bias based on good practice guidelines within the industry. However, species presence and ecological parameters can change over time.

Heather Stuckey BA(Hons) Martin O'Connor Dip, BSc (Hons), CBiol, MRSB Bat license level 3 and 4. GCN level 1, Dormouse level 1 and Barn Owl martin@cherryfieldecology.co.uk 07950279790



Contents

0.0 Non-Technical Summary
0.1 Background
0.2 Results and Findings4
0.3 Impact Assessment and Recommendations4
1.0 Introduction
1.1 Aim of the Survey5
1.2 Background Information5
2.0 Methods
2.1 Limitations7
3.0 Results
3.1 Desk Study
3.2 MAGIC
3.3 Biological Records Data10
3.4 Site Location and Surrounds11
3.5 Building, Tree or Other Structure12
3.5.1 Description12
3.5.2 General12
3.5.3 External12
3.6 Bats, Evidence or Likelihood of Bat Presence14
3.7 Supplementary Observations14
4.0 Conclusions Discussion and Pocommondations 16



4.1 Conclusion and Discussion	16
4.2 Potential Impact	16
4.3 Recommendations	17
4.4 Recommended Mitigation and Enhancements	17
5.0 References	19



Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)

0.0 Non-Technical Summary

0.1 Background

The survey undertaken follows national guidelines Collins (2016) allowing for a day-time inspection and recommends for further surveys if considered necessary. If a deviation from the guidelines has been made this will be detailed in the Method Section.

The following report details the findings and recommendations for the site of Globe Lawn Tennis Club 190A Haverstock Hill London NW3 2AL.

The client commissioned Cherryfield Ecology to undertake a PRA as the proposals include for floodlighting, the club plans have not been provided and only a verbal description has been given.

0.2 Results and Findings

- The site consists of a tennis club house and 4 associated tennis courts.
- No bats or evidence of bats were found on site.

0.3 Impact Assessment and Recommendations

No impacts are foreseen; however, if bats are found during the development, all works must stop, and advice sought.

The findings outlined in this report are valid for one year, after which updated surveys will be required.

Enhancements and mitigation are recommended (please see Section 4 for further details).



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Aim of the Survey

This survey aims to inform the client of any bat issues that may be present on site and that could affect the development. It recommends for further survey when considered necessary and provides possible mitigation and enhancement should this become required.

1.2 Background Information

The client, Thorsten Lindner c/o Globe Lawn Tennis Club (hereafter referred to 'the club'), has commissioned Cherryfield Ecology to undertake a PRA for the site of Globe Lawn Tennis Club 190A Haverstock Hill London NW3 2AL. Planning permission is being sought to install floodlights on two tennis courts (T1&2- see site map, figure 7) within the club.

This survey has checked all buildings, trees (from ground level only) or structures due to be affected by the proposals for bats, signs of bats or features known to be used by bats e.g. crevices, gaps or holes that cannot be checked for a variety of reasons.

The inspection was conducted on the 11/04/2021.

The survey can only ever provide a 'snapshot' of the site at the time of the survey and circumstances may change following this report. Health and Safety restrictions or obstructions may limit the ability to find evidence.

Biological records have been requested to give the report context and allow a study of the surrounds. The information is often sensitive and, therefore, a synopsis is provided. The survey can be conducted year-round, however it can be limited due to bad weather and in the winter, when bats are not active, thus evidence and bats are often not found. During these periods, habitat value (likely presence) becomes more important to the assessment of the site.

All 18 species of bat common in the UK (17 known to be breeding) are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended) 1981 through inclusion in Schedule V of the Act. All bat species in the UK are also included in Schedule II of The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, which



transpose Annex II of the Directive 92/43/EEC 1992 on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora ("Habitats Directive") which defines United Kingdom protected species of animals.

Bats species are afforded further protection by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

This combined legislation makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally or deliberately kill, injure or capture bats.
- Deliberately disturb bats, whether at roost or not.
- Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts.
- Possess or transport bats, unless acquired legally.
- Sell, barter or exchange bats.

A bat roost is well-defined by the legislation as the 'resting place' of a bat. However, the word roost is used to describe this resting place and is generally accepted as the word describing where a bat or bats rest, feed or sleep.



2.0 Methods

The survey follows the national guidelines Collins (2016), and the following equipment is available for the inspection (it may or may not all be used):

- Torches (e.g. LED Lensar type).
- Ladders (Standard 4m telescopic surveying ladder).
- Endoscope where holes, cracks and crevices are accessible.
- Mirrors as above (extendable and movable mirror face).
- Binoculars (Pentax close focus).
- Thermometer/hygrometer.
- Camera.
- Sample bags for collecting dropping and feeding evidence (should this be found).

The assessment allows for a detailed inspection of the site looking for bats, evidence of use by bats e.g. droppings/feeding remains, and features known to be used by bats for roosting e.g. gaps, crevices and holes. Trees and buildings are assessed from ground level only and may require climbed surveys of holes, cracks and crevices.

Biological records data is ordered from the local records centre to provide context and background information. As the data is often sensitive, a synopsis is provided.

If a deviation from the guidelines has been made, the reason and justification will be explained below:

No deviation from the standard guidelines has been made for this survey.

2.1 Limitations

This survey provides a snapshot of the site at the time of the survey only. Bats are highly mobile and can turn up from time to time, unexpectedly. All care has been taken to ensure the results and recommendations are suitable to the context of the development and the information gathered on surveys.



Table 1: Roosting features (likelihood) of bat presence assessed against Collins (2016)

guidelines Source: Adapted from Collins (2016) pp 35, Table 4.1.

Likelihood of bat presence	Features that bats can use, regardless of evidence being present.
(Habitat Value)	
Confirmed Bat	Bats are found to be present during the survey.
Presence	Evidence of bats is found to be present during the survey.
	Pre-20th century or early 20th century construction.
	Agricultural buildings of traditional brick, stone or timber construction.
	Large and complicated roof void with unobstructed flying spaces.
	Large (>20 cm) roof timbers with mortice joints, cracks and holes.
Higher likelihood of bat presence.	Entrances for bats to fly through.
	Poorly maintained fabric providing ready access points for bats into roofs, walls, bridges, but at the same time not too draughty and cool.
	Roof warmed by the sun, in particular south facing roofs.
	Weatherboarding and/or hanging tiles with gaps.
	Low level of disturbance by humans.
	Bridge structures, follies, aqueducts and viaducts over water and/or wet ground.
	Modern, well-maintained buildings or built structures that provide few opportunities for access by bats.
	Small, cluttered roof space.
	Buildings and built structures comprised primarily of prefabricated steel and sheet materials.
Moderate and Lower likelihood of bat presence.	Cool, shaded, light or draughty roof voids.
	Roof voids with a dense cover of cobwebs and no sections of clean ridge board.
	High level of regular disturbance.
	Highly urbanised location with few or no mature trees, parkland, woodland or wetland.
	High levels of external lighting.
Negligible likelihood of bat presence.	No features suitable for roosting, minor foraging or commuting.

Notes on using this table

1 The features listed here may not be indicative of use of the site by bats during winter or spring.

2 Pre-1914 buildings may present the greatest likelihood of providing roost space for bats due to their design, materials used and age. Pre-1990 buildings, especially when close to good foraging habitat, and with favoured features such as cavity walls and soffits, also have a high likelihood of providing roost sites for some bat species.

3 Post-1990 buildings are generally less likely than older buildings to house roosts; however, some modern designs provide access to suitable roosting spaces for bats. Pipistrelles, in particular, occupy modern buildings and built structures providing that there are suitable access gaps (>8mm) and provided the structure has appropriate characteristics for roosting.



3.0 Results

The following section details the results of the desk study, inspection and survey; it includes MAGIC information, biological records data and map/aerial photo information. The results detail the building, structure or tree (numbered for reference) description of any evidence found and habitat value if no evidence has been located.

3.1 Desk Study

The desk study is centred on Grid Reference - TQ274851 and Postcode - NW3 2AL.

Table 2: Weather Records

Temperature	14ºC
Cloud cover	20%
Precipitation	None
Wind	3/12

3.2 MAGIC

The following statutory sites and Natural England Protected Species (NEPS) have been located within the 2km search area (Figure 1):

- There are two statutory sites located within the search area.
- Both are Local Nature Reserves (LNR), Belsize Wood, located take to the site and Adelaide located approx. 1km from site.
- There are No NEPS licences granted for bats within the search area:



MAGiC Globe Lawn Tennis Club, NW3 2AL



Figure 1: Magic Map Search

3.3 Biological Records Data

A 1km data search of existing records for protected species and nature reserves has been commissioned, below details the results and site context.

Biological records were obtained from London Bat Group (2022).

Species	Number of Records	Closest record (accuracy)	Most recent record (year)
Barbastelle Barbastella barbastellus			
Brown Long-Eared Plecotus auritus	40	800m	2018
Common Pipistrelle Pipistrellus pipistrellus	163	550m	2020
Daubenton's Myotis daubentonii	80	930m	2020



Leisler's Nyctalus leislerii	7	2070m	2014
Nathusius' Pipistrelle Pipistrellus nathusii	26	1295m	2020
Natterer's Myotis nattererii	26	1560m	2020
Noctule Nyctalus noctula	97	1492m	2019
Serotine Eptesicus serotinus	5	2085m	2014
Soprano Pipistrelle Pipistrellus pygmaeus	185	1200m	2020
Unidentified Bat Chiroptera			
Unidentified Long-Eared Plecotus sp.	2	1697m	2014
Unidentified Myotis Myotis sp.	23	1050m	2020
Unidentified Pipistrelle Pipistrellus sp.	114	675m	2019
Unidentified Vesper Vespertilionidae	26	293m	2020
Whiskered Myotis mystacinus			
Whiskered/Brandt's Myotis mystacinus/brandtii	5	1980m	2017

3.4 Site Location and Surrounds

The site is located in Hampstead, London and is surrounded by high density housing, retail etc.in the immediate local. Table 4 details the commuting, feeding and habitat features in a 1km radius of the site.

Table 4: Habitat features suitable for bat use in the general area

Feature	Description
Water course	There are no significant water courses within the search area.
Water bodies	A large waterbody is found in Hampstead Heath to the north of the site
	approx. 743m from site.
Woodland	Belsize wood is located to the north and east of the site.
Linear e.g. hedgerows	Garden hedging is located in the immediate surrounds.
Pasture/arable/grassland	Amenity grassland dominates the general area.
Other	n/a

www.cherryfieldecology.co.uk



3.5 Building, Tree or Other Structure

This section details the structures reference and description (see Figure 7 for Site Plan).

3.5.1 Description

3.5.2 General

The site consists of a tennis club house and four associated tennis courts, surrounded by high density housing and associated urban infrastructure, such as a tube station to the front of the site.

3.5.3 External

The northeast of the site is bordered by a line of trees, comprised of three horse chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*, two poplar *populus sp*. and one cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*. These trees provide negligible potential for roosting bats due to a lack of holes, crevices and other suitable roosting features. English Ivy *Hedera helix* climbs the base of the trees low to the ground so is unlikely to mask any suitable roosting features. No other possible roosting habitats are found on site.

The site is well lit from existing floodlights installed in neighbouring tennis courts, which are approx. 30 years old and provide a large amount of light spill. Some flood light columns also have a small backlight installed below the floodlight. Additionally, street lights line the street to the east of the site and security lights are found on the residential buildings to the south and east of the site.

The rear of the site backs onto a small woodland nature reserve (Belsize Wood), which is lit from the eastern side by street lights.



Figure 2: Example of tree line to rear of site (by T2)





Figure 3: Example of existing floodlight by T2



Figure 4: Image of T1 and residential surrounds



Figure 5: Example of existing floodlight by T1, with additional small backlight installed.





Figure 6: Example of street lighting on site border by T1

3.6 Bats, Evidence or Likelihood of Bat Presence

The following table details the results of the surveys:

Table 5: Bats, evidence or likelihood of bats being present.

Bats found	No bats were found at the time of the survey.
Evidence of bat use	No evidence of bats was found at the time of the survey.
Potential for bat use	Level of likelihood of presence - Negligible for roosting and low for feeding
	and commuting.
	There are no suitable roosting features found on the trees on site. There
	is a low potential for bats to utilise the trees along the boundary of the
	site for feeding and commuting purposes, however, due to the current
	lighting levels it is unlikely that bats will be impacted by any additional
	lighting.

3.7 Supplementary Observations

There were no other protected species found at the time of the survey.





Figure 7: Site Plan



4.0 Conclusions, Discussion and Recommendations

The following section details the conclusions, discussion, potential impacts and recommendations in the context of the proposed works.

4.1 Conclusion and Discussion

The proposals include for the installation of flood lights onto two tennis courts within the club. The site consists of the tennis club house and four associated tennis courts. No bats or evidence of bats were found at the time of the survey. The line of trees found on site provides negligible potential for roosting bats due to a lack of suitable roosting habitats.

The site is well lit from existing floodlights installed in neighbouring tennis courts, which are approx. 30 years old and provide a large amount of light spill. Some flood light columns also have a small backlight installed below the floodlight. Additionally, street lights line the street to the east of the site and security lights are found on the residential buildings to the south and east of the site.

Existing and proposed lighting on site is expected to be turned off by 21.30 on weekdays and 19.30 on weekends and will likely only be needed during the months of October to March to light the darker evenings, which coincides with reduced bat activity over the winter period.

4.2 Potential Impact

Impact assessments must be proportionate to the scale of the development (CIEEM, 2018) and the following details a proportionate impact assessment based on current information.

Impact	n/a
Characterisation of unmitigated impact on the feature	n/a
Effect without mitigation	n/a

Table 6: Impact Assessment





Mitigation or enhancement	See Table 7
Significance of effects	
of residual impacts	n/a
(after mitigation)	

4.3 Recommendations

No impacts are foreseen; however, if bats are found during the development, all works must stop, and advice sought.

The findings outlined in this report are valid for one year, after which updated surveys will be required.

Enhancements and mitigation are recommended (please see Section 4 for further details).

4.4 Recommended Mitigation and Enhancements

The following table details the possible outcomes following further survey , table 7 details works if bats are found.

Table 7: Proposed mitigation and compensation- as no further survey is required, the local planning authority have a duty to impose enhancement, the below details affordable, simple enhancement suitable for the site.

Work	Specification
Lighting	Any lighting near or shining onto any trees will be designed to minimise the impact it
	has on potential bat roosting and commuting.
	Lighting will be in line with the BCT lighting guidelines (Bats and Lighting in the UK (Bat
	Conservation Trust, 2018) <u>https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/guidance-note-8-</u>
	bats-and-artificial-lighting/
	This lighting were possible will be of low level, be on downward deflectors. Using LED
	directional lighting can also be a way of minimizing the light spill affecting the habitat.



No up-lighting should be used. Light spill should ideally be minimized to 0.5lux where possible.

Existing and proposed lighting on site is expected to be turned off by 21.30 on weekdays and 19.30 on weekends and will likely only be needed during the months of October to March as the evenings are darker, which coincides with reduced bat activity over the winter period.

It is recommended that the existing floodlighting be upgraded to minimise the light spill that is currently on site, in line with the BCT lighting guidelines as above.

This will ensure that the roosting and commuting resources that the bats are likely to be using is maintained.





5.0 References

- CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal, September 2018. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester, online at <u>https://www.cieem.net/data/files/ECIA%20Guidelines.pdf</u>
- Collins, J. (ed), (2016), Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines 3rd Edition, BCT, London

Google Earth, (2017), Located on site postcode, online

MAGIC, (2017): Magic maps, NEPS licences and designated sites, online http://www.magic.gov.uk/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fMagicMap.aspx, accessed as report date.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004), Bat Mitigation Guidelines, English Nature, Peterborough Records: London Bat Group (2022)