

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 - 46 Hampstead Lane, London



+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com

### Document Information

#### Document prepared for

Cliff Willis  
Harrison Varma Projects Ltd

#### Date of issue

12/10/2022

#### Issue no.

1

#### Our reference

10032 - 44 - 46 Hampstead Road - Bat Assessment Report - 2210-12snc rw

#### Document prepared by

Sara Curtis

#### Quality assured by

Rachel Whitham

#### Disclaimer

This report is made on behalf of Eight Versa Ltd. By receiving the report and acting on it, the client - or any third party relying on it - accepts that no individual is personally liable in contract, tort or breach of statutory duty (including negligence).

#### Contents:

|                                                                      |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Document Information .....                                           | 1  |
| Executive Summary .....                                              | 2  |
| Introduction .....                                                   | 3  |
| Methodology .....                                                    | 5  |
| Survey Results .....                                                 | 7  |
| Impacts and Mitigation .....                                         | 8  |
| Conclusion .....                                                     | 9  |
| Validation .....                                                     | 10 |
| Appendix A - Map of Ecological Features and Surveyor Positions ..... | 11 |

---

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London



+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com

### Executive Summary

Eight Versa has been commissioned by Harrison Varma Projects Ltd to conduct a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and a subsequent bat emergence survey to inform the proposed development located at 44 - 46 Hampstead Lane, Highgate, London Borough of Haringey, N6 4LL, hereinafter referred to as 'the site'. The site is centred on National Grid Reference TQ 27093 87641.

No evidence of bats was recorded during the PRA. A number of features with the potential to support roosting bats were identified, including lifted and broken roof tiles, broken soffits and slight lifting in flashing around the chimneys. In line with the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Good Practice Guidelines<sup>1</sup>, the buildings have both been categorised as having low potential to support opportunistic roosting bats.

In line with the BCT Good Practice Guidelines, one bat emergence survey was undertaken on the features with bat roosting potential. No bats were identified emerging from the building during the survey, however as the survey was undertaken in September, a precautionary approach will be undertaken on the building including a tool-box talk and soft stripping methodology. As the features could be used opportunistically, if a bat is found during the demolition of the building, works will stop and a licence from Natural England will be obtained. Integrated bat boxes will be installed within the new building to enhance the site for roosting bats.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bat Conservation Trust (2016) Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition)

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Introduction

Eight Versa has been commissioned by Harrison Varma Projects Ltd to conduct a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and a subsequent bat emergence survey to inform the proposed development located at 44 - 46 Hampstead Lane, Highgate, London Borough of Haringey, N6 4LL, hereinafter referred to as 'the site'. The site is centred on National Grid Reference TQ 27093 87641.

### Site Description

The site currently comprises two detached residential dwellings with associated residential gardens, patios, hardstanding (driveways), tennis courts and a swimming pool. Figure 1 to the right of this page illustrates the location of each building. The site is bounded by Hampstead Lane to the south, across which is Hampstead Heath and Kenwood House and gardens, Courtney Avenue to the west and further residential dwellings with associated gardens to the north and east.

### Previous Survey Work

An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) report was previously prepared by JDEcology in September 2021<sup>2</sup> to inform a planning application at the site and should be read in conjunction to this report. The EclA included a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the buildings onsite and determined that the buildings onsite had low potential to support roosting bats and therefore further Phase II surveys were required to inform the proposals. The EclA includes impacts, mitigation and enhancements in relation to habitats, protected species and statutory and non-statutory sites. The report concluded that overall, the site has low ecological value and further Phase II surveys are required in relation to bats to inform the proposals.

### Site Proposals

The proposals for the site include the demolition of the existing buildings for the construction of a care home with associated landscaping and access. The proposals will result in the loss of mixed broad-leaved and non-native trees, amenity grassland and ornamental planting and shrubs. A number of mature trees will be retained as part of the proposals.

The purpose of this Bat Assessment Report is to provide the results of the updated PRA and the subsequent emergence survey on both buildings.



Figure 1: Site boundary (Basemap: Google Satellite, 2022)

<sup>2</sup> JDEcology (2021) 44-46 Hampstead Lane, London - Ecological Impact Assessment

---

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

eight  
versa

+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com

### National and Local Biodiversity Policy

The following EU, international, national and local legislation, policies and strategic plans are considered to be relevant:

- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, EU exit, 2019 (as amended) – provides European protection for a variety of habitats and protected species including bats;
- The Wildlife & Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended) – provides UK legal protection for a variety of habitats and protected species including bats;
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 - requires local authorities to avoid and minimise impacts on biodiversity and, where possible, to provide net gains in biodiversity when taking planning decisions;
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 – Strengthens species enforcement provisions of the WCA 1981 (as amended); and
- London Borough of Haringey Local Plan<sup>3</sup> - Sets out the Council's planning policies including Policy SP13 relating to open space and biodiversity.

---

<sup>3</sup> London Borough of Haringey Local Plan (2013, alteration in 2017). Available at: <https://www.haringey.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan>

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Methodology

#### Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)

The purpose of a PRA is to determine the suitability of buildings, structures and trees within the site boundary that have the potential to support roosting bats. This type of survey can be carried out at any time of year and is used to inform a decision on whether further surveys with respect to bats are required. The PRA followed the guidance set out within BCT Good Practice Guidelines. Each building onsite was assessed for its potential suitability to support roosting bats using the suitability index described in Table 1 to the right of this page.

The perimeters of the buildings were walked and the exterior of each section of the building was assessed with the aid of binoculars and a high-powered torch, where necessary. The internal loft space of the buildings were also assessed with a high-powered torch to search for signs of bat presence. Figure 1 outlines the location of each building onsite. Notes were made on the construction type and features providing potential access points and roosting opportunities for bats, including (but not exclusively):

- Suitable gaps beneath roof tiles;
- Suitable access points via any other roof features e.g. beneath ridge tiles;
- Gaps created by missing mortar in brickwork / rendering; and,
- Access via the gable end wooden panels at the rear of the main residential building.

For the internal inspection, notes were made relating to the relevant characteristics of internal features providing potential access points and roosting opportunities for bats, including (but not exclusively):

- Suitable gaps between tiles and roofing liner if present;
- Access points via eaves; and,
- Gaps between timbers.

The surveyors searched for direct evidence of the presence of bats in the form of:

- Bats in situ;
- Feeding remains such as butterfly/moth wings;
- Bat droppings;
- Dark staining caused by bat faeces;
- Splashes and staining caused by urine;
- Polished surfaces at a possible access point;
- Staining caused by the natural oils in bat fur; and
- Scratch marks made by bat claws.

All buildings were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats and placed into one of the four following categories, in line with BCT guidelines, as displayed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1** Categories for assessing a buildings bat roosting potential (BCT Good Practice Guidelines)

| Categorisation | Description – roosting habitats                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High           | A structure with one more roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis or for longer periods of time.                                                           |
| 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. |
| Low            | A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats opportunistically.                                                                                                                     |
| Negligible     | Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats                                                                                                                                               |

#### Previous PRA Results

A PRA was undertaken on the 8<sup>th</sup> September 2021 by JDEcology (full methodology and results within the EcIA). During the site visit, access to 46 Hampstead Lane was not possible. No bats, or their droppings or feeding remains were recorded during the building inspection of 44 Hampstead Lane. Internally, potential roost features include roof voids between the bedrooms and roof tiles. Externally, potential roost features include raised lead flashing, raised or slipping roof tiles, gaps between the soffit boxing and brickwork, and under tiles where the mortar is missing.

Overall, both 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane were categorised as having low suitability to support roosting bats, likely by crevice-dwelling species such as *Pipistrellus* sp.

#### Updated PRA

A PRA of both 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane was undertaken on the 26<sup>th</sup> September 2022 by Sara Curtis, Principal Ecologist, full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and bat licence holder (level 1) to search for any new features or evidence of roosting bats, such as droppings or the individuals themselves. Internal access to 46 Hampstead Lane was gained during this survey, however access into the topmost loft void was not possible. All other loft voids and the cellar could be accessed.

Weather conditions during the survey were light rain with 100% cloud cover, slight breeze and temperature of 13°C.

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Emergence Survey

As a result of the PRAs and in line with the BCT Good Practice Guidelines, one bat emergence survey was undertaken on the features with bat roosting potential to determine whether roosting bats are present/likely absent. Table 2 below details the baseline dates and weather condition for the emergence survey.

During the survey, four surveyors and three infra-red cameras were used to inform the survey. Surveyors used a combination of visual observation and echolocation detection to identify any bats emerging from both 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane buildings. Surveyors were equipped with Echo Meter 2 Pro bat detectors and echolocation calls were analysed post survey in Kaleidoscope, a software used to analyse sonogram calls. Panasonic infra-red cameras with infrared illuminators were used to aid the survey effort where required.

In line with survey guidance the dusk emergence survey began 15 minutes before sunset and continued for a minimum of 1.5 hours after sunset.

**Table 2** Dates and weather conditions for bat emergence / re-entry surveys

| Survey Number | Survey    | Date       | Sunset/<br>Sunrise<br>Time | Start/<br>End<br>Time | Weather Conditions                                                              |
|---------------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1             | Emergence | 26/09/2022 | 18:50                      | 18:35<br>20:20        | Temperature: 14°C<br>Wind: Light wind<br>Precipitation: Dry<br>Cloud Cover: 90% |

### Limitations

Ecological surveys are limited by any factors which could affect the presence/likely absence of plants and animals. These include the time of year, weather conditions, migration patterns, and behaviour. Accordingly, any ecology assessment must be considered as a 'snapshot' of the site conditions at the time of the survey as ecological constraints will change over time. Furthermore, many species are mobile in nature and might leave the site frequently. The evidence (or absence of evidence) of a species should therefore not be taken as conclusive proof that this species is or is not present, or that it will or will not be present in the future. As an example, bats do not always leave visible signs of their presence on the external features, and if left these signs can be washed away by wet weather.

The emergence surveys was undertaken in September which is considered to be a sub-optimal month for bat surveys as roosts which form earlier in the year, such as maternity roosts, may be missed. However, survey conditions were optimal and the features onsite are likely to be used opportunistically, therefore suitable mitigation has been proposed.

According to Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidance, the findings of this report are considered to be valid for a period of 12 to 18 months from the date in which the survey was undertaken, after which the survey should be repeated to ensure the baseline conditions have not changed.

### Quality Assurance

All ecologists at Eight Versa are either members of, or are working towards, membership of CIEEM and abide by the Institutes Code of Professional Conduct. All ecology surveys and reports are validated by a full member of CIEEM.

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Survey Results

#### Preliminary Roost Assessment

The site is split into two detached properties – 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane. Both properties are of similar construction comprising brick-built residential dwellings. Both buildings have converted the loft voids to create three-storey structures with roof voids present between the bedroom ceiling and the ridge of the building and along the lower areas of the roof with access from internal doorways within the hallway. Internally, the loft voids are insulated with tiles are backed by felt and well-sealed.

Generally, the brickwork is in a good state of repair on both buildings. The frontage of the buildings has rendering with Tudor effect timbers. Both buildings have wooden soffits which are mainly sealed, although a few gaps between the soffit and brickwork are present along the northern aspect of 44 Hampstead Lane. The roofs of both buildings are multi-pitched with tiled roofs.

The chimneys on the eastern gable of 44 Hampstead Lane had raised lead flashing and the Velux windows on the eastern elevation had gaps/raised tiles present. The ridge at the north-eastern corner had missing mortar, and there were raised tiles across the roof, including hip tiles. Lead flashing over the south-western corner over the garage was risen in places.

Lead flashing around the chimneys on the eastern aspect of 46 Hampstead Lane is slightly raised. The frontage and eastern aspect of this property are also well lit by surrounding street and security lighting. A cellar is present within 46 Hampstead Lane, accessed through stairs within the property. The cellar is dark in places and used for storage. Ventilation to the cellar is through brick vents, all of which are well sealed and small, restricting bat access into the cellar and no evidence of bats was observed in the cellar.

Both buildings are surrounded by residential gardens with areas of mown lawn, ornamental planting and a number of young to semi-mature trees. 44 Hampstead Lane also has a swimming pool and a tennis court to the rear of the property. London plane *Platanus* sp. trees line Hampstead Lane.

As a result, both buildings were categorized as having low potential to support roosting bats due to the buildings having one or more potential roost sites which could be used by individual bats opportunistically. No direct evidence of roosting bats was observed during the 2021 or 2022 surveys. The site is located adjacent to a busy road which is well lit, therefore providing sub-optimal conditions for species which are more sensitive to lighting.

No trees onsite were identified as providing bat roosting potential and were categorised as providing negligible potential to support roosting bats.

#### Emergence Survey

No bats were observed emerging from either 44 or 46 Hampstead Lane during the survey. General bat activity was limited to individual passes along the boundaries of the site by common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, soprano pipistrelle *P. pygmaeus* and noctule *Nyctalus noctule*. Although the emergence survey was undertaken in September, a month considered to be sub-optimal for emergence surveys, none of the bat activity recorded during the survey was close to the onsite building and, together with the presence of security lighting and similar buildings with bat roosting potential in the vicinity of the site, including Kenwood House, it is considered that if a roost is present onsite, it would be by an opportunistic individual bat.

Due to the nature of the site and the close proximity of Hampstead Heath and Kenwood House and gardens to the site, it is considered that any sporadic foraging or commuting bat assemblage is unlikely to be solely reliant on the site alone.

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Impacts and Mitigation

#### Proposed Development

The proposals for the site include the demolition of the existing buildings for the construction of a care home with associated landscaping and access. The proposals will result in the loss of mixed broad-leaved and non-native trees, amenity grassland and ornamental planting and shrubs. A number of mature trees will be retained as part of the proposals.

#### Impacts and Mitigation

Following nocturnal bat surveys, no bats were seen emerging from either building onsite. However, due to the nature of the site, the onsite opportunistic roosting features and the timing of the emergence survey, suitable mitigation measures should be in place to avoid triggering legislation which protects bats and their roosts during the demolition of the buildings.

Bats and their roosts are protected under national and international legislation. Therefore, the demolition of the existing residential property has potential for:

- Destroying a place of shelter used by a bat;
- Possible killing/injuring a bat; and
- Possible disturbance to a bat whilst using a place of shelter.

Prior to the demolition of both buildings which have been identified as providing low potential to support roosting bats, a toolbox talk to all contractors onsite will be carried out by a suitably qualified bat licenced ecologist, detailing all legal protection of bats. Prior inspection of the potential roost features by the suitably qualified bat licenced ecologist with an endoscope will then take place, followed by supervised 'soft stripping' of building materials by hand (if necessary, or if the whole feature could not be explored from available access points), until the feature no longer provides potential refuge for bats.

Should a bat be found during either the inspection or soft stripping works, all demolition works should cease, and advice sought from Natural England. A European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) or registration of the site under a low impact Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL) with a registered consultant may be required to proceed with the demolition works lawfully.

Despite low-levels of light tolerant species of bat being recorded throughout the survey, to further reduce further impacts to foraging and commuting bats, no lighting at night during construction will be proposed.

Post-development, the provision of native species planting on the site including within new communal areas and around the boundary of the site will enable bats to continue to forage and commute around the site.

To provide future long-term potential roosting sites for bats within the site, new roosting opportunities should be made by installing four integrated bat boxes (such as those designed by Ibstock – Enclosed Bat Box Type A, B or C, or similar) into the proposed buildings, or installed on newly planted, appropriately sized trees (such as Eco Kent Bat Box or similar).

Bat boxes should be installed at a height of no less than 2 m above ground and ideally 5-7 m above ground or more. They should be located away from any artificial light source, as per the manufacturer's specifications.

#### Birds

During the updated PRA, no evidence of nesting birds was observed in the building. If any evidence of birds is observed utilising the building, then demolition works should cease, to be resumed only once the chicks have fledged or the nest has been abandoned, as confirmed by a suitably qualified ecologist.

---

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London



+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com

### Conclusion

The bat surveys undertaken at 44 and 46 Hampstead Lane, including the PRA, did not identify any bats emerging from the building. However, due to the timing of the survey and the potential impacts to roosting bats, a precautionary approach including a tool-box talk and soft-stripping of features with bat roosting potential will be undertaken during demolition of the buildings. If a bat is identified, works will stop immediately and Natural England will be contacted.

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

### Validation

#### **Report produced by Sara Curtis:**

|                                  |                                                                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ecologist's Qualifications:      | MSc - Environmental Consultancy (Biodiversity and Conservation)<br>BSc - Environmental Science                                                                          |
| Evidence of practicing Ecologist | Eight Versa - Principal Ecologist and Sustainability Consultant specialising in Ecology (2022 to present date), Senior Ecologist (2018 - 2021), Ecologist (2013 - 2018) |
| Professional Membership          | Full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management (CIEEM)                                                                               |

#### **Report verified by Rachel Whitham:**

|                                  |                                                                                                                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ecologist's Qualifications:      | MSc - Ecology and Evolutionary Biology<br>BSc - Zoology                                                                    |
| Evidence of practicing Ecologist | Eight Versa, Assistant Ecologist (September 2021 to present), Eight Versa, Seasonal Ecologist (May 2021 - September 2021). |
| Professional Membership          | Member of the Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management (CIEEM)                                       |

#### **Validation**

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

|                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| Suitably Qualified Ecologist | Stacey Cougill |
| Signature of Ecologist       | SC             |
| Date                         | 12/10/2022     |

# Bat Assessment Report

## 44 – 46 Hampstead Lane, London

eight  
versa

+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com

Appendix A - Map of Ecological Features and Surveyor Positions



Basemap from Google, 2022

eight  
versa

+44 (0)20 7043 0418  
info@eightversa.com