

Armstrong Ecology Ltd

Longfield House Outbuilding

Preliminary Bat Roosting and Bird Nesting Assessment

September 2026

Client:	Gareth Eaton
Site:	Longfield House Outbuilding
Report title:	Preliminary Bat Roosting and Bird Nesting Assessment
Surveyor and report author:	Brian Armstrong
Date of original issue:	24 th August 2026
Date of issue of updated report:	28 th September 2026
Summary of updates:	Update to description of project to reflect demolition of building and construction of a dwelling in its place rather than conversion of the existing structure.
Status:	Final report
Reference:	2026-030

Disclaimer

This report is issued to the client for their sole use and for the intended purpose as set out in agreement between the client and Armstrong Ecology Ltd. Third parties may not rely on this report unless there is explicit written agreement with Armstrong Ecology Ltd. The use of this report by unauthorised third parties is at their own risk; no responsibility or duty of care is accepted to unauthorised third parties.

Armstrong Ecology Ltd has exercised due care in preparing this report. It has not, unless specifically stated, independently verified information provided by others. Any recommendation, opinion or finding stated in this report is based on circumstances and facts as they existed at the time that the survey work was carried out and the report was written. Armstrong Ecology Ltd accepts no liability for any loss resulting from errors, omissions or misrepresentation made by others.

The content of this report does not constitute legal opinion, where observations are made relating to structures and trees these relate solely to ecology and do not constitute structural or arboricultural advice.

Contents

Section	Contents	Page
1	Introduction	4
2	Methods	5
3	Results and Interpretation	6
4	Analysis and Recommendations	9
5	References	12
6	Photographs	13
7	Figures	15

1. Introduction

Site description and context

- 1.1 The site consists of an outbuilding at Longfield House, Thurgoland as shown in Figure 1. The OS grid reference for the approximate centre of the building is SE 28657 01501.
- 1.2 The surrounding context of the site can be summarised as follows:
- Cropped agricultural fields lie to the south west, north west, and north east of the site.
 - A grassed field lies to the south east of the site with the Longfield House approximately 110m beyond.
 - Grassed fields lie to the south of the site that contain an outbuilding approximately 30m from the site and an ornamental pond approximately 90m from the site. A review of aerial photographs indicates that the pond is likely to be turbid and has minimal submerged, emergent and bankside vegetation.

Description of project

- 1.3 It is proposed to demolish the existing outbuilding and erect a single storey dwelling in its place.

Role of Armstrong Ecology Ltd

- 1.4 Armstrong Ecology Ltd was commissioned August 2026 to undertake a preliminary bat roosting and bird nesting assessment of the building in the context of the works proposed.
- 1.5 The methods, results and recommendations of this assessment are set out in this report.

2. Methods

Desk study

- 2.1 South Yorkshire Bat Group (SYBG) was contacted to provide bat records for a 2km radius from the centre of the site. These records were received on the 14th of August 2026.
- 2.2 The Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website (accessed 20/08/26) was reviewed to search for records of European Protected Species Licences for bats within a 2km radius from the site.
- 2.3 Online aerial photographs and mapping (Bing Maps accessed 20/08/26) were also reviewed to inform the appraisal of the site.

Field survey

- 2.4 The field survey was undertaken on the 18th of August 2026 between 10:15 and 11:45 hrs by ecological consultant Brian Armstrong MCIEEM, who holds a Natural England scientific survey licence for bats (Level 2 Class Licence No. 2025-85084-CL18-BAT). A summary of Brian's experience can be found at: www.linkedin.com/in/brian-armstrong-05562226/?originalSubdomain=uk. The weather during the survey was overcast and dry.
- 2.5 The building was inspected externally and internally for evidence of bat roosting and bird nesting, and to identify potential bat access points and features with bat roosting potential with reference to Bat Conservation Trust guidance (Collins, 2023). A high-powered torch, binoculars, ladders and an endoscope were used to assist with the inspection.

Limitations

- 2.6 There are not considered to have been any limitations to the survey work carried out.

3. Results and Interpretation

Desk study: Bats

- 3.1 Two European Protected Species Licences for bats are recorded within 2km of the site on the MAGIC.gov website. These are for:
- The destruction of a common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* non-breeding roost approximately 1600 north east of the site between 2020 and 2026.
 - Damage to a common pipistrelle breeding roost approximately 1900m west of the site between 2020 and 2023.
- 3.2 SYBG returned 365 records within 2km of the centre of the site dating between 1987 and 2025. These include brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* (37), common pipistrelle (106), soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* (35), pipistrelle *Pipistrellus* sp. (62), Daubenton's *Myotis daubentonii* (56), Natterer's *Myotis nattereri* (6), whiskered *Myotis mystacinus* (7), whiskered/Brandt's/Alcathoe *Myotis mystacinus/brandtii/alcathoe* (8), *Myotis Myotis* sp. (9), Leisler's *Nyctalus leisleri* (6), noctule *Nyctalus noctula* (13), *nyctalus Nyctalus* sp. (6) and unidentified bat species (14). The closest record is approximately 500m south of the site and is attributed to a common pipistrelle bat roost in a church.

Field survey

- 3.3 The building (Photographs 1 and 2 in Section 6) is of single storey concrete block construction with a concrete tiled roof pitched to the north west and south east and gabled to the north east and south west. The roof is underlined with bituminous felt and overhangs the south east wall of the building by approximately 0.5m.
- 3.4 Internally the building is used as a workshop, office space and for storage. The interior of the building is open to the roof apex (Photographs 3 and 4).
- 3.5 The findings of the building assessment are set out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Findings of building assessment

Area	Description	Photographs
South east elevation	• Concrete roof tiles fit tightly together and sit tight against fascia at bottom of roof pitch. • No gaps at ridge. • No gaps between window or door frames and wall. • Some gaps between trim at wall top and wall behind but do not extend beyond the depth of the trim. • Gap behind trim over window at north east end of elevation with underfelt visible through gap of approx. 8mm at top. Trim overhangs the top of window and potential bird/bat access would be convoluted. Gap behind trim and gap above trim is considered unlikely to be accessible to bats and birds.	1, 5 and 6
North east elevation	• Gap at east corner leading behind trim at wall top. Densely cobwebbed internally. • Gap in verge mortar. Densely cobwebbed. Narrows down to approx. 8mm. • Gap under trim below gable verge. Densely cobwebbed.	1, 7 to 9

Area	Description	Photographs
North west elevation	- Concrete roof tiles fit tightly together and sit tight against fascia at bottom of roof pitch. - No gaps at ridge. - No gaps around window. - No potential bat roosting features recorded.	2
South west elevation	- Gap present behind trim below gable verge. - Gap of approx. 6mm above this trim at gable verge considered unlikely to be accessible to bats and birds. - Gap at south and west corners leading behind trim at wall top. Densely cobwebbed internally and does not lead to a larger cavity.	2, 10 to 12

3.6 No evidence of bat roosting or bird nesting was recorded internally or externally during the inspection undertaken.

3.7 No habitat features likely to be of higher value for bat foraging or movement within the landscape were identified in close proximity to the site. The nearest feature of potentially higher value for bat foraging is an ornamental pond approximately 90m south of the site.

Assessment of bird nesting potential of building

3.8 The gaps under the trims at wall tops and below gable verges are vertical and without a ledge suitable for nest building. As such these features are considered unlikely to be suitable to be used by nesting birds.

3.9 The gaps behind trims at the corners of the building may have some potential to be accessed by smaller bird species but these do not lead to a chamber/cavity that would typically be suitable for nesting.

3.10 The gap in the verge mortar on the north east elevation narrows to approx. 8mm and is considered likely to be inaccessible to even the smallest bird species such as blue tit *Cyanistes caeruleus*¹.

3.11 No evidence of bird nesting was recorded and the presence of nesting birds is not considered to be reasonably likely. The proposed works are therefore assessed to be unlikely to potentially impact upon nesting birds and nesting birds are therefore not considered further in this respect within this report. Recommendations for enhancement measures for nesting birds are included in Table 2 in Section 4 of this report.

Assessment of hibernation bat roosting potential of building

3.12 With reference to professional guidelines prepared by the Bat Conservation Trust for undertaking an assessment of hibernation bat roosting potential (Collins, 2023, with particular reference to Figure 4.1 and preceding text):

- The habitat surrounding the site is assessed to overall be of low to moderate value for bats and to have low levels of connectivity and therefore to fall within the poor categorisation.

¹ Nest boxes for this species typically include an entrance hole of 25mm: <https://shopping.rspb.org.uk/bird-feeders-boxes-tables/bird-houses-nest-boxes/garden-bird-nest-boxes/rspb-classic-nestbox.html>.

- The building is assessed to fall within the category of non-classic hibernation sites (e.g. not underground, cellar, tunnel etc.).
- 3.13 The features recorded are assessed to be unlikely to provide cool stable temperatures or high levels of humidity typically required by most bat species during the peak hibernation period. These features are assessed to have low potential to be used as non-classic bat hibernation sites during the hibernation period (November to March).

Assessment of non-hibernation bat roosting potential of building

- 3.14 Taking into account the character of the features recorded as well as the context of the building (value of surrounding habitat and level of connectivity), with reference to professional guidelines prepared by the Bat Conservation Trust (Collins, 2023) the features recorded are assessed to have low bat roosting potential. I.e. they could be used by individual bats opportunistically between April to October/outside of the bat hibernation period but these features are not considered suitable to be used by larger numbers of bats (such as a maternity roost).

4. Analysis and Recommendations

Protected species and planning: context for analysis and recommendations

- 4.1 Paragraph 98 of Government Circular 06/2005 advises that:

“The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat...”

- 4.2 Paragraph 99 of Government Circular 06/2005 advises that:

“It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision... However, bearing in mind the delay and cost that may be involved, developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development...”

Bats

- 4.3 Bats are protected species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). In summary, this legislation means that bats are protected against disturbance, killing or injury and their roosts are protected against obstruction, damage or destruction. Seven UK bat species are also listed as priority species under the NERC Act (2006).

Potential hibernation bat roosting

- 4.4 The features recorded for the building are assessed to have low hibernation bat roosting potential. With reference to the Bat Mitigation Guidelines (English Nature, 2004/Reason and Wray 2025) the restriction of works to for example take place outside of the hibernation period for bats is not considered appropriate/would be considered disproportionate. In the unlikely event that any bats are found during work to the building during the winter period, work should stop, and further advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist with respect to how to proceed.

Potential non-hibernation bat roosting

- 4.5 The features recorded for the building are assessed to have low potential to be used by roosting bats between April to October/outside of the bat hibernation period. Given the presence of bat roosting opportunities, without mitigation, work to the building is at a low risk of damaging and/or destroying a bat roost and/or disturbing bats.
- 4.6 Survey guidance for bats (Collins, 2023, Paragraph 5.2.44) sets out that:
- “If the structure has been classified as having low suitability for bats, an ecologist should make a professional judgement on how to proceed based on all of the evidence available and the balance of probabilities... If complete inspection is not possible then proportionality must be considered. A single survey in the summer months may be adequate to ensure that nothing obvious has been missed and/or precautionary measures could be applied during the works”.*
- 4.7 On the above basis it is considered that the application of precautionary measures to works to the building undertaken between April to October, would represent a reasonable approach that is proportionate to the low risk of bats being present, subject to this including:

- An inspection by a suitably qualified ecologist immediately prior to the commencement of work to the features identified.
- A tool-box talk from a suitably qualified ecologist for those undertaking work to the features identified.
- The removal of the features identified carefully by hand under ecologist supervision.
- Work stopping if any bats are found and an assessment being made by a suitably qualified ecologist with respect to the need for a Natural England Licence to be sought.
- The incorporation of suitable bat roosting features within the new exterior walls to be constructed as outlined in Table 2 below.

Bats and lighting

4.8 It is recommended on a precautionary/good practice basis that any external lighting associated with proposals for the site should be:

- Designed to limit its spread and illumination and be of the minimum power required.
- Of a type that does not emit an ultra violet component (such as LED lighting) or have a high blue spectral component (which can include some types of LED lighting) as these can especially attract night flying insects (Institute of Lighting Professionals, 2023)².
- Motion activated and/or set on a timer so that it is capable of activation only during the periods it is required. This approach would be particularly relevant during the period of April to October when bats are more active, and less relevant outside of these months.

Retention and enhancement of the ecological interest of the site

4.9 Recommendations for potential ecological retention and enhancement measures are set out in Table 2. These are considered to be reasonable and proportionate measures relevant to the proposals and provide a basis from which to achieve compliance with part 1.f of Policy N2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2026).

Table 2: Recommendations for potential ecological retention and enhancement measures

Potential Measure	Description
Bird nesting ³	Two swift <i>Apus apus</i> nest boxes ⁴ to be integrated at eaves height or as high as possible within a gable of non-south facing elevations not over windows or doors. These boxes are also suitable to be used by starling <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i> and house sparrow <i>Passer domesticus</i> . To be installed prior to the completion of construction and photographs provided to the planning authority.

² This can otherwise have the effect of a local loss of availability of foraging/prey items for slower flying/more light avoidance prone bat species such as brown long-eared and myotis bat and/or encouraging faster flying/less light avoidance prone bat species such as pipistrelle and Nyctalus bat species to forage around lights potentially in turn making them more susceptible to predation.

³ Please note in respect of the Construction Design and Management Regulations 2015, that while Armstrong Ecology Ltd can advise on suitable ecological locations for bird and bat boxes (for example via liaison with a site manager) we cannot instruct personnel in their installation, fixing or erection.

⁴ Such as <https://www.nhbs.com/woodstone-build-in-swift-nest-box-deep>, or equivalent.

Potential Measure	Description
Bat roosting ³	Two bat boxes ⁵ to be integrated into new walls at eaves height or as high as possible within a gable not over doors or windows. Can be installed on any elevation including south facing. To be installed prior to the completion of construction and photographs provided to the planning authority.
External lighting	External lighting to be: • Designed to limit its spread and illumination and be of the minimum power required. • Of a type that does not emit an ultra violet component (such as LED lighting) or have a high blue spectral component (which can include some types of LED lighting). • Motion activated and/or set on a timer so that it is activated only when required, particularly between the period between April to October.

⁵ Such as <https://www.nhbs.com/vivara-pro-build-in-woodstone-bat-box>, or equivalent.

5. References

Bing Maps www.bing.com/maps (Accessed 20th August 2026).

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London: <https://www.bats.org.uk/resources/guidance-for-professionals/bat-surveys-for-professional-ecologists-good-practice-guidelines-4th-edition>

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017): <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/made>

English Nature (2004). *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*: www.cieem.net/resource/bat-mitigation-guidelines

Government circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impacts within the Planning System: www.gov.uk/government/publications/biodiversity-and-geological-conservation-circular-06-2005

Institute of Lighting Professionals/Bat Conservation Trust (2023): *Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night: Guidance Note 08/23*. <https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting>

The Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC): www.magic.defra.gov.uk (Accessed 20th August 2026).

National Planning Policy Framework (2026): [National Planning Policy Framework](http://www.nationalplanningpolicyframework.org)

Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006): www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2025). *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Version 1.2*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield: <https://cieem.net/resource/uk-bat-mitigation-guidelines-2025/>

Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981): www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69

6. Photographs

Photograph 1: North east and south east elevations



Photograph 2: South west and north west elevations



Photograph 3: Interior of building (south west end)



Photograph 4: Underside of roof of building



Photograph 5: Gap behind trim at wall top on south east elevation



Photograph 6: Gap behind trim over window on south east elevation



Photograph 7: Gap at east corner of north east elevation



Photograph 8: Gap in mortar of gable verge of north east elevation



Photograph 9: Gap under trim below gable verge on north east elevation



Photograph 10: Gap under trim below gable verge on south west elevation



Photograph 11: Gap above trim at gable verge on south west elevation



Photograph 12: Gap at south corner of south west elevation



7. Figures



Legend

 Building Location

Armstrong Ecology Ltd

www.ArmstrongEcology.com

Site: Longfield House Outbuilding

Figure 1: Building Location

Drawn by: Brian Armstrong

Scale: 1:2500 @ A4

Date: 20/08/26

Copyright: Armstrong Ecology Ltd

No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing/measurements are included for indicative purposes only.

OS Open data © Crown copyright and database right 2026 | Aerial Photography © Bing Maps