

11 Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe

Bat Survey Report

22nd May 2025



Prepared by:

Middleton Bell Ecology, School House, Green Moor, Sheffield, S35 7DQ

Document ref: MBE/BAT/2025/039/01				
Purpose and Description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Date
For Planning	G Slack MCIEEM	P Middleton MCIEEM	G Slack MCIEEM	22/05/2024

Disclaimer

This report is issued to the client for the sole use and for the intended purpose as stated in the agreement between the client and Middleton Bell Ecology Limited (MBE) under which this work was completed, or else as set out within the report. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express written agreement of MBE. The use of this report by unauthorised third parties is at their own risk and MBE accepts no duty of care to any such party.

MBE has exercised due care in preparing this report, it has not, unless specifically stated, independently verified information provided by others. No other warranty, express or implied, is made in relation to the content of this report and MBE assumes no liability for any loss resulting from errors, omissions or misrepresentation made by others.

Any recommendations, opinion or finding stated in this report is based on circumstances and facts as they existed at the time that MBE performed the work. Nothing in this report constitutes legal opinion. If legal opinion is required, the advice of a legal professional should be secured.

Contents

1. Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Habitat Assessment.....	5
4. Methodology	6
5. Results.....	9
6. Assessment	15
7. References	18
Appendix 1. Legislation and Policy Guidance	19
Appendix 2. Roofing and Cladding Membranes	21
Appendix 3. Bat Records.....	23

1. Summary

- 1.1.1 A bat survey of a dwelling at 11 Wood Street Skelmanthorpe was commissioned by planning consultant Michael Townsend on behalf of the client Linfit Investments Ltd. The survey was undertaken to inform the demolition of the dwelling and garage on the site and the subsequent construction of four new dwellings. The site was located on the northeastern edge of Skelmanthorpe, West Yorkshire.
- 1.1.2 The two existing buildings on site (the dwelling and garage) were located in the middle of the L shaped site. The survey identified that the dwelling had low suitability to support roosting bats, and the garage had negligible suitability. The subsequent emergence surveys recorded a single common pipistrelle emerging from a roost near a chimney on the eastern elevation in 2024. An update nocturnal survey was undertaken on 6th May 2025.
- 1.1.3 A European Protected Species Licence from Natural England is required in order to demolish the bungalow. The following mitigation measures are required to ensure the safety of roosting bats, and the favourable conservation status of bat populations using the site:
 - A toolbox talk should be given to contractors by the ecologist prior to demolition works.
 - The removal of key bat roost features, including all the slates around the bat roost, should be supervised by the licenced ecologist.
 - The demolition should take place outside of the core hibernation season (taken to be December, January, and February).
 - The loss of the pipistrelle roost should be mitigated by the inclusion of an integrated bat box into each of the new dwellings.
 - Measures have been included to reduce the impact of new lighting associated with the proposed development.
 - The use of a bat safe roofing felt is recommended. Standard breathable roofing felts are not safe for use in bat roosts.
- 1.1.4 It is recommended that a native species-rich hedgerow is planted along the western site boundary to maintain north-south connectivity in this location. Lighting restrictions are also recommended to prevent excessive lighting in key locations.
- 1.1.5 No post construction monitoring is required given the low conservation status of the roost.
- 1.1.6 No bird nests were recorded within either building but the brash and remaining vegetation on site was considered very likely to be used by nesting birds. Also, if the condition of the building deteriorates it is more likely to be utilised by nesting birds. The demolition and any further vegetation clearance should commence outside of the nesting bird season or be preceded by a check, by a suitably qualified ecologist, to determine whether any active nests are present.
- 1.1.7 To mitigate the loss of nesting habitat it is recommended that two swift bricks are built into each new dwelling.
- 1.1.8 The recommendations included in this report are considered valid for 24 months from the survey date.

2. Introduction

- 2.1.1 A bat survey of a dwelling at 11 Wood Street Skelmanthorpe was commissioned by planning consultant Michael Townsend on behalf of the client Linfit Investments Ltd. on 9th April 2024. The survey was undertaken to inform the demolition of the dwelling and garage on the site and the subsequent construction of four new dwellings.
- 2.1.2 The site was located on the northeastern edge of Skelmanthorpe, West Yorkshire.
- 2.1.3 The preliminary roost assessment was conducted on 23rd April 2024 followed by a nocturnal survey on 11th June 2024, and a second nocturnal survey on 6th May 2025. The surveys aimed to determine the current presence or likely absence of roosting bats and, if present, the roost locations, potential access points, species present, and the level of use, where possible.
- 2.1.4 The legislative context to the survey and assessment reported here is included in Appendix 1.

3. Habitat Assessment

- 3.1.1 The immediate surrounding area consisted of adjacent dwellings and gardens to the north, east and south. The land to the west comprised farmland, and a small block of woodland extended northwards from the western edge of the site. Aerial photographs show the woodland extending across the western edge of the site, but recent vegetation clearance meant that this was not the case at the time of survey.
- 3.1.2 Wood Street to the south of the site was lined with mature trees. Mature trees were dotted around the wider Skelmthorpe area.

Figure 1. Site location, outlined red



- 3.1.3 The habitat in the red line boundary and surrounding area was considered to be above average in terms of its suitability for use by foraging bats. The number of bats and diversity of bat species likely present within the local area was considered to be above average. Table 1 summarises the habitats present within, and adjacent to the red line boundary.

Table 1. Location and habitat table

Name and address: 11 Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe, HD8 9BN			
OS Grid Ref. SE 22934 10733		Altitude. 172 m	
Local Planning Authority: Kirklees Council			
Features on site and adjacent to site			
Feature	On site	Adjacent	Comments
Buildings	✓	✓	The dwelling and adjacent dwellings.
Watercourse bordered by trees			None.
Standing water			A square pool / pond was present approximately 270 m north of the site.
Bridges tunnels and culverts			None.
Trees	✓	✓	Mature trees were present on the boundary of the garden, the adjacent woodland, and dotted around the nearby area of Skelmanthorpe.
Woodland		✓	Small woodland block adjacent to the northern edge of the site.
Grassland	✓	✓	Lawns were located within the site and adjacent gardens.

3.2 Aims

3.2.1 The survey was conducted to help determine the:

- Presence/absence of roosting bats.
- Potential roosting areas and roost access/egress points.
- Level of bat roost suitability associated with the buildings.
- Further survey work or mitigation requirements.

4. Methodology

4.1 Data Consultation

4.1.1 A desk study was undertaken with West Yorkshire Bat Group and West Yorkshire Ecology to request bat records for locations within 2 km of the site.

4.1.2 A search of the Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website was undertaken to identify historic European Protected Species (EPS) licences obtained for locations within 2 km of the site.

4.2 Field Survey

Internal and External Visual Inspection

- 4.2.1 The survey of the building was conducted on 23rd April 2024 by Greg Slack (MCIEEM; Class licence WML-A34-Level 4, 2017-28068-CLS-CLS).
- 4.2.2 The following activities were carried out during the survey:
- An examination of all parts of the survey area to record structural features and condition, and features that may be suitable for use by roosting bats. Particular attention was paid to any holes, crevices or gaps in walls, lintels, gaps/holes in cladding and soffits and to the possibility of finding droppings stuck to walls, floors or other surfaces (including below any insulation), or insect remains below features.
 - Any signs indicative of a bat roost presence including live or dead bats, droppings, feeding remains, scratch marks and staining were recorded.
 - An assessment of the buildings' bat roost suitability (negligible, low, moderate, high or confirmed roost).
- 4.2.3 The following equipment was used during the survey:
- a clulight;
 - binoculars;
 - an endoscope; and
 - a camera.

Nocturnal Survey

- 4.2.1 The nocturnal bat survey comprised dusk emergence surveys completed on 11th June 2024, and 6th May 2025. Two surveyor positions were used during each of the two surveys. The following personnel conducted the nocturnal survey and were equipped with Wildlife Acoustics EM Touch bat detectors and tablet recorders:
- Greg Slack (MCIEEM, Natural England Bat (WML-A34-Level 4, licence number: 2016-25236-CLS-CLS);
 - Carl Dixon; and
 - John Pearse.
- 4.2.2 The surveyors covered two surveyor positions during the survey. The surveyor Locations are shown on Figure 2.
- 4.2.3 Two Canon XA10 video cameras were used during the initial survey (one at each of the two Surveyor Positions). The camera used by the Surveyor at Position 2 was located to the northeast of the building to provide additional visibility of the northern edge of the hipped gable on that elevation. The surveyor at Position two also used a Guide TK612 Gen2 Thermal Imaging Monocular at the surveyor location shown.
- 4.2.4 During the second survey the surveyor in Position 1 used a Canon XA10 camera, the surveyor in Position 2 used a Nightfox Whisker.
- 4.2.5 The footage from the night vision aids was reviewed as required to check and confirm the observations made by the surveyors.

Figure 2. Nocturnal survey plan



4.2.6 The nocturnal surveys were carried out in compliance with relevant Bat Survey Guidelines (Collins 2023). The survey continued from 15 minutes before sunset until 1.5 hours after sunset.

4.3 Survey Limitations

- 4.3.1 Spots of rain were recorded at the start of the emergence survey on 11th June 2024. The unforecast rain began approximately 15 minutes before the start of the survey as a light shower. The intensity reduced to spotting rain prior to the start of the survey but the spotting rain persisted until 21:58 (23 minutes after sunset). In addition to the spotting rain the temperature was relatively cool for the time of year.
- 4.3.2 The survey continued as the weather in the preceding days had not been substantially better with temperatures having been cool for the past two weeks or so, and rain during the evening and night having been recorded relatively frequently. Although superficially the weather conditions appeared sub-optimal, the survey was considered valid and in line with survey guidance which states that “ecologists avoid weather conditions that are likely to affect/change emergence behaviour”, and that surveys should aim to avoid “heavy rain” (Collins, 2023).

5. Results

- 5.1.1 The survey identified that the dwelling had low suitability to support roosting bats, and the garage had negligible suitability. The subsequent emergence survey recorded a single common pipistrelle emerging from a roost near a chimney on the eastern elevation.

5.2 Data Consultation

- 5.2.1 West Yorkshire Bat Group provided 26 bat records for locations within a 2 km radius. Species positively identified in the West Yorkshire Bat Group data comprised common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, and Daubenton's bat *Myotis daubentonii*. Additional records of bats identified as unidentified bat species and unidentified *Pipistrellus* species were also provided.
- 5.2.2 Bat records from West Yorkshire Ecology (the local biological records centre) also included records of soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, and noctule *Nyctalus noctula*.
- 5.2.3 The closest record was located approximately 50 m south of the site boundary at 7 Huddersfield Road. The record was of a single unidentified pipistrelle bat species casualty.
- 5.2.4 No bat EPS mitigation licences had been issued within 2 km of the site.

5.3 Field Survey

Internal and External Visual Inspection

- 5.3.1 The two buildings on site (the dwelling and garage) were located in the middle of the L shaped site. The mature garden comprised shrubs and lawns. An area of trees and some shrubs had been cleared prior to the survey.
- 5.3.2 Potential roost features (PRFs) comprised missing mortar, raised slates, lifted lead flashing and air vents which allowed access into the wall cavity. All of the PRFs were location on Building 1 (the dwelling) which was identified as having Low bat roost suitability. Building 2 (the garage) was identified as having negligible bat roost suitability.
- 5.3.3 No bird nests were recorded within either building but the brash and remaining vegetation on site was considered very likely to be used by nesting birds. If the condition of the buildings deteriorates it is possible that nests could be built in or on the buildings.

Building description – the dwelling (B1)

- 5.3.4 The two-storey building was a stone dwelling constructed in 1954. The dwelling had a two pitched roof with dormers on both pitches. The dormer on the east pitch had a two-pitched roof and the dormer on the west had a flat roof (Plate 1 and 2). A small, single-storey, flat-roofed porch was present on the southern end of the building and a staircase was present on the western aspect leading up to the dormer.
- 5.3.5 The pitched sections of roof were covered with Welsh slate and the ridges were covered with angled ridge tiles. The verges were mortared, and lead was present in

the valleys and around chimneys and the dormers. The windows were double-glazed and framed with uPVC.

Plate 1. The house viewed from the northeast with the corner of the garage shown on the right hand side



Plate 2. The house and garage viewed from the west



External inspection – The dwelling (B1)

- 5.3.6 Potential bat roost features present comprised raised slates, missing mortar, lifted lead flashing, and air vents leading into the cavity wall. The potential roost features (PRFs) are shown in Table 2 and Figure 2 below.

Table 2. Potential Roost Features (PRF) Recorded

PRF	Photo	Description
A		Missing mortar.

PRF	Photo	Description
B		Raised slates.
C		Air vents.
D		Lifted lead flashing.

Figure 2. PRF locations on the dwelling (B1) and garage (B2)



Internal inspection – the dwelling (B1)

- 5.3.7 A roof void was present in the apex of the pitched roof with an additional void under the eaves on the east side of the building. The void in the apex was approximately 1.8 m high. The roof was supported with rafters and purlins (Plate 3). The slates were backed by Type 1F bitumen coated roofing felt. The entrance hatch was relatively small, and the void did not appear to have been used for storage.

Plate 3. The roof void in the apex of the pitched roof



- 5.3.8 The void in the eaves had been boarded out and appeared to have been used for storage

Plate 4. The void in the eaves on the east side of the building



- 5.3.9 No bats or signs of bats were recorded within the roof voids, although it is likely that the roofing felt would have prevented droppings from entering the void if bats were roosting between the slates and the felt.
- 5.3.10 Because the majority of features were relatively small, and no bats or signs of bats were recorded, the dwelling (B1) was considered to have low suitability to support roosting bats.

Building description – the garage (B2)

- 5.3.11 The building was a stone, concrete block, and brick-built single-storey, double garage (Plate 1, 2, and 5). The garage doors were located at the rear (west) and were separated by a brick pillar. The flat roof was covered with bitumastic roofing felt. A single-glazed window was present on the front (east), the window had a wooden frame.

Plate 5. The garage viewed from the steps of the adjacent dwelling



External inspection – B2

- 5.3.12 The masonry was well maintained, and no potential bat roost features were identified on the exterior of the building.

Internal inspection – B2

- 5.3.13 The flat roof of the garage was supported by wooden joists (Plate 6). No bats or evidence of bats was recorded within the garage.

Plate 6. The interior of the garage roof



- 5.3.14 The garage was considered to have negligible suitability to support roosting bats.

Nocturnal Survey 11th June 2024 – dusk emergence survey

- 5.3.15 The temperature at the beginning of monitoring was 10°C, with no wind (Beaufort Scale 0) and full (eight oktas) cloud cover. The temperature dropped to 8°C by then end of the survey and the cloud cover remained full. Sunset was at 21:17. As discussed in the limitations section, at the start of the survey spotting rain was recorded which lasted until 21:58 (41 minutes after sunset).

- 5.3.16 One common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* was recorded emerging from next to the chimney on the eastern roof pitch at 22:21 (64 minutes after sunset). The roost location is shown in Plate 7 below and a video of the emergence is available at: <https://youtu.be/SRqK0PGqRHg>.

Plate 7. Roost location



- 5.3.17 No other bats were recorded emerging during the survey.
- 5.3.18 A common pipistrelle was the first bat recorded on site at 21:34 (1 minute before sunset). After the initial bat which was briefly heard but not seen by the surveyors, no bat activity was recorded until the rain stopped at 21:58. From that time sporadic common pipistrelle activity was recorded with one or occasionally two bats recorded foraging over the site, and quite often crossing the site from the north to south. At 22:40 (65 minutes after sunset) bat activity on site broadly ceased until 22:51 (11 minutes later) when a foraging common pipistrelle returned.
- 5.3.19 No other bat species were recorded within the site.

6th May 2025 – dusk emergence survey

- 5.3.20 The condition and suitability of the building was considered similar to that recorded in 2024 (Plate 8). The temperature at the beginning of monitoring was 11°C, with two oktas cloud cover and calm conditions (Beaufort Scale 0). The temperature dropped to 9°C by the end of the survey with no change in wind or cloud cover. No rain was recorded throughout. Sunset was at 20:46.

Plate 8. Bungalow viewed from surveyor Position 2 on 6th May 2025



5.3.21 The first bat recorded was a common pipistrelle recorded at 21:07, (21 minutes after sunset). No bats emerged from the building during the survey.

5.3.22 The level of bat activity recorded was moderate, with intermittent foraging by common pipistrelle observed from 21:15 and regular activity from 21:21. A *Myotis* species was also detected at 21:36 (50 minutes after sunset).

6. Assessment

6.1 Summary and Evaluation of Findings

6.1.1 The dwelling has a common pipistrelle summer day roost which was recorded in June 2024. Although the roost wasn't recorded in May 2025 it is likely to be in use intermittently as part of a range of roosting options used by the bat, or the wider local common pipistrelle population. A bat mitigation licence from Natural England is required in order to demolish the bungalow. Common pipistrelle summer day roosts are identified as being of Site level importance (Reason & Wray, 2023).

6.1.2 No further survey is required in order to identify the potential impacts and suitable mitigation for the site.

- 6.2.5 It is recommended that a native species-rich hedgerow is planted along the western site boundary to maintain north-south connectivity in this location. The new hedgerow planting should be of UK provenance and sourced from a UK supplier such as Myers Beck Nursery¹. The plants must be planted in the autumn, winter or early spring and well-watered at the time of planting and in periods of dry weather.
- 6.2.6 The design of outside lighting should be carefully considered in line with guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals and the Bat Conservation Trust Guidance (IILP, 2023).
- 6.2.7 Switched external lighting on the two proposed houses at the western end of the site should be limited to the front of the properties. All external lighting on the sides and rear of these properties should be limited to lights activated only by PIR sensors with no switched override. This will help to retain a dark corridor along the western edge of the site, and prevent excessive light spill into the adjacent woodland. All external lighting should be relatively low level, it should be a warm colour tone (i.e. not cold white or blue), with a horizontal cut off, and no upwards component.
- 6.2.8 Much of the vegetation within the garden had already been cleared, however the presence of nesting birds should be considered during any future clearance work. Vegetation clearance and demolition should commence outside the bird nesting season (March to August inclusive), or a check for active nests should be undertaken by an ecologist prior to the start of works. If active nests are present, they must be protected until the young have fledged (Appendix 1).
- 6.2.9 To mitigate for the loss of nesting habitat it is recommended that two swift bricks (S bricks or similar²) are installed in each new dwelling. Bird boxes should be installed at wall top height on the north, east or west aspects, but not immediately above windows, doorways or balconies.

6.3 Conclusion

- 6.3.1 A bat mitigation licence from Natural England is required in order to demolish the bungalow. It is considered that the mitigation measures proposed in this report are sufficient to safeguard the bat, if present in the roost during the demolition works. The four integrated bat boxes would also be sufficient to mitigate for the loss of the roost.
- 6.3.2 The proposed swift bricks in the new dwellings will also provide replacement bird nesting opportunities within the site.
- 6.3.3 The demolition and any further vegetation clearance work should commence outside of the nesting bird season or be preceded by a check by a suitably qualified ecologist to determine whether any active nests are present.
- 6.3.4 The recommendations included in this report are considered valid for 24 months from the survey date.

¹ <https://www.miresbeck.co.uk/>

² S bricks area available from: <https://www.actionforswifts.com/>

7. References

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines. The Bat Conservation Trust.

ILP (2023) Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night. Institute of Lighting Professionals. Available online at: <https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/>

Appendix 1. Legislation and Policy Guidance

Bats

Bats receive protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

It is an offence to:

- Deliberately capture (or take), injure or kill a bat.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb bats whilst they are occupying a structure or place used for shelter or protection or obstruct access to any such place.
- Damage or destroy the breeding or resting place (roost) of a bat.
- Possess a bat (live or dead), or any part of a bat.
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.
- Sell (or offer for sale) or exchange bats (dead or alive), or parts of parts.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, signed in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992, requires member states to develop national strategies and to undertake a range of actions aimed at maintaining or restoring biodiversity. The UK Biodiversity Strategy was produced in response to the Convention.

In England & Wales, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006 imposes a duty on all public bodies, including local authorities and statutory bodies, in exercising their functions, “to have due regard, as far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”. It notes that “conserving biodiversity includes restoring or enhancing a population or habitat”. Barbastelle *Barbastella barbastellus*, Bechstein’s bat *Myotis bechsteinii*, brown long-eared bat, greater horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*, lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, noctule *Nyctalus noctula* and soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* are included as priority species within Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. At a more local level there are Local Biodiversity Action Plans for smaller geographical areas which may cover a greater or lesser range of bat species.

Where it is proposed to carry out works which will have an adverse impact on roosting bats a European Protected Species (EPS) license must first be obtained from Natural England. This requirement applies even if no bats are expected to be present when the work is carried out.

The National Planning Policy Framework for England was revised in 2021. This document states that plans should ‘promote the conservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity’.

Birds

All wild birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), which makes it illegal (subject to exceptions) to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird.
- Take, damage or destroy the nest (whilst being built or in use) or eggs of any wild bird.

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework for England was revised in 2021. This document states that plans should 'promote the conservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'.

Appendix 2. Roofing and Cladding Membranes

Standard roof membranes can cause the death of significant numbers of bats. Traditional bitumen coated roofing felt is recommended where roosting bats are expected to be present.

The problem

Standard non-bitumen coated membranes (including almost all breathable membranes) used below roof slates and tiles present a significant problem for bats. Over time, strands are pulled away from the surface of these materials as bats crawl over them. These fuzzy strands are very strong and can tangle and trap bats, sometimes causing the death of bats over multiple years³.

One example we have encountered comprised a pipistrelle roost which formed in a building extension constructed in 2009. Over the course of just 13 years the roofing felt degraded to the extent that it trapped and killed more than 10 bats. Fortunately, the problem in this roost was identified and remedial work was undertaken to replace the roofing membrane in 2022.

Plate 1. Four dead pipistrelles tangled in breathable roofing membrane



Although a new roof might be considered to lack potential bat access points, that is often not the case. Roofs covered with stone slates almost always have gaps large enough to be accessed by bats, this is often also the case where imitation stone slates are used. On older buildings the uneven roof timbers and/or building design also often results in gaps on wall tops and between slates. Even on new builds it is often possible for bats to access potential roosts via features such as dry verge capping. Some bats can access a space no wider than a biro pen, therefore it is not surprising that they can find their way into most buildings.

Safe roofing membranes (and membranes behind cladding)

From a bat perspective, the best membrane option for areas where roosts are expected comprises traditional hessian-backed Type 1F bituminous felt. This product has been widely and safely used as a secondary weather barrier since approximately the 1950s/1960s. Wooden sarking has also been used for many decades and if appropriately treated, is safe for

³ Wearing S. Essah E., Gunnel K. & Bonser R. (2013) Double jeopardy: the potential for problems when bats interact with breathable roofing membranes in the United Kingdom. Architecture and Environment

use in bat roosts. Wooden sarking also has the benefit of providing adding additional insulation and is usually breathable.

At the time of writing (and to our knowledge) two products have passed the 'snagging propensity' test; consequently these products are approved by Natural England for use in bat roosts. This test attempts to replicate the wear and tear which results from bats crawling over the membrane. The approved products are: TLX BatSafe^{4,5} and SIGA Majcoat 350. Although they have passed this test, it is unclear how these membranes will degrade in the medium and long term, particularly in larger bat roosts. Therefore we do not recommend that they are used for roosts with multiple bats, and particularly for large (maternity roosts). A third product, SIGA Majcoat 200 SOB Diffusion, passed the test for its upper surface only. This product should not be used in known bat roosts or locations where bat mitigation is to be installed. Although none of these products are considered to be as safe as traditional Type 1F bituminous felt, they may provide an option for roofs where future bat use cannot be ruled out, and a breathable solution is required.

Additional considerations

In recent years a fairly substantial proportion of the lofts we have surveyed which had existing breathable felt, were found to have been damaged by wasps (Plate 2). The wasps appear to have chewed holes in the felt and formed nests. This doesn't appear to be a problem associated with traditional bitumen coated roofing felt. Any holes within roofing felt are likely to significantly reduce its functionality as a secondary weather barrier. Where bats or birds come into contact with breathable roofing membranes, they can also damage it causing it to leak, they can also significantly reduce the breathability of the felt in that location.

Plate 2. Damage to a breathable roofing membrane adjacent to a wasp nest



Traditional bituminous Type 1F roofing felt is a non-breathable product and therefore ventilation is required. Sufficient ventilation can be usually be achieved, even in buildings with vaulted ceilings, however, some consideration during the design stage is required. Products to increase the ventilation within roofs where bituminous Type 1F felt has already been installed are also available.

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bats-apply-for-a-mitigation-licence#full-publication-update-history~:text=Use%20of%20safe%20roofing%20membranes>

⁵ TLX BatSafe requires all joints and cut edges to be taped in order to prevent the fraying of bare edges.

Appendix 3. Bat Records

In accordance with best practice and the requirements of bat licensing, bat records collected during surveys are supplied to the relevant biological record centres and bat groups. The records to be supplied in accordance with this survey are shown below.

Date	Species	Site Address	OS Grid Reference	Notes
11/06/2024	Common pipistrelle	11 Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe	SE 22934 10733	Summer day roost – 1 bat.
06/05/2025	Common pipistrelle	11 Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe	SE 22934 10733	In flight record