

12th July 2022
Our reference: 2022/05/28

Milton Mount Church, Clarence Place, Gravesend, DA12 1LD

The site and its immediate surroundings were considered in terms of potential habitat for bats during a day-time walkover survey undertaken on 12th July 2022 by Katia Bresso CEnv MCIEEM, a qualified professional consultant ecologist with over 20 years of experience, licensed bat surveyor (Class Licence CL19, Level 3, Registration Number: 2016-27133-CLS-CLS) and Registered Consultant of the Bat Low Impact Class Licence WML-CL21 with Natural England (Registered Consultant Reference Number RC056, since May 2015).

A visual examination of the external and internal areas of the buildings was undertaken. This consisted of a visual inspection using a bright torch (Cluson CB1 Clubman Standard High Power, 500,000 candle power). Cracks and holes were inspected using an endoscope¹, if needed. The purpose of the survey was to look for signs of bats such as droppings, urine staining, marking around entrance/exit holes, and any animals; and to note any potential roosting locations and access points. The latter is important because signs of bats are frequently not present; for example, they can be washed off external surfaces by wind and rain and are often not visible where bats roost in crevices such as gaps between tiles and boarding or felt, behind weatherboarding, holes in brickwork, timbers and similar.

Bat roosting potential of all structures, buildings and trees was classified according to the following criteria set out in the Table below, taken from the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Guidelines (2016).

Suitability	Criteria
Negligible	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions, and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by a larger number of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation). A tree of sufficient size and age to contain PRFs but with none seen from the ground or features seen with only very limited roosting potential.
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions, and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only - the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species

¹ RIDGID CA-350x Inspection Camera System 63888

Suitability	Criteria
	conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protections, conditions and surrounding habitats.

The building is located near Windmill Hill recreation ground which consists of short-mowed grass and trees and thus offers limited foraging habitat for bats locally. Street lighting is present on both sides of the building along the roads and thus only non light-sensitive bat species are expected to be present locally.

No bats nor signs of bats were found externally or internally. The main room has a vaulted ceiling with no roof void above but either side are two inaccessible voids (with false ceiling tiles). The building has slate and concrete tile roofs, mainly in a good state of repairs but a small number of tiles are missing, which provide low suitability for single crevice-dwelling bats.



IMG_1078



IMG_1088



IMG_1089



IMG_1095



IMG_1099

Missing/slipped tile

The Bat Conservation Trust's guidelines provide a table stating the 'minimum number of presence/absence survey visits required to provide confidence in negative preliminary roost assessment from buildings, built structures and trees in summer.

Table 7.3 Recommended minimum number of survey visits for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a negative result for structures (also recommended for trees but unlikely to give confidence in a negative result).

Low roost suitability	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability
One survey visit. One dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey ^a (structures). No further surveys required (trees).	Two separate survey visits. One dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. ^b	Three separate survey visits. At least one dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. The third visit could be either dusk or dawn. ^b

^a Structures that have been categorised as low potential can be problematic and the number of surveys required should be judged on a case-by-case basis (see Section 5.2.9). If there is a possibility that quiet calling, late-emerging species are present then a dawn survey may be more appropriate, providing weather conditions are suitable. In some cases, more than one survey may be needed, particularly where there are several buildings in this category.

^b Multiple survey visits should be spread out to sample as much of the recommended survey period (see Table 7.1) as possible; it is recommended that surveys are spaced at least two weeks apart, preferably more. A dawn survey immediately after a dusk one is considered only one visit.

Table 7.1 Recommended timings for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a negative result for structures (also recommended for trees but unlikely to give confidence in a negative result).

Low roost suitability	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability
May to August (structures) No further surveys required (trees)	May to September ^a with at least one of surveys between May and August ^b	May to September ^a with at least two of surveys between May and August ^b

Thus one night-time bat survey is recommended as per above.