

02 September 2026

By Email Only (gwbprojex@icloud.com)

Mr Brown
7 Linnet Drive
Attleborough
Norfolk
NR17 2FY

Ref: JK/26/37

Kennedy Avenue, East Grinstead: Ground Level Tree Assessment

JWK Wildlife Surveys Ltd was commissioned by Mr Brown to undertake a bat roost assessment of the proposed development site which included a Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) and Building Inspection in regard to roosting bats for proposed development work at 26 Kennedy Avenue, East Grinstead, West Sussex (here after referred to as 'the site').

This report includes the results of the surveys undertaken to establish the ecological baseline conditions within the site and to identify any potential ecological constraints to the proposed development in relation to roosting bats within features subject to proposed works.

The surveys were undertaken by Jack Kellett MCIEEM who is appropriately licenced and has over 15 years professional consultancy experience.

Description of Assessments

All bat surveys were undertaken in consideration of current good practice guidelines, which include the Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Mitchell-Jones, 2004); Surveying for Bats in Trees and Woodland BS 8596 (BSI, 2015), The Bat Workers Manual (Mitchell-Jones and McLeish, 2004), Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition) (Collins, 2023) and Bat Roosts in Trees (BTHK, 2018). In addition, all surveys were undertaken by an ecologist who holds a Natural England Class 2 bat survey licence (WML-CL18).

Trees

Trees scheduled for works were visually inspected from the ground using a high-powered torch and close-focusing binoculars. Potential roost features (PRF), such as rot holes, woodpecker holes, cracks, cavities and thick-stemmed ivy, were recorded and each tree was assigned a category as detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Explanation of BRP Categories for Trees (adapted from Collins, 2023)

Bat Roost Potential	Description of Roosting Habitats
High	A tree with one or more potential roost sites that are 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, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat.

Bat Roost Potential	Description of Roosting Habitats
Moderate	A tree 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 (with respect to roost type only – the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).
Low	A tree of sufficient size and age to contain potential roost features, but with none seen from the ground or features seen with only very limited roosting potential.
Negligible	Negligible features likely to be used by roosting bats.

Building

The interior and exterior of the building was inspected closely with the aim of identifying the presence of bats and any secondary evidence together with any potential roost sites. Secondary evidence includes droppings, feeding remains, scratch marks and oil and urine staining.

The external inspection comprised a detailed search of all accessible architectural features for roosting bats or secondary evidence. A high-powered torch was used to illuminate internal features at height, for instance the apex of a roof and associated supporting beams, and these were inspected using close focusing binoculars when required.

Where access permitted, and where present, roof voids were also inspected. This comprised a search of the floor area and other flat surfaces, including stored materials, in order to find evidence of discarded feeding remains and bat droppings. Internal features such as the roof lining were examined to assess actual or potential roost opportunities.

Where a potential bat roosting feature or confirmed roost was identified, the surveyor assessed how these could be used by bats throughout the year, in accordance with Natural England (2015):

- day roost - where individual bats, or small groups of males, rest or shelter in the day, but rarely on summer nights;
- night roost - where bats rest or shelter at night, but rarely during the day;
- feeding roost - where bats rest at night between feeding sessions, but rarely during the day;
- hibernation roost - where bats are found during winter;
- transitional or occasional roost - where bats gather at a temporary site before and after hibernation;
- mating site - where males and females gather from late summer to early winter;
- maternity roost - where babies are born and raised until they are independent;
- satellite roost - where breeding females roost close to the main nursery colony in the breeding season; and
- swarming site - where bats gather in large numbers from late summer to autumn.

Limitations

It is important to note that bat roosts are transitory in nature and the results of this assessment reflect the baseline conditions at the specific time of survey. The features surveyed may not currently support a bat roost, but they may be used by roosting bats in the future if new features form.

The findings of this report represent the professional opinion of qualified ecologists and do not constitute professional legal advice. The client may wish to seek professional legal interpretation of the relevant wildlife legislation cited in this document. Should there be a delay in the proposed timeline, it is considered prudent that the survey findings be reviewed and updated as required for subsequent planning applications so that the assessment of ecological impacts is undertaken against an accurate baseline.

Results

GLTA was undertaken on the 03rd June 2026 with a building inspection completed on 19th August 2026, the weather conditions were dry and bright.

Trees

A total of two trees and one tree group were subject to ground level inspections.

All trees/tree groups assessed are included within Table 2 below.

Table 2: Results of GLTA.

Tree	BRP Category	Features	Photograph
T1	Negligible	Domestic fruit tree (<i>Malus sp.</i>). No features.	



Tree	BRP Category	Features	Photograph
T2	Negligible	Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) – Some sparse Ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>) cladding – no features.	
G1	Negligible	Comprising non-native Cedar (<i>Cedrus sp</i>) and Cypress (<i>Cupressus sp</i>). No features	

Building

The structure was considered to provide negligible potential for roosting bats due to the lack of any potential roosting features present on the gable face or roof areas that will be associated with the development proposals.

Photo and Notes	Photograph
P1 – View along the gable face proposed for connection to the development.	
P2 – View of roof edge features showing good condition and lack of features.	
P3 - View of roof edge features showing good condition and lack of features.	

Discussion and Recommendations

Under current proposals all onsite trees will be lost and works to the onsite structure will be limited to the connection to the existing gable face and linkage of the roof to the new build areas. In consideration of the lack of any onsite roosting habitat associated with the trees or building assessed no further survey or mitigation works are required in regard to roosting bats.

Proposed development presents an opportunity to enhance the site for bats; it is recommended that a single bat box is incorporated into the design of the scheme. This could include Schwegler 2F box or the Schwegler 1 FQ, which is maintenance free. The bat box should be oriented southwest to southeast and located at least 3m above ground level.

I trust the above details relating to the completed ecological works at the site are satisfactory but feel free to ask any questions if not.

Yours sincerely



Jack Kellett
Principal Ecologist