



Precautionary Working Method Statement to Safeguard Bats

The Granary - Gibbshaven Farm

Furnace Farm Road Furnace

Wood Felbridge

East Grinstead

RH19 2PU

October 2024

Wild Earth Ecology

07930216662 | Fishers Cottage, Stockbridge, Hampshire, SO20 6BP

laura@wildearthecology.uk

Project Details

<i>Client</i>	David & Claire Parish
<i>Site/Job</i>	Gibbshaven Farm, Felbridge, East Sussex, RH19 2PU
<i>Report Title</i>	Precautionary Working Method Statement to Safeguard Bats
<i>Report Reference</i>	Gibbshaven1/PWMS/24
<i>Report author</i>	Laura Kahane
<i>Grid Reference</i>	TQ 35618 39227
<i>Survey date(s)</i>	Roost Assessment: 18/09/2024 Emergency works: 30/10/2024
<i>Surveyed by</i>	Laura Kahane
<i>Architect/Agent</i>	Harry & Co
<i>Planning reference</i>	DM/20/2602

Quality Control

<i>Version</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Author(s)</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Reviewed/ Approved by</i>	<i>Signature</i>
1	Complete	29/10/2024	Laura Kahane		Kari Bettoney	K. BETTONEY
This report remains valid for 12 months from date of issue. Survey data are valid for 12-24 months from the date the survey was undertaken.						

Disclaimer

This report has been produced by Wild Earth Ecology in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing 2017¹ and CIEEM's Code of Professional Conduct. All opinions expressed represent our true and professional bona fide opinions.

This report has been prepared by Wild Earth Ecology for the client and associated agents for use solely as a Precautionary Works Method Statement. Wild Earth Ecology accepts no responsibility or liability for any use that is made of this document other than by the client for the purposes for which it was originally commissioned and prepared.

This is a technical report which does not represent legal advice. You may wish to seek legal advice if this is required. This report is not intended to be submitted with a planning application for a development without supporting documents, including results of further surveys and detailed assessments of the effects of the proposed development.

It is the duty of care of the landowner/developer to act responsibly and comply with current environmental legislation if protected species are suspected or found prior to works.

¹ CIEEM (2017) *Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

Contents

Project details.....	2
Quality Control.....	2
1.0. Introduction & background.....	4
1.1.3. Protected Species Legislation.....	6
2.0. Site Assessment & Risks of Impact.....	7
2.1. Survey Results.....	7
2.4. Risks of Impacts.....	7
2.5. Other Impacts.....	7
3.0. Reasonable Avoidance Measures.....	8
3.1. Timing of works.....	8
3.2. Toolbox talk.....	9
3.3. Pre-works Check.....	9
3.4. Provisional Roosting Opportunity.....	9
3.5. Careful Working Practices	9
3.6. If a Bat is Found During Works	10
3.7. Bat Boxes.....	10
4.0. References.....	12
5.0. Declaration.....	13
6.0. Induction Record.....	13
Appendix 1: Site Map.....	14
Appendix 2: Image 1	14
Appendix 3: Letter from building consultant evidencing state of The Granary and emergency works required to make it safe.....	15

1.0. Introduction & Background

- 1.1. This Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) is intended to ensure that bats are not harmed, and no offence is committed under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2019) (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) during proposed development works at Gibbshaven Farm, Felbridge, East Sussex, RH19 2PU centred at grid reference TQ 35618 39227 (hereafter referred to as the 'site').
- 1.2. A Bat Roost Assessment was undertaken at Gibbshaven Farm, Felbridge, East Sussex, RH19 2PU on the 18th September 2024. Wild Earth Ecology was commissioned to undertake the survey effort. The building was surveyed by ecological consultant Laura Kahane (Natural England Class 2 bat licence number (2020-45059-CLS-CLS) for its suitability to support roosting bats, and to ascertain evidence of bat roosting and nesting birds. The survey and report undertaken followed the Bat Conservation Trust (2023) good practice guidelines and are in accordance with our industry standards as set out by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). This consisted of a walkover assessment of the site within the red line boundary. The full planning application proposes the conversion of the axillary building into a garage on the ground floor and a residential dwelling on the 1st floor.
- 1.3. This PWMS should be read in conjunction with the Bat Roost Assessment Report provided by Wild Earth Ecology in October 2024. A summary of the methodology and survey results are included within this PWMS.
- 1.4. This document presents a mitigation strategy in relation to the requirement for emergency works to be carried out on the Granary building (B2 in Bat Roost Assessment Report Wild Earth Ecology, 2024). The emergency works required for the Granary building are of an overriding risk to public health and safety (immediate action is necessary to prevent serious harm or danger). Due to severe water ingress and damage to its integrity, the building is at severe risk of structural collapse without urgent intervention, posing a risk to human life and is not expected to last beyond the winter of 2024. Clear evidence of structural damage/risk has been provided within a report from a building professional (see appendix 3).
- 1.5. The Granary building has planning consent granted by Mid Sussex District Council reference no. DM/20/2602.
- 1.6. Following the building assessment inspection, the Granary building was assessed as having moderate potential to support low numbers of roosting bats within potential roost features (PRF's) such as missing clay roof tiles, and missing or lifted timber cladding on the southwestern and northeastern elevations as well as the southeastern facing gable end.
- 1.7. Given that emergency works are required to take place during winter, and the building is not likely to be sustained into the next viable bat survey season, it is not considered feasible to gather further evidence as to the likely presence or likely absence of bats within the building. For this reason, a Licensing Policy 4 (LP4) licence (which would assume likely presence) is not considered feasible for this development where it lacks roost

characterisation evidence. Therefore, likely absence of bats during a specified, and heavily restricted time of urgent works, accompanied by a PWMS is considered appropriate.

- 1.8. The entirety of the building is due to be materially impacted by the emergency works (see letter from building consultant in appendix 3) including;
 - o Removal and replacement of the roof tiles (salvaging old tiles where possible)
 - o Scaffolding and supports
 - o Straighten out building and carry out structural repairs to timbers (including replacement where required)
 - o Foundational works
 - o Removal and replacement of timber cladding
- 1.9. This PWMS provides best practice precautionary measures which are to be implemented during the development detailed within the application. Development proposals include urgent works to stabilise, waterproof and make safe the structure of the building. All of the above works will require full supervision by a licensed bat professional.
- 1.10. The proposed development site is located on the outskirts of the village of Felbridge, approximately 3.7km northwest of East Grinstead, Sussex. The wider site comprises two detached agricultural buildings with associated grounds (see appendix 1. Site map). Immediately surrounding the proposed development site are areas of further residential dwellings with associated gardens, agricultural land and a mature treeline.
- 1.11. Given that likely absence of bats is assumed during the period of works through the winter season, and a PWMS is in place to prevent any material impact/destruction of any unknown or incidental bat roosts or access points, the works are not considered to cause any temporary roost 'disturbance' (noise and vibration) and will furthermore be on a limited scale. This offers an appropriate opportunity for avoiding a mitigation licence, that would otherwise be impossible to acquire (without evidence of roost characterisation) through the use of appropriate timing and a PWMS. This PWMS aims to minimise any potential disturbance to bats on the basis that it is not possible to carry out further survey works. The works will occur within a limited, or temporary period, and as quickly as possible, outside of the active bat season whilst supervised, and therefore on balance the proposed activity is reasonably unlikely to result in an offence. Furthermore, no field signs or evidence of bats were found. All evidence acquired during the Roost Assessment suggests that at most, low numbers of common bat species could potentially be using the building during the summer active season. The PWMS is appropriate and proportionate to the level of risk and provides adequate care facilities for any bats found. No long-term impacts are anticipated.
- 1.12. The Bat Mitigation Guidelines (2023) state that "Where there is an immediate danger to the public, a decision may be made to undertake actions outside of licensing. According to published guidance, immediate danger - should reasonably be interpreted to mean that the structure or tree will fail or collapse, and is at risk of harming the public, within a short

timescale and thus gives little scope for obtaining a licence". However, it should be noted that "there is no defence under the Habitats Directive, or the various Habitats Regulations transposing the Habitats Directive into domestic law, which allow for emergency works. The only statutory defence that may apply in these circumstances is under the W&CA where (as discussed above) it can be demonstrated that the "act was the incidental result of a lawful operation and could not reasonably have been avoided". However, this defence only has the potential to protect against the bat offences under s.9(4) (b) and (c); it does not protect against the Habitats Regulations offences. Therefore, where a bat or evidence of a roost i.e. droppings) is found unexpectedly and not covered by a licence, then the SNCBs advise that all work must stop, and an ecologist should advise on the most appropriate course of action (it is not the SNCB's role to advise on all of these situations). This would depend on the exact circumstances and the appropriately licensed ecologist on the ground (or their accredited agent) would be best placed to make a judgement call. For example, it may be appropriate for the bat's welfare to remove it; or conversely to re-instate the roost.

- 1.13. Whilst no prior bat survey information is available, a letter from the Mike Bird, Principal Ecologist consulting on behalf of Mid-Sussex District Council, within a former planning application (withdrawn in 2019), concludes that whilst the proposal may impact on existing bat roosts in an another building on site, given the poor state of the building, it would appear that the conversion with replacement roost provision will provide more secure long-term roosts and that "In my opinion, there are no biodiversity policy reasons for refusal or amendment of the proposals, subject to conditions" which include a roost provision. Suitable enhancement roosting opportunities including permanent integrated features have been recommended within this report.

Protected Species Legislation

Bats

- 1.14. In England and Wales, all bat species and their roosts are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended); the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006); and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2019) (as amended). You will be committing a criminal offence if you;
- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat.
 - Intentionally or recklessly disturb a group of bats where the disturbance is likely to significantly affect the ability of the animals to survive, breed, or nurture their young or likely to significantly affect the local distribution or abundance of the species whether in a roost or not.
 - Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time).
 - Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat.
 - Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost

For this reason, a roost is defined as being 'any structure or place that is used for shelter or protection' and since bats are highly mobile and regularly move roost site throughout the year, often unpredictably, a roost retains such designation whether or not bats are present at the time.

- 1.15. Barbastelle, Bechstein's, greater horseshoe, lesser horseshoe, brown long-eared, soprano pipistrelle, and noctule bats are all priority species under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) and have also been adopted as species of principal importance in England under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006.

2.0. Site Assessment & Risks of Impact

Survey results

- 2.1. The Granary, a square two-story detached agricultural building constructed from timber and cladding, with a double-pitched, combination-style roof lined with clay tiles was assessed for its potential to support roosting bats. The majority of the building was recorded to be in derelict condition (internally and externally) with the integral structural timbers supported by steel props, and the entirety of the building tilting to the west. Some areas of the upper pitched roof, particularly on the eastern elevation offers opportunity for significant water ingress and there is evidence of this internally resulting in very damp, drafty conditions which are also exposed to high levels of natural light without sheltered areas. A total of six gaps (suitable potential roost features) for crevice-dwelling species are present externally within lifted and slipped roof and hip tiles and gaps under lifted lead flashing on the walls and roof. No bats or evidence of their presence was discovered within the areas of the building proposed for works. All areas of the building were accessed, and no other limitations were observed, or assumptions made during any part of the survey (desk or field study). It is considered that with the access gained and recording undertaken an accurate assessment of the site's ecological value has been made.
- 2.2. Crevice-dwelling bats, such as Pipistrelles often use the same buildings during the active season, as they do for winter hibernation. Using the Assessment of hibernation potential for 'non-classic' hibernation sites within the Bat Mitigation Guidelines (2023), the building was further assessed for its potential to support features which bats could utilise for hibernation and recorded a 'low' level of 'non-classic' features overall. Within this assessment, roosting potential, foraging and commuting habitat and known roosts have been considered.
- 2.3. In this circumstance, the need for a licence is being avoided through assuming absence during, and within the application of appropriate timing of works, and where working methods are put in place to ensure any incidental roosts are not impacted adversely. Therefore, the following steps are recommended to continue with emergency works and reasonable precautions must be taken to minimise the effects on bats;
 - o employ all possible measures to minimise damage and harm to bats (including appropriate provision for any bats needing to be caught and released or taken into care);
 - o ensure detailed written records of all planning/survey work undertaken are kept demonstrate good practice (this will strengthen the case for the actions being 'reasonable');
 - o ensure that a written record is kept of the date, the decision, names of persons involved and times and details of the actions, as well as a photographic record; this should include supporting written evidence from an appropriately qualified person, such as a structural engineer, arboriculturist or tree surgeon (as appropriate) to support any claim of immediate danger; and
 - o ensure that appropriately qualified persons plan and carry out the work to minimise ecological impacts.

Risk of Impacts

- 2.4. The absence of roosting evidence within the building and overall derelict condition has been considered and it is considered that no impacts to bats are anticipated as a result of the proposed works so long as the PWMS is followed carefully. The methodology outlined in this PWMS details Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) which should be followed at all times during construction works in order to further reduce risks to bats during works.

Other Impacts

- 2.5. No other impacts are anticipated.

3.0. Reasonable Avoidance Measures

The following RAMs should be implemented during the site construction phase;

3.1. Timing of works

- The optimal period for commencing works is October-November (inclusive) or March-April (where possible). Given that the emergency works are required to be carried out immediately, and prior to the onset of harsher weather (e.g. heavy wind or rain, or snow) which is likely to result in collapse of the structure, works should be completed at within the above timeframes, under full supervision. The only further limitation on works is to avoid the coldest periods (generally Jan & Feb), as this is when bats enter a time of reduced activity or torpor which makes disturbance impacts more significant. The assessment of potential to support hibernating bats is considered 'low' as a 'non-classic' site (within no classic features) and only a very small numbers of bats are likely to be found (if any). Therefore, the risk of harm to any torpid bats found can be reduced by only stripping roofs when:
- Weather conditions are dry/calm and;
- Temperatures are no lower than 8°C for at least an hour or two from dusk on 3-4 consecutive nights (which would be sufficient for bats to be active and to feed).

Prescribing an appropriate timing of works offers the opportunity to carry out proposed work without the need for a mitigation licence. Given the building carries moderate potential to support small numbers of bats, on an opportunistic basis, it is considered that low numbers of bats will be actively using the main building between the summer active season (May to September inclusive), and that bats are considered least likely to be present during the typical hibernation period (October/November to April inclusive, depending on prevailing weather conditions).

Pre-construction

Summary

- All contractors must read and comply with this method statement, as well as to be aware of the process to follow if a bat is found.
- A signed copy of the method statement (signed by contractor and client) must be kept on site at all times.
- A toolbox talk will be given to all staff/contractors on bat presence and the Method Statement protocol.

- Prior to works taking place, a suitable bat box will be erected nearby for translocation for any bats found during supervised destruction of the building. The location of this is to be decided by a licensed bat worker that is designated to supervise the works.
- A lighting scheme (if new lighting is proposed) sensitive to wildlife, roof lining material and timber treatment recommendations made in The Bat Roost Assessment (2024) from Wild Earth Ecology should be followed through the design process and all construction phases. Non-bitumen-coated roofing membranes (formerly known as breathable roofing membranes, modern roofing membranes, BRMs or MRMs) should not be installed into a roof as these are made from spun-bond polypropylene/polyethylene filaments that are known to cause harm to or kill bats.

3.2. Toolbox Talk

Prior to any internal or external construction commencing on site, all construction personnel will receive a toolbox talk from a licensed ecologist regarding bat presence, their level of protection including places of shelter and adherence to the method statement protocol. This will include the protocol on how to proceed if a bat is found during work and safe working practices to minimise the chances of bats being present during the works.

3.3. Pre-works check

Immediately before works on site commence, a bat licensed ecologist will carry out an internal and external inspection of the building to confirm that no new roosting features have formed since the survey date. This check will occur after the toolbox talk has been provided and will also confirm the absence of bats within the building.

3.4. Provisional Roosting Opportunity

Prior to any works commencing, at least one bat box (Schwegler 2FN or similar) suited to the species present, should be installed on a mature tree or an alternative building within the site, under the supervision of a licensed ecologist. If this make and model is unavailable due to supply issues, other manufacturers and specifications of boxes can be recommended. This bat box should be mounted at a height of at least 4m from the ground and face in a south or south-westerly direction. A suitable location for this would be the mature Oak on the left (southwest) of the access driveway to the southeast of the site (location shown on Map 1 in appendix 1). This will provide a provisional roosting opportunity for any bats that are found incidentally during works and supervision as well as opportunities for other bats present in the area.

During Construction

Summary

- Lighting, vibration and noise will be minimised.
- Any roof stripping will require supervision of licensed bat ecologist and;
- Removal of any roof tiles, flashing, roof coverings or structures should be by hand and lifted vertically to prevent any bats from being crushed. Crevices between and the underneath roof materials should be checked as removed for the presence of bats.
- The roosts will remain unaffected/intact at all times.
- All works with the potential to encounter/harm bats must be carried out under the supervision of a licensed bat worker.

- If a bat is found unexpectedly during operations, then all works must cease, and licensed Ecologist be contacted for immediate advice.

3.5. Careful Working Practice

All works, especially those pertaining to the removal of roofing materials including tiles, felt, timbers, cladding, barge boards, windows, light fittings and similar must be undertaken slowly, by hand and with particular care. Each roof tile should be removed carefully and checking beneath and to the sides for the presence of bats before it is processed. A licensed bat worker should supervise all critical works, such as when tiles and other key roofing components are removed. Where required for safety, the client will provide secure scaffolding (or a cherry picker) in order for the ecologist to safely inspect the roof. Areas considered suitable for bats and supervision are at the licensed bat workers discretion. Furthermore, all proposed works to the roof should be carried out using hand tools without the need for machinery, where possible.

3.6. If a bat is found during works

Should bats be discovered at any point during the development (and when the licensed ecologist is not on site), all works must cease immediately, and Wild Earth Ecology should be contacted on 07930216662 for advice. A European Protected Species Licence would likely be required from Natural England in order to allow works to proceed further and the risks to bats and their roosts from the works would require review. Only licensed bat workers are legally able to handle bats discovered during the development process.

3.7. A hardcopy of this method statement will be available at all times on site.

Post construction

- 3.8. The erection of 2x bat boxes has been recommended post-construction and should be retained as ecological enhancement. Where possible, integrated bat boxes or 'raised bat tiles' should be used to offer a more permanent provision of roosting opportunities. Full detailed recommendations for this option including a 'raised access tile' can be found below.

Bat boxes

- 3.9. It is recommended that two 2FN Schwegler Bat Boxes or equivalent (dependent on product availability, e.g., Beaumaris Bat Box, Vivara Pro Woodstone Bat Box) are installed on suitable retained trees or buildings nearby. The bat box used as a 'provisional' opportunity (referred to in 3.4 of this report) during works can be kept in the same location post-development as 'ecological enhancement'. To maximise opportunity, a further box could be erected on another mature tree on site. Alternatively, the second bat integrated (see description below) box could be erected on the southwestern elevation of the replacement roof on the Granary at a height of 3m or more. The position of the boxes should have a clear route of entry to it and be free from dense vegetation or branches. Any further detailed advice on location and erection of these boxes can be sought from the author of this report. The bat box should ideally be made of woodcrete, and be positioned at least 3-5m high, in a south or south-west facing direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance (free from obstruction) and away from artificial light such as sensor operated flood lights. Please note that the inclusion of a bat box on a building, does not mean that bats will be

attracted to roosting within the building itself. The installation of bat boxes within the vicinity of the buildings will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. Bats often require time to locate new roosting sites, and it may be several years before a box is colonised.

- 3.10. Within the new development, integrated bat roost features offer the most preferable, suitable, permanent enhancement for roosting opportunities and are easy to integrate into the design of most buildings. These integrated features provide a more permanent integrated opportunity for an individual or small number of "crevice dweller" species that requires tight gaps to roost within. These can be selected to match the aesthetic of the building. The Integrated Eco Bat Box (see link below) is made from lightweight, long-lasting woodcrete and can be bolted to supporting timbers or brickwork beneath, with timber cladding fitted around it. An integrated box could be fitted at the highest point of the southwestern wall under the eaves. Alternatively, these boxes can be fixed externally. Further advice on location or specification can be sought at any time from the author.

https://www.nhbs.com/integrated-eco-bat-box?fbclid=IwAR1Oj21BUzGJni9wXni-vWpyLa2nKKgn8IJZs1SoUWPTt2ytfX_gb7ZRZs

- 3.11. An example of how a building might look with permanent integrated bat box/tube fitted below timber cladding can be seen below;



- 3.12. A further alternative to bat boxes would be to further enhance bat roosting opportunity on site, by replacing a roofing tile with a 'raised access tile' which can provide a more permanent integrated opportunity for an individual or small number of "crevice dweller" species that requires tight gaps to roost within. These can be chosen to match the aesthetic of the roofing material. A suitable location for this would be on the southwestern elevation at a height of at least 3-5m, with the tile replaced during the works. A small rectangular access hole the width of the tile should be cut in the roof lining to allow access to a roof cavity beneath. The tile should not be illuminated by nearby artificial lighting. Regular tiles can be flat or pegged (outwards) or alternatively a specialist tile can be purchased from retailers online such as the following. Further advice on location or specification can be sought at any time from the author. Advice set out within the PWMS will make the most suitable recommendation for provisional bat roosting opportunities on site, however further bat boxes in the form of either stand alone or preferably integrated bat boxes or bat tiles will also be required to enhance the site for use by bats.

<https://www.nhbs.com/search?q=bat+access+tiles> (photo shown below)

https://www.roofingsuppliesuk.co.uk/products/spicer-tiles-handmade-bat-access-clay-roof-tile-medium-antique?variant=43842377711856&gclid=EAlalQobChMImfWskuWkgQMVxltQBh3jlAWgEAQYBCABEgl6DfD_BwE

Further advice on location or specification can be sought at any time from the author.



4.0. References

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Bat Conservation Trust (2014). Artificial lighting and wildlife. Interim Guidance Recommendations to help minimise the impact of artificial lighting. BCT, London.

BSI, (2013). BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development. BSI Standards Ltd, London: British Standards Institute.

CIEEM (2011). Competencies for Species Survey guidance documents. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

Institute of Lighting Professionals (2018). Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK Guidance Note. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

JNCC (2004). Bat workers manual (3rd edition). JNCC, Peterborough.

Magic website. <http://www.magic.gov.uk>

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Schofield, H. W. & Mitchell-Jones, A.J (2004). The Bats of Britain and Ireland. Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury.

Wild Earth Ecology (2024). Bat Roost Assessment Report.

Wray *et al.* (2010). Valuing bats in ecological impact assessment. In Practice, 23-25.

5.0. Declaration

We declare that this Non-Licensed Method Statement will be strictly adhered to. We understand that any deviation from the works as proposed in this PWMS could result in a breach of the law.		
Signature of the SITE MANAGER		Date
Full name in BLOCK LETTERS		
Signature of CONTRACTOR		
Full name in BLOCK LETTERS		
Signature of SITE ECOLOGIST		
Full name in BLOCK LETTERS	LAURA KAHANE	

6.0. Method Statement for Non-Licensed emergency works to The Granary, Gibbshaven Farm

Induction Record

Date of Induction	Name	Signature	Trade	Employer	Signature of Site Manager

7.0. Appendix 1 - Site Map



Appendix 2: Image 1. View of the Granary building from the southwest.



Image 1. Photo of The Granary building from he from the southwest.

Appendix 3: Letter from building consultant evidencing state of The Granary and emergency works required to make it safe



Waterbury Consultants Ltd

m: 07808608424
e: patrick@waterburyltd.co.uk
a: John de Mierre House, Bridge Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1UA
w: www.waterburyltd.co.uk

13TH OCTOBER 2024

To whom it may concern ,

The state of the roof on the single storey west elevation on the main barn and the granary building have got into a very poor condition. There are now many holes and severe damage to the structure and without immediate attention to remove the roof tiles and repair the structure these parts of the buildings are highly likely not to last another winter.

GIBBSHAVEN BARN

GRANARY

WORKS NEEDED TO PREVENT FURTHER DILAPIDATION OF CLAY TILE ROOF .
THERE IS ALREADY EVIDENCE OF NAIL FATIGUE IN THE BATTENS AS WHOLE
SECTIONS OF TILING IN SOME AREAS ARE SLIPPING AND THERE ARE HOLES WITHIN
THE ROOF COVERING WHICH ARE CAUSING SEVERE DAMP ISSUES TO THE
WHOLE STRUCTURE.

STRONG WINDS, FROSTS, SNOW LOADS COULD IMMEDIATELY CAUSE FURTHER
DILAPIDATION

PROPOSAL

- SCAFFOLD AND SUPPORT STRUCTURE
- CAREFULLY REMOVE ROOF TILES AND SALVAGE ANY FOR RE-USE . LUCKY IF WE GET 30% WITH THE DELAMINATION AND BREAKAGES ALREADY.
- STRAIGHTEN OUT BUILDING AND CARRY OUT STRUCURAL REPAIRS/REPLACEMENT OF TIMBERS
- FOUNDATION WORK
- NEW CLADDING TO SPEC.
- NEW ROOF TO SPEC.

MAIN BARN WEST ELEVATION ROOF

- ALREADY HAS SCAFFOLD TO SUPPORT STRUCTURE...DESPITE THIS
- ROOF TIMBERS ARE BROKEN AND COLLAPSED
- SECTIONS OF THE ROOF ARE COMPLETELY COLLAPSING AND ALMOST HORIZONTAL
- LOTS OF AREAS WHERE THERE IS WATER INGRESS
- THE WHOLE SECTION OF THIS LOWER ROOF ON THE WEST ELEVATION NEEDS TO BE STRIPPED AND SALVAGED TO PREVENT FURTHER DEGRADATION AND COMPLETE COLLAPSE WHICH IS A VERY REAL POSSIBLTY OVER THE WINTER PERIOD

Patrick Kyaing BSc Bld.