



Martin Prescott Environmental Services

*Woodland Management, Ecological
Surveying, Wildlife Events...*

FAO Vicky Saunders,
BTP Architects

cc Nilesh Bhatt
74 Gartside Street,
Manchester
M3 3EL

07814 220780

Martin Prescott
330 Hollins Lane,
Hollins,
Bury,
Lancs.
BL9 8BS

0161 796 6211
07946 488467

martin.dauby@tiscali.co.uk

1.10.2019

Daylight Bat Survey of 13 St. Johns Street, Manchester.

Surveyor- Martin Prescott (licence no. 2015/15466 CLS)

Contents

1. Introduction

2. Method

3. Results

4. Conclusions

5. Recommendations

6 Photos

Summary

The building was considered to have very low bat roosting potential.

The planned works were not considered to have any significant effect on roosting bats.

Work can be carried out with minimal risk to roosting bats.

1. Introduction

1.1 Reason for Survey

It is planned to convert this building into living accommodation.

1.2 The Site

The site was at 13 St. Johns Street, Manchester.

2. Method

This survey was carried out in order to assess the site and search for potential roosting sites and signs of bat occupation.

The eaves, roof void, cellar and walls were inspected for gaps suitable for bat access.

The areas beneath the eaves, walls, windows and floors, were searched for signs of bat occupation such as bat droppings.

The area was assessed for bat foraging potential and the presence of potential roosting sites.

2.2 Risk Assessment, Possible Hazards

The required access to the site was easy. There were no hazards other than those normally encountered when surveying sound buildings.

2.3 Equipment

The equipment used consisted of a powerful hand held torch, ladders, a camera and close-focus binoculars.

3. Results

3.1 Daylight Survey, 30.9.2019, see photos.

The building was part of a terrace of similar buildings of brick with a lined, pitched slate roof. See plan and photos.

There was a in the soffit at the front aspect, but this was immediately next to a street lamp and therefore unlikely to be used by roosting bats.

There were gaps under end slates and fascia boards to the rear, but these were similarly lit from lighting for a car park at the rear.

Most of the roof area was converted for use, but there was a small void. This was insulated at floor level and the roof slates were lined.

The cellar had been in use and was quite dry. There was no access from the outside available for bats.

No signs of bat occupation were found.

3.2 Alternative Roosts

There were many houses and other buildings close by which were likely to have significant bat roosting potential.

3.3 Foraging Potential

The immediate area included garden areas with occasional semi-mature street trees. It was considered to have low bat foraging potential. Common Pipistrelles are likely to forage here in low numbers.

4. Conclusions

4.1 The building was considered to have very low bat roosting potential.

4.2 The immediate area was considered to be of low value for foraging bats with no high quality habitat within easy bat commuting distance. There were many houses and other buildings close by which were likely to have significant bat roosting potential.

4.3 Nesting birds are unlikely.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Work can commence with minimal risk to roosting bats.

5.2 If work has not started before April 2020, a repeat survey will be required.

5.3 It should be remembered that bats are occasionally found in the most unexpected places. If any bats or active birds' nests are found during the work, the consultant (0161 796 6211, 07946 488467) should be notified and work stopped immediately.

6. Photos



P1 Front aspect – mid-terrace



P2 Gap in eaves next to street lamp



P3 Rear aspect, lit by lights around car park



P4 Gap under fascia, to rear



P5 Gap under end slate to rear



P6 Used area going into roof



P7 Small roof void



P8 unused section of cellar



P9 Used section of cellar, no outside bat access

M.G. Prescott