Martin Prescott
Environmental
Services
Woodland Management, Ecological
Surveying, Wildlife Events...

D K Seddon
Howard and Seddon
64 Washway Road
Sale
Cheshire
M33 7RE

0161 973 8296

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

0161 796 6211
07946 488467
martin.dauby@tiscali.co.uk

18.5.2008

Bat Survey of Buildings at 1 Rushford Avenue, Longsight
17th May 2008
Surveyor- Martin Prescott

Contents

1. Introduction

2. Method

3. Results

4. Conclusions

5. Recommendations

1. Introduction

1.1 Reason for Survey

In order to obtain planning permission for developing this site a bat survey was requested.

1.2 The Site

The site was at 1 Rushford Avenue, Longsight, Manchester.
The buildings were situated amongst housing.

1.3 The Building

The buildings consisted of a large 2-storey house with converted loft, converted into several apartments..

2. Method

2.1 Risk Assessment, Possible Hazards

The required access to the site was relatively easy.
The buildings were in good condition and there were no hazards other than those normally associated with surveying inside buildings and surveying at night.

2.2 Daylight Survey

The initial survey took place on 17th May 2008.
A daylight survey was carried out in order to assess the site and search for potential roosting sites and signs of bat occupation.

Areas underneath all possible roosting areas in the building and the perimeters of the building was searched for bats, their prey remains, droppings and urine stains.
This survey was carried out after a period of mostly dry weather and droppings were likely to be evident..

Areas searched were:

2.2.1 Outside, the walls and roof for potential crevices and access holes, the ground and any other surfaces likely to catch droppings, underneath the eaves around the perimeters of the building.
2.2.2 The inside floor areas of the building, including lofts and cellars and any other surfaces likely to catch droppings or prey remains, especially around the outside walls.
2.2.3 Either side of the ridge beam and other roof timbers.

The area was assessed for bat roosting and foraging potential.

2.3 Evening Emergence Survey

2.3.1 Emergence Survey

Two surveyors equipped with ultrasonic bat detectors were sited such that the eaves and walls of the house were in view.

Weather conditions and all observed bat activity was recorded.
The survey started shortly before sunset and continued until about an hour after sunset.

2.4 Equipment

The equipment used consisted of hand held torches, ladders, bat detectors and binoculars.

3. Results

3.1 Daylight Survey, Possible Roost Sites

3.1.1 The House

The main house had a 2-storey section with a gabled slate roof.
There was an attached 2-storey flat-roofed section to the east, a small 2-storey gabled section to the south (rear) and a single storey section attached to the west, flat-roofed to the north and pitched tile to the south.
There were potential bat access points under end slates at the gables of the 2-storey sections, and under barge boards at several points around the building.
The roof void over the 2-storey section to the south was searched. No other roof voids were accessible.
The building was considered to have moderate bat roosting potential.

There was a cellar, but most of this was considered rather too dry for bat occupation, and there was no obvious bat access point. It was considered to have very low potential for hibernating bats.

3.2 Evening Survey

3.2.1 Emergence Survey

Sunset was at approximately 21.09.
The weather conditions were suitable for foraging bats: 10c, 7/8 cloud, light breeze.

A very low level of bat activity was recorded.
A single Common Pipistrelle was recorded in the garden. It was seen flying from the direction of the eastern side of the house. It is possible, but unlikely that it emerged from the building.

No bats were seen emerging from the house.

3.3 Possible Foraging and Roosting Sites

The immediate consisted of mature gardens with mature and semi-mature trees. The wider area was less well vegetated, mostly with small trees and was considered to have low potential for foraging bats.
There were many dwellings close by with high bat roost potential.

4. Conclusions

4.1 There was a low probability that a single Common Pipistrelle was using the building as a roost at the time of the survey.

4.2 The building was considered to have a moderate bat roosting potential.

4.3 There were many dwellings nearby with bat roosting potential.

4.4 The immediate area was considered to be of low value for foraging bats.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Work on these buildings can be carried out with low risk to roosting bats, but as temporary occupation is likely it is recommended that when the roofing slates are removed, the first two rows at the gables and the ridge tiles are carefully removed by hand in the presence of a suitably qualified bat worker. It would be preferable to avoid the hibernation season, November to March for this operation.

5.2 It is recommended that mitigation is included in the replacement buildings.
This should be in the form of bat bricks, allowing bat access to the cavity wall, and small gaps (5cms long by 2cms wide) under soffit or barge boards at two gables facing opposite directions.

5.2 It should be remembered that bats are occasionally found in the most unexpected places. If any bats are found during any work, Natural England (01942 820364) or myself (0161 796 6211, 07946 488467) should be notified and work stopped immediately.

5.3 If nesting birds are discovered during work, then work on that area of the building should stop until the young have fledged.

Marti