Bat Survey
Arbtech Consulting Ltd

The Surveyor

The surveyor and principal author of this report is Jo Gregory BA (Hons), MSc GradIEEM (Bat Licences N.E. 20122461; S.N.H. 13660; C.C.W 39248.)

The Client

The client is Heesom Contracts.

Site of Proposed Development

The client is preparing a planning application to convert the former Bay Horse Public House, 544-548 Stockport Road, Longsight, Manchester, M12 4JJ.

The Survey Brief

The client commissioned Arbtech to undertake a scoping bat survey; referring to a method of ecological assessment outlined in the Bat Conservation Trust publication "Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines 2nd Edition" (BCT 2012).

These guidelines state that the aim of the scoping bat survey or appraisal is to observe and catalogue "*informing and identifying the type and extent of further bat survey work needed (if any).*", thus recommendations for further survey work may be recommended in this report, which is appropriate to the development.

Data Searches

A search of the National Biodiversity Network Gateway[1] returned relevant records that can be found in *Survey Results* section of this report.

Date of the Survey

1st October 2012.

Limitations

This survey type can be conducted at any time of year and therefore no constraints or limitations have been identified at this time.

If information about the development or project has been with-held from the surveyor, it may become necessary to change the results of this report.

[1] http://data.nbn.org.uk/

Informative: Statues and English Law

All 18 species of bat common in the U.K. are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended through inclusion in Schedule V. All bat species in the U.K. are also included in Schedule II of the Habitats Regulations 2010 which transpose Annex II of the Council Directive 92/43/EEC 1992 on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora ("EC Habitats Directive") which defines European protected species of animals.

Bats species are afforded further protection by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

Cumulatively, this legislation makes it illegal to:

1. Intentionally or deliberately kill, injure or capture bats.
2. Deliberately disturb bats, whether at roost or not.
3. Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts.
4. Possess or transport a bat or any part of a bat, unless acquired legally.
5. Sell, barter or exchange bats, or any part of a bat.

A bat roost is defined by the Bat Conservation Trust publication Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines as "*the resting place of a bat*" (BCT 2012). Generally however, the word roost is interpreted as "*any structure or place, which any wild bat uses for shelter or protection.*"

Bats tend to re-use the same roosts; therefore legal opinion is guided by recent case law precedents[2], that a roost is protected whether or not the bats are present at the time. This can include for summer roosts, used for breeding; or winter roosts, used for hibernating.

Informative: Planning Policy

In addition to the statutes described above, various local planning policy imposes duties upon would-be planning applicants to take account of protected species and habitats at sites of proposed development and in particular, protected species. The objective of these policies is to prevent a net loss of species and habitats diversity identified as priorities for the U.K. as a consequence of development activity.

Further, The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the following when EU protected species may be affected:

'119. The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined.'

[2] Internet search for e.g. the Woolley case (R. Simon Woolley v. Cheshire East Borough Council) and see here: http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/WoolleyVsCheshireEastBC_tcm6-12832.pdf

The Survey Methodology

In order to fully assess the potential value of bat habitat at this site this scoping bat survey has observed widely accepted national standards set out in the Bat Conservation Trust publication Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines (BCT 2012).

The survey includes for a thorough internal and external inspection of all buildings (and trees) referred to in the *Survey Results* section below for cracks, holes, cavities and voids in buildings and cracks, fissures and voids in trees.

Inspections are internal and external, making use of torches, ladders, endoscopes, mirrors, binoculars and cameras where appropriate to do so.

The survey is performed during daylight hours and provides an opportunity to exclude the need for further survey work, if the following triggers can be confirmed absent from the site of proposed development:

1. Bats.
2. Evidence of recent bat activity e.g. droppings, prey remains, urine staining.
3. Features suitable for roosting.

If bats, evidence of their recent activity and or features suitable for roosting cannot be confirmed absent from the site of proposed development, this report will make recommendations for further survey work and or mitigation where this is consistent with the BCT (2012) guidelines and considered appropriate by the surveyor in the context of the proposed development.

Recommendations for further survey work may include so-called "*Roost emergence surveys*" (BCT 2012) which enable e.g. population numbers and species to be confirmed present, indeterminate or absent.

Bat Potential

Table 1: Bat roost **habitat value** adapted from the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT 2012).

Confirmed	✓ Bats are found to be present during the survey. ✓ Evidence of bats is found to be present during the survey. ✓ Bats heard 'chattering' inside a roost on a warm day or at dusk
High	✓ Buildings, trees or other structures with features of particular significance for roosting bats e.g. mines, caves, tunnels, ice houses and cellars. ✓ Habitat of high quality for foraging bats e.g. broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. ✓ Site is connected with the wider landscape by strong linear features that would be used by commuting bats e.g. river and or stream valleys and hedgerows. ✓ Site is close to known roosts.
Medium	✓ Several potential roosts in buildings, trees or other structures. ✓ Habitat could be used by foraging bats e.g. trees, shrub, grassland or water. ✓ Site is connected with the wider landscape by linear features that could be used by commuting bats e.g. lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens.
Low	✓ A small number of potential roosts, most likely less significant roosts. ✓ Isolated habitat for foraging e.g. a lone tree or patch of scrub but not parkland. ✓ An isolated site not connected by prominent linear features.
Negligible	✓ No features suitable for roosting, foraging or commuting.

"A continuum is presented between low and high potential value. By referring to this continuum and using their expert judgement, surveyors may wish to classify potential development sites, habitats, or features as low, medium or high value for bats (Negligible is an Arbtech addition)." (BCT 2012).

All buildings and or trees within the site of proposed development referred to in the *Survey Results* section have been assessed in accordance with the criteria in Table 1 under the judgment of the surveyor [expert].

Survey Results

Table 2: Buildings, Groups or Trees referred to by number and in accordance with the sketch plan at Appendix I.

Desk Study Records	The desk study search returned the following results for the grid square SJ89 (SJ867955) from the National Biodiversity Network (NBN). **NBN:** *Species from the NBN data search cannot be published without the owner's permission.* *The NBN has been checked for records from the site.*		
Local Environment	The site is surrounded by housing in the immediate vicinity. Woodland is located approx. 883m away to the southwest, approx. 558m away to the southeast, and approx. 859m away to the east of the site. Open water cannot be located with 1km of the site. Fields are located approx. 3,975m southeast of the site. Tree lined roads and gardens are located in close proximity to the site offering commuting routes to and from the woodland and other foraging areas. There is one building on site; building B1. B1 will be converted under planning permission. B1 is a brick built two-storey former public house, with a low pitched roof of a trussed rafter construction and comprising of cement tiles which are felt lined, minor tears were visible in the felt lining during the internal inspection but the tiles are tight fitting providing no access to the interior loft space. The eaves comprise of wooden barge boards with no gaps. The windows and doors are wooden framed and are tight fitting. **Weather conditions [at time of survey]:** Temperature: 13.9˚C Cloud Cover: 100% Precipitation: Light Wind:0/8		
Building; Tree; Group of trees	**Actual bats found.**	**Evidence of Activity**	**Habitat Value** (Negligible/Low/Medium/High potential roosting habitat.)
B1	Negative. No bats found.	Negative. No evidence was located either externally or internally.	Negligible. No suitable features allowing access into the loft space or between the tiles and lining could be found in the roof structure. No gaps or crevices could be found around the lead flashing or window frames. No other suitable features could be found within the structure of the property.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Table 3: Buildings, Groups or Trees referred to by number and in accordance with the sketch plan at Appendix I.

Building; Tree; Group of trees	**Habitat Value [As defined in Table 1]**	**Are emergence survey works necessary?**	**Is an EPSL necessary?**
B1	Negligible.	No. As no evidence or suitable roosting features could be found either internally or externally no further surveys are felt necessary. **Recommendations:** In the highly unlikely event bats are found during the demolition, work should stop and further advice sort from an experienced, licenced bat ecologist.	No.

Contact Information

For further information please contact:

Arbtech Consulting Ltd
Arboricultural and Ecological Consultants
Tel. 0800 072 5596

Head Office:
Murlain House, Union Street, Chester, Cheshire CH1 1QP
Also in Bedfordshire, London, Lancaster, Kent, Surrey & Sussex

More information about our company, people and services can be accessed via our Web site, at the URL: http://www.arbtech.co.uk.

www.arbtech.co.uk

Bibliography

Hundt L (2012) Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd edition, Bat Conservation Trust ISBN-13: 9781872745985

http://www.bats.org.uk/publications_detail.php/1127/bat_surveys_good_practice_guidelines_2nd_edition

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/nppf

Document Production and Approval

Status	Issue	Surveyor	Edits	Date
Draft	1	J Gregory	First draft	05/10/2012
Issued	2	J Gregory	Issued	05/10/2012

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this Report for the sole use of the above named Client or his Agents in accordance with our terms of business, under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Copyright

© This Report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Appendix I. Sketch plan



Legend

Building (B1)

Drawn by: JG
Signed off by: MOC

Scale:

Not to scale

N

Reproduced with permission of
OS Opendata, 2010

ARBTECH
Consulting Limited