APPENDIX 3

THE TYRER PARTNERSHIP



Ecology Consultants/Surveyors
Specialising in Protected Species

12 Tyrers Close, Formby, Merseyside L37 4BE

Tel: 01704 875781 Fax: 01704 382304 Mobile: 07719 108429

Email address **bat.man@ blueyonder.co.uk**



Building at New Smithfield Market, Manchester

Inspection and Assessment in Relation to Bats

Prepared for:

OakTech limited
Flint Glass Works
Jersey St
Manchester
M4 6JW

Issued : 4 November 2013

Building at New Smithfield Market, Manchester

Inspection and Assessment in Relation to Bats

1. Introduction and Reasons for Survey.....

2. Bats & Their Requirements.....

3. Bat Species in Greater Manchester…….....

4. Survey Methodology …….....

5. Constraints …….....

6. Daytime Results.....

7. Daytime Conclusions & Implications.....

8. Daytime Survey Recommendations.....

APPENDIX 1 - Site Photographs

Building at New Smithfield Market, Manchester

Inspection and Assessment in Relation to Bats

1.0 Introduction & Reason for Surveys

1.1 As part of the proposed Planning Application New Smithfield Market, Manchester, a daytime inspection and assessment of a multi-unit industrial building was undertaken in relation to bats. OakTech Limited, on behalf of their client, commissioned the inspection and report. It is understood that proposals for the site involve the demolition of the building, which will allow for the development of a waste processing plant. As part of the Local Authority's Planning Policies ecological surveys are generally required, particularly where a specially protected species is or may be present and could be affected by the proposals for which the Application seeks consent.

1.2 The aim of the inspection was to initially ascertain whether the building is of value to bats; if the building was found to be suitable for bats, signs of use were located or the survey results were inconclusive then more detailed surveys would be recommended i.e. nocturnal emergence surveys during the main active season of bats i.e. between May – August. If bats were subsequently found during those detailed surveys and may be affected by the work then a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence would be required to legally proceed with the development.

1.3 The optimum time to investigate buildings for evidence of a bat roost is May – August, however that is not to say they cannot be inspected and assessed outside of that time and frequently the results can be conclusive, which can save time and expense for Planning Applicants but it should be borne in mind that equally the inspection can be inconclusive.

2.0 Bats & Their Requirements

2.1 All British bats and their roosts are afforded protection under the 1981 Wildlife & Countryside Act (as amended) and are listed in Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). When dealing with cases where a European Protected Species (all UK bats) may be affected, a planning authority is a competent authority within the meaning of the Regulation 7 of the 2010 Regulations and therefore has a statutory duty to have due regard to the provisions of the Regulations in the exercise of its functions.

2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has replaced the existing Planning Policy Guidelines. (PPG's) In relation to wildlife PPG 9 was one of the documents to which Planning Authorities referred to, particularly where a specially protected species is or may be present and will be affected by a development for which a Planning application seeks consent. The aims of the NPPF in relation to species and habitats are that it places a clear responsibility on Local Planning Authorities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and to encourage on the consideration that should be given to Protected Species where they may be affected by development. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Circular 06/2005 provides administrative guidance on the application of the law in relation to planning and nature conservation.

This is supported by a guide to good practice entitled 'Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Building in Biodiversity' in which paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35 identify that species such as bats are highly dependant upon built structures for survival and that roosts can be easily incorporated into existing and new developments/conversions to benefit these species.

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles

If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused

2.3 Use of Buildings by Bats
a) Summer breeding roost.
b) Hibernation.
c) Transitional or temporary roost.

Roost selection is often closely correlated to suitable foraging habitat within a reasonable commuting distance from the roost and different sites are used depending upon insect densities and abundance, climatic conditions can also affect their ability to successfully forage. All British bats are insectivorous.

** The term roost is generically referred to as a place that bat/s use for the any of the above reasons, however it should be noted that under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (Regulation 41) the term roost is not used but refers to "*a breeding site or resting place of such an animal"* which essentially is the same and is afforded legal protection. The roost, breeding site or resting place of bats, which ever terminology is used is legally protected whether or not bats are in occupation.

3.0 Protected Species in Greater Manchester

3.1 Up to nine bat species have been regularly recorded in Greater Manchester most of which use built structures, notably occupied residential properties for roosting. The most frequently encountered species is the Pipistrelle bat; its abundant status in Greater Manchester is reflected throughout the UK. All British bats and their roosts are afforded protection under the 1981 Wildlife & Countryside Act (as amended) and are listed in Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010. When dealing with cases where a European Protected Species (all UK bats) may be affected, a planning authority is a competent authority within the meaning of the Regulation 7 of the 2010 Regulations and therefore has a statutory duty to have due regard to the provisions of the Regulations in the exercise of its functions.

4.0 Survey Methodology

4.1 The surveys were conducted on the 28th June 2013 by an employee of the Tyrer Partnership i.e. by Mr. Jamie Ian Thomson who is employed as an ecologist by the Tyrer Partnership and is currently training as a bat surveyor; he has had extensive nocturnal and daytime survey experience.

He is also a university graduate in Science, Ecology and Conservation Management, and in the subject of Rural Resource Management. The report contents, conclusions and recommendations have been checked, verified and agreed with by Mr S. Irwin who is the proprietor of the Tyrer Partnership and has 28 years experience in the field of bat conservation and surveying.

4.2 The daytime surveys were conducted at a time when bats are active, and within their main breeding season. Though, if evidence of use was found to be absent the results, conclusions and recommendations are based upon surveyor experience and knowledge of bat ecology.

4.3 A number of factors are used for the survey methodology, which include:-
Knowledge of bat species relevant to the site location
Nature of the immediate and surrounding habitat in relation to foraging opportunities
Condition of the building
Presence/absence of roost potential
Value of roost potential – if present

4.4 During the survey the surrounding habitat was assessed in relation to bats as very often roost selection is closely correlated with the surrounding habitat.

5.0 Constraints

5.1 The daytime survey was conducted within the main active period and breeding season of bats. Furthermore no access restrictions preventing assessment of all required building features arose. Consequently, a full appraisal and inspection of the building was achievable in relation to assessing the level of bat roost potential that may exist.

5.2 In context with the above it is considered that there were no survey constraints that would prevent the gathering of information on which to base conclusions and recommendations.

6.0 Daytime Results

6.1 The surveyed building is located within the New Smithfield Market, which is situated within an eastern peripheral zone of Manchester City, approximately 5 kilometres from the city centre. As a consequence the surrounding landscape encompasses a heavily industrialized environment, which progresses to an urban-residential mosaic, before extending to a dominant and underpinning semi-natural agricultural landscape.

6.2 Despite the industrial location, the immediate and connected semi-natural habitat consists of residential gardens, linear and scattered tree/shrub, specifically along roadsides and gardens. Amenity grassland also plays host to tree plantation in both linear and scattered form, e.g. within school recreational grounds and local parks. Additionally, Gorton Upper Reservoir and a golf course are situated approximately 1.2 kilometres south east of the site.

6.3 Ecological connectivity does, to varying degrees, exist between all of these landscape features, thus providing a potentially valuable urban ecological network for bat species such as the Pipistrelle, (*Pipistrellus)* which is the most frequently occurring species in urban and semi-urban connotations. Where such habitat is present close to buildings then the percentage use of those buildings, by bats, increases given that roost opportunities are available. The breeding roosts of Pipistrelle bats are proportionally higher in occupied residential dwellings were the warm, dry conditions favour the requirements of a maternity colony but other structures are also used, especially for hibernation or by male bats which do not need the same conditions as a maternity colony.

6.4 The building measures approximately 64m long x 19m wide and is a single storey solid brick construction with a flat roof constructed from corrugated steel, which features integrated skylights. Each of the six units that collectively form the entire structure, are subject to frequent disturbance typical of their industrial purpose. Moreover, all units are open to the underside of the roof, and as a result do not feature a loft space or equivalent roof void. Taking the latter into consideration the building is considered incompatible in relation to the required niche of the Brown Long Eared (*Plecotus auritus*), which is a species that favour large undisturbed lofts spaces that allow free flight and crevices to seek shelter. Underfelt or comparable roof insulation is absent throughout; when such insulating materials are in place, providing exterior access is available, i.e. under the roofing material, roosting opportunity for crevice dwelling bats, such as the Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus*) can be present whereby they often roost between the two materials.

6.5 During the external assessment it was noted that the building, as a consequence of its constructional materials and physical form is tight fitting and as a result offers no conceivable access openings for crevice dwelling bats. Furthermore, there is a complete absence of structural features often favoured by crevice dwelling bats, such as soffit, fascia and barge boards or hanging tiles, whereby ingress can often be found between such features and the external wall.

7.0 Daytime Conclusions & Implications

7.1 No physical evidence of use by bats has been located on or within the building at New Smithfield Market; additionally, no opportunities for either loft or crevice dwelling bats was been identified within the fabric of the building.

8.0 Daytime Survey Recommendations

8.1 No further recommendations or surveys are required in relation to the species considered during this survey, i.e. bats.



Location of building immediate & surrounding landscape

APPENDIX I –
Site Photographs



West facing (front) elevation



Interior nature of the building