

CRABTREE LANE, MANCHESTER.

Nocturnal Bat Survey Report

September 2024



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Crabtree Lane, Manchester
 Project Reference: CW 20-2148
 Report Title: Nocturnal Bat Survey Report
 Report Reference: CW20-2148-RPT-002
 Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

<i>Rev</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Prepared</i>	<i>Reviewed</i>	<i>Approved</i>
/	27/09/2024	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	CO	JH	OC
/	10/12/2024	Final report sent to Client.	CO	JH	OC

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Keepmoat Limited and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Keepmoat Limited and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Keepmoat Limited and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION..... 5

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE 5

1.2. LOCATION 5

1.3. OBJECTIVES..... 6

2 METHODOLOGY 7

2.1. NOCTURNAL BAT SURVEY 7

2.2. SURVEY LIMITATIONS 7

3 SURVEY RESULTS..... 8

3.1. DUSK SURVEY (07/05/2024) 8

3.2. ASSESSMENT..... 8

4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION 9

4.1. IMPACT ASSESSMENT 9

4.2. MITIGATION..... 9

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY10

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE

- 1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Keep Moat to undertake a Nocturnal Bat Survey at the land at Crabtree Lane, M11 4GU, (NGR: SJ 88713 98009). This report has been prepared to inform an outline planning application for the construction of 70 residential dwellings and four apartment blocks, including access roads, private amenity gardens and Public Open Space.
- 1.1.2. The author of this report is Caitlin O'Connor, Consultant Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental. This report has been reviewed by Jon Hayter, Senior Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Jon is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning permission. Jon holds a Class 2 Natural England Bat Licence and is experienced assessing sites for bat roosting potential and undertaking bat emergence and re-entry surveys along with analysing video and sound data.
- 1.1.3. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was undertaken by Ascerta in June 2022 which found the buildings on site to provide low bat roosting potential. Bat emergence surveys were carried out by Ascerta in June 2022, which identified the buildings as not being used by roosting bats. This report details the results of the updated nocturnal bat survey conducted in August 2024.

1.2. LOCATION

- 1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location. The site is located approximately 4km east of Manchester City Centre, north of Openshaw, a suburb of Manchester.



Figure 1.1 Site Location

1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The objectives of the Nocturnal Bat Survey are as follows:

- Identify any bats roosting within the buildings.
- Assess the value of the buildings for roosting bats.
- Identify the species assemblage of bats using the site.
- Provide recommendations on any further surveys licensing and mitigation required for bats on site.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1. NOCTURNAL BAT SURVEY

2.1.1. One nocturnal bat survey was undertaken as a dusk survey on 21st August 2024 by five suitably experienced surveyors. The vantage points (VP) used during the survey and their respective field of view is detailed below in Figure 2.1.1.

2.1.2. Each VP was occupied by an Infrared Camera (IR) consisting of Nightfox Red and Nightfox Whisker IR cameras.



Figure 2.1.1 VPs used during the surveys

2.1.3. The survey was undertaken in line with guidance as set out in Collins (2023, as amended). Surveyors used Echo Meter Touch Bat detectors along with Anabat and Chorus static bat detectors. All surveyors were suitably experienced undertaking bat emergence surveys. Please refer to Table 2.1 below for details of surveyors.

2.1.4. The IR camera footage was reviewed by competent ecologists within 2 days of the survey using relevant media players.

Table 2.1.1 – Survey Details

Date	Sunset/ Sunrise Time	Start	Finish	Surveyors	Weather Conditions
21/09/2024	20:23	20:08	21:53	VP1- Iman Rafiq and camera. VP2- Chris A and camera. VP3- Eleanor Clark and camera. VP4-Rhiannon Hobbs and camera. VP5-Shona Bancroft and camera.	Temperature: 17°C Cloud cover: 8/8 (overcast) Wind: 2 (Beaufort scale) Precipitation: None

2.2. SURVEY LIMITATIONS

2.2.1. Dense vegetation was found to be present around certain aspects of all buildings, limiting the view of the IR

cameras. This constraint has been considered within the mitigation recommendations.

- 2.2.2. The IR camera on VP8 experienced a malfunction during the survey. The vantage point was covered by Shona Bancroft, an experienced surveyor. Shona had an unobstructed view of the potential roosting features during the survey; therefore, this is not considered a significant constraint to survey data.

3 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1. DUSK SURVEY (21/08/2024)

- 3.1.1. Bat activity was recorded periodically throughout the survey with only common and widespread species identified foraging and commuting within the wider area. The species recorded were common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), and noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*),
- 3.1.2. A peak count of two common pipistrelles were observed foraging between Buildings 1 and 3 at 20:43. Common pipistrelles were most frequently observed foraging with noctule identified to a significantly lesser extent.
- 3.1.3. A review of the IR camera footage did not identify any bats emerging and/or re-entering the buildings at any of the vantage points.
- 3.1.4. The Appendix attached provides images of the IR cameras at the darkest point of the survey.

3.2. ASSESSMENT

- 3.2.1. The survey found the site to support low numbers of foraging and commuting common pipistrelle and occasional noctule passes. The site was not found to support rare or geographically restricted species.
- 3.2.2. No bat roosts were identified in any of the buildings on site either by the IR cameras or the surveyors. However, some of the aspects of the buildings were not visible due to dense areas of vegetation. Due to very low bat activity levels recorded throughout the survey, the likelihood of the site offering roosting is very low. The site provides overall low foraging value, also.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION

4.1. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1.1. The proposed development works will include the full demolition of the buildings and construction of new buildings on the site. Considering all of the survey information it is deemed that the development carries a **very low** risk of injuring and/or killing bats or disturbing/destroying bat roosts.

4.2. MITIGATION

- 4.2.1. Due to vegetation growth partially obscuring some of the vantage points, it is feasible that bat roosts may exist within some aspects of the buildings although very unlikely, it is therefore recommended that the demolition work is done under Precautionary Working Methods (PWMs).
- 4.2.2. It is recommended that the following PWMs are to be undertaken under the supervision of a licenced bat ecologist to reduce the risk of killing or injuring any bats that may be affected during construction:
- All contractors working on the site will be briefed with a Toolbox Talk by the licenced ecologist, on the legal protection afforded to bats and their roosts, and on how to proceed if a bat is discovered during the work.
 - The licenced ecologist will undertake a daylight inspection to assess the status of the site for bats prior to works commencing on site. This will be conducted using an elevated platform, scaffolding, or ladders where necessary to inspect the wall for field signs of bats.
 - All potential roosting features identified within the initial Preliminary Roost Assessment (as part of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) completed by Ascerta (2022; Ref: P.1547.21) will be inspected with a torch and /or endoscope, if no evidence of bats is found, works may proceed unsupervised at the discretion of the appointed ecologist.
 - If any bats are discovered during the proposed works, all works will cease, and Natural England is to be contacted immediately and a licence to be obtained before any further work can continue.
 - Construction noise should be kept to a minimum, where feasible to minimise risk of noise disturbance.
 - Timings of the construction working hours should be constrained to between 08:00-18:00, where possible, so as not to disturb the bats emerging or returning to the roost during the dusk and dawn periods with temporary additional lighting.
- 4.2.3. If a bat is discovered at any unsupervised time, work must cease immediately, and a licenced bat handler must be called for advice. This advice will include leaving the bat to disperse of its own accord or wait for the licenced ecologist to move the bat. Builders and contractors are explicitly forbidden from handling bats except in the case of finding a trapped or injured bat. In which case the bat may be moved into a safe and secure place (e.g., a box) and the registered ecologist must be contacted immediately.
- 4.2.4. All bats have some degree of sensitivity to artificial night-time lighting. Introducing artificial lighting to areas that are not currently illuminated may sever important bat flight lines and discourage bats from using roost provisions. It is recommended that where external lighting is to be provided on the new buildings that this is designed and installed to comply with current legislation and to minimize the impact on any bats in the locale.
- 4.2.5. It is advised that a light mitigation plan is produced to assess the pre- and post-development changes in lighting and to advise on an appropriately sensitive lighting scheme as part of the development.
- 4.2.6. Due to the nature of the species recorded locally and the potential utilisation of the new building and wider habitat for foraging and commuting purposes it would be deemed beneficial as an enhancement of the site to include a number of crevice dwelling bat boxes at the design stage of the project.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bat Conservation Trust (2023). Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night: Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 4th edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005). Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.
- Mitchell-Jones (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines: Working Today for Natura Tomorrow. English Nature.
- Mitchell-Jones and McLeish (2004). Third Edition Bat Workers' Manual.
- 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. Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

6 APPENDIX

Table 6.1.1 Screenshots from the IR cameras at the darkest point during the survey.

VP 1	VP 2	VP 3
		
VP 4	VP 5	VP 6
		
VP 7	VP 8	VP 9



Covered by a surveyor.



VP 10

VP 11



