Bridgestone Construction Ltd

Didsbury Point, Manchester

Preliminary Roost Assessment Report

EPS GENERAL NOTES

Project No.: N/A

Title: Didsbury Point – Preliminary Roost Assessment Report

Client: Bridgestone Construction

Date: 22/05/2024

Office: Blackett Street, Manchester, M12 6AE

Status: Version 1

Author	Nick Carter	**Technical reviewer**	Dr Rob Coles
Signature		Signature	
Date:	22/05/2024	Date:	22/05/2024
Project manager	Nick Carter	**Quality reviewer**	Lucy Brocklehurst
Signature		Signature	
Date:	22/05/2024	Date:	22/05/2024

Eps Ltd (Eps) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and Eps. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by Eps for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of Eps and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of Eps Ltd.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary **3**

1. Introduction/Background **4**

1.1 Principal Author 4

1.2 Purpose and Brief 4

1.3 Description of Site and Local Area 4

1.4 The Proposed Development 4

2. Relevant Legislation and Planning Policy **5**

2.1 Relevant Legislation 5

2.2 Relevant Planning Policy 6

3. Methods & Methodology **7**

3.1 Desk Study 7

3.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) 7

3.3 Limitations 7

4. Survey Results and Recommendations **8**

4.1 Baseline and Assessment of Impacts & Effects - Desk Study 8

4.2 Assessment of Impacts & Effects - Roosting Bats 8

5. Recommendations **11**

5.1 Bats 11

References **12**

Appendix 1 – Site Location Plan **13**

Appendix 2 – Site Photographs **14**

Executive Summary

Table 1 below provides a summary of the findings of the preliminary roost assessment for The Building at the Site.

Table 1. Summary of findings for the Building

The Building	
Was evidence of roosting bats found during the internal or external assessment of The Building? **If so, what evidence?**	No evidence of bats was recorded during the internal and external building inspections.
What level of suitability for roosting bats has been assigned to The Building?	Based on the building inspection findings the property was assessed as displaying negligible Bat Roost Potential (BRP). All survey work was undertaken in accordance with best practice guidelines (Collins, 2023).
What (if any) further surveys have been recommended to inform the planning application for The Building?	No further surveys are required so long as the work is undertaken within 12 months of the survey.
When must these surveys be undertaken?	N/A

1. Introduction/Background

1.1 Principal Author

1.1.1 The Principal Author of this report is Nick Carter BSc (Hons). Nick holds a Level 2 bat licence (2018-33650-CLS-CLS.) and is a Full Member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management ('CIEEM') and is therefore subject to CIEEM's Code of Professional Conduct.

1.1.2 The detail provided within this report is a true and accurate reflection of both the Site conditions at the time the survey was completed, as well as the professional opinion of the Principal Author.

1.2 Purpose and Brief

1.2.1 The brief was to complete a Preliminary Roost Assessment 'PRA' at The Avenue, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 2ET (known henceforth as 'the Site') to identify the suitability of The Building for and any evidence of roosting bats and to provide advice in relation to a planning application for the Proposed Development as detailed above.

1.3 Description of Site and Local Area

1.3.1 The Site is comprised of an area of waste ground within a suburban area of south Manchester. The Building is a single-story block-built building for switch housing, with a flat bituminous felt covered timber roof. The Building is located in Didsbury at Grid Reference: SJ 83533 92594.

1.3.2 The site is located in the suburb of Didsbury, with The Avenue to the west, The Boulevard to the north and a mixture of residential and commercial properties to the wider area.

1.4 The Proposed Development

1.4.1 The Proposed Development involves the demolition of the single-story building and the construction of 76 one and two bedroom apartments and a medical centre.

1.4.2 The proposals detailed above will be referred to throughout this report as the 'Proposed Development'.

2. Relevant Legislation and Planning Policy

2.1 Relevant Legislation

Bats

2.1.1 Bats are European Protected Species (EPS) and are protected under both European and UK legislation comprising The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HMSO, 1981) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2017 (as amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (HMSO, 2017) (HMSO, 2019). Offences under the legislation which are potentially relevant to this development include:

- The deliberate capture, injury or killing of a bat;
- The deliberate disturbance of a bat, particularly disturbance which is likely to; impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young, to hibernate or migrate, or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species; and
- The damage/destruction of, or obstruction of access to a breeding site or resting place (even if unoccupied) – referred to within this report as a '*roost*'.

2.1.2 Several species of bats are also listed as Species of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (HMSO, 2006). This legislation requires planning authorities to consider biodiversity when undertaking their duties.

2.1.3 Full legislative text should be referred to as above text is a summary only. Please refer to the online legislation for the most recent legislative updates.

2.1.4 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 provides safeguards for European Protected Sites and Species (as listed in the Habitats Directive). This has recently been amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 which continue the same provision for European protected species, licensing requirements, and protected areas now that the UK has left the European Union.

2.2 Relevant Planning Policy

2.2.1 Planning policies which are relevant to the proposed development are summarised below in Table 2.

Table 2. Planning Policy Relevant to the Proposed Development

Planning Policy	Relevance to the Proposed Development
National Planning Policy Framework (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2021)	National Planning Policy Framework section 174 states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural end local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressure. Section 179 of the NPPF states that to protect and enhance biodiversity, plans should identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. Plans should also promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. Section 180a and 180c (respectively) of the NPPF state: *"if significant harm to biodiversity 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".* *"Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists."*

*Full policy text should be referred to as table text is a summary only

3. Methods & Methodology

3.1 Desk Study

3.1.1 Natural England's Multi Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website (www.magic.gov.uk) was consulted for information on statutory designated sites for bats and EPS licences pertaining to bats within 1 km of the site in May 2024.

Information obtained from MAGIC is included in the report as appropriate.

3.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)

3.2.3

3.2.1 The PRA was carried out on 21st May 2024 by the Nick Carter, and the survey followed Collins, J, (ed) 2023, Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition).

3.2.2 Nick Carter is an experienced bat surveyor with over 10 years of experience in ecology consultancy and holds a level 2 bat licence.

The building was assessed externally to check for evidence of roosting bats (i.e. staining at entry points, droppings etc.) and for areas of the building that may be used as entry points to a roosting feature (i.e. gaps in soffit boarding), or indeed as roosting features in their own right (i.e. missing mortar in brickwork).

3.2.4 All external areas of the building were accessible to survey.

3.2.5 The internal assessment involved a rigorous search of the inside of the building for evidence of roosting bats as well as an assessment of suitable roosting features and the internal abiotic factors (i.e. light levels, temperature etc.) to determine its suitability to support roosting bats.

3.2.6 The assessment of the suitability of the building to support roosting bats is based on Table 4.1 of the Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, 2023).

3.3 Limitations

3.3.1 This report is based solely on the Site conditions on 21st May 2024 and provides a 'snapshot' of Site conditions at that time only.

3.3.2 Full access was possible both internally and externally. Survey work undertaken is considered in-line with that recommended within the Bat Survey Guidelines (Collins, 2023). As such, we consider that a robust assessment of the bat roost potential for the site has been made.

4. Survey Results and Recommendations

4.1 Baseline and Assessment of Impacts & Effects - Desk Study

4.1.1 There are no statutory or non-statutory sites designated for bats within 1km of the Site.

4.1.2 MAGIC returned four EPS licenses pertaining to bats within 1 km of the Site. These are summarised below in Table 3.

Table 3. EPS licences

Bat licence dates	Licensable Activity	Distance/Direction from Site
2015-13055-EPS-MIT	Destruction of a Common Pipistrelle	0.4 km southeast
2018-38076-EPS-MIT	Destruction of a Common Pipistrelle	0.8 km east
EPSF2011-2990	Destruction of a Common Pipistrelle & Soprano Pipistrelle bat	0.9 km south
2015-18385-EPS-BDX	Destruction of a Soprano Pipistrelle bat	1 km southeast

4.2 Assessment of Impacts & Effects - Roosting Bats

4.2.1 The Building is comprised of a single-story block-built building with a flat bituminous felt covered timber roof.

4.2.3 Table 4 below, describes The Building at the Site in relation to its suitability to support roosting bats. The table should be read in conjunction with the photos that are included in Appendix 2.

Table 4. Detail of Bat Roost Potential for The Building

External Assessment		
Feature	**Present During Inspection?**	**Notes**
Lifted/warped/missing tiles	No	N/A
Missing mortar (at roof level)	No	N/A
Missing mortar (in brickwork)	No	N/A
Lifted lead flashing	No	N/A
Gaps around lintels (windows and doors)	No	N/A
Gaps in hanging tiles/cladding	No	N/A
Gaps at soffits/eaves/bargeboard	No	N/A.
Other	No	N/A
Internal Assessment		
Feature	**Present During Inspection?**	**Notes**
Light ingress to roof void?	No	N/A
Roof lining	No	N/A
Roof timbers	Yes	Exposed
Small/medium/large void	Small	N/A
Cobwebbing	Yes	Extensive and undisturbed
Temperature (°C)	Ambient	N/A
Flight space	Low	No evidence of roosting bats
Evidence of bats found?		No
Suitability of The Building		Negligible

4.2.4 No evidence of current or historic use of the buildings by roosting bats was recorded during the building inspection. Consequently, no further bat surveys are recommended providing works on the building commence within 12 months.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Bats

5.1.2 Whilst no roosts were recorded in the building, it should be appreciated that almost any structure may be used by individual bats, in a transient manner, from time to time. Bats require very limited cavity space and only very small roost entry gaps and can be found not only in roof voids, but also under roof-tiles, within wall cavities or within any structure that provides close shelter. Should bats be discovered on site at any time, works should be halted in the immediate area and an appropriately trained, qualified and licensed bat ecologist should be consulted.

References

Collins, J, (ed) 2023, Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition).

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2021. National Planning Policy Framework, London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

HMSO, 1981. The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

HMSO, 2006. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

HMSO, 2017. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

HMSO, 2019. The Conservation of Habitats and Species (amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

Appendix 1 – Site Location Plan

Appendix 2 - Site Images

1. Block built building in urban location

2. Simple Internal roof structure.