

The Jolly Miller,
Harpurhey
Daytime Bat Survey
2024



RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY

Client [Manchester City Council](#)
Project Title [The Jolly Miller, Harpurhey](#)
Project Reference [RHE.4269](#)
Project Leader [Simon Holden](#)
Contact Details simon@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Simon Holden	Associate Ecologist	13/06/2024
Reviewer			
Revision			



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

The Stables, Paradise Wharf, Ducie Street, Manchester, M1 2JN

0161 465 8971

www.rachelhackingecology.co.uk

mail@rachelhackingecology.co.uk



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

Report Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methods	6
3. Results	7
4. Assessment	11
5. Recommendations	12
Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation	13



Executive Summary

Development Details

The client is proposing demolition of The Jolly Miller, Fernclough Road, Harpurhey, hereafter referred to as the 'site'.

This report describes the potential for the site to support roosting bats and assesses the potential impacts of the development on bats and their roosts. Recommendations are provided so that the development is compliant with biodiversity policy and legislation.

Ecological Interest

The site has low potential to support roosting bats. No evidence of use by bats was recorded but there are several features that could be used by roosting bats.

Outcomes

A single dusk emergence survey is required to establish the status of roosting bats and inform mitigation requirements.



1. Introduction

1.1 Project Brief

- 1.1.1 Rachel Hacking Ecology Limited was commissioned in 2024 by Manchester City Council to undertake a Daytime Bat Survey at The Jolly Miller, Fernclough Road, Harpurhey, hereafter referred to as the 'site'. The site is located at O.S. grid reference: SD858015 (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. Map showing the location of the site (after Bing Maps)

Description of Development

- 1.1.2 The site will be the subject of a planning application for the demolition of the building.

Relevant Planning History

- 1.1.3 No previous surveys have been undertaken.

1.2 Scope of Work

- 1.2.1 The Client commissioned Rachel Hacking Ecology to undertake an external and internal assessment of the building affected by the development proposals.

1.3 Aims of the Survey

- 1.3.1 The aims of the survey were to:
- Assess the potential of the site to support roosting bats;
 - Identify the requirement for any further detailed surveys.



2. Methods

2.1 Daytime Bat Survey

- 2.1.1 The exterior of the site was surveyed from the ground using binoculars and a high-powered torch. Features offering potential access to roosting bats were recorded. Such features may include suitable gaps in roof coverings, gaps behind external cladding/facia and gaps in masonry.
- 2.1.2 Evidence indicating the presence of roosting bats was also searched for. This may include bat droppings on walls, windows or on the ground below roost entrances or staining from fur oil around roost entry points.
- 2.1.3 The interior of the building, including the roof void, was surveyed to identify any evidence indicating use by roosting bats. Such evidence may include bat droppings, feeding remains, urine splashes, live or dead bats and staining from fur oil on timbers.

2.2 Assessment Criteria

- 2.2.1 Interpretation of survey findings and assessment of roosting potential was undertaken using professional judgement and criteria described in published guidance^{1,2}.

2.3 Site Visit Information

Survey Details

- 2.3.1 The survey was undertaken by Simon Holden MCIEEM on 13th June 2024. Simon has 19 years' professional experience of undertaking similar surveys and holds a level 2 class bat survey licence (2019-42937-CLS-CLS).

Site Conditions

- 2.3.2 The weather at the time of the survey was dry and overcast, with an average temperature of 13°C. The site conditions were appropriate for a full assessment to be undertaken.

¹ Collins, J. (Ed.) (2023) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists-good practice guidelines*. 4th edn. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

² 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.

3. Results

3.1 Survey Constraints

3.1.1 The site was fully accessible and no constraints affected the survey.

3.2 Habitat Appraisal

3.2.1 The site is a pub located within an urban environment. Woodland and running water are present approximately 300m to the west, offering good bat foraging habitat.

3.3 External Survey

3.3.1 The site is a detached part one-, part two-storey former pub. The walls are brick and the main roof is pitched and covered with concrete tiles. The single-storey sections have a flat roof.



Photograph 1 showing the site from the northeast corner

3.3.2 The main roof is largely intact but small gaps are present along the verges at both gable ends (see Photograph 2).



Photograph 2 showing a gap on the verge at the southeast gable

- 3.3.3 A further gap is present along the edge of the main roof where underclanking is visible (see Photograph 3).



Photograph 3 showing a gap at the northeast edge of the main roof

- 3.3.4 The wooden soffits are intact and no gaps were recorded behind them.
- 3.3.5 The windows are all fitted with grilles.
- 3.3.6 The flat roof appears intact and no suitable gaps were recorded around the edges. PVC cladding is present around the edges of some of the single-storey sections; there are gaps behind this where cladding is missing (see Photograph 1).

3.1 Internal Survey

- 3.1.1 Internally, the site is dark and has been vandalised. The roof is lined with Type 1F underfelt and fibreglass insulation is present on the floor. The roof is trussed (see Photograph 4).



Photograph 4 showing the northwest gable wall

- 3.1.2 Occasional gaps are present between breezeblocks (see Photograph 5).



Photograph 5 showing the southeast gable wall

3.1.3 No evidence of use by bats was recorded.



4. Assessment

4.1 Interpretation of Results

- 4.1.1 The gaps in the main roof covering offer potential access to bats. The presence of a lining offers a potential roost area for crevice-dwelling bats.
- 4.1.2 No evidence of use by bats was present but given the features present the site is assessed as offering low potential to support roosting bats.
- 4.1.3 It is very unlikely that the site supports a significant bat roost (a maternity roost) as evidence would have been present at this time of year. However, the presence of a day roost used by individual or small numbers of Common Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* cannot be discounted.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Further Surveys

- 5.1.1 Further survey is required to determine the status of roosting bats at the site and inform mitigation requirements.
- 5.1.2 A single dusk emergence survey should be undertaken between May and September, in accordance with current guidelines. Three surveyors would be required to provide visual coverage of the the potential roosting features.

General Precautions

- 5.1.3 This report is considered to be valid for two years. After this, a suitably qualified ecologist should be consulted to assess its validity. An assessment update may be required.



Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) describes the Government's planning policy for England and how it should be applied. Within this framework, the requirements in relation to biodiversity are included within several policies. The two most relevant to individual planning decisions are Paragraphs 180 and 180, shown below:

- 180. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
 - a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
 - b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
 - c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
 - d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
 - e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
 - f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.
- 186. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
 - a) 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;
 - b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments),



should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;

- c) 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; and
- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Legislation

All bat species are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 (Amendment) (EU Exit), which make it an offence to:

- Deliberately kill, injure or capture a bat;
- Deliberately disturb bats;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat.

The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) contains further provisions making it an offence to intentionally or recklessly:

- Obstruct access to any structure or place which any bat uses for shelter or protection; or
- Disturb any bat while occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose.

Proposed development works that are likely to disturb or destroy bats or their roosts will need to obtain a licence from the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (e.g., Natural England) prior to work commencing.

