

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:

42 Ladybarn Road, Manchester, M14 6WW

Client:

Nicholas Humphreys

Survey date:

11th June 2024

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Manchester City Council. The proposal is described as:
Erection of side and rear extension to deliver no.8 flats and one commercial office space.

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

The site survey was undertaken by Gareth Hey BSc (Hons), MSc, ACIEEM (Natural England Protected Species Licence Numbers: [Bats] (2021-51195-CLS-CLS) [Great Crested Newts] (2017-30374-CLS-CLS))					
Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
11/06/2024	12	84	20	9	None
PRA Survey Factor		Detailed using desk study and site survey. Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.			
See PRA plan in Appendix 1, location plan in Appendix 2, proposed plans in Appendix 3 and photos in Appendix 4.					
Background and Site Location					
Summary of site and desk Study		<u>Site description</u> The site is centred on grid reference SJ 85671 93839 and has an area of 0.05ha. It is located in a highly urbanised environment, on Ladybarn Road in Fallowfield, Manchester. The site comprises a building, garage, and areas of hardstanding. The existing premises have previously been occupied by office accommodation at ground floor level with a residential dwelling at first floor level. The adjacent service yard was previously used as a storage area. To the author’s knowledge, no previous ecology reports have been produced for this site There are two ESPL listed on Magic Maps within 2km of site. The closest of these (2018-38076-EPS-MIT) is located ~1.8km south-west from site, allowing the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle.			

	<p>The site is not subject to any designation, and there are no known statutory sites nearby.</p> <p>The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 1km/2km of the site cannot be established without data from the local records centre. However, given the presence of significant urban development adjacent to the site, it is unlikely that such designations exist.</p>
Field survey results	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	<p>Foraging and commuting habitat</p> <p>There are no habitats at the site that could provide value for foraging and commuting bats, with it comprising entirely hardstanding. There are limited opportunities for foraging and commuting bats within the wider area, also, given that the site is located within a heavily urbanised environment. However, there are some linear features within close proximity to the site, that could possibly connect the site to areas of suitability within the wider landscape.</p> <p>Roosting habitat</p> <p>Buildings to be impacted by the proposed development are assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. No evidence of roosting bats was identified on or within B1 or B2.</p> <p><i>Building B1</i></p> <p>B1 is a two-storey, brick-built building. The main brickwork around the building appears in excellent condition with no gaps or cracks in which bats can roost. On the gable end on the southern elevation, two areas of missing mortar are present between the roof tile and brickwork, resulting in a gap of</p>

	<p>approximately 7cm, in both areas. These two features could provide suitable access for roosting bats to access.</p> <p>The roof structure of B1 comprises a cross-pitched, concrete tile roof. As with the brickwork, the tiles throughout the roof structure were in excellent condition, with no gaps or holes present that provide suitability for roosting bats.</p> <p>There are uPVC windows present throughout the building. These are all in excellent condition, with no gaps between the window frames and brickwork which bats could utilise for roosting.</p> <p>Around B1, there are timber soffts, fascias and bargeboards present throughout the building. These are all well sealed and have no gaps or holes present that provide suitable access for roosting bats.</p> <p>There are two separate loft spaces within the interior of B1. However, they are identical in their composition.</p> <p><i>Loft Spaces B1</i></p> <p>The roof structure comprises a timber frame. There are no suitable crevices present in the network of timber frames that provides suitability for roosting bats. Within the loft spaces, there was a significant number of cobwebs present throughout, which may suggest a lack of recent bat roosting activity.</p>
--	--

	<p>No roofing membrane was present within the loft space of B1, with the slate tiles positioned directly on the roof and sealed with mortar in places. No light was observed to be directly entering the loft space of B1.</p> <p>No bats or evidence of bat occupation (e.g. droppings, oil staining, etc.) was identified on or within any of the roof spaces of B1.</p> <p><i>B1 Suitability Assessment</i></p> <p>Given the presence of missing mortar on the southern gable end of B1, that provides suitable access for roosting bats, B1 is determined to be of low suitability for roosting bats.</p> <p><i>Building B2</i></p> <p>B2 comprises a single storey, brick-built structure with a flat roof, lined with bitumen felt. The building was previously utilised as a garage. There are timber fascias present around the structure, that are in close contact with the brickwork throughout, with no gaps or holes present for crevice dwelling bat species. On the southern elevation, the bottom of the fascia is slightly away from the wall, however, there is no gap present behind it which bats could utilise for roosting. The metal roller shutters present on the western and northern elevation are well sealed within their frame, with no gaps where bats could access the internal areas.</p> <p>No internal assessment was undertaken on B2, however, given the absence of roosting features identified on the building, this was not found to alter the conclusion of the report.</p>
--	--

	<p><i>B2 Suitability Assessment</i></p> <p>Given the absence of suitable roosting features, B2 was determined to be of negligible value for roosting bats.</p>
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	<p>The proposed development will result in renovations to B1. This could result in the destruction of any bat roosts present and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats.</p> <p>Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within B2 and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development.</p>
<i>Recommendations</i>	<p>One bat emergence survey is required on B1 during the active bat season (May – September) to confirm presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building.</p> <p>This survey visit should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August inclusive.</p> <p>Sub-optimal: early May and September. Would require greater justification of timing e.g., weather conditions, known local bat activity.</p> <p>The survey should be undertaken at dusk, and supported by night vision aids (NVA).</p> <p>Three surveyors are required to provide full coverage of the building's elevations to look for emerging bats. An infrared camera should also be employed as part of the survey to see where any specific roost locations are located.</p>

	<p>Lighting mitigation may be required based on the outcome of the night bat survey(s).</p> <p>If any bat roosts are confirmed from this survey schedule, a bat licence would be required for works to proceed at the site, as it would involve the destruction, modification or disturbance of roosts. This is applied for with the help of a class 2 licensed bat ecologist after planning permission is granted, but before commencement of works.</p> <p>Enhancements are dependent on the outcome of further surveys.</p>
Nesting Birds	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within both buildings at the site, as they are deemed to provide negligible habitat value for nesting birds due to a lack of suitable nesting sites or access points.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts are anticipated on nesting birds as a result of the proposed development.
<i>Recommendations</i>	<p>None required.</p> <p><i>Suggested biodiversity enhancements</i></p> <p><i>The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on mature trees around the site boundaries or on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g.</i></p> <p><i>Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings)</i></p> <p><i>Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings)</i></p> <p><i>Schwegler 1B Nest Boxes (trees)</i></p> <p><i>Schwegler 2H Robin Boxes (trees)</i></p>

	<p><i>Woodstone Nest Box (buildings or trees)</i></p> <p><i>Or a similar alternative brand.</i></p> <p><i>Tree boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight. Small-hole boxes are best placed approximately 1-3m above ground on an area of the tree trunk where foliage will not obscure the entrance hole.</i></p> <p><i>Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.</i></p>
--	---

Appendix 1: PRA plan



Appendix 2: Location map



Appendix 3: Proposed plan



Appendix 4: Photos



Photo 1: Northern elevation of B1



Photo 2: Eastern elevation of B1.



Photo 3: Southern elevation of B1.



Photo 4: Close up of missing mortar present on southern elevation of B1.



Photo 5: Western elevation of B1.



Photo 6: Loft space of B1.



Photo 7: Southern and western elevation of B2.



Photo 8: Northern and western elevation of B2.

Limitations and CopyrightLegal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that 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 Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

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

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Gareth Hey BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM	12/06/2024
Final	1.0	Craig Williams BSc (Hons), MSc, DIC – Principal Ecologist	20/06/2024