



Preliminary Roost Assessment and Ecological Walkover

Cheetham Hill Road, Manchester

Reference: 81-135-R1-1

Date: July 2023



PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT AND ECOLOGICAL WALKOVER

Cheetham Hill Road
Manchester

Prepared for:
ZX Cheetham Hill Development Ltd

Report Ref: 81-135-R1-1
Date Issued: 27/07/2023

E3P

Taylor Road
Trafford Park
Urmston
Manchester
M41 7JQ

+ 44 (0) 161 707 9612
<https://e3p.co.uk/>

Registered in England
CRN: 08725262

QUALITY ASSURANCE

PROJECT NUMBER	81-135		
VERSION	Version 1		
REMARKS	Final		
DATE	July 2023		
PREPARED BY	C. Evans		
QUALIFICATIONS	BSc (Hons), MRes, QCIEEM, Graduate Ecologist		
CHECKED BY	H. Morgan		
QUALIFICATIONS	BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, MCIEEM, Senior Ecologist		
AUTHORISED BY	C. Barlow		
QUALIFICATIONS	BSc (Hons), MSc, MEnvSc, CEnv, MCIEEM, Associate Director		



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site Address	33 - 41 Cheetham Hill Road, Cheetham, Manchester M4 4FT
Coordinates	E 384076, N 399407
Site Area	Approximately 0.1 ha
Current Site Use	The site comprised a disused building and associated flat roof extension, surrounded by an area of hardstanding.
Proposed Development	The proposed scheme includes the development of an apartment complex with associated car parking. The building on-site will require demolition in order for the development to proceed.
Results	The on-site building was assessed as having Moderate bat roost potential due to multiple entry-points on the south facing aspect that have suitability to support roosting bats on a regular basis. The brash piles on-site were assessed as having nesting bird potential.
Conclusions and Recommendations	Two Nocturnal Bat Surveys are required on the on-site building between May and September, with at least one of the surveys taking place between May and August. It is recommended that works or the removal of vegetation take place outside of the breeding bird season (March to September inclusive). If this is not possible, a nesting bird check should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist up to 24 hrs before works commence. If a nest, or nest in construction, is located, then a stand-off distance should be maintained until the young have fledged.



Table of Contents

1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Background	5
1.2. Proposed Development.....	5
1.3. Site Location	5
1.4. Objectives	6
2. METHODOLOGY	7
2.1. Desk Study	7
2.2. Preliminary Roost Assessment	7
2.3. Ecological Walkover	8
2.4. Limitations	8
3. RESULTS	9
3.1. Local Bat Group Records	9
3.2. MAGIC Review	9
3.3. Site Context.....	9
3.4. Preliminary Roost Assessment	9
3.5. Ecological Walkover	13
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
4.1. Bats	15
4.2. Nesting Birds	15
4.3. Biodiversity Net Gain	15
5. REFERENCES	16



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

E3P has been instructed by ZX Cheetham Hill Development Ltd to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment at Cheetham Hill Road, hereafter referred to as “the site”. An Ecological Walkover was also undertaken to assess the site for any additional protected species constraints.

The report was produced by Conor Evans BSc (Hons) MRes QCIEEM Graduate Ecologist, who has experience in completing PRAs and nocturnal bat surveys at many sites across the UK.

1.2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Detailed proposals include the development of an apartment complex with associated car parking. The building on-site will be demolished in order for the development to proceed.

1.3. SITE LOCATION

The site is located within north Manchester, in the urban area of Cheetham Hill. A series of commercial units are situated to the south and the west of the site. Carnarvon Street defines the site boundary to the north. Cheetham Hill Road defines the east boundary of the site. St Michael's Flags and Angel Meadow Park is located approximately 380 m south east of the site, with the River Irwell located approximately 520 m south west Please refer to Figure 1.1. for the approximate site location.

FIGURE 1.1 APPROXIMATE SITE LOCATION



1.4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Preliminary Roost Assessment are as follows:

-  Determine if bats currently, or could potentially, utilise the building for roosting.
-  Determine whether further surveys (e.g. nocturnal bat surveys) and/or further mitigation is necessary for development to proceed.

The objectives of the Ecological Walkover are as follows:

-  Identify the major habitats present.
-  Ascertain the presence or potential presence of any legally protected species and habitats.
-  Recommend any further surveys or mitigation that may be required.

The survey findings are detailed in this report, as well as any recommendations.



2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. DESK STUDY

The following sources of information and ecological records were consulted:

- ✳ MAGIC – A government web-based interactive mapping system, demonstrating European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) and Natural England Licences which have been previously granted within England.
- ✳ Information and species records from South Lancashire Bat Group.

A search via MAGIC was undertaken in July 2023 to identify EPSL within 1 km of the site boundary. This search area is considered suitable for the size of the development and the surrounding habitat.

2.2. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT

The Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was undertaken on the 26th June 2023 by Conor Evans who has undertaken multiple PRA's on buildings and trees across the UK. The weather was dry and overcast.

The survey involved undertaking a systematic search of the trees and buildings, searching for signs of bats, or spaces where bats would be able to access. The methodology followed that described in *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists, 3rd Edition* (Collins, 2016).

The trees and buildings were categorised for their bat roosting potential as described in Table 2.1 in accordance with Collins (2016).

TABLE 2.1 BAT ROOSTING POTENTIAL CLASSIFICATION OF BUILDINGS

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION
NEGLIGIBLE	A building with no roosting features present or of an age/species that would not support roosting bats.
LOW	A building with one or more potential roost site. However, the potential roost sites do not provide suitability for large numbers of bats (i.e. for maternity or hibernation) and would only be used on an occasional basis.
MODERATE	A building with one or more potential roosting feature which could support bats but is of a suitability meaning that it would be unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status.
HIGH	A building with several potential roosting features which would be able to support large number of bats on a regular basis and for longer periods of time. The building would have suitability to support maternity or hibernation roosts.

The survey was undertaken utilising suitable binoculars and ladders to access all areas where safe to do so.



2.3. ECOLOGICAL WALKOVER

A site walkover was undertaken by Conor Evans on 26th June 2023 to assess the site for any protected or notable species.

The walkover survey was undertaken to the standard methodology as detailed by the JNCC Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey (2010). The assessment follows the methodology as per "Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal" (CIEEM, 2017).

Searches were made for uncommon, rare and statutorily protected plant species, those species listed as protected in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and species which are indicators of important and uncommon plant communities. All plant nomenclature follows Stace (2019).

Searches were carried out for the presence of invasive species, including those listed on the revised (April 2010) Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) including but not limited to Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*), Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) and giant hogweed (*Heracleum mantegazzianum*).

2.4. LIMITATIONS

Access to all areas within 30 m of the site was not possible due to commercial units bordering the site, however, due to the urban nature of the site, this is not considered to be a major constraint.

Internal access into the building was not possible. This is not considered to be a major constraint as if any further bat surveys are required, they will identify whether bats are roosting within the building.



3. RESULTS

3.1. LOCAL BAT GROUP RECORDS

Based on information from South Lancashire Bat Group, species present within the local area include; Brandt's bat (*Myotis brandtii*) brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*), common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*), soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), Nathusius' pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus nathusii*), Natterer's bat (*Myotis nattereri*), noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*), and whiskered bat (*Myotis mystacinus*).

3.2. MAGIC REVIEW

A MAGIC review identified three European Protected Species Licences were located within the 1 km search area. The closest licence was located approximately 610 m south-east of the site boundary. The licence was active from 2015 to 2020 for the destruction of a common pipistrelle non-breeding roost.

3.3. SITE CONTEXT

The site comprised a disused building and associated flat roof extension, surrounded by an area of hardstanding. The site is situated within a predominately commercial area, with a series of residential apartments located to the east of the site. These areas are anticipated to offer little value to local wildlife. A large area of woodland is located approximately 310 m north-east of the site boundary. A railway line is located approximately 210 m south-east of the site boundary. The River Irwell is located approximately 515 m south-west of the site. These areas are anticipated to provide foraging opportunities for local bat species.

3.4. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT

A PRA was undertaken on the building on-site. No other buildings or trees were present within the site boundary.

The building comprised brick walls with a flat roof. The brickwork of the building was mostly in good condition and well-sealed, with no gaps observed that could be used by crevice dwelling bat species. However, there was access into the building where the fascia had been damaged on the south-west facing aspect, which provided suitability for roosting bats. Due to the flat roof, the building has the potential to support nesting birds.



PLATE 1 SHOWING MAIN ENTRANCE ON SOUTH-WEST FACING ASPECT



PLATE 2 SHOWING CLOSE UP OF ENTRY-WAYS INTO MAIN BUILDING



A flat roofed extension constructed from metal was present on the south-west facing aspect. The extension is unlikely to possess any potential to support roosting bats due to a lack of suitable features. Due to the flat roof, the extension has the potential to support nesting birds.



PLATE 3 SHOWING FLAT ROOFED EXTENSION



A weep hole and numerous holes were present on the north-east facing aspect of the building. These feature may support crevice-dwelling bat species on an occasional basis.

PLATE 4 SHOWING WEEP HOLE ON NORTH-EAST FACING ASPECT



PLATE 5 SHOWING DAMAGED BRICKWORK



An entry way into the building was present underneath the fascia on the north-west facing aspect of the building. This feature may support roosting bats on a regular basis, and provide bats with access to the building.

PLATE 6 SHOWING GAP UNDER FASCIA



Internal access could not be gained into the building during the survey. The building was assessed as having **MODERATE** bat roosting potential due to the missing fascia on the south-west facing aspect and the damaged brickwork on the north-east facing aspect. Both of these features lead into the building, and thus have the potential to support roosting bats on a regular basis.



3.5. ECOLOGICAL WALKOVER

The habitats on-site comprised hardstanding and brash piles. The habitats are described below.

The hardstanding had been left unmanaged and colonised by flora comprising butterfly-bush (*Buddleja davidii*), smooth hawk's beard (*Crepis capillaris*), Canadian fleabane (*Erigeron canadensis*), narrow-leaved ragwort (*Senecio inaequidens*), and wall barley (*Hordeum murinum*).

PLATE 7 SHOWING HARDSTANDING



Brash piles were present throughout the site. The species could not be identified. The brash piles have potential to support nesting birds. Due to the urban nature of the site, the brash piles are unlikely to support a population of amphibians.



PLATE 8 SHOWING BRASH PILE



4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. BATS

The main building was assessed as having **MODERATE** bat roosting potential. As such, two Nocturnal Bat Surveys are required on the building between May and September, with at least one of the surveys between May and August. If bats are identified roosting within the building, a third survey to characterise the roost, and a European Protected Species Licence will be required and would require up to date surveys from the survey season prior to the application submission.

4.2. NESTING BIRDS

It is recommended that any demolition works or the removal of vegetation/brash piles take place outside of the breeding bird season (March–September inclusive). However, if this is not possible, then a suitably qualified ecologist should inspect the area no more than 24 hours prior to the removal. Should any nests, or nests in construction be located, a suitable stand-off distance should be maintained until the young have fledged. The ecologist will advise on suitable stand off and provide a toolbox talk to all site contractors regarding their working limits and legal implications.

4.3. BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

The proposed development will be exempt from a Biodiversity Metric calculation in line with the Environment Act (2021) due to the habitats on site being below the threshold of 25 m² of habitat, or 5 linear meters of water courses or hedgerows.

To further increase the site's value for wildlife, bat and bird boxes could be integrated into the proposed development.



5. REFERENCES

- ✦ Bat Conservation Trust (2014). Artificial Lighting and Wildlife Interim Guidance: Recommendations to Help Minimise the Impact of Artificial Lighting.
- ✦ Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK: Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- ✦ Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.
- ✦ CIEEM (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine.
- ✦ Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- ✦ Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005). Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.
- ✦ JNCC (2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: A technique for environmental audit. English Field Unit, Nature Conservancy Council.
- ✦ JNCC (2004). The Bat Workers Manual. 3rd Edition.
- ✦ Mitchell–Jones (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature.
- ✦ Stace, C. A. (2019). New Flora of the British Isles. Fourth Edition. Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ Wildlife and Countryside Act (2010) Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

END OF REPORT

