URBAN GREEN

FAO Joe Johnson

Chancerygate,

601 Birchwood One, Dewhurst Road,

Warrington,

WA3 7GB

Date 3rd November 2023

Project Ref UG2066

Dear Joe,

Re: Former Walkers Site, Crabtree Lane – Preliminary Roost Assessment

A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the buildings at the Former Walkers Site, Crabtree Lane was completed on the 28th of July 2023 by Jake Healy MSc, QCIEEM, Ecologist at Urban Green, alongside a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Urban Green, 2023). The weather conditions were 20°c, cloudy (4/8 oktas), wind speed 1 Beaufort scale.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was carried out on the site buildings and trees using close-focussing binoculars.

The PRA methodology is based on information contained within the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidelines, 3rd edition (Collins, 2023). The categorisation within this report is based on that set out in Table 1, which is used as a basis for determining the requirement for further surveys.

Table 1 - Suitability of Buildings and Trees for Roosting Bats (adapted from Collins, 2023)

Category of Suitability	Typical Characteristics	Further Survey Requirements
High Roost Suitability	A structure/tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat.	Three separate survey visits. At least one dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. Surveys can be undertaken between May and September, with at least two surveys between May and August.
Moderate Roost Suitability	A structure/tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but are unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status.	Two separate survey visits. One dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. Surveys can be undertaken between May and September with at least one survey between May and August.

Ground Floor, The Tower
Deva City Office Park, Trinity Way
Manchester, M3 7BF

Company No. 07176374
VAT No. 157718676
Urban Green Space Ltd is registered in England and Wales.

Category of Suitability	Typical Characteristics	Further Survey Requirements
Low Roost Suitability	A structure/tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate condition and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis by larger numbers of bats.	Structures: one emergence/re-entry survey between May and August. Trees: No further survey required but precautionary methods of felling recommended.
Negligible Suitability	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.	No further work required.

Results

A total of six buildings were present on site and assessed for bat roosting potential.

Building 1

Building 1 comprised a steel storage shed constructed of single layer corrugated metal sheeting. Internally the building was a large, sheltered space open to the environment through a permanently open door. Evidence of arson was present inside with remnants of fire and burnt boxes present.

There were no suitable roosting features present within the structure and was as such assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Building 2

Building 2 was a small single storey brick building comprising a single room with a flat roof. Multiple defects were present within the brickwork however, there was no cavity wall present and no other suitable features that could support a bat roost.

Building 2 was assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Building 3

Building 3 was a modern warehouse unit comprised of breezeblock and metal sheeting. The building had a pitched roof also constructed of metal panelling. Internally the building was an abandoned warehouse with well-sealed breezeblock walls and metal cladding. Sky lights in the roof provided lots of natural light within the room. There was internal connectivity to B4. The structure was well sealed with no obvious access points or defects. No suitable roosting features were identified.

Building 3 was assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Building 4

Building 4 was a large brick warehouse unit with a pitched felt roof. The brick work was predominantly in good condition, with only minor defects present in the gable ends.

Internally the building comprised an abandoned warehouse unit with connectivity between B3 and B5. The external features identified were visible internally providing potential access into the building, however, there were no cavity walls present that could provide roosting features and the internal rooms were open with no loft void or wooden beams.

As such, building 4 was assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Building 5

Building 5 comprised the largest warehouse unit on-site. Constructed of brick with a flat and domed felt roof. The majority of the brick work was in good condition with only minor defects on the eastern façade.

Internally the building comprised an abandoned warehouse floor and offices. The roof had collapsed in within one area that provides access into the building however the internal structures were well sealed and with parts of the roof showing evidence of water damage. The external features identified were located internally and seen to provide potential access into the building, although there were no suitable roosting features present.

Building 5 was assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Building 6

Building 6 was a small single storey brick, building with a flat roof. The building appeared to be well sealed with no suitable roosting features present.

Building 6 assessed as providing negligible roosting potential.

Summary

In summary, none of the buildings present on site were found to provide bat roosting potential, with no evidence of use identified, such as droppings and feeding remains (moth wings), or suitable roosting features. As such no further consideration to roosting bats is required in order to procced with the proposed demolition of buildings.

Please let me know if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,



Jake Healy

Ecologist, MSc, QCIEEM

URBAN GREEN

T: +44 (0) 161 312 3131

Jake.healy@weareurbangreen.co.uk

Table 2 – Photos of buildings on site

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
B1			Negligible
B2			Negligible

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
			
B3			Negligible

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
			
B4			Negligible

Building Reference	Evidence	Category of Suitability
	   	

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
			
B5			Negligible

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
			
			

Building Reference	Evidence		Category of Suitability
B6			Negligible