

182 BURNAGE ROAD, MANCHESTER

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report

July 2023



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: 182 Burnage Road, Manchester
 Project Reference: CW20-783
 Report Title: Preliminary Roost Assessment Report
 Report Reference: CW20-783 RPT 001
 Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

Rev	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
1	04/07/2023	Draft report sent to Client for comment	KBrewer	KB	OC
2	23/11/2023	Final report sent to Client	KBrewer	KB	OC

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Newpark Commercial and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Newpark Commercial and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Newpark Commercial and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.0 SCOPE & PURPOSE	5
1.2. LOCATION	5
1.3. OBJECTIVES	5
2. METHODOLOGY	6
2.1. DESK STUDY	6
2.2. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT	6
2.3. SURVEY LIMITATIONS	6
3. SURVEY RESULTS.....	7
3.1. DESK STUDY	7
3.2. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT	7
3.3. SUMMARY	10
4. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
4.1. FURTHER SURVEYS.....	11
4.2. LIGHTING MITIGATION	11
4.3. NESTING BIRD MITIGATION	11
5. SUMMARY	12
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY	13

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Newpark Commercial to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at 182 Burnage Road, Manchester, M19 1EF. This report has been produced to inform planning permission for at the site.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Katie Brewer BSc (Hons), Assistant Ecologist at Collington Winter and this report has been supervised by Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM Principal Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Katie is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.

1.2. LOCATION

1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location. The site is located within Manchester and is approximately 3.7km northwest from Stockport city centre.



Figure 1.1 Site Location

1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The objectives of the PRA are as follows:

- Identify any areas of bat roosting potential within the building
- Assess the value of the building for roosting bats
- Search for signs of bats
- Provide recommendations on any further surveys or mitigation required for bats

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. DESK STUDY

2.1.1. An initial desk-based assessment of the site was undertaken to collate baseline data. The desk study included:

- Review of aerial and OS maps for habitat information.
- Review of potential habitat links on and off site, to determine the potential zone of influence of the proposed development.
- Locations of granted European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) within 5 km of the site based on consultation with magic.gov.uk.

2.2. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT

2.2.1. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the site was undertaken on 28th June 2023 by Katie Brewer, and was supervised by Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM Principal Ecologist who holds a Class II Bat Licence (Reference: 2020-48950-CLS-CLS).

2.2.2. The survey was undertaken following guidance set out in Collins (2016). This includes undertaking a detailed internal and external inspection of any features to compile information on potential roosting features (PRFs) and potential access points. A search for field signs of bats (i.e. droppings, urine stains and feeding remains) was also completed. The use of binoculars and torches assisted with the survey.

2.2.3. The building was assessed as per categories listed in Table 4.1 Collins (2016) and reproduced in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Assessment Criteria for Bat Roosting Potential

Bat Roosting Potential	Description
Negligible	Negligible features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.
Low	A structure 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 conditions and/ or suitable surrounding habitats to be used on a regular basis by larger numbers of bats.
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats, but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status.
High	A structure or 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 for longer periods of time.

2.3. SURVEY LIMITATIONS

2.3.1. Throughout the PRA there was limited access to the internal aspect of the dwelling, this was because the first floor was in bad condition and was deemed unsafe to access as many holes were identified throughout the floor.

2.3.2. There was limited inspection on the roof throughout the buildings, as this consisted of a row of shops the roof was not visible on most aspects. Ladders were used where possible to inspect the roof however, a full inspection could not be completed. It is likely that PRF's were located along the roof of the building which were missed throughout the survey and this was considered within the assessment.

2.3.3. Internal access to the building located on the northern aspect, adjacent to the One Stop Shop was not possible throughout the survey.

2.3.4. A large number of bird faeces were located within some of the buildings which limited the inspection for bat droppings and feeding remains.

3. SURVEY RESULTS

3.1. DESK STUDY

3.1.1. The site is located within an urbanised area and is surrounded by residential dwellings and retail units on all aspects. Cringle Playing Fields is located approximately 0.5km east from the site boundary and Ladybarn Park is located approximately 0.6km west from the site boundary. It is anticipated that these areas may be of value for local commuting and foraging bat populations. Heaton Moor Golf Club is located approximately 0.6km southeast from the site boundary which consists of grassland with trees this is also anticipated to be of value for local bats.

3.1.2. The following EPSLs were located within 3.5 km of the site based on consultation with Magic.gov.uk:

- 2018-38076-EPS-MIT - located approximately 2.5km west from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) between 2018-2019.
- 2016-22910-EPS-MIT - located approximately 2.5km north from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle between 2016-2021.
- EPSM2010-2649 - located approximately 2.5km southwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) between 2011-2014.
- 2015-13055-EPS-MIT - located approximately 2.8km southwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle between 2015-2020.
- 2015-18385-EPS-BDX - located approximately 3km southwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place and breeding site for soprano pipistrelle between 01/04/2016 – 30/04/2016.
- EPSF2011-2990 – located approximately 3.1km southwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place and breeding site for common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle between 2011-2013.
- 2016-21779-EPS-MIT - located approximately 3.1km northwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle between 2016-2021.
- 2015-17752-EPS-MIT - located approximately 3.25km north from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle between 04/01/2016 – 30/09/2016.
- 2020-50519-EPS-MIT - located approximately 3.3km southwest from the site boundary which allowed for the destruction of a resting place and breeding site for common pipistrelles and brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*) between 2021 – 2031.

3.1.3. A further 11 EPSL's were located within 5km of the site boundary.

3.2. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT

3.2.1. The site consisted of multiple two storey and single storey commercial units, most were vacant excluding the William Hill Betting Shop located on the south-eastern aspect of the buildings. The eastern and western aspects of the buildings consisted of red bricks throughout, this was found to be in moderate condition with some missing mortar identified. The missing mortar created some small gaps, the crevices were minor, and it is unlikely that they will lead into any further openings, they are not anticipated to be suitable to support crevice dwelling bat species.

3.2.2. The southern aspects of the buildings consisted of metal sheets along the walls of the buildings, these were located above the commercial units which includes the vacant buildings and one building which is still currently open as a William Hill Betting Shop. Small gaps were identified along the top of the metal sheets, it is unknown if they lead any further to create a suitable roosting feature or possibly lead into the internal aspect of the dwelling. The northern aspect of the building was attached to a One Stop Shop (not included within the assessment), the brickwork along the buildings was connected to this shop.

3.2.3. There was a very limited view of the roof on all aspects of the dwellings, a ladder was used on the western aspect of the buildings which allowed an inspection of the slate tiles located on the northern aspect. This identified a flat roof which connected to the elevated, pitched slate tile roof. The flat roof was found well sealed throughout this

inspection, it should be noted that not all of the flat roof was visible on this aspect, and it is possible that there were PRF's located out of sight, which would have been unobserved. The slate tile roof consisted of slipped and lifted tiles on this aspect, these were identified as a PRF as they may provide suitable shelter for local bat populations. It should be noted that internal access into this anticipated loft space was not possible, and it is unknown if there is internal access points into the dwelling along these tiles. It should also be noted that only the northern aspect of the slate tiles was visible and there could be more PRF's along the elevated slate tile roof which were missed throughout the survey.

3.2.4. The site consisted of several commercial units, all conjoined, all units were accessible throughout the roost assessment apart from the unit located on the northern aspect, adjacent to the One Stop Shop. The external inspection showed that this had a flat roof, therefore it is anticipated that this may only consist of a ground floor, however this cannot be confirmed without an internal inspection.

3.2.5. The second building along could be accessed throughout the survey which consisted of previously sealed rooms along the ground floor, numerous holes were identified along the roof on the ground floor where the ceilings and external roof had collapsed. A staircase was located within this dwelling however the first floor surrounding this staircase was found to have collapsed, therefore was considered unsafe to access. This collapsed area showed a large gap along the roof of the building, allowing internal access throughout the building. It should also be noted that a large number of pigeons (*Columba livia domestica*) were found within the building, that are anticipated to be utilising this large access point. This gap allows access throughout the building which may also be used by bats.

3.2.6. A singular loft space was visible throughout one of the buildings located southeast of the commercial units, this was separated internally from the building mentioned in point 3.2.5. by internal walls. The loft space consisted of roofing felt with supporting wooden beams, this was visible from the ground floor as the ceiling had also collapsed (Please refer to photos in table 3.1). There were no access points to further assess this loft space and it is unknown if bats are present within this area. There was no evidence of pigeons within the building and no obvious access points were identified. The William Hill Betting Shop was located on the southeastern aspect of the buildings, this was an active shop which is still used, this is not anticipated to provide any roosting features along the ground floor. There was no access to a potential first floor above this shop and therefore it is unknown if bats are present in this area.

3.2.7. There were no bat droppings or feeding remains identified throughout the buildings, where it was possible to gain access. It should be noted that the building which had a large number of pigeons inside also has a large amount of bird faeces' throughout, it is possible that droppings and feeding remains may have been missed due to this in this dwelling.

3.2.8. Please refer to Table 3.1 for photographs.

Table 3.1 Building Photographs

Feature	Photograph
Eastern aspect of the building	

<i>Southern aspect of the building</i>	
<i>Western Aspect of the building.</i>	
<i>Roof visible using ladders for the inspection.</i>	
<i>Loft space area which was visible in one building.</i>	

<i>Large gap identified located at the staircase.</i>	
<i>Holes throughout ceiling.</i>	

3.3. SUMMARY

- 3.3.1. The identified PRF's throughout the dwelling in relation to the external access points and the slate tile roof which consisted of cracked and slipped tiles. Without a full inspection of the buildings, it is unknown if bats utilise these features and access the internal access of the buildings, however it is possible.
- 3.3.2. It is also noted that the external access points mean that the buildings are open to the external weather conditions and the building will fluctuate in temperature depending on the external weather conditions. It is also noted that the high number of pigeons which are most likely breeding within the building may also impact the usage of local bat populations.
- 3.3.3. As such the building was assessed as having low bat roosting potential.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. FURTHER SURVEYS

- 4.1.1. The building was found to provide bat roosting potential and therefore, in accordance with Best Practice guidance (Collins, 2016) a further nocturnal/ re-entry surveys should be undertaken between May-September (inclusive) to determine usage by roosting bats. It was assessed as **'low bat roosting potential'**; therefore, a minimum of one further survey is recommended.
- 4.1.2. The results of the further surveys will determine if any mitigation is required for roosting bats. If roosting bats are located within any of the buildings, a Natural England Mitigation Licence may be required for development to proceed. The Licence can only be obtained once planning permission has been granted and all wildlife conditions discharged. However, the bat emergence surveys must be undertaken prior to planning permission being applied for as they are a material consideration.

4.2. LIGHTING MITIGATION

- 4.2.1. Construction lighting should not be directed towards retained and surrounding habitats. The construction lighting will impact bats which are sensitive to light. Directional lighting will be achieved by angle and orientation of beam, use of a cowl, louvre or other light shield, or a combination of these.

4.3. NESTING BIRD MITIGATION

- 4.3.1. Pigeons were identified throughout the building and can access the building through the large gap that leads externally. Pigeons nest all year round and therefore a suitably qualified ecologist should undertake a nesting bird check no more than 48 hours prior to removal. If nesting activity is observed, the nest(s) should be left in situ until the young have fledged. A suitable buffer will be maintained and determined by the ecologist.

5. SUMMARY

- 5.1.1. Low bat roost suitability was assigned to this building due to the lack of evidence of PRFs during the PRA. One emergence or re-entry survey is to be completed in order to confirm if a bat roost is present and whether further mitigation is necessary.
- 5.1.2. **It is recommended that no works to the building is completed until the further surveys are carried. If works proceed without the further surveys, there is a risk of breaching relevant legislation.**

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK: Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Downs, N. C. et al (2003) The effects of illuminating the roost entrance on the emergence behaviour of *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*. Biological Conservation 111, 247-252.
- Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005). Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.
- Mitchell-Jones (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines: Working Today for Natura Tomorrow. English Nature.
- Mitchell-Jones and McLeish (2004). Third Edition Bat Workers' Manual.
- Packman, C., Zeale, M., Harris, S. & Jones, G. (2015). Management of bats in churches – a pilot. English Heritage Research Project: 6199.

