Kayleigh Davies BSc (Hons) MSc
Consultant Ecologist
Email: Kayleighdavies@arbtech.co.uk
Arbtech Consulting Ltd
arbtech.co.uk

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment

Survey site:

78-80 Tib Street, Manchester, M4 1LG

Client:

Lau Yuk Ltd

Survey date:

22nd April 2025

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Manchester City Council. The proposal is described as:

Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement.

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2025.**

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2025.**

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Site Location and Context

The survey site is centred on National Grid Reference SJ 84534 98594 and has an area of approximately 0.1ha.

The site comprises one terraced building with rear alley. It is situated within the built-up urban area of Manchester city centre. The surrounding landscape comprises of dense urban infrastructure including buildings, and tarmacked roads with high kerbs subject to heavy traffic daily. There are scattered green spaces such as North Ridge Recreation Area situated ~1.6km to the east. This habitat provides grasslands, riparian habitat and woodland areas and likely enhances area for a variety of species, including bats, amphibians and reptiles.

Survey Details

The site survey was undertaken by Kayleigh Davies BSc, MSc, Consultant Ecologist (Accredited on Natural England Bat Licence Number: details available on request)

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
22/03/2025	13	53	100	8	None

Executive Summary

Precautionary working measures will be followed to ensure that nesting birds are not harmed by the works.

In the unlikely event that a protected animal is found during construction, all works must stop and a suitably qualified ecologist must be contacted.

Survey limitations

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This assessment provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of protected species being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the wider landscape, the ecology and biology of species as currently understood, and the known distribution of species as recovered during the searches of historical biological records.

No specific limitations during the survey.

Ecological Survey Factor Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations	Detailed using desk study and site survey (carried out under good weather conditions). 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.

Habitats and plants (see habitat map in appendix 1, location plan in appendix 2, proposal plan in appendix 3 and photos in appendix 4).

Botanical species are described with reference to the DAFOR scale (D = Dominant; A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare).

Summary of Survey Findings	The site does not contain any habitats listed as a habitat of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). Other habitats within the site are common and widespread and have low ecological value. Notable habitats are present within 2km. **On-site habitat descriptions** **u1b** – Developed land/sealed surface There is an alley to the south of the property that is concrete sealed surface with the presence of discarded rubbish and other items. No observed vegetation. **u1b5** – Buildings There is one building on the site that has buddleia present growing within the walls and within the top floor of the property where there is damaged roof and flooring. **Local notable habitats** There are several Priority habitats situated within 2km of the site boundary. These are as follows: - **Deciduous Woodland - ~890m north.** Due to the surrounding urban infrastructure, there is no direct connectivity between the site and nearby notable habitats.
Foreseen Impacts	**On-site habitats** The proposed development will result in the loss of a building with small amount of buddleia. This is likely to have a minimal impact on biodiversity due to the low ecological value of these habitats. **Notable habitats** No impacts to any notable habitats are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such habitats as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers.
Recommendations	**On-site habitats** On site habitats are of low value and loss of them is not considered to have impact on biodiversity. The following habitat creation could improve biodiversity onsite: • Green walls/roof • Planters with pollinator friendly plants **Notable habitats** None. **Biodiversity net gain**

	The Environment Act (2021) requires all developments (excluding exemptions) to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. The project falls under one of the exemptions (less than 25m^2 of habitat being impacted) and therefore does not trigger the requirement for a biodiversity net gain assessment.
Locality and Designated Sites	
Summary of Survey Findings	**On-site designations** The site is not subject to any designation. **Statutory designated sites (within 2km)** There are no statutory designated sites within 2km. The site lies within the impact risk zone for Hollinwood Branch Canal Moss Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) situated ~6.5km east. **Non-statutory designated sites** The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the Greater Manchester Local Record Centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environments of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designation quality.
Foreseen Impacts	**On-site designations** No impacts foreseen. **Statutory and non-statutory designated sites** No impacts to designated sites are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such sites (where known) as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers. The site lies within the impact risk zone for Hollinwood Branch Canal Moss SSSI situated ~6.5km east. The proposed development is not listed as posing a threat to this designation.
Recommendations	**On-site designations** None required. **Statutory and non-statutory designated sites** None required.
Invasive / Non-native species	
Summary of Survey Findings	No problematic invasive and non-native species recorded on site.

<table>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recommendations</td><td>No further surveys but remain vigilant.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Invertebrates</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>Due to the suburban context of the site and small extent and type of habitats recorded, the site is not considered suitable to support a protected and/or notable assemblage of invertebrates. The habitats present on-site, is limited to the presence of a small amount of buddleia.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>Small amounts of buddleia will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local invertebrate populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recommendations</td><td>No further surveys.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements
The incorporation of bee bricks (e.g. Ibstock BeeHabitat or similar alternative brand) into the fabric of the new buildings would provide sheltering opportunities for pollinators. These should be installed 0.5m above ground level on a south-facing elevation with no obscuring vegetation. The site could be further enhanced via the provision of native wildflowers or wildflower turf, which would provide foraging opportunities for invertebrates.
Green walls/roof
Planters with pollinator friendly plants</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Bats</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>EPSL data
A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. There are 19 EPSLs present within a 2km radius of the site.

<table>
<tr><th>EPSL reference</th><th>Bat species affected</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr>
<tr><td>EPSM2013-5644</td><td>~280m northeast</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-6380-EPS-MIT</td><td>~350m northwest</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2016-24504-EPS-MIT</td><td>~380m northeast</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-3531-EPS-MIT-2</td><td>~470m east</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2018-33674-EPS-MIT</td><td>~550m southwest</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-490-EPS-MIT</td><td>~570m south</td><td>Common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-4219-EPS-MIT</td><td>~840m northwest</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017-31569-EPS-MIT</td><td>~890m northwest</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>Destruction of a resting place</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

2020-45213-EPS-MIT	~900m southwest	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
2019-38955-EPS-MIT	~980m south	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
2020-50604-EPS-MIT	~1.1km southeast	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2012-5061	~1.1km southwest	Brown long eared	Destruction of a resting place and resting site
2019-41924-EPS-MIT-1	~1.1km east	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
2019-43484-EPS-MIT	~1.3km northeast	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2013-5575	~1.4km southwest	Common pipistrelle	Activity not listed
2014-3569-EPS-MIT	~1.7km west	Common pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place
2014-4400-EPS-MIT	~1.7km south	Common pipistrelle	Damage to resting place
2015-16009-EPS-MIT	~1.8km southwest	Common pipistrelle	Damage to resting place
EPSM2010-1888	~1.9km northeast	Common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle	Destruction of a resting place

The following are bat records returned Greater Manchester Record Centre within 2km of the site:

Species of bat	Number of records	Distance from site (closest)	Type of record
Common pipistrelle	52	~120m north (roost)	22 roosts, field observations
Pipistrelle sp.	13	~930m southeast (roost)	4 roosts. Remainder field observations.
Soprano pipistrelle	2	~1.84km southwest	Foraging
Myotis sp.	1	~950m southeast	Roost
Noctule	1	~550m southeast	Commuting

There are no Special Areas of Conservation designated for bats within 10km of the site.

Foraging and commuting habitat
Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide low value for foraging and commuting opportunities for bats with the site offering small amounts of buddleia within the building. The immediate surrounding habitats consists of urban context and has scattered flower beds and urban trees.

Roosting habitat
Buildings to be impacted by the proposed development are assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. The site consists of one building. No evidence of roosting bats was identified on or within B1.

B1 Building description			***Photographs***
Summary The building is a three-storey building, with a flat roof. The roof is bitumen felt lining, and the walls are of mix of cement blocks and brick. The windows are boarded up with wooden boards, with one board missing. There is a presence of buddleia throughout the building and there is significant damage to the roof and walls of B1. The building is to be demolished. The building has **negligible habitat value**.			
Feature	***Materials***	***Condition/description/suitability***	***Photograph(s)***
Walls	Cement blocks and brick	The walls of the building consists of brick and cement blocks which have damage to the northern wall of B1, connected to the adjoining building. These bricks on further assessment were observed to be sealed off with further bricks behind the gaps and the gaps themselves are considered too shallow and too wide to be a suitable bat roosting feature. The remainder of the walls have no observed suitable features.	

Roof	Bitumen felt, suspended ceiling tiles and timber beams.	There is significant damage to the southern roof of the building, with ~50% of the roof missing and the remainder with a high level of water damage and further missing sections of lining. The gaps between the lining and the ceiling of the building have a large gap, ~20cm in height, and is open to the external elements such as wind. Furthermore, the water damage present to the ceiling suggests the high level of water that enters the roof space. The damage to the roof does not offer shelter from rain and external elements and therefore is considered unsuitable for roosting bats.	
Eaves	Cement	The eaves to the north of the property are sealed with no visible crevices or gaps suitable for roosting bats. The damage to the southern portion of the roof means no eaves are present within this point.	

Window/doors frames and lintels	Wooden boarded windows	The windows of B1 are boarded. However, one of the windows is open with no wooden board present allowing internal access.	
Internal voids	Cement and brick walls, wooden beams and suspended ceiling tiles.	The interior of B1 was recorded to be 13°C and 64% humidity. There is no loft present. Throughout the interior of the property a high level of water damage was observed. Sections of the floors and ceilings have damage from excess rainwater entering the space. There is a presence of mould throughout the interior of the property also suggesting that the building is regularly subject to high levels of water ingress. Gaps within the ceiling and roof structure was observed, however there is a large presence of mould covering the ceiling and wooden beams. The gaps created are wide and were not observed to provide protection from external elements. Although there is interior access into the building, the high levels of rainwater that enters the building makes the interior suboptimal for void dwelling bats. Furthermore, no crevices were observed which could be utilised by roosting bats. The damage to the roof also allows in sunlight and causes a fluctuation in temperature for internal areas of the property which is reflected with the interior temperature recorded during the survey matching the external recorded temperature. The internal areas of the building as also considered to be sup-optimal for hibernating bats.	

		No bat evidence was observed during the survey.	

Foreseen Impacts	**Roosting habitat [Buildings]** Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within this building and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development. **Foraging and commuting habitat** The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats. However, the proposed development will include the use of lighting which could spill on to bat roosting, foraging or commuting habitat and deter bats from using these areas. **Artificial lighting** The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats.
Recommendations	**Roosting habitat [Buildings]** In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice. **Foraging and commuting habitat** No further surveys are required. **Artificial lighting**

	A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting-2 **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The installation of two bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be incorporated into the fabric of the new building. Suitable bat boxes include Habibat Bat Box, Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box or similar alternative brand. Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.
Birds	
Summary of Survey Findings	**Local records** • 45 x peregrine - ~840m southwest. • 6x bullfinch – closest ~530m southwest. • 30 x Dunnock – closest ~730m south. • 19 x house sparrow - closest ~40m west. • 17 x song thrush – closest ~340m north. • 15 x starling – closest ~130m northwest. **Buildings** Pigeons were observed nesting within the building. Furthermore, the building is considered suitable for nesting. **Barn owls** The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls. **Overwintering birds** Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.
Foreseen Impacts	**Buildings** The proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests. **Barn owls** None foreseen. **Overwintering birds** None foreseen.

Recommendations	**Buildings** Any building removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the vegetation should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged or an ecologist has confirmed the nesting attempt has concluded. Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged or an ecologist has confirmed the nesting attempt has concluded. **Barn owls** None required. **Overwintering birds** None required. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on the building once development is complete will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings) Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings) Or a similar alternative brand. 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.
Reptiles	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL data** A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for protected reptiles within 2km of the site. **Habitat suitability** There is no suitable habitat present on site for reptiles due to a lack of habitats such as scrub and rank grassland which would offer refuge for these species. Further, the site is surrounded by urban development (i.e. roads and buildings) which is considered sub-optimal for reptile migration and therefore reptiles are considered unlikely to migrate from any nearby suitable habitats to the development site. As such it is likely that reptiles are absent from the development site. **Wider landscape** The wider landscape is considered unsuitable for reptiles due to the urban environments consisting of busy roads and concrete streets and lack of suitable green space.

Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on reptiles as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None required.
Amphibians	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL and survey data (and biological records data if obtained)** A review of the MAGIC database returned one record granted EPSL records for great crested newts within 2km of the site. • EPSM2011-3316 – Destruction of a resting place - ~350m northwest. No positive class survey licence return or DLL historic survey data (2017 – 2019) were present within 2km of the site. No records returned from biological record data. **Aquatic habitat suitability (including ponds within 500m)** Great crested newts (GCN) exist in metapopulations and are known to utilise ponds and their connecting terrestrial habitat during their life cycle; great crested newts are typically found within terrestrial habitats up to 500m from breeding ponds (Langton et al. 2001). There are no ponds on the site, but a review of aerial imagery (MAGIC and OS Maps) indicates the presence of a two ponds within 500m; both ponds are situated ~470m northwest on the far side of the M62. This landscape feature is likely to represent a significant barrier to dispersal due to heavy traffic flow and high kerbs along the road, eliminating connectivity to the site for great crested newts. **Terrestrial habitat suitability** The site provides no observed suitable terrestrial habitat for amphibians given the areas of hard standing and lack of suitable habitat for terrestrial amphibians.
Foreseen Impacts	Given the lack of suitably connected breeding ponds within 500m of the site, the presence of GCN on-site is considered unlikely and therefore impacts to amphibians as a result of the proposed development are deemed to be acceptably low.
Recommendations	None required.
Badger	
Summary of Survey Findings	No badger setts were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. Further, no evidence of foraging badgers was noted within the development area. The hardstanding on site is unsuitable for sett making and offers no foraging habitat.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on badgers as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None required.

Riparian animals	
Summary of Survey Findings	Local records • 4x otter – closest ~980m northwest. A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for otters or water voles within 2km of the site. There are no water courses on or connected to the site. There are also no riparian habitats present on site or within an influencing distance.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None required.
Hazel dormouse	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL data** A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for hazel dormice within 2km of the site. **Habitat suitability** The site lies outside of the know current range for hazel dormice and there are no suitable habitats within the development area. As such it is considered likely that hazel dormice are absent from site.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on hazel dormice as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None foreseen.
Other e.g. hedgehog	
Summary of Survey Findings	Local records The following are records returned from Greater Manchester Local Record Centre: • 14 x hedgehogs – closest ~1.4km west. The hardstanding onsite suboptimal habitat for hedgehogs with no opportunities for shelter.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on hedgehogs as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None.

Appendix 1a: PEA and PRA map



Appendix 2: Location map



Appendix 3: Proposed plan

None available at the time of writing.

Appendix 4: Habitat Photos

Buildings	
Photograph	**Description**
	Fig 1 – the onsite building.
Developed Land Sealed Surface	
Photograph	**Description**
	Fig 2 – the alley to the south of the property.

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

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	Kayleigh Davies BSc (Hons) MSc Consultant Ecologist	28/04/25
Proof	0.2	Leo Plevin BSc (Hons), MSc Principal Ecologist	29/04/2025
Final	1.0	Kayleigh Davies BSc (Hons) MSc Consultant Ecologist	30/04/2025