



**The Park Public House,
153 Moorcroft Road,
Wythenshawe,
Manchester.**

On behalf of Watson Homes Ltd.

**Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat
Scoping Report**

Report Number	<u>ThePark/001-2025</u>
Author	Christian Leigh
Date	2 nd October 2025
First Check	Julie Leigh
Final Technical Check	Roy Leigh

Important Information to Readers

This report has been prepared for Watson Homes Ltd, in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment for a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat scoping survey. Leigh Ecology Ltd cannot accept any responsibility for the use of or reliance on the content of this report by any third party.

The advice contained in this report is based on the information available and/or collected during the period of study. We cannot completely eliminate the possibility of important ecological features being found through further investigation and/or by survey at different times of the year or in different years.

Surveys and assessments are undertaken on the understanding that nothing in our reports will be omitted, amended or misrepresented by the client or any other interested party.

Please be aware the information contained within this report is valid for a period not exceeding two years. After this time, data contained within will require updating.

This report and its contents remain the property of Leigh Ecology Ltd until payment has been made in full.

Contents

1. Executive summary 4

2. Introduction 5

3. Methodology 7

4. Results..... 10

5. Constraints and Recommendations 20

6. References..... 22

7. Appendices.....

Appendix 1 – Phase 1 Habitat map and legend

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Leigh Ecology Ltd was commissioned to undertake a preliminary ecological appraisal and bat scoping survey of a former public house building, with supporting land. The subject building is The Park, Wythenshawe.

The site comprises a free-standing public house of mixed construction, located within the densely developed residential suburb of Wythenshawe. The building features consistent brick external walls with a felt-lined roof. Timber fascia and soffit boards are present, though several areas show damage. Decorative elements are present on sections of the external walls, including cladding details at the front elevation and areas of timber boarding.

The surrounding grounds include overgrown grassland areas that have not been maintained since the pub's closure. A line of mature trees runs along Sledmoor Road, with the canopy extending over parts of the building and the former outdoor seating area. Artificial lighting is also prominent around the site, and the treeline along Sledmoor Road provides a visual and ecological link to nearby richer habitats.

The immediate area is dominated by residential housing and associated infrastructure; however, the site maintains ecological connectivity to nearby habitats. Nan Nook Wood, a broadleaved woodland with several water bodies, is located approximately 130 m southeast of the site, while Mere Wood lies around 660 m further southeast. The on-site treeline extends toward these higher-quality habitats, supporting potential wildlife movement.

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing building and its replacement with a small-scale residential development. To facilitate these works, an ecological survey has been required to assess the presence of protected species. The survey focuses primarily on bats (Order: Chiroptera) but also includes nesting birds, amphibians, reptiles, and other mammals that may inhabit or utilise the site.

The survey indicates that the building on site offers **low potential for bat roosting**, as the structure is largely unsuitable due to its construction, condition, and configuration. Some areas of damage were noted to fascia and external boarding; however, these features are not considered sufficient to support roosting bats.

The building is situated adjacent to a treeline corridor, with small parcels of richer grassland and areas less affected by artificial lighting, providing some limited potential for foraging or commuting bats.

The site offers limited habitat for other protected species. No signs of badger activity were observed, and the dense urban setting isolates the site from suitable Great Crested Newt (GCN) habitats. Overall, the likelihood of other protected species utilising the site is considered low.

The site is located in close proximity to Wythenshawe Park (Local Nature Reserve), which forms part of a collective network of woodlands and richer habitats, including Nan Nook Wood, Mere Wood, and Gib Lane Wood. These areas provide higher-quality ecological resources within the suburban landscape. Kenworthy Woods (LNR) is situated approximately 1.5 km northeast of the proposed development site, further contributing to the connectivity of local green infrastructure.

The proposed development will retain all bordering mature trees on the site. Works will involve the removal of ornamental planting, sections of existing grassland, and the existing building.

2. INTRODUCTION

Background

Leigh Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Watson Homes to undertake an Ecological Appraisal and Bat Scoping Survey of the former Park Pub building and associated land in Wythenshawe, for a proposed residential development. The site is approximately located at *National Grid Reference (NGR)* SJ805902. The study area is defined by the redline boundary shown on Figure 2.1.



Figure 2.1; Site Location and Extent.

(Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0.)

Sites of biodiversity conservation value, habitats and species in UK and Local Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPS) and protected species are material considerations in the planning process (Department for Communities and Local Government. 2012).

The study is documented in this report and includes the following:

- Preliminary ecological baseline for the site;
- Protected mammals' assessment of the site;
- Potential ecological constraints to the development of the site; and
- Further ecological work necessary for a planning submission.

All Work was undertaken in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (CIEEM) Code of Practice.

A preliminary understanding of the ecological baseline of the development site (hereafter referred to as 'the site') was derived through desk study and site survey.

Desk study

Designated sites of nature conservation value (statutory and non-statutory).

Information was also obtained from the following websites:

- www.magic.gov.uk – information on protected sites up to 1 km from the site.
- www.nbn.org.uk – protected species distribution.
- An ecological data search including data from the site and a 1km buffer from the site boundary.

The UK BAP and Local BAP were also reviewed.

Site survey

A site survey to inform the Ecological Appraisal was undertaken on 17th September 2025, following Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) Phase 1 Habitat Survey methodology (2010). The survey identified the habitat types present on site and recorded the presence or potential presence of protected or notable species. The results are illustrated on the Phase 1 Habitat Plan (refer to Appendix 1).

In addition, water bodies within 250 m of the site were identified using Ordnance Survey (OS) mapping, QGIS software, and aerial photography to assess potential connectivity for aquatic and semi-aquatic species.

Bat Surveys

The external roost survey was undertaken by Christian Leigh NE License No. 2022-10863-CL18-BAT. Survey methods were based-upon the standard and specification detailed in the BCTs Bat Surveys-Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition, 2023). The building was inspected externally on the 17th of September 2025.

Tree Inspection

The primary objective of the survey was to locate any signs of bat activity, for example:

- Bat droppings
- Feeding remains
- Grease staining / urine marks.

As tree roosts are extremely difficult to locate, it is prudent to note that all potential roost entrances, cracks, cavities, woodpecker holes and fissures in order to undertake emergence surveys should there be an impact on the trees.

External building inspection

The objective of the survey was to locate any signs of bat activity, for example:

- Bat droppings
- Feeding remains
- Grease staining/ urine marks
- Corpses or skeletons
- Potential access points to internal roosts.

The bat signs listed above are visible from the outside of the building. The following areas were searched using binoculars:

- Ground floor casing
- Any cracks/ holes in the panels
- Between wall panels and framework

- On external panelling, and ridge.

Any signs of bird usage including any current live or old nests, droppings, pellets etc. were noted during the bat survey.

Survey limitations

The building was not accessed internally during the survey. However, given the construction of the building and the fact that the upper floor was previously in active use, it is likely that limited roof space may have been accessible, particularly within the single-storey flat roof sections.

Landscape Assessment

Bats use regular commuting and foraging routes; these are usually linear features such as hedgerows and watercourse corridors. The loss and severance of such a feature may have an indirect impact on the bats. Therefore, it is important that if the development impacts on these features, they are assessed.

Breeding Birds

An assessment of potential habitat for breeding birds was undertaken.

Protected species Surveys

The site and linear features were checked for feeding signs, prints, trails, droppings, holes etc. for species including badger, as well as suitability for other protected species such as GCN.

3. RESULTS

Site survey

Habitats within the survey area

The results of the Phase 1 Habitat Survey are presented in Appendix 1, with accompanying photographs included within the text. Habitat types are described, and species are referred to using their English names. The survey covered the full extent of the land shown in Figure 2.1.

The site comprises a closed public house, which has been out of use for several years. The building is accompanied by self-seeded young trees, unmowed rich grassland, and ornamental planting, all of which have developed naturally over time. Several mature trees are present along the eastern boundary, notably a black poplar and a lime tree adjacent to the main building; these trees do not contain any Potential Roost Features (PRFs).

The subject building is primarily of traditional mixed brick construction with a felt-lined roof and includes several single-storey extensions attached to the main two-storey structure. There are multiple areas of wooden cladding and boarding, with the fascia boards noted as rotting and damaged in several locations.

The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing building and hardstanding features, along with the removal of sections of grassland and ornamental planting, to be replaced with a small residential development.

Site Boundaries

The site features boundaries on the southern, northern and western sides. The southern boundary is garden fencing, from adjacent residential property. An adjacent trade building features as the western boundary and small fencing is noted as the northern boundary.

Surrounding habitats

The site sits within the suburban area of Wythenshawe, which comprises typical urban environment of residential housing and commercial rows. Scattered green spaces and richer habitats are dotted within proximity of the proposal site, notably Wythenshawe Park (LNR).

A map showing the specific habitat areas is presented in **Appendix 1**.



Photograph 1; An external view from the southern side of the building, clearly showing the composition. The building features several single storey extension sections, all sections feature a felt external roof.



Photograph 2; View of the main section of the building, showing the two-storey base of the former pub. The external brick walls are well-structured and in good condition.



Photograph 3; A view of the attached flat roof section with corrugated roller door. A slight linear buffer of modified grassland, featuring common thistle and stinging nettle.



Photograph 4; A view of the front of the subject building, beneath one of the single storey, flat roof sections. External fascia boarding shows some sign of rotting and cosmetic damage. External windows are boarded.



Photograph 5; Clay cladding tiles feature on the front face, with some instances of damage noted.



Photograph 6; A view of some wooden fascia boarding, which is detached from the external walls and damaged. This paneling is set away from the wall, and when investigated does not lead to internal cavity space or roof space.



Photograph 7; A front view of the clay tile cladding exterior. Again, damage was noted and lead directly to the external wall, with crawlspace between the tiles and the wall. This cladding sits atop the external wall and does not lead to the internal composition.



Photograph 8; A view of the northeastern face of the building, where the former outdoor seating area was located. The single storey section features damage to external wooden wall panels (circled).



Photograph 9; A distant view of the external felt roof. The roof is in good condition considering the age and composition.



Photograph 10; A view of further fascia boarding which shows signs of damage, notably at an intersection of the single storey section with the larger building.



Photograph 11; A view of a large patch of unmanaged, other neutral grassland situated to the front of the building.



Photograph 12; A closer view of the grassland section. Quadrat sampling was undertaken to find ryegrass and common bent dominance, with broad-leaved dock and creeping thistle prominent, common thistle and Robert geranium were noted toward periphery areas, as well as horseweed between hard standing slabs.



Photograph 13; A view of the grassland and accompanying benches within the previous outdoor seating area of site. Common bent and ryegrass dominance was noted.



Photograph 14: A row of prominent, mature trees has been identified along the northeastern boundary, with their canopy extending over the hard standing area of the site. It is essential that the black poplar, as well as the lime trees located further along, are retained. This tree line continues along Stedmoor Road, leading toward Wythenshawe Park (Local Nature Reserve).



Photograph 15: A section of managed modified grassland accompanying the rear car parking area.



Photograph 16: A small bund, featuring mixed grass and forbs species at the rear of the car park. Bramble, Yorkshire fog and curled dock are prominent within the bund.



Photograph 17: A view of the southwestern boundary of site, comprising a dense hedgerow with some succession growth atop disturbed land, as well as a small pile of felled tree limbs. Oak and privet are the dominant species across this hedgerow boundary.

Protected and notable species

Invertebrates

No notable invertebrate species were recorded, but given the site visit was undertaken in September, it is outside of the optimum survey period for invertebrates, although given the site composition, and location it can be assumed that the site is not vitally important for invertebrate species

Amphibians

Great crested newts are protected by Schedule 2 of the Convention of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981, as amended), which provide protection to both the individuals and the areas they use for rest, shelter or breeding. Great crested newts are also a UK BAP and LBAP priority species.

The site features limited suitability for GCN, given the site is an active car parking area and is situated within dense urban habitat. The position of the site offers minimal link to water bodies surrounding the site. Several water bodies were noted via OSMAPS within Nan Nook Wood, but upon inspection on the day of the site visit were found to be dry. The closest of these water bodies is around 214m from site.

Bats

Surrounding habitat and Tree Inspection

The site contains prominent, mature trees along its northeastern boundary, which are to be retained as part of the development. These trees form an important ecological corridor for bat species, providing an (almost) continuous canopy connection to richer foraging habitats. The canopy is also partially sheltered from artificial lighting, enhancing its value for nocturnal wildlife. Additionally, the southern and southwestern boundaries of the site are defined by hedgerows and linear features, which contribute further to habitat connectivity and biodiversity.

External Inspection

The building is a former pub, comprising a main two-storey section with attached single-storey elements. The two-storey section has a felt-pitched roof supported by wooden fascia linings. The external walls are brick, with visible variations in age reflecting later extensions.

A large single-storey section also features a pitched felt roof, while other sections have flat felt roofs. Wooden fascia boarding was noted as damaged in several locations, particularly on the front elevation and at junctions between the single- and two-storey sections. The front elevation also includes

decorative tiled cladding, which shows multiple areas of damage. These damaged areas in both the fascia and cladding may provide potential roosting opportunities for bats. The PRF's identified across the building are small and unsuitable for larger roosts due to the size and positioning, mostly being slight damage to external cladding or boarding. The specific PRF's identified may be more suitable for a transient roost, given they are shallow openings and upon the exterior of the building mostly.

Internal Inspection

The building could not be internally accessed.

Breeding Birds

The site offered limited suitability for breeding bird species, with no evidence of nesting found externally or across the site, though it is recognized that the survey was undertaken outside of the main bird nesting period.

Badger

There were no signs of badger foraging or occupation on site and therefore, no further action is required.

Other mammals

The proposal site, given its location may be frequented by foxes or hedgehog. To encourage hedgehog usage, it is recommended that gaps within proposed fencing be implemented to encourage hedgehog passage.

4. CONSTRAINTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed development (within the red line site boundary as shown in *Figure 2.1*) will consist of the demolition of the existing building, and creation of a small residential development.

Positioning, construction, and post construction impacts are therefore likely upon both the habitats and species within and immediately adjacent to the site. Ecological constraints and recommendations with regard to any development of the site are discussed below.

Protected species.

Bats

The building on site was characterised as offering **low bat roost potential**, due to the various instances of damage noted across the building, as well as positioning directly adjacent to prominent tree canopy cover and decent connectivity considering its urban location. The external openings were small and fairly shallow, when investigated did not lead to internal cavity space or roof space and likely only suitable for transient or small/ single bat roosts.

Therefore, a further bat activity survey should be undertaken to determine the presence of bats within the building and across the site, also assessing the use of the bordering treeline for bat species. The findings of this survey are included within appendix 2 below.

Where lighting is necessary in areas of tree/shrub planting this will be low wattage, directional, low level and/or shaded to minimise light spill (<1Lux) onto potential flight lines and foraging habitat to ensure that the overall impact caused by lighting the site is negligible. The lighting scheme will be designed with regard to guidance such as the Bat Conservation Trust Statement on the impact and design of artificial light on bats, and the Institution of Lighting Professionals Guidance Notes, to minimise disturbance to bats and other wildlife due to artificial lighting.

Birds

Any potential removal of habitat associated with this development is regarded as relatively insignificant as there is limited value across the site for breeding birds. However, nesting birds are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (and amendments) and it would be an offence to damage

or destroy a nest or otherwise disturb a nesting bird.

Bordering hedgerows and ornamental planting may be impacted/removed to facilitate the works, which is ideal habitat for bird nesting. **it is recommended that the demolition and removal work be done outside of the bird nesting season (March-August) or after a thorough check for active nesting by a qualified ecologist directly prior to demolition work beginning.**

Other Mammals

It is possible that Hedgehogs (*Erinaceus europaeus*) may frequent the area during their nightly foraging activity, therefore it is suggested that any changes to fences, or newly erected within the proposed development should contain hedgehog highway gaps to allow free movement between gardens and the wider area.

5. REFERENCES

ARG UK 2010. ARG UK Advice Note 5: Great crested newt Habitat Suitability Index.

Amphibian and Reptile Groups of the United Kingdom.

Botanical Society of the British Isles (BSBI) (2013). Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora. Available at: http://www.brc.ac.uk/plantatlas/index.php?q=title_page

Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing.

Cheffings, C.M. & Farrell, L. (Eds), Dines, T.D., Jones, R.A., Leach, S.J., McKean, D.R., Pearman, D.A., Preston, C.D., Rumsey, F.J., Taylor, I. 2005. The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain. Species Status 7: 1-116. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

Department for Communities and Local Government 2012. National Planning Policy Framework.

Eaton MA, Brown AF, Noble DG, Musgrove AJ, Hearn R, Aebischer NJ, Gibbons DW, Evans A and Gregory RD (2012) Birds of Conservation Concern 3: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. *British Birds* 102, pp296-34

HMSO 1981. Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (and amendments). (c.69), London: HMSO.

HMSO 2010. Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, London, HMSO.

Hundt, L. (2016). Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd edition. Bat Conservation Trust.

Gilbert, O.J. & Anderson, P. 2000. Habitat Creation and Repair. Oxford University Press, New York.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2010. Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – a technique for environmental audit. JNCC.

Oldham R.S., Keeble J., Swan M.J.S. & Jeffcote M. 2000. Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*). *Herpetological Journal* 10(4), 143-155.

Roth, T., & Weber, D. (2008). Top predators as indicators for species richness? Prey species are just as useful. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 45(3), 987-991.

Stace, C. A (1997). New Flora of the British Isles Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.

UK BAP 2008. Priority Habitat Descriptions [Online]. Available at:

<http://www.ukbap.org.uk/library/UKBAPPriorityHabitatDescriptionsfinalAllhabitats200810>

Appendices

Appendix 1 – UKHABS Map



Appendices

Appendix 2 – Bat Activity Survey Results

Leigh Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Watson Homes Ltd to undertake a single bat emergence survey at a former pub building named the Park Pub, Wythenshawe (hereafter referred to as 'the site'). The survey was carried out to support a planning application for proposed demolition and subsequent works.

The preliminary roost assesment concluded that the building classified as **low bat roost suitability** in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidelines. As a result, a single follow-up nocturnal emergence survey was recommended to further assess the potential use of the building by bats, and record any bat activity within the wider site.

Table 7.1. Recommended timings for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a negative result for structures (also recommended for trees where other methods such as PRF inspection are not possible, but unlikely to give confidence in a negative result). To be used in tandem with Table 7.2.

Low roost suitability or PRF-I	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability or PRF-M
May to August (structures)	May to September ^a , with at least one of surveys between May and August ^b	May to September ^a , with at least two of surveys between May and August ^b
No further surveys required (trees)		
a September surveys are both weather- and location-dependent. Conditions may become more unsuitable in these months, particularly in more northerly latitudes, which may reduce the length of the survey season. September surveys are likely to miss maternity roosts due to dispersal before this time, but may pick up mating roosts. b Multiple survey visits should be spread out to sample as much of the recommended survey period as possible; it is recommended that surveys are spaced at least three weeks apart, preferably more. Survey timings should consider the prevailing conditions in the year of survey, which will vary geographically. In years with a cold spring, the surveys should not be started in early May or all completed in May. The surveys should maximise the possibility of detecting maternity roosts, which can switch roosts between pregnancy and lactation, and the optimum coverage includes the pre-parturition, post-parturition and mating periods.		

Table 7.2. Recommended minimum number of survey visits for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a negative result for structures (also recommended for trees but unlikely to give confidence in a negative result).

Low roost suitability or PRF-I	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability or PRF-M
One survey visit. One dusk emergence survey ^a (structures).	Two separate dusk emergence survey visits ^b .	Three separate dusk emergence survey visits ^b .
No further surveys required (trees).		
a Structures that have been categorised as low potential can be problematic and the number of surveys required should be judged on a case-by-case basis (see para 5.2.44). In some cases, more than one survey may be needed, particularly where there are several buildings in this category. b Multiple survey visits should be spread out to sample as much of the recommended survey period (see Table 7.1) as possible; it is recommended that surveys are spaced at least three weeks apart, preferably more.		

Survey Methodology and Results

Leigh Ecology Ltd was commissioned to undertake the recommended phase 2 survey.

A single dusk emergence survey was conducted on the 23rd of September, in accordance with the *Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (4th edition, 2023). The decision to undertake the survey in the month of September, outside of the period suitable for sites characterized as offering low bat roost potential was due to several factors; The composition of the building offers a traditional slate tiled roof which is in good condition, with instances of damage to the building identified within external wall cladding and external boarding features, these are suboptimal PRF's and judged as more suitable for bat transient roosts. The weather conditions at the time of survey were ideal also, and bats were present across the site during the survey. Also, bat presence and emergence had been noted in separate bat activity surveys undertaken on other sites in the days prior.

The survey was led by Roy Leigh ACIEEM, a Natural England licensed bat ecologist (licence number: 2015-15883–CLS). To ensure full coverage of all potential access points, **four surveyors and one thermal imaging camera were positioned at strategic points around the site, with clear views of all elevations and roof lines of the main building and adjacent treeline.** This setup allowed for simultaneous monitoring of all potential roost features. Surveyor locations are shown in the accompanying plan (*see Figure 1 – Surveyor Location Plan below*).

The survey commenced 30 minutes prior to local sunset and continued for 90 minutes post-dusk, adhering to best practice guidance for dusk emergence surveys.

Surveyors were equipped with:

- Wildlife Acoustics EchoMeter (iPad 4 compatible)
- EMT Pro bat detectors
- IRPro 19mm thermal imaging camera

The combined use of acoustic and thermal detection ensured a robust assessment of bat activity and potential emergence.



Figure 1: Surveyor positions  and Thermal Imaging Camera position 

(Google Satellite, 2025)

Survey Findings (in brief):

- No bats were observed emerging from the main building.
- Foraging activity was recorded along the bordering mature line of trees, as well as cutting across the front modified grassland:

- ⇒ One **Common Pipistrelle** (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)
- ⇒ Up to two **Soprano Pipistrelle** (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*)

These bats were recorded by the surveyors at the front of the building (Moorcroft Road), as well as the surveyor along Sledmoor Road, these bats showed no signs of roosting within the buildings.

The results indicate **no evidence of a bat roost within the building proposed for demolition**. It is likely that bats recorded on site are utilising nearby habitat features for roosting, with the bordering treeline being an ideal feature for bat usage and as a corridor toward the nearby Wythenshawe wood.

Dusk Emergence Results

- Survey Date: 23.09.2025
- Sunset Time: 19:04
- Survey Start Time: 18:45– Survey End Time: 20:40
- Wind (0-5): 0
- Rain (0-5): 0
- Cloud cover (%): 20
- Temperature (Degrees Celsius): 14

Time first Observed	Species	Behavior	Location Observed	Notes
19:34	Common Pipistrelle	Foraging along treeline	From Moorcroft Road, across grassland to front of building and subsequently along adjacent treeline.	Passed twice to front of building and along treeline. <i>One bat observed.</i>
19:00-19:15	Soprano Pipistrelle	Foraging at front of building, along Moorcroft Road.	Foraging at front of the building, as well as passing over single storey extension section toward Sledmore Road.	Early observation of bat foraging at front of building before sunset time, likely due to time of year survey undertaken. Bat commuted to site from north. <i>Three bats observed in total.</i>
		No emergence	All elevations monitored	No bats identified as emerging from building.

No bats were observed emerging from the building during the survey period. All elevations and potential access points were continuously monitored by surveyors and a thermal imaging camera throughout the dusk emergence survey.

Bat activity recorded during the survey consisted of low-level foraging by *Pipistrellus* species. The first detection occurred at **19:00**, when a single Soprano Pipistrelle was observed commuting at height across

the site from the north. This was a brief pass, consistent with typical foraging or commuting behaviour for the species.

From 19:15 BST onwards, Soprano Pipistrelle bats were noted foraging along the tree line along Sledmoor Road, using the trees as a sheltered foraging space from artificial lighting nearby. Two bats were observed following each other in quick succession, these bats proceeded to make passes along the tree line and toward the front of the building.

At 19:24, Common Pipistrelle activity was detected at the front of the building by two surveyors, passing parallel to Moorcroft Road atop the parcel of grassland at the front of the building.

Overall, while low levels of foraging activity were recorded, **there was no evidence of bat emergence or roosting within the building.** The bat activity observed is consistent with individuals utilizing the sheltered corridors and unlit grassland at front of site. The early registration of Soprano Pipistrelle commuted from the north of site, is likely roosting close by.



Figure 2: Surveyor and Thermal Imaging Camera Viewpoints.

Use of Thermal Imaging Camera

A thermal imaging camera (IRPro 19mm) was employed during the survey in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition, 2023). The use of thermal imaging enhances detection capabilities, particularly in low-light conditions or where visual observation is obstructed. It enables surveyors to detect the heat signatures of bats in flight or emerging from potential roost features, allowing for more accurate assessment of presence/absence and behaviour. All thermal observations were conducted by a trained and experienced operator and were cross-referenced with acoustic data for species identification. Images captured using the device are included (*below*) as supporting evidence.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of the dusk emergence survey indicate that the building named the former Park Pub **does not currently support roosting bats**. No emergence activity was observed from the main building during the survey period, and all recorded bat activity was limited to low-level foraging by *Pipistrellus* species and commuting along the adjacent, overhanging treeline.

The survey was undertaken outside of the ideal period for surveying of a building designated low bat roost potential, but given the characteristics of PRF's across the building and weather conditions at the time of survey, the survey can be considered reliable. It was noted that PRF's of the building are more suitable for smaller, single bat transient roosts used for short periods by small numbers or individual bats. Given these findings, **it is considered that the proposed development works can proceed without the need for a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence**, provided that a precautionary approach is followed during demolition.

To ensure legal compliance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the works should proceed under a **Bat Safeguard Method Statement**. This will include appropriate measures such as:

- A toolbox talk for contractors prior to commencement of works.
- Sensitive removal of roof materials (e.g., tiles, soffits) by hand under ecological supervision.
- Immediate cessation of works and consultation with a licensed ecologist if any bats or signs of bats are encountered during the works.

Biodiversity Enhancements

In order to contribute to local biodiversity objectives, it is recommended that **integrated bat bricks** be installed on the completed building. These should be positioned:

- On an elevation facing away from the main road and any existing floodlighting.
- At a height of at least 3 metres.
- In locations sheltered from strong winds and direct sunlight, preferably near vegetation or tree lines.

These measures will enhance the long-term roosting potential of the site and align with national and local biodiversity policy, including the aims of the Environment Act 2021.



Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box 'C'

Lighting Considerations

To minimise potential disturbance to foraging and commuting bats, the site's external lighting strategy must be designed with ecological sensitivity. Where lighting is necessary, particularly near boundary vegetation, retained trees, or new planting, it should be:

- Low wattage and directional
- Positioned at low height and/or fitted with cowls or shields to reduce light spill
- Timed or motion-activated to limit usage

The overall aim is to **maintain light levels below 1 Lux** along key linear features and vegetated corridors used by bats. The lighting design will follow the principles set out in:

- *The Bat Conservation Trust and ILP Guidance Note 08/18 – Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK*
- *The Bat Conservation Trust Statement on the Impact and Design of Artificial Light on Bats*

By implementing these reasonable avoidance measures and enhancements, the proposed development will remain compliant with legislation, safeguard local bat populations, and contribute positively to ecological resilience on site.