

Spring Lane, Radcliffe, Manchester, M26 2SZ (Cyclops junction). Potential roost feature inspection surveys - trees

Version One. 13/12/23
Prepared for: Morgan Sindall Construction

Version 1

1.1	Introduction	
1.1	Site Description Location and Context	3
1.2	Purpose, aims and objectives	3
2.	Methods	4
2.1	Summary of survey methods	4
2.2	Pre Survey data search	4
2.3	Surveyor information	4
3.	Results	5
3.1	Summary results	5
4.	Assessment and summary	6
4.1	Constraints on survey information or equipment	6
4.2	Assessment summary	6
5.	Recommendations and mitigation	6
5.1	Recommendations	6
5.2	Mitigation measures and mitigation licenses	6

Appendix

Appendix 1 Legislation

Appendix 2 Images

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Site description, location, context, and development proposals
- 1.2 The site is located within Radcliffe, Manchester an urban environment and surrounded by existing residential land uses. The additional land to be assessed for bat roost potential (on trees) is woodland plantation located southwest of 'Spring Lane School' and adjacent to 'Banana Path'.
- 1.3 This report is formulated to assess trees on the site for Potential Roost Features (PRFs) and to determine the PRF suitability. The site includes a multitude of trees (40+) within the area classified as plantation woodland. After review of the proposed development, removal of a limited number of trees is necessary to the site frontage as detailed in the AIA.
- 1.4 The proposed development includes tree removal and therefore a Bat Roost Assessment is required as such proposals could have a direct impact on protected bat species.
- 1.5 The purpose of this report is to establish the potential of the affected trees to offer shelter and / or roost facilities to protected bat species.
- 1.6 The objective of the report is to be able to assess a range of factors including a rated (none, negligible, low, moderate or high) potential of the trees to offer shelter for bats, absence/presence of protected species, species affected, population numbers, potential access points, types of roost and their seasonality of use.
- 1.7 The objectives include the provision of any applicable mitigation measures and / or further survey recommendations in relation to the extent and use of the site by protected species as is required by the current BCT guidelines section (Collins, J. (ed) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good practice Guideline (4th Edn).

2.0 Methodology

- 2.1 Summary of survey methods
- 2.2 An external inspection was carried out on the trees in relation to their potential use by bat species in accordance with the 2023 BCT guidelines section 5.2 preliminary roost assessment - structures (and in particular 5.2). This was carried out on the 13th December 2023 by Simon Brain.
- 2.3 In summary this means an external examination of the trees was conducted looking for signs of bat use and to quantify any field signs for their ecological significance. The

inspection and report shall consider section 5.2 (complementary methods, timing and survey effort) of the 2023 BCT guidelines including Table 4.2.

2.4 Pre-existing data on local bat species

The closest granted European Protected Species (EPS) license application by Natural England was for bat species approximately 350m from site (C-PIP).

2.5 Surveyor information

Simon Brain has attained a Post Graduate Certificate in Biological Recording and has attended residential FSC Field Courses for Land mammal, Songbird Barn Owls (CIEEM) and Advanced Bird Survey Techniques. He holds a NE Class 2 bat license (17334-CLS). He has over ten years experience as a practice ecologist and 30 years experience as an arborist.

3.0 Results

Summary

3.1 Out all the trees on the site that may be affected by development, five trees have been identified as containing PRFs. None of the trees to be removed contain PRF.

T1 and T2 contain thick ivy cover where the stem is detached from the base in some areas and +3cm in stem diameter. The base of T1 and T2 appeared thin and shown no minimal opportunity for shelter (crevices/knot holes/broken branches/peeling bark) behind ivy when assessed by the surveyor. PRFs identified in T3, T4 and T5 consist of ivy cover however, the stem is >3cm in diameter. The potential of these features have been reliably assessed as having negligible potential. Other remaining trees on site had a complete absence of roost features appropriate for protected bats. In accordance with Table 6.2 neither PRF-I or PRF-M apply to the trees that contain features as the features are negligible potential for roosting bats. In accordance with Table 6.3 no known bat roosts are identified on the site during previous activity surveys or through desktop analysis using MAGIC Maps.

4.0 Assessment and Summary

- 4.1 The surveyor was able to inspect all parts of the trees from ground and aerial levels when needed using rope and harness techniques. No evidence of bat activity was identified during the survey e.g., bat droppings or staining where bats are accessing the trees.
- 4.2 The habitat surrounding the trees is urban, whilst some trees are in green spaces, this habitat type is limited on the site thereby limiting foraging opportunities from the subject trees. Additionally, bats adapted to living in urban areas, typically prefer urban dwellings and contrasting PRFs (cracks/crevices, loose tiles) as they are suitable for them to retain heat and conserve energy while torpid. The trees discussed in this report are not suitable for bat roosting in this respect.

5.0 Recommendations and mitigation

5.1 Recommendations

The five trees that contain features have negligible potential and no further surveys are needed for the trees to be removed.

5.2 Mitigation measures and mitigation licenses

Mitigation measures and the need for Natural England licensing is not required in this case due to lack of bat roost potential.

Appendix One – Legislation

All bat species in the UK are fully protected under The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 2010 (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 2 of the Act. Regulation 41 prohibits:

Deliberate killing, injuring or taking (capture) of bats.

Deliberate disturbance of bats in such a way as to:

impair their ability to survive, breed, or rear or nurture their young; or

affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of bat species; or impair their ability to hibernate or migrate

Damage or destruction of a bat breeding site or resting place i.e. roost

- Keeping, transporting, selling, exchanging or offering for sale whether live or dead or of any part thereof.

All bat species in the UK are also protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 5. Under this Act, it is an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly disturb any bat while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct the access to any place of shelter or protection used by bat(s)
- Sell, offer or expose for sale, possess or transport a bat(s) for the purpose of sale.

A European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) Licence issued by the relevant countryside agency (e.g. Natural England) will need to be applied for to allow derogation from the relevant legislation i.e. for works liable to affect a bat roost or for operations likely to result in a level of disturbance which might impair their ability to undertake those activities mentioned above (e.g. survive, breed, rear young, hibernate, migrate). In certain circumstances, important foraging areas and/or commuting routes can be regarded as being afforded *de facto* protection, for example, where it can be proven that the continued usage of such areas is crucial to maintaining the integrity and long-term viability of a bat roost.

Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 2010

The species protection provision of the EC Habitats Directive 1992, as implemented by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, comprises three “derogation tests” which must be applied by the Local Planning Authority when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a development that could harm a European Protective Species. The three tests are that:

- The activity to be licensed must be for imperative reasons of overriding public interest or for public health and safety;
- There must be no satisfactory alternative; and,
- Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of the species must be maintained.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to submit sufficient information to address these tests when applying for planning permission. For development activities, an EPSM Licence application can only be obtained after planning permission has been granted. However, the granting of planning permission does not guarantee that a licence will be issued by the relevant countryside agency.

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) sets out the Government's national policies on different aspects of planning in England. Section 10 paragraphs 109 to 125 details planning policies on the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

In summary:

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: *'minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.'* (NPPF Section 10, para 109)

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused (Section 10, para 118).
- Proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted (Section 10, para 118).
- Development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted (Section 10, para 118).
- Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Section 10, para 118).

7 Planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss (Section 10, para 118)

- Potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation, listed or proposed Ramsar sites and sites identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, should be given the same protection as European sites (Section 10, para 118).
- The presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined (Section 10, para 119)
- Planning policies and decisions should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation (Section 10, para 125).

Local planning authorities must take account of the conservation of protected species when determining planning applications. The presence of protected species is a material consideration when assessing a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. This requirement has important implications for bat surveys as it means that, where there is reasonable likelihood of bats being present and being affected by the development, surveys must be carried out before planning permission is considered' (BCR 2012). In order for the Local Planning Authority to adequately assess a development proposal against National and Local Planning Policy, full comprehensive ecological surveys need to be carried out and suitable mitigation strategies compiled prior to the submission of any planning application. This information

will be reviewed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the relevant countryside agency and other conservation bodies.

Any developer should, in the first instance, consult the relevant Local Plans to assess the suitability of their proposal (refer to NPPF Section 10 paras 113 to 117).

Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC)

Part 3, Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 states that 'every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity', otherwise known as the Biodiversity Duty. Under Section 41 of the Act, the Secretary of State must publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat which in the Secretary of State's opinion are of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This list is based on those species listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) as priority species. The S41 list replaces the list published under Section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000.

Biodiversity Action Plan

Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) set out actions for the conservation and enhancement of biological diversity at national, regional and local level. They consist of both Habitat Action Plans (HAPs) and Species Action Plans (SAPs) and species and habitats listed within these are defined as being of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biodiversity under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006. Local authorities must consider these species and habitats when determining planning applications.

Appendix Two – PRF images.

T1 + T2- Thick ivy cover tree surface. Stem is detached from based and +3cm in stem Diameter. The base appeared thin and shown no opportunity for shelter (crevices/knot holes/broken branches/ect.) behind ivy (negligible).



T3- Ivy cover with -3cm stem diameter and tree has thin base (negligible).



T4- Ivy cover with -3cm stem diameter (negligible).



T5- Ivy cover with -3cm stem diameter (negligible).



Other trees assessed as negligible due to lack of PRF.



