

21 Pinfold Lane, Prestwich,
Manchester
Bat Emergence Surveys
2023



RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY

Client Wyvern Partnership

Project Title 21 Pinfold Lane, Prestwich, Manchester

Project Reference RHE.3867

Project Leader Ben Crossthwaite

Contact Details ben@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Ben Crossthwaite	Senior Ecologist	14/09/2023
Reviewer			
Revision			



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

The Stables
Paradise Wharf
Ducie Street
Manchester
M1 2JN

0161 465 8971

www.rachelhackingecology.co.uk

mail@rachelhackingecology.co.uk



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

Report Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methods	6
3. Results	7
4. Assessment	9
5. Recommendations	10
Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation	11
Appendix 2: Survey Data	13



Executive Summary

Development Details

The client is proposing the demolition of the current building at 21 Pinfold Lane, Prestwich, hereafter referred to as 'the site'.

This report describes the ecological features of the site and its surroundings and assesses the potential impacts of the development on the ecological interest. Recommendations are provided so that the development is compliant with biodiversity policy and legislation.

Outcomes

The results indicate the building on site is host to a day roost for a small number of Common Pipistrelle bats. Mitigation will be required to be installed on the external facades of the newly constructed building and suitable retained tree in the rear garden. A bat mitigation licence will be required prior to commencement of works which can be sought following the granting of planning permission.



1. Introduction

1.1 Project Brief

- 1.1.1 Rachel Hacking Ecology Limited was commissioned in 2023 by Wyvern Partnership to carry out a Daytime Bat Survey at 21 Pinfold Lane, Prestwich (O.S. grid reference: SD 80519 05657).



Figure 1. Map showing the location of the buildings on site courtesy of Google Maps

Description of Development

- 1.1.2 The site will be the subject of a planning application for the demolition of the existing buildings to make way for a replacement dwelling.

Relevant Survey History

- 1.1.3 A Preliminary Bat Roost Inspection (Daytime Bat Survey) was undertaken in July 2023. The results concluded the building offered moderate bat roost suitability. It was recommended two bat emergence surveys are conducted to determine if the bat roost is active and if so, by what species and how many bats.

1.2 Scope of Work

- 1.2.1 The Client commissioned Rachel Hacking Ecology to carry out the following works:
- Undertake two dusk emergence surveys of the site to assess the presence of a bat roost.

- Provide any necessary licence or mitigation or mitigation recommendations that may be required as a result of the survey findings.

1.3 Aims of the Survey

1.3.1 The aims of the survey were to:

- Establish the status of roosting bats at the site.
- Identify the requirement for any further surveys or mitigation.



2. Methods

2.1 Emergence Surveys

- 2.1.1 Two dusk emergence surveys were undertaken in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust's Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (2016). For the survey, two surveyors and two infra-red cameras monitored the building, to ensure complete visual coverage. The emergence surveys began 15 minutes before sunset and continued for 90 minutes after sunset. The surveyors used Anabat Walkabout and Anabat Scout bat detectors to record the echolocation calls of bats.

2.2 Assessment Criteria

- 2.2.1 Interpretation of survey findings was undertaken using professional judgement and criteria described in published guidance^{1,2}.

2.3 Site Visit Information

Surveyor Details

- 2.3.1 The surveys were undertaken by Ben Crossthwaite (Senior Ecologist) and Steve Smith (Ecological Assistant) on the 30th August and 13th September 2023. Ben has 8 years' professional experience of undertaking similar surveys and holds a level 2 class survey licence (Reference 2020-48541-CLS-CLS). Both the surveyors are experienced and trained in nocturnal bat surveys.

Site Conditions

- 2.3.2 The weather at the time of the first survey was clear, cool, dry and still. The average temperature was 14°C.
- 2.3.3 The weather at the time of the second survey was dry with light cloud cover turning overcast later on, with a minimal breeze and mild. The average temperature was 15°C.
- 2.3.4 The site conditions were appropriate for a full assessment to be undertaken.

¹ Collins, J. (Ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists-good practice guidelines*. 3rd edn. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

² Mitchell-Jones, A. J. (2004) *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.



3. Results

3.1 Constraints

- 3.1.1 Field survey results are valid for a limited duration and no investigation can provide a complete description and characterisation of a site. The composition of habitats and species can change depending on environmental variables and the mobility of species, so the results of a study become less reliable over time. In some cases, surveys that are 3 years old may be acceptable for a project assuming that habitats have not significantly changed in the intervening period, but for protected species it is likely that survey data will need to be no more than 18 months old.

3.2 Surveyor Positions

- 3.2.1 Figure 2 shows the locations of the surveyors during the surveys.



Figure 2 showing the surveyors (yellow stars) and infra-red cameras (red stars) positions during both surveys

3.3 Survey Results

- 3.3.1 A maximum of five Common Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* bats were recorded emerging from the roof edge of the south-eastern elevation of the building during the first emergence survey (see Photograph 1).
- 3.3.2 A maximum of two Common Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* bats were recorded emerging from the same area as the first emergence survey, around the roof edge of the south-eastern elevation of the building during the second emergence survey (see Photograph 1).
- 3.3.3 See Appendix 2 for detailed survey results.



Photograph 1 showing the location of the Common Pipistrelle emergences

- 3.3.4 Low levels of bat activity were recorded during the surveys, Common Pipistrelle were recorded infrequently foraging around the surrounding tree canopies and the buildings during the first survey, and solely around the trees in the rear gardens during the second survey.

4. Assessment

4.1 Interpretation of Results

- 4.1.1 During the first dusk survey, a maximum of five Common Pipistrelle bats were observed emerging from the building (see Figure 3 below).
- 4.1.2 During the second dusk survey, a maximum of two Common Pipistrelle bats were observed emerging from the building (see Figure 3 below).
- 4.1.3 Given the evidence of bat emergence during both surveys, the results suggest that the house on site is in use as a day roost for small numbers of Common Pipistrelle bats.
- 4.1.4 The trees and hedgerows immediately adjacent to the buildings offer good foraging and commuting habitat. Low levels of foraging activity were recorded around these features and the buildings during the surveys.



Figure 3 showing the roost exit points recorded during both surveys (red circles) and areas of low levels of foraging (yellow areas)

5. Recommendations

- 5.1.1 As the existing building on site has a confirmed bat roost present, mitigation will be required to be installed on the newly constructed building and retained mature trees within the rear garden. Two Greenwoods Ecohabitats Crevice Bat Boxes are to be erected onto the external facade of the building/ and tree. The bat boxes are to be installed at a minimum height of 4 metres, facing south or west and away from potential predation risks.
- 5.1.2 A bat mitigation licence will be required prior to commencement of works. The licence can be sought following the granting of planning permission. The licensable works on site will include the destruction of the bat roosts carried out under ecological supervision. A toolbox talk will be given to contractors prior to the commencement of the works.



Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021) describes the Government's planning policy for England and how it should be applied. Within this framework, the requirements in relation to biodiversity are included within several policies. The two most relevant to individual planning decisions are Paragraphs 174 and 180, shown below:

- 174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
 - a. protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
 - b. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
 - c. maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
 - d. minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; etc...

- 180. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
 - a. if significant harm to biodiversity 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;
 - b. development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;



- c. development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- d. development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 places a duty on every public authority to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Section 41 of the same Act requires that the Secretary of State must publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitats that are of 'Principal Importance' for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The Secretary of State must take steps, as appear reasonably practicable, to further the conservation of those living organisms and habitats in any list published under this section. The list of species and habitats of principal importance currently includes 943 species and 56 habitats.

Legislation

All bat species are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 (Amendment) (EU Exit), which make it an offence to:

- Deliberately kill, injure or capture a bat;
- Deliberately disturb bats;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat.

The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) contains further provisions making it an offence to intentionally or recklessly:

- Obstruct access to any structure or place which any bat uses for shelter or protection; or
- Disturb any bat while occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose.

Proposed development works that are likely to disturb or destroy bats or their roosts will need to obtain a licence from the relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (e.g., Natural England) prior to work commencing.



Appendix 2: Survey Data

Table 1. Results from the first dusk emergence survey				
Survey Type	Date	Average Temp (°C)	Sunset/ Sunrise	Weather
Emergence	30/08/2023	14°C	20:04	Clear, cool, dry and still
Results				
Common Pipistrelle recorded infrequently foraging around the surrounding tree lines to the north and south between 20:10 – 21:01				
A single Common Pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 20:28.				
A single Common Pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 20:29.				
A single Common Pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 20:32.				
Two Common Pipistrelle bats were recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 21:35.				

Table 2. Results from the second dusk emergence survey				
Survey Type	Date	Average Temp (°C)	Sunset/ Sunrise	Weather
Emergence	13/09/2023	15°C	19:30	dry with light cloud cover turning overcast later on, with a minimal breeze and mild
Results				
Common Pipistrelle recorded infrequently foraging around the surrounding tree lines within the rear garden and surrounding gardens between 19:30 – 20:26				
A single Common Pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 20:02.				
A single Common Pipistrelle bat was recorded emerging from the south-eastern edge of the roof at 20:25.				

