

Bat Emergence Report

The Elms, Bury

Prepared for: Bury Council

Prepared by:
Simon Brain P.G.C.E. (Natural England 2015-17334-CLS-CLS)

05.054.2023

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Site description, location and context	3
1.2 Purpose, aims and objective of this report	3
2. Methods	4
2.1 Summary of survey methods	4
2.2 Pre Survey data search	4-5
2.3 Surveyor information	5
3. Emergence Survey Results	5-7
3.1 Dusk emergence results	5-7
4. Constraints and legislation	8
4.1 Constraints on survey information or equipment	8
4.2 Potential impacts of development	8
4.3 Legislation and Policy guidance	8
5. Recommendations and mitigation	8-10
5.1 Further survey	8
5.2 Mitigation measures	8-10
5.3 Mitigation licenses	10
6. Recommendations and mitigation / compensation	10
6.1 Summary	10

1. Introduction

1.1 Site description, location, and context

The site is The Elms (Flats) M45, Bury.

The surrounding wider landscape consists of scattered mature trees which offers some foraging and communing opportunities for bats.

1.2 Purpose, aims and objectives of this report

A Bat Roost Assessment compiled for the scheme stated :

“The building offers some bat roost potential, as it has a slate roof, with sarking boards present in places, and some gaps offering potential access. The interior of the building is damp and rotten with negligible potential for void-dwelling bats. I consider the potential for a maternity roost to be very low, but think there is reasonable potential for day roosting bats.”.

The purpose of this report is therefore to establish use of the building for bats by means of one dusk emergence surveys. This survey shall be carried out at the identified points of potential entry or shelter for bat species identified in the BRA. We shall aim to establish absence or presence on the development site in reference to the use of the building by bats. The objective of the report is to be able to assess the bat use in the building, the impact of construction and any applicable mitigation measures in relation to the extent and use of the site by bats.

2. Methods

2.1 Summary of survey methods

The BCT January 2016 good practice survey guidelines shall be used to design and inform the survey effort with particular regard to section 7.1 page 49-52.

The BCT January 2016 good practice survey guidelines recommend a minimum survey effort for buildings with moderate potential to support roosting bats of a dusk emergence surveys.

During the survey surveyors were positioned to observe the building. The survey was undertaken in good weather conditions and although it was undertaken in late September bats were present on the site and temperatures hadn't fallen below 8 degree overnight low hence the conditions to identify roosting bats had been acceptable.

Generally the surveyors record weather and all bat activity including the number of bats emerging / passes, species detected, behaviour for example feeding or commuting, flight direction and any relevant comments. Each surveyor used an Echo Meter Touch and a BatBox Duet/Elekon detector. There were no weather or HS related constraints and all bats were detectable with the equipment used.

Each surveyor was placed so as to have an unobstructed view of elevations on the building to as to be able to view all parts of the potential roost features. Surveyor positions allowed for coverage of all identified features in the initial report.

2.2 Pre Survey data search

No searches have been undertaken by us.

2.3 Surveyor information

Simon Brain (Managing Director) has attained a Post Graduate Certificate in Biological Recording and has attended FSC Field Courses for Land mammals, Songbird identification, Barn Owls (CIEEM) and Advanced Bird Survey Techniques (Level M). He has four years experience in bat and avian work. He has accumulated over 450 hours of bat contact time and holds an NE Class 2 license (70619:OTH:CSAB:2016). He has attended courses for trees and bats, bat survey

techniques, mitigation and handling and attended three european workshops. Dawn Good fellow is an experienced senior ecologist with a number of years of bat experience. Jack Mallinder holds a NE Class 2 license and other stated surveyors have a number of years of bat surveying experience.

3. Emergence Survey - Results

3.1 Dusk emergence results

Summary

No bats were seen to emerge from the building and it was considered that bats and bat roosts were absent from the building during the survey. One bat species was recorded (Common Pipistrelle) as commuting within detector range.

Detailed survey records

Site: The Elms, Whitefield - Visit 3 of 3 (dawn)

Date: 01/05/23

Lead Surveyor: DG

Conditions/Wind - Start: Dry, 100% cloud cover, NE 3 6mph

Conditions/Wind - End: Dry, 100% cloud cover, E 3mph

Sunrise: 05:35hrs

Start time: 04:05hrs

End time: 06:05hrs

Temperature - Start: 12°C

Temperature - End: 10°C

Surveyor: Dawn Goodfellow - positioned at S face of building (EMT 2 used)

Time (hrs)	Species	Comment
04:46	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen, single brief pass.
05:19	Bat	Observed to fly around eastern gable end, swoop to roof and fly eastwards.

Surveyor: Spencer Dwyer Moss-Rathbone - positioned at W face of building (EMT 2 used)

Time (hrs)	Species	Comment
04:13	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
04:17	Noctule	Bat observed circling high above and then heading northwards.

Surveyor: Bobby Moss-Rathbone - positioned at N face of building (Bat Box Duet used)

Time (hrs)	Species	Comment
04:13	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
04:37	50kHz Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:06	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:09	S. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:11	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:19	S. Pip	Bat observed passing over house from NW to SE.
05:24	C. Pip	Bat observed passing over house from NW to SE.

Surveyor: Jack Mallinder - positioned at NE corner of building (Peterson M500 & SonoBat Live)

Time (hrs)	Species	Comment
04:13	C. Pip	Bat observed passing from E to W along N elevation.
05:06	C. Pip	Bat observed passing from W to E along N elevation.
05:19	C. Pip	Bat observed approaching eastern gable from E but then headed away eastwards again.
05:25	C. Pip	Bat observed passing over building from W to E.

Surveyor: Tracey Minogue - positioned at SE corner of building (EMT 2 used)

Time (hrs)	Species	Comment
04:37	C. Pip	Bat observed passing high over house from S to N.
05:00	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:10	C. Pip	Bat observed near eastern gable but did not enter.
05:15	C. Pip	Bat heard but not seen.
05:19	C. Pip	Bat observed approaching eastern gable from E but then headed away eastwards again.

No bats recorded as re-entering the building observed.

4. Constraints and legislation

4.1 Constraints on survey information or equipment

It was considered that no constraints were applicable.

4.2 Potential impacts of development

All UK bat species and their roosts (occupied or unoccupied) are legally protected and demolition of a roost site is a criminal offence.

4.3 Legislation and Policy guidance

All bats are European Protected Species as defined by Bern and Bonn Conventions, Conservation of Habitats and Species regulations 2010, Habitats Directive Annex 4, some are also Annex 2.

All bats are protected by domestic legislation including Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended, CROW and NERC Act 2006.

5. Recommendations and mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures

5.1 Further survey effort

In relation to the existing building and in accordance with the BCT good practice guidelines February 2016 absence of bats has been established by means of the emergence survey and therefore further surveys are not required.

5.2 Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures

No bats were recorded in the building and therefore no measures are required to mitigate the effects of development on bats in this instance or to compensate for their presence. No roosts were identified during the emergence survey and therefore no EPS license is required for development to commence.

Enhancement measures

There is no loss of any roost type on the site and no roosts were discovered on survey. The site is being used for regular commuting and feeding. Specific mitigation for loss of foraging and commuting routes is not required. Under the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and the NERC Act 2006 there is a requirement to improve existing environment through enhancement.

The development proposals can maintain the ecological connection between the site and the locality. Where new planting is to be introduced native tree and shrub planting plan is preferred. Species of local provenance are recommended in preference to non-native, ornamental species. Planting of tree and shrub species that support a high insect biomass and provide a potential food source for bats throughout the bat activity period (spring to autumn) such as rowan, silver birch, alder buckthorn, dogwood, crab apple and wild plum are recommended..

Research has found that lighting can cause considerable disturbances to bats and may interfere with bat navigation during nocturnal commuting flights to suitable feeding sites. It is recommended by the Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Engineers that lighting at ground level should be below 3 Lux (BCT & ILE 2008). The site was found to be largely unaffected by lighting and the redevelopment will seek to ensure that lighting will be appropriately designed to ensure minimal light spill, particularly on the vegetated boundary of the site. This could be achieved by:

- Ensuring lights are only erected where they are needed, illuminated only during the time period that they will be used, and at levels that enhance visibility.
- Using narrow spectrum bulbs, to lower the range of species affected by lighting, and avoiding the use of light sources that emit ultraviolet.
- Ensuring that there are no bare bulbs or lights that point upwards.
- Ensuring that the spread of light is kept near to or below the horizontal plane.
- Reducing the height of the lighting columns since light at a low level reduces ecological impact.
- Ensuring only low level lighting that is as directional as possible is provided and that light emitted from these fixtures is below 3 lux at ground level.

- LED lighting, ideally amber LED (bat-lamps) that have a negligible UV component may be a preferred option since these show a low insect attractiveness comparable to low pressure sodium lamps and they are more directional, thus reducing light spill
- Where possible, external lights should comprise sensor activated lamps) so that lights are only operational when they are needed.
- Avoiding the illumination of habitat features used by bats, notably the boundary tree and linear hedgerows.

5.3 Mitigation licenses

In relation to the building there are no requirements for mitigation licensing as there is no requirement for anyone to carry out activity prohibited under wildlife legislation.

6. Summary

- 6.1 No bats were found to emerge from the building. As a result, no measures are required to mitigate the effects of development on bats and there is no requirement for an EPS license (derogation or low impact) from Natural England in this instance.