



Pioneer
ENVIRONMENT

Head Office: Spring Farm, Spring Lane,
Wymondham, LE14 2AY



Tel: 0116 350 0370



Email: office@pioneerenvironment.co.uk

Web: www.pioneerenvironment.co.uk



Preliminary Roost Assessment and Bat Survey Report

Unit 32,
Stakehill Industrial Estate,
Manchester

Report on Behalf of:

Ross Jones

Date: 10/09/2025

PEG681-02B

Unit 32

Stakehill Industrial Estate,
Middleton, Manchester, M24 2RW



Document Control

Revision	Issue Status	Notes	Prepared By / Date	Approved By / Date
A	First Issue	Issued to client	Isabella Shorrock / 01.10.25	Lewis Andrew / 06.10.25
B	Re-issued	PWMS added and survey requirements adjusted to reflect the altered work schedule.		Lewis Andrew / 10.10.25

Pioneer Environment Group Ltd. has prepared this report for the sole use of the commissioning party in accordance with the agreement under which our services were performed. This report is property of Pioneer Environment Group Ltd. and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained, or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the written consent of Pioneer Environment Group Ltd.

CONTENTS

1.0	NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	1
2.0	INTRODUCTION	3
	Site Description and Project Overview	3
3.0	LEGISLATION	4
4.0	METHODOLOGY	5
	Desk Study	5
	Field Study	5
	Bats - Preliminary Roost Assessment	5
	Bats – Roost Emergence Surveys	7
	Birds.....	7
	Constraints and Limitations.....	7
5.0	RESULTS.....	8
	Desk Study	8
	Field Survey	8
	Bats	8
	Birds.....	10
	Bat Roost Emergence Surveys.....	10
	Dusk Emergence Survey – 25/09/25	10
	Birds.....	11
6.0	EVALUATION	12
7.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	13
8.0	PRECAUTIONARY WORKING METHOD STATEMENT.....	13

TABLES

Table 1: Assessing the Potential Suitability of a Development Sites for Bats (Taken from Collins, 2023).....	5
Table 2: Surveyors and Equipment	10
Table 3: Survey Conditions – 25/09/25	11

FIGURES

Figure 1 - Site Location and Desk Study Plan
Figure 2 - Site Layout and PRF Location Plan
Figure 3 - Bat Emergence Survey Results Plan 25/09/25
Figure 4 – Development Impact Plan

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Bat PRA results

Appendix B: Bat Emergence Survey Results - September 2025

Appendix C: Darkest Point Photographs

1.0 Non-technical Summary

Background
In September 2025 Pioneer Environment Group Ltd. were instructed by Ross Jones to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and one subsequent bat emergence survey of a collection of four industrial buildings at Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Middleton, Manchester, M24 2RW (central grid reference SD 88665 08308).
Site Description
The site comprises of four buildings: • A large detached temporary metal shed with a pitched canvas ‘tent’ roof (B1) • A large detached temporary metal shed with a metal sheet pitched roof (B2) • A larger industrial shed with offices at the front, constructed of metal sheet and brick, with sections of flat, felted, and pitched, metal-sheet roof (B3) • Brick offices with a flat, felted roof adjoining an industrial shed with a pitched fibre-board roof to the rear (B4).
Development Proposal
Development plans are for the demolition of B2 and the rear warehouse of B4 and reduction of B3 by removing the Southern section of the structure. B1 is to be retained and utilised as a truck showroom whilst the footprint of B4 will be used for the showroom parking. The front, brick section of B4 will be retained.
Purpose
The purpose of the surveys was to: • Identify potential bat roosting features within structures at the site. • Assess the potential value of those features for bats following best practice guidelines. • Assess the potential of the surrounding habitats for foraging and commuting bats. • Identify potential for and signs of nesting birds within the site. • Identify whether the site is in use by roosting bats and ascertain the details of any roosts present.
Results
Bats PRA No evidence of roosting bats was identified within the site, though some Potential Roost Features (PRFs) were identified within B4. The structures were assessed as follows: B1 - the suitability of B1 to support roosting bats was assessed as ‘None’. B2 - the suitability of B2 to support roosting bats was assessed as ‘None’. B3 - the suitability of B3 to support roosting bats was assessed as ‘None’. B4 - was assessed as offering ‘Low’ suitability to support roosting bats. Bat Roost Emergence Survey (B4) A nocturnal survey was undertaken on B4 which was deemed suitable to support roosting bats. Two emergences of individual common pipistrelle bats were observed from separate locations behind the facias on the Northern aspect of B4 and the bat roost assessment of this structure was adjusted to ‘Confirmed Roost’.

Birds

No evidence of nesting birds was identified within the site during any of the surveys.

Other Species

No evidence of other protected or invasive species was identified during these visits. A thorough walkover of the site was conducted, and no further ecological constraints were noted.

Recommendations**Bats**

Following the completion of these surveys, it was deemed that roosting bats were present with B4 (Figure3). Two further bat surveys are recommended between May and September 2026 to ascertain an accurate and thorough understanding of the use of B4 by roosting bats.

As two bat roosts were identified within the Brick section of B4, no structural, external, or demolition works should be undertaken on B4 until further surveys have been completed. In order to demolish B4, a bat mitigation license suitable to the species and roost type present will be required if significant works are required.

As no PRF's or bat roosts were identified to the rear "shed" of B4, This section of the building has been agreed for soft demolition in winter 2025/2026 if undertaken in accordance with a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) provided in Section 8 of this report.

Buildings B1 – B3 are deemed unsuitable to support roosting bats and works can continue to these structures with no further constraints.

If roosting bats are identified within the site at any point during works, then all works must cease immediately, and the advice of Pioneer Environment or Natural England be sought.

Nesting Birds

If nesting birds are identified at this time or at any time during demolition, then further advice and recommendations should be sought from a qualified ecologist.

2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 In September 2025 Pioneer Environment Group Ltd. were instructed by Ross Jones to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and one subsequent bat emergence survey of a collection of four industrial buildings at Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Middleton, Manchester, M24 2RW (central grid reference SD 88665 08308).
- 2.2 The PRA was undertaken by Martin Woolley MCIEEM (NE bat licence number 2018-36842-CLS-CLS) on 15th September 2025 to establish, as far as possible, whether the site offered any potential to support roosting bats, assess the necessity for any further bat surveys, and identify any further ecological issues within the site and surroundings which may constitute a constraint to the proposed development.
- 2.3 The following assessment is informed by the Bat Conservation Trust's publication Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition) (Collins, J. (Ed) 2023)¹.

Site Description and Project Overview

- 2.4 The proposed development site was situated within the Stakehill Industrial Estate on the outskirts of Middleton, 11km Northeast of Manchester City Centre (Figure 1).
- 2.5 Immediately South and East of the site sits the dense industrial development of Stakehill Industrial Estate. To the North and West the landscapes were predominantly rural comprising a golf course and country park with mixed farmland, mature hedgerows, and scattered mature trees. Lords Wood is part of the Hopwood Woodlands LNR and was located 600m to the West of the site, consisting of approximately 4 Ha of mixed broadleaf woodland. Tandle Hill Country Park comprises managed grassland and mixed broadleaf woodland spanning approximately 44 Ha and was located 1.3km to the Northeast. Both of these spaces provide suitable commuting and foraging habitat for a range of bat species. The Rochdale Canal SAC & SSI runs approximately 180m West of the site at its nearest and further enhances opportunities for bats in the area. The wider rural landscape was well connected by hedgerows, woods, the Rochdale Canal, and corridors of trees. Some smaller wooded areas and lines of trees were interspersed throughout the industrial estate itself, providing potential commuting and foraging opportunities for bats.
- 2.6 The site comprised four buildings (Figure 2):
- A large detached temporary metal shed with a pitched canvas 'tent' roof (B1)
 - A large detached temporary metal shed with a metal sheet pitched roof (B2)
 - A larger industrial shed with offices at the front, constructed of metal sheet and brick, with sections of flat, felted, and pitched, metal-sheet roof (B3)
 - Brick offices with a flat felted roof adjoining an industrial shed with a pitched fibre-board roof to the rear (B4).
- 2.7 Development plans are for the demolition of B2 and the rear warehouse of B4 and reduction of B3 by removing the Southern section of the structure. B1 is to be retained and utilised as a truck showroom whilst the footprint of B4 will be used for the showroom parking. The front, brick section of B4 will be retained.

¹ COLLINS, J. (ED.) (2023). BAT SURVEYS FOR PROFESSIONAL ECOLOGISTS —GOOD PRACTICE GUIDELINES, (4th EDITION), BAT CONSERVATION TRUST, LONDON.

3.0 Legislation

- 3.1 Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended) and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. In summary this makes it an offence to damage, destroy or obstruct any place used by bats for breeding and shelter, disturb a bat, or kill, injure, or take a bat. Seven bat species are listed as Species of Principal Importance under the provisions of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006 (as amended).
- 3.2 All wild birds are protected under Section 1 of the WCA 1981 (as amended). Subsection 1(1) makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure, or take any wild bird; take, damage, or destroy the nest of any such bird whilst it is in use or being built; or take or destroy an egg of any such wild bird. It is, furthermore, an offence to either intentionally, or recklessly, disturb any wild bird listed on Schedule 1 while it is nest building, or at a nest containing eggs or young, or disturb the dependent young of such a bird. The law covers all species of wild birds including common, pest or opportunistic species.
- 3.3 The ODPM Circular 06/05 makes the presence of a protected species a material consideration within the planning process. It states that it is essential for the presence of protected species and the extent they may be affected by proposed development be established through appropriate surveys before the planning permission is granted and encourages the use of planning conditions to secure the long-term protection of the species.
- 3.4 The NERC Act (2006), puts an obligation on public bodies to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Under the terms of the Act, conserving biodiversity includes restoring or enhancing populations and/or habitats. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) or other determining authority must therefore consider the effects of planning applications upon biodiversity and how it can be mitigated for or enhanced.
- 3.5 Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment' and that 'opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity'.

4.0 Methodology

Desk Study

- 4.1 In order to compile existing baseline information, relevant ecological information surrounding a 2km radius was reviewed, and included:
- Landscape structure using Ordnance Survey base maps (www.bing.com) and aerial photographs from Google Earth (www.maps.google.co.uk).
 - Historically granted European Protected Species Licences (EPSLs) (<https://magic.defra.gov.uk/>)

Field Study

Bats - Preliminary Roost Assessment

- 4.2 A preliminary roost assessment was completed by Martin Woolley (NE Licence number 2018-36842-CLS-CLS) on all features with potential to provide suitable habitat for roosting bats and birds (Figure 2). The exterior and interior of the buildings were visually assessed for potential bat access points and evidence of bird and bat activity on the 15th of September 2025. Features such as gaps in the fabric of the buildings and broken windows/doors, which have potential to be used as access points were sought. Suitable nesting/roosting features were also mapped, and evidence of potential access points were described.
- 4.3 Ladders, torches, binoculars, and an endoscope were used to aid this assessment.
- 4.4 The survey work was completed in accordance with Bat Conservation Trust's "Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists". The rationale behind the value given to the suitability of a feature to support bats is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Assessing the Potential Suitability of a Development Sites for Bats (Taken from Collins, 2023)

Potential suitability	Description	
	Roosting habitats in structures	Potential flight-paths and foraging habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/underground levels).	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight-lines, or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible^a	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flight-paths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.

PRA and Bat Survey Report: Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Manchester

Potential suitability	Description	
	Roosting habitats in structures	Potential flight-paths and foraging habitats
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions ^b and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site, but could be used by individual hibernating bats ^c).	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight-paths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation – the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flight-paths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g. maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation site.	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flight-paths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

a) Negligible is defined as ‘so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant’. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute).

b) For example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.

c) Evidence from the Netherlands shows mass swarming events of common pipistrelle bats in the autumn followed by mass hibernation in a diverse range of building types in urban environments (Korsten et al., 2016 and Jansen et al., 2022). Common pipistrelle swarming has been observed in the UK (Bell, 2022 and Tomlinson, 2020) and winter hibernation of numbers of this species has been detected at Seaton Delaval Hall in Northumberland (National Trust, 2018). This phenomenon requires some research in the UK, but ecologists should be aware of the potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in prominent buildings in the landscape, urban or otherwise.

Bats – Roost Emergence Surveys

- 4.5 One dusk emergence survey was conducted at the site by experienced bat surveyors, in suitable weather conditions and following the guidelines set out by the Bat Conservation Trust's "Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists". Observations were made by surveyors situated around B4 at locations that were considered most likely for bats to emerge (Figure 3).
- 4.6 The dusk emergence survey was conducted from a minimum 15 minutes before sunset and concluded a minimum of 1.5 hours after the sunset time.
- 4.7 Detectors used for bat observation and identification were Echo Meter Touch 2s paired with Android tablets. All bat passes were noted and identified to species level where possible, and all observed bat flight paths were mapped (e.g., commuting, foraging) (Appendix B, Figure 3).
- 4.8 Sound analysis was carried out on recorded bat calls, using Kaleidoscope computer software to confirm and enable species identification.
- 4.9 Canon XA infrared cameras, along with supplementary infrared lighting, were employed to enhance the survey process and facilitate in-depth analysis of bat activity.

Birds

- 4.10 During the PRA assessment signs of nesting birds were also sought throughout the site including active or disused nests, evidence of previous nesting such as concentrations of pellets or droppings, old nesting material, eggshells, or dead bird remains.

Constraints and Limitations

- 4.11 Bat emergence surveys, even if conducted within the optimal season with several replicates, can only provide a limited summary of bat roosting behaviours at the time of survey. Bats are known to exhibit nomadic tendencies in their roosting habits, and they may utilise certain roosting features sporadically and in small numbers. In areas where numerous potential roost features are present, there is a possibility that bats may be roosting in features that were not identified during the surveys. Consequently, when implementing mitigation measures, it is advisable to adopt a precautionary approach towards features with a high likelihood of being used by bats, even if their presence was not recorded during the surveys.
- 4.12 Due to the absence of PRFs at the Southern end of B4, and the PRA assessment of B4 as having 'Low' suitability for roosting bats, no surveyors were located at the Southern of the building. SL03 notes that early observations of bats flying from South to North may be a result of unobserved emergences from the Southern end of B4. Further surveys should take this into account with increased surveyor positions and coverage of the southern aspects.

5.0 Results

Desk Study

- 5.1 One statutory site was identified within 2km of the site:
- Rochdale Canal SAC & SSI: approximately 200m West, running parallel to the site.
- 5.2 One previously granted EPSM licence was identified within 2km of the site (Figure 1):
- EPSM2010-2397: approximately 1km West of the site, license to destroy a breeding and resting place of Common pipistrelle bats (10/01/2011 – 31/10/2013).

Field Survey

Bats

Foraging and commuting

- 5.3 The proposed development was situated in a mixed industrial and rural environment North of Middleton, a town on the outskirts of Manchester. The site itself offered little vegetation; however the wider industrial estate offered some vegetated and wooded areas which provide some foraging and commuting habitat for bats. Higher quality foraging and commuting habitat was present immediately North and West of the site comprising mixed farmland, tree-lined corridors, hedgerows, ponds, and the Rochdale Canal. The wider landscape offered highly suitable foraging and commuting habitat for bats due to the abundance of ideal prey habitat and linear features for commuting and foraging. Overall, the foraging and commuting habitat on site was assessed as 'Low' suitability with 'High' suitability surroundings.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

Building Descriptions

- 5.4 The site structure and PRF locations can be seen on Figure 2. Full PRA survey notes including building descriptions, exact locations, and photographs can be found in Appendix A. A short summary for the site has been given below.

B1

- 5.5 The site comprised 4 separate buildings. B1 was a large temporary single-storey detached metal shed with a pitched canvas 'tent' roof. The building has two gable ends and the canvas roof allows light into the building.
- 5.6 Internally the building presented a single open space with no contents and no insulation or underlining present. Daylight conditions were present throughout due to the canvas roof, making the unit unsuitable for void roosting bats.
- 5.7 No external or internal PRF's were identified within B1.
- 5.8 No external or internal PRFs or evidence of roosting bats were identified and the suitability of B1 to support roosting bats was identified as 'None'.

B2

- 5.9 B2 comprised a single-storey, large detached temporary structure of steel construction. The building was clad with metal sheeting with a pitched sheet-metal roof. A gable end was present on either end with two UPVC windows present on the Western aspect.
- 5.10 Internally the building contained a single, large open space with two small, separated offices constructed at one end. No insulation or underlining was present, and the structure was found to be inaccessible to bats with no suitable roost features.
- 5.11 No external or internal PRFs or evidence of roosting bats were identified and the suitability of B2 to support roosting bats was identified as 'None'.

B3

- 5.12 B3 comprised a larger, two-storey industrial shed, constructed of metal sheet and brick, with sections of flat felted timber, and pitched metal sheet roof, presenting two gable ends. The front of the building comprised offices, and the rear was used as a metal-polishing workshop. PVC panels were present along the pitched roof, acting as sky lights for the workshop. Wooden Facias and UPVC windows were present throughout the flat-roofed section. Flashing was present where the front porch joins the brickwork though no lifting or gaps were present. Sheet metal cladding was present around the rear, workshop area.
- 5.13 Internally the unit was separated into front and back sections with internal office rooms with false ceilings present to the northern aspect. No roof void was present due to the flat roof. The internals extend straight to the metal ceiling of the structure and offer no suitable PRFs. The workshop offered a single open space with no underlining or insulation present. The conditions were bright and unsuitable for void roosting bat species. No internal PRFs were identified in B3.
- 5.14 No external or internal PRFs or evidence of roosting bats were identified and the suitability of B3 to support roosting bats was identified as 'None'.

B4

- 5.15 B4 comprised a two-storey unit in use as offices at the front with an industrial shed to the rear. The structure was constructed of brick flat and pitched roof sections clad with cement fibre-board. The office roof was flat, felted-timber, whereas the shed roof was pitched cement fibre-board with the same cladding on the walls. One gable end was present, and two uPVC sheet rooflights provided light to the internal shed space. Windows were present throughout the office section, all of UPVS construction and timber facias adorned the roof edges.
- 5.16 Internally the structure consisted of multiple office rooms at the front, flat roofed section of the structure with no roof void present due to the flat roof construction. The rear shed presented a single open space with no underlining or insulation, and daylight conditions resulting from the rooflights.
- 5.17 Potential roost features were identified in the fabric of B4 limited to the front, office sections consisting of:
- A single lifted Facia on the eastern aspect.
 - Lifted fascias along the Northern aspect.
 - Weep holes in the Brickwork on the Northern aspect.

PRA and Bat Survey Report: Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Manchester

- 5.18 No evidence of roosting bats was identified during the survey, however a limited number of PRFs were identified, therefore the suitability of B4 to support roosting bats was identified as 'Low'.
- 5.19 No PRF's were identified within the rear "shed" of B4 and this section was considered unsuitable for roosting bats.

Birds

- 5.20 No nesting material was observed within the buildings and no active bird nests were identified during the survey.

Bat Roost Emergence Surveys

- 5.21 Table 2 provides details of the surveyors for each survey occasion, including name, surveyor location reference, equipment used, years of experience, and relevant bat licence numbers. The corresponding surveyor locations are also annotated on Figure 3.
- 5.22 Table 3 shows the weather conditions at the start and end of the survey.
- 5.23 Appendix B and Figure 3 provide the detailed bat observations for each survey with species, times and flight paths all noted.
- 5.24 Appendix C provides "Darkest Point" photographs captured by each surveyor during each survey. These images demonstrate the visibility levels for NVAs at each survey point, supporting the assessment of survey validity and efficacy.

Table 2: Surveyors and Equipment

Survey Date	Surveyor	Experience/License Number	Equipment	Surveyor Location (Figure 3)
25/09/25	Oliver Amy	Level 2 2015-13069-CLS-CLS	Echo Meter Touch 2 detector, Samsung Galaxy A7 Lite tablet, Canon XA15 IR camera	SL01 (B4)
	Megan Gale	2 Years` Experience	Echo Meter Touch 2 detector, Samsung Galaxy Tab A9 SM-X110 tablet, Canon XA15 IR camera	SL02 (B4)
	Eilidh Brown	6 Years` experience	Echo Meter Touch 2 detector, Samsung Galaxy Tab A9 SM-X110 tablet, Canon XA15 IR camera	SL03 (B4)

Dusk Emergence Survey – 25/09/25

- 5.25 Two emergences of individual common pipistrelle bats were observed from separate locations behind the facias on the Northern aspect of B4.
- 5.26 Two bat species were recorded commuting and foraging in close proximity to the site. One noctule *Nyctalus noctula* was detected acoustically commuting past the site, and 13 common pipistrelles *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* were observed commuting and foraging within the site, two more common pipistrelles were detected acoustically but not visually observed. Social calls were detected from common pipistrelle bats at around 19:50-19:52.

Table 3: Survey Conditions – 25/09/25

Parameter	Start	End
Time	18:44 (Sunset 18:59)	20:58
Temperature (°C)	17	12
Precipitation	Dry	Dry
Cloud Cover (0-8)	0	0
Wind Speed (Beaufort Scale)	1	1

Birds

5.27 No active bird nests were observed during the survey.

6.0 Evaluation

- 6.1 Site evaluation has been undertaken based on the current level of survey findings including the PRA and subsequent bat survey as described above. Recommendations with regards to likely impacts have been given where possible based on the proposed design plans provided.
- 6.2 During the initial emergence survey, two bat roosts were identified within B4. Two Common pipistrelles were observed emerging from behind lifted flashing on the office section of B4 (Appendix B, Figure 3). These roosts have been identified as day roosts for single common pipistrelle bats.
- 6.3 All surveys were conducted during the recommended season, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of bat activity at that time. Based on the findings, it is concluded that roosting bats were present on site and that further assessment is required for B4.
- 6.4 Buildings B1 – B3 are considered unsuitable for roosting bats and works can continue to these structures with no further constraints.
- 6.5 As all identified PRF's within B4 were located within the brick sections of the structure, and these are to be retained, the soft demolition of the rear "shed" structure is permitted, providing that it is undertaken in line with a suitable PWMS as outlined in section 8 of this report. Figure 4 identified the development impact and requirements for each structure.
- 6.6 As the single emergence survey on B4 was conducted outside the optimal survey season for bats, it is possible that any roosts of higher ecological value (maternity roosts) may have already been vacated, and the bats moved to other locations. This could lead to undervaluing the roosting status of the site and designing unsuitable mitigation. If further structural, external, or demolition works are required to B4, two further bat roost emergence surveys are recommended between May and August 2026 with ideally one survey visit within the maternity season (June-July). The results of these surveys will inform an application for a bat mitigation licence to allow the works to proceed legally and in a manner sensitive to the local bat populations. If no further works are planned to this structure, outside of those outlined in section 8, then these additional surveys will not be required.
- 6.7 Given the knowledge of the two bat roosts present within B4, any alteration, damage, or destruction of these roosts, without proper survey effort and licencing consent, will constitute an offence under the WCA 1981 (as amended) and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.
- 6.8 Due to the legal protection afforded to bats in the UK, if any bats are unexpectedly discovered prior to works commencing or during works, all activities in that area should immediately cease and the advice of Pioneer Environment Group Ltd., or Natural England sought.

7.0 Recommendations

- 7.1 Due to the use of the site by roosting bats any proposed lighting both during works and permanent lighting following completion of the development should employ LED luminaires where possible due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability. A warm white light source (2700 Kelvin or lower) should be adopted to reduce blue light component, and lighting should be directed towards the ground using hoods or covers, to prevent unnecessary dispersal of light into surrounding habitats. Lighting should only be used where necessary within the completed development, avoiding artificial lighting of known roost features, enhancement roost features, hedgerows and trees. These recommendations are based on the BCT Guidance Note GN08/23 Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night 2023.

8.0 Precautionary Working Method Statement

- 8.1 Prior to any internal or external construction starting on-site, all construction personnel will receive a toolbox talk from a licensed ecologist regarding bats and their awarded level of protection and places of shelter. The toolbox talk will also include information on how to proceed if a bat is discovered during the course of the work. A hard copy of the toolbox talk information will be available on-site at all times.
- 8.2 Following the toolbox talk and immediately before commencing works, the bat-licensed ecologist will undertake a thorough inspection of all PRFs within close proximity of the work area (Rear of B4) to ensure that no bats are present. All PRF's are to remain intact and unaffected by the proposed works. If any bats are found which are deemed likely to be impacted by the proposed works, then works must cease and further ecological advice will be given.
- 8.3 Once the ecologist is satisfied that no bats are present likely to be impacted by the soft demolition works, Removal of all materials adjoining the brick section of B4 must be undertaken by hand and with hand tools. This will ensure that no damage to the roost structure potential roost features is incurred and will reduce dust, noise and vibration which may adversely affect the known roost locations.
- 8.4 The remaining sections of the rear "shed" of B4 can be demolished following completion of all these steps.
- 8.5 If a roosting bat is discovered during any phase of the project, then works must cease immediately, and the advice of the ecologist should be sought. In this eventuality, it is likely that a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence will be required before works can legally continue. No member of the construction team is permitted to handle bats discovered in the development process.
- 8.6 A paper copy of this document will be available on-site at all times for reference.




Key

-  Site Boundary
-  1km Buffer
-  2km Buffer
-  Buildings
-  Previously Granted EPSL

Statutory Sites

-  Hopland Woodlands LNR
-  Rochdale Canal SAC & SSI

0 0.25 0.5 0.75 1 km




Project Name: **Unit 32 Stakehill Industrial Estate**

Client: **Ross Jones**

Figure No: **Figure 1**

Date: 06.10.2025	Title: Site Location & Desk Study Plan
------------------	--





Key

Potential Roost Features

- Gap Behind Facia
- Weep Hole in Brickwork

0 10 20 m

Project Name:

Unit 32 Stakehill Industrial Estate

Client:

Ross Jones

Figure No:


Figure 2

Date:

06.10.2025

Title:

Site Layout and PRF
Location Plan



Key

- Site Boundary
- Buildings (With Reference)
- Surveyor Locations
- Bat Roost Location
- Common pipistrelle
- Bat Observations (Appendix B)
- Common Pipistrelle

0 5 10 15 m

Project Name: **Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate**

Client: **Ross Jones**

Figure No: **Figure 3**

Date: 06.10.2025 Title: Bat Emergence Survey Results Plan 25/09/25

 **Pioneer**
ENVIRONMENT





Pioneer Environment

Ecology. Mitigation. Enhancement.

Pioneer Environment
Spring Farm, Spring Lane,
Wymondham, LE14 2AY



Tel: 0116 350 0370



Email: office@pioneerenvironment.co.uk
Web: www.pioneerenvironment.co.uk



Appendix A:

Preliminary Roost Assessment Results

PEG681-02

Bat Building PRA

Bat Building PRA - 2024



PEG681, Middleton, Manchester, September 15, 2025

10/8/2025, 12:40:47 PM UTC



CREATED

🕒 9/15/2025, 9:13:08 AM UTC

👤 by Pioneer Data

UPDATED

🕒 10/8/2025, 12:40:47 PM UTC

👤 by Pioneer Data

STATUS

🟢 Completed

LOCATION

📍 53.571336, -2.172728

PEG Job Number	PEG681
Date	September 15, 2025
Site Name	Middleton, Manchester
Surveyor	Martin Woolley
Risk Assessment	September 15, 2025, Middleton, Machester

Building (4 Items)

Building - B1

Help and Info	
Building Number	B1
Structure Type	Industrial Unit
Structure Description	A large, detached, temporary metal shed with a pitched, canvas sheet roof.
No. of Storeys	1
Basic Construction	Steel, Metal Sheet
Roof Type	Pitched
Roof Material	Canvas
Chimneys	No
Gable Ends	Yes
Number of Gable Ends	2
Sky Lights/Roof Windows	Yes
Number of Skylight/Roof Windows	1
Sky Lights/Roof Windows Description	The roof is translucent allowing plenty of light into the internal structure.
Eaves	None
Fascias	None
Soffits	None
Barge-boards	None
Window Construction	None
Exposed Lintels	None
Dormers	No
Flashing Present	No
Cladding	None
Mortar Condition	

Conservatory/Extension?

Further Notes	No suitable features for roosting bats or birds and no evidence of either observed.
----------------------	---

External Photos



Internal Description (1 Item)**Internal Description - B1 - Internal Space**

Help and Info	
Roof Void Number	B1 - Internal Space
Description of Internals	No actual roof void present. The internals comprise a large open single space which is completely light.
Width (m)	18
Length (m)	23
Height (m)	6
Beam Structure	Steel tent
Beam Type	Steel
Underlining	No
Insulation	None
Cobwebs	None
Draft	Completely sealed
Lightness	Completely Light
Evidence of Bats Present	No
Further Notes	No evidence of bats observed and no suitable roost features identified.
Internal Photos	



PRF

Bat Roosting Potential	None
Hibernation Potential?	No
Number of Surveyors Required for Nocturnals	0

Building - B2

Help and Info	
Building Number	B2
Structure Type	Industrial Unit
Structure Description	A Large, detached, temporary metal shed with a sheet-metal, pitched roof.
No. of Storeys	1
Basic Construction	Metal Sheet
Roof Type	Pitched

Roof Material	Metal sheet
Chimneys	No
Gable Ends	Yes
Number of Gable Ends	2
Sky Lights/Roof Windows	No
Eaves	None
Fascias	None
Soffits	None
Barge-boards	None
Window Construction	uPVC
Exposed Lintels	None
Dormers	No
Flashing Present	No
Cladding	None
Mortar Condition	Good, No Gaps

Conservatory/Extension?

Further Notes | No evidence of bird or bats roosting and no suitable habitat identified.


External Photos




Internal Description (1 Item)**Internal Description - B2 - Internal Space**

Help and Info	
Roof Void Number	B2 - Internal Space
Description of Internals	A single, large room, with 2 small office rooms separated to one end. Bright conditions and no suitable potential roost features identified.
Width (m)	16
Length (m)	21
Height (m)	6
Beam Structure	Steel truss
Beam Type	Steel
Underlining	No
Insulation	None
Cobwebs	None
Draft	Completely sealed
Lightness	Completely Dark
Evidence of Bats Present	No
Further Notes	Two offices inside which are self contained units. No access for bats internally and the space was unsuitable for roosting bats.

Internal Photos







PRF

Bat Roosting Potential	None
Hibernation Potential?	No
Number of Surveyors Required for Nocturnals	0

Building - B3

Help and Info	
Building Number	B3
Structure Type	Industrial Unit
Structure Description	Large industrial unit with the front (northern) section of brick construction with a flat tiled roof in use as offices. Large steel-framed workshop adjoining the rear with a pitched, sheet-metal roof.
No. of Storeys	2
Basic Construction	Brick, Metal Sheet
Roof Type	Flat, Pitched
Roof Material	Metal sheet
Chimneys	No
Gable Ends	Yes
Number of Gable Ends	2
Sky Lights/Roof Windows	Yes
Number of Skylight/Roof Windows	30
Sky Lights/Roof Windows Description	Translucent plastic panels on the roof acting as rooflights for the shed.
Eaves	None
Fascias	Wood
Soffits	None

Barge-boards	None
Window Construction	uPVC
Exposed Lintels	None
Dormers	No
Flashing Present	Yes
Flashing Description	Flashing where the front porch joins the brickwork. No gaps.
Cladding	Metal Sheets
Mortar Condition	Good, No Gaps

Conservatory/Extension?

Further Notes	Externally the building is completely sealed and internally the building is light and open. Metal beams and structure also makes for unsuitable roosting places as they tend to provide unstable conditions. Frontage is used as offices with false ceiling.
----------------------	--

External Photos





Internal Description (1 Item)**Internal Description - B3 - Internal Space****Help and Info**

Roof Void Number	B3 - Internal Space
Description of Internals	No roof void present within the office section as all rooms are lined and sealed. The rear workshop has a single large open space with no insulation or underlining.
Width (m)	23
Length (m)	53
Height (m)	8
Beam Structure	Metal Truss
Beam Type	Steel
Underlining	No
Insulation	None
Cobwebs	None
Draft	Few Drafts
Lightness	Completely Light
Evidence of Bats Present	No
Further Notes	No evidence of bats or birds present and no suitable habitat identified.

Internal Photos



PRF	
Bat Roosting Potential	None
Hibernation Potential?	No
Number of Surveyors Required for Nocturnals	0

Building - B4

Help and Info

Building Number	B4
Structure Type	Offices
Structure Description	Brick- built, two-storey offices with a flat, felted-timber roof at the front. The rear is and industrial shed with a pitched, fibre-board roof
No. of Storeys	2
Basic Construction	Brick, Concrete Fibre-board, Cement Fibre-board
Roof Type	Flat, Pitched
Roof Material	Cement fibre-board
Chimneys	No
Gable Ends	Yes
Number of Gable Ends	1
Sky Lights/Roof Windows	Yes
Number of Skylight/Roof Windows	2
Sky Lights/Roof Windows Description	Two plastic panels act as rooflights in the shed. No rooflights present in the office spaces.
Eaves	None
Fascias	Wood, Cement fibre-board
Soffits	None
Barge-boards	None
Window Construction	uPVC
Exposed Lintels	None
Dormers	No
Flashing Present	No
Cladding	Cement fibre-board
Mortar Condition	Good, No Gaps

Conservatory/Extension?

Further Notes	No evidence of bats or birds identified, but potential roost features were found around the front portion of the structure.
----------------------	---


External Photos



Internal Description (1 Item)**Internal Description - B4 - Internal Space****Help and Info**

Roof Void Number	B4 - Internal Space
Description of Internals	No roof void present within the office section and all rooms are lined and sealed. The rear workshop has a single, large open space with no insulation or underlining.
Width (m)	22
Length (m)	28
Height (m)	8
Beam Structure	Steel truss beams
Beam Type	Steel
Underlining	No
Insulation	None
Cobwebs	None
Draft	Noticable Drafts
Lightness	Mostly Light
Evidence of Bats Present	No
Further Notes	No internal PRFs or evidence of bats or birds identified.

Internal Photos



PRF (3 Items)

PRF - A

Feature Letter	A
Feature Type	Gap behind fascia
Size of PRF Opening	3cm x 1.4m
Description	Single fascia board lifted which allows a gap behind. Gap enters approx 5cm and tapers to a point. No evidence of roosting but could support a single opportunistic bat.

PRF Photos



PRF - B

Feature Letter	B
Feature Type	Fascias on the front
Size of PRF Opening	5cm
Description	Fascia along the front is slightly lifted allowing access behind.

PRF Photos



PRF - C

Feature Letter	C
Feature Type	Weep holes
Size of PRF Opening	5cm x 2cm
Description	A line of weep holes approximately 3m high. Endoscope show the holes entering to 1 brick deep before meeting the damp proof membrane.


PRF Photos

Bat Roosting Potential	Low
Hibernation Potential?	No
Number of Surveyors Required for Nocturnals	3

Survey Completed

Survey Completed?	Yes
--------------------------	-----

Sign-off Signature



Signed 9/15/2025, 10:58:43 AM UTC

Quality Assurance

QA Date	October 8, 2025
QA Completed by	Lewis Andrew
QA Completed	Yes
QA Comments	Minor grammatical alterations made.



Pioneer Environment

Ecology. Mitigation. Enhancement.

Pioneer Environment
Spring Farm, Spring Lane,
Wymondham, LE14 2AY

Tel: 0116 350 0370

Email: office@pioneerenvironment.co.uk
Web: www.pioneerenvironment.co.uk



Appendix B:

Bat Emergence Survey Results: September 2025

PEG681-03

Bat Survey Report: Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Manchester

Survey Results – 25/09/2025

Observation	Time	Species	Heard/Seen	Activity	Surveyor Notes	Surveyor
1	19:00	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Commuting	Around back of brick building and to NE	SL03
2	19:03	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Commuting	Flying over far side of brick building and around front to the W. Flew parallel to front of building continuing W	SL01, SL02, & SL03
3	19:10	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Commuting	Flew N from obscured side of building.	SL01
4	19:10	Common pipistrelle	Heard Only	Commuting	Heard a couple of very brief calls	SL02
5	19:12	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Commuting	Flew N from obscured side of building.	SL01
6	19:12	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging	Appeared foraging in front of building and then headed N. Seen foraging to NW of building around trees	SL02 & SL03
7	19:17	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Emergence	Emergence from Facia near air vent on the northern aspect of B3	SL03
8	19:24	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Emergence	Single bat emerged from the facia above the windows on the northern aspect of B3.	SL02
9	19:24	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging	Seen from back of brick building to E	SL03

Bat Survey Report: Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Manchester

10	19:25	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging	From E to forage around front of building and back to E	SL03
11	19:25	Noctule	H	Commuting	Brief pass	SL03
12	19:32	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging	Fly across building from SW towards NE	SL03
13	19:40	Common pipistrelle	H	Commuting	Extremely brief call file 190447	SL01
14	19:51	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Socialising	Multiple passes around S side of building from multiple bats.	SL01
15	19:51	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging/Socialising	Foraging to N and E of building, some passes HNS, sporadic passes for 5 mins	SL03
16	19:52	Common pipistrelle	Seen and Heard	Foraging/Socialising	Social calls heard nearby for few minutes, and visually flew overhead to SW, heard again at 19:58	SL02
17	19:59	Common pipistrelle	Heard Only	Foraging	Constant until 20:00	SL03



Pioneer Environment

Ecology. Mitigation. Enhancement.

Pioneer Environment
Spring Farm, Spring Lane,
Wymondham, LE14 2AY

Tel: 0116 350 0370

Email: office@pioneerenvironment.co.uk
Web: www.pioneerenvironment.co.uk




PEG681-03

Appendix C: Darkest Point Photos

Bat Survey Report: Unit 32, Stakehill Industrial Estate, Manchester

Darkest Point Photos – 25/09/2025



SL01 – Oliver Amy



SL02 – Megan Gale



SL03 – Eilidh Brown