

DALE STREET, MILNROW

Nocturnal Bat Survey Report

September 2025



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Dale Street, Milnrow
Project Reference: CW20-1421
Report Title: Bat Survey Report
Report Reference: CW20-1421 RPT 003
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

<i>Rev</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Prepared</i>	<i>Reviewed</i>	<i>Approved</i>
/	02/09/2025	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	EA	OC	OC
/	03/09/2025	Final report sent to Client.	EA	OC	OC

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Howe Rigout and Construction and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Howe Rigout and Construction and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Howe Rigout and Construction and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 4

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE 4

1.2. LOCATION 4

1.3. OBJECTIVES 4

2 METHODOLOGY 5

2.1. NOCTURNAL BAT SURVEY 5

2.2. SURVEY LIMITATIONS 5

3 SURVEY RESULTS 6

3.1. DUSK SURVEY (23/06/2025) 6

3.2. DUSK SURVEY (16/07/2025) 6

3.3. ASSESSMENT 7

4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION 8

4.1. IMPACT ASSESSMENT 8

4.2. MITIGATION 8

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY 9

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE

- 1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Howe Rigout and Construction to undertake Nocturnal Bat Surveys at Dale Street, Milnrow. These surveys and the subsequent report have been undertaken to inform planning permission at the site to convert the top floor of the onsite building into apartments.
- 1.1.2. The author of this report is Emma Anderson MSc, Consultant Ecologist. The project has been overseen by Olivia Collington BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, CEnv, Director at Collington Winter Environmental. Olivia is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.
- 1.1.3. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the building on site was undertaken by Caitlin O'Connor who holds a Level 2 Natural England Bat Licence (Reference 2023-11812-CL17-BAT), in February 2024. The building was found to have **Moderate** bat roosting potential; therefore, a minimum of two further surveys were recommended, the results of which are detailed in this report.

1.2. LOCATION

- 1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the approximate site location. The site is situated at Dale Street, Milnrow within an urban district of Rochdale.

Figure 1.1 Site Location



1.3. OBJECTIVES

- 1.3.1. The objectives of the Nocturnal Bat Survey are as follows:
- Identify any bats roosting within the buildings.
 - Assess the value of the buildings for roosting bats.
 - Identify the species assemblage of bats using the site.
 - Provide recommendations on any further surveys or mitigation required for bats.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1. NOCTURNAL BAT SURVEY

2.1.1. The nocturnal surveys were undertaken as dusk surveys on 23rd June 2025 and 16th July 2025 by three qualified surveyors. Four infrared cameras (Nightfox whisker, Digital Night Vision Goggles) were used during the survey to cover vantage points of the building.

2.1.2. Please refer to Figure 2.1 for locations of vantage points used during the surveys.

Figure 2.1 Surveyor Locations – Red line depicts the onsite building



2.1.3. The surveys were undertaken in line with guidance as set out in Collins (2023). Surveyors used Echo Meter Touch bat detectors. All surveyors were suitably experienced undertaking bat emergence surveys. Please refer to Table 2.1 below for details of surveyors.

Date	Sunset Time	Start	Finish	Surveyors	Weather Conditions
23/06/2025	21:42	21:27	23:12	VP1 – IR Camera and Jen Thomas VP2 – IR Camera and Joshua Lesser VP3 & VP4 – IR Cameras and Tina Marshall	Temp at start: 14 Celsius Cloud start: 8 (Oktas) Wind: 3 max (Beaufort scale) Rain:0
16/07/2025	21:28	21:13	22:58	VP1 – IR Camera and Georgia Duffy VP2 – IR Camera and Joshua Lesser VP3 & VP4 – IR Cameras and Max Robinson	Temp at start: 18 Celsius Cloud start: 1 (Oktas) Wind: 1 max (Beaufort scale) Rain:0

2.2. SURVEY LIMITATIONS

2.2.1. No limitations were observed during the nocturnal bat surveys.

3 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1. DUSK SURVEY (23/06/2025)

- 3.1.1. Bat activity was recorded minimally throughout the survey, with common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) recorded or observed commuting across all vantage points.
- 3.1.2. The first bat was recorded at 21:44 (approximately two minutes after sunset) in the vicinity of VPs 3 & 4, and was identified as a common pipistrelle. This bat was observed foraging. Another common pipistrelle was observed foraging in the same vicinity at 22:03 and was then observed commuting from this location towards VP1 at 22:05. This instance of commuting was recorded across all VPs, and observed by surveyors at VP3 and VP1.
- 3.1.3. A single instance of noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*) was recorded at VP2 at 22:12. This bat was heard but not seen.
- 3.1.4. No roost locations were observed during the survey.

Table 3.3 – Images of Camera Footage at the Darkest Point

IRC 1	IRC 2
	
IRC 3	IRC 4
	

3.2. DUSK SURVEY (16/07/2025)

- 3.2.1. Bat activity was recorded intermittently throughout the survey, with common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) recorded or observed across all vantage points.
- 3.2.2. The first bat was recorded at 22:02 (approximately thirty-four minutes after sunset) in the vicinity of VPs 3 & 4 and was identified as a common pipistrelle. This bat was heard but not seen. Further instances of common pipistrelle were recorded across all VPs intermittently, with the final recording occurring at 22:52. Several instances of commuting common pipistrelle were observed; by VP1 at 22:19 and 22:26, by VP2 at 22:14, and by VP3 & 4 at 22:35.

3.2.3. One instance of soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) was recorded in the vicinity of VP1 at 22:20.

3.2.4. No roost locations were observed during the survey.

Table 3.4 – Images of Camera Footage at the Darkest Point



3.3. ASSESSMENT

3.3.1. Two dusk surveys were conducted on 23/06/2025 and 16/07/2025. During the first survey, common pipistrelles was recorded in the vicinity of all vantage points, with commuting and some minimal foraging activity observed. Similar results were obtained on the second survey, indicating that the site supports a limited level of bat foraging and commuting activity. Single instances of both noctule and soprano pipistrelle were recorded during survey one and survey two, respectively.

3.3.2. Overall, minimal bat activity was recorded throughout the NBS. Field observations and AI footage review confirm that no emergencies occurred, and that activity was limited to commuting and minimal instances of foraging. As no evidence of bat roosts or significant bat activity was observed on site, no further licences or surveys are required to proceed with the proposed development.

4 RECOMMENDATIONS AND MITIGATION

4.1. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1.1. The proposed development works will include the development of the upper floor of the onsite building into residential apartments. As the survey completed at the site did not identify roosting bats it is not considered the development has the risk of injuring and/or killing bats or disturbing/destroying any known bat roosts and therefore, there is no requirement for a Natural England European Protected Species License (EPSL) to be in place prior to works starting on site
- 4.1.2. As bats were observed utilising the area for commuting and foraging, measures to minimize the impact on any bats in the local area has been recommended (section 4.2)

4.2. MITIGATION

- 4.2.1. All bats have some degree of sensitivity to artificial night-time lighting. Introducing artificial lighting to areas that are not currently illuminated may sever important bat flight lines and discourage bats from using roost provisions. It is recommended that where external lighting is to be provided on the new buildings that this is designed and installed to comply with current legislation and to minimize the impact on any bats in the locale.
- 4.2.2. It is advised that an external lighting mitigation plan is produced to assess the pre- and post-development changes in lighting and to advise on an appropriately sensitive scheme as part of the proposed development, this will help to identify and retain the commuting and foraging dark corridors on site.
- 4.2.3. Any proposed lighting/existing lighting should follow the guidance outlined in the Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2023) "Bats and artificial lighting at night – Guidance Note (GN08/23)". An External Lighting Scheme had not been produced at the writing of this report. As such, the following recommendations are to be considered on-site to minimise the impacts of lighting. The recommendations are as follows:
- Keep site lighting to minimum levels.
 - Luminaries should lack UV elements and preferably LED lighting with a warm white light should be used over cool white light (ideally <2700Kelvin).
 - Lighting should feature peak wavelengths greater than 550nm.
 - Light placement should be downward facing to prevent excess horizontal or vertical light spill.
 - The use of integrated fittings such as cowls, shields, louvres and hoods, that effectively contain light spill from unintended areas.
 - The use of hard landscaping features to block light and create dark corridors.
 - Avoid illuminating habitats of value.
 - Use of timed security lights should be set on motion-sensors and using short, 1-minute timers, to minimise light use.
 - Column heights of lighting can be considered to minimise light spill.
- 4.2.4. Due to the nature of the species recorded locally and the potential utilisation of the new building and wider habitat for foraging and commuting purposes, it would be deemed beneficial as an enhancement of the site to include a number of crevice-dwelling bat boxes at the design stage of the project.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK: Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 4th edition. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Institute of Lighting Engineers (2005). Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.
- Mitchell-Jones (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines: Working Today for Natura Tomorrow. English Nature.
- Mitchell-Jones and McLeish (2004). Third Edition Bat Workers' Manual.

