curious
ECOLOGISTS

Curious Ecologists
Ecological Consultants
156, Meadow Lane
Coalville
LE67 4DP
Tel. 01530 457440
curiousecologists@yahoo.co.uk

Report for

Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley, Leicestershire
Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 6th March 2010

Proprietors

Bern Gibney (Ecologist) – 07875 484342 (mob)
Karen Headley (Ecologist) – 07913 873904 (mob)
Martin Randall (Woodland and Arboricultural Consultant) – 07968 297893 (mob)

Protected Species Survey at Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley

Name of Client: Mr Halbourg

Address of Client: Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 1LF

Name of Agent: Henderson Scott, contact Michael Scott

Address of Agent: 3 Millers Yard, Church Square, Market Harborough Leicestershire, LE16 7PW

Date of Survey: 5th March 2010

Weather Conditions: 10% cloud, breezy, dry, cool 5^0C

Address of survey site: Moorbeck, 7 Butt Lane Close, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 1LF

Planning Application Number: 10/00067/EXT

Grid Reference of survey site: SP 4347 9426

Name of Surveyor: A.B.Gibney BSc (Hons), MIEEM

Licence Numbers: Bat 20093453 issued by Natural England

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

It is proposed to extend the property, which involves joining the extension roof into the existing roof and also converting the roof space into living space. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested as part of the Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a suburban setting, and consisted of a detached two storey house, surrounded by garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (slabs), herbaceous/shrub borders and mown lawn. There were trees in the area, but none affected by the proposed development. There were no ponds on the site. There was no vegetation to be removed within the area of the proposed development.
The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences.

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached two-storey house, with rendered brick walls and a tile roof (flat clay tiles).
The main roof was in sections with gable ends. The roof sections were supported by timber purlins and rafters. The roof was at different heights with unequal pitches on some sections. There were no missing tiles, and the gaps between the tiles were full of webs. The tiles had a roof felt lining in part and had cement torching in other sections. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey. It was insulated. There were many webs in the loft space, particularly on the ridge boards, indicating that nothing had disturbed the space for some time. There was light entering the loft space, through gaps under the tiles, where the torching had fallen away. The ridge tiles were all in place and there were no gaps under them. There were no soffits or fascias supporting the guttering, and the gap between the wall plate and the tiles was blocked with boarding, and the rendering on the walls. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. There were wooden framed windows and doors, and there were no gaps or cavities around these. The lead flashing over the chimney joint was tightly fitted with no gaps or cavities. The pointing on the gable ends was mostly in place, and where it was missing, the gaps were full of webs. There was wooden barge boarding on the gables, but this was well away from the wall, and the space between the bargeboard and the rendered wall was full of webs.

2) Survey Methods

The building was searched in a systematic pattern, all available spaces were searched, looking for signs of bats, in particular droppings, insect remains (where bats have fed), lack of spiders' webs (where bats have roosted), the bats themselves and body oils stains (where bats have squeezed through gaps). Particular attention was paid to undisturbed surfaces, walls (where bat droppings sometimes stick) and window sills (both inside and outside the buildings). The search was carried out with a high power torch inside the building and binoculars on the outside (particularly searching under eaves and ridge tiles). All cavities were checked using an endoscope to establish if anything was within them. Bats would not be active at the time of year that the survey was undertaken.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds are unlikely to be nesting at the time of year that the survey took place.

The ground was searched for tracks, trails or signs (particularly droppings and food/feeding signs) of protected species.

3) Results

3.1 Bats – There was no evidence of bats found during the survey, there were no droppings or other signs, all surfaces and cavities were covered in spiders' webs. There did not appear to be any access points for bats to gain access under the eaves of the roof as the render had blocked any gaps. All possible access points where there were missing tiles or pointing, were full of webs.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found in or on the building. There was no vegetation that would be suitable for birds to nest in, that would be affected by the proposals.

3.3 There was no evidence of any other protected species on the site, and there did not appear to be any habitat suitable for other protected species.

4) Conclusions

4.1 Bats had not used the building as a roost site.

4.2 There were no suitable nest sites for birds in the vicinity of the proposed development, and no evidence of birds nesting on the building.

4.3 There were no indications of any other protected species on the site.

5) Recommendations and Mitigations

- None necessary

References and Bibliography

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. [ed.] (1999) *The Bat Workers' Manual* JNCC

K.Parsons (ed.) (2007) *Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines* Bat Conservation Trust

Hill, D., Fasham, M., Tucker, G., Shewry, M. & Shaw, P. (Eds) (2006) *Handbook of Biodiversity Methods: Survey, Evaluation & Monitoring* Cambridge

Betts, C.J. (2001) *Checklist of Protected British Species* Christopher Betts Environmental Biology

Report Produced by

Alan Bernard Gibney BSc (Hons), MIEEM - Ecologist (Curious Ecologists)

Appendix 1: Photographs of Site



Photo 1: Moorbeck viewed from front



Photo 2: Moorback, view from Butt Lane Close