curious
ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

36 Main Road, Twycross
Leicestershire
Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 5th August 2009

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 36 Main Road, Twycross

Name of Client: Mr & Mrs Tebbutt

Address of Client: 36 Main Road, Twycross, Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 3PL

Name of Agent: C.A. Underwood

Address Of Agent: The Barn, Church Lane, Ravenstone, Leicestershire, LE67 2AE

Date of Survey: 4th September 2009

Weather Conditions: 100% cloud, slight breeze, showers, 19^0C

Address of survey site: 36 Main Road, Twycross, Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 3PL

Planning Application Number: 09/00530/FUL

Grid Reference of survey site: SK 3363 0511

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

Licence Numbers: Bat 20083261 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. Also another roof is to be extended. 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 village setting, and consisted of a detached two storey house, surrounded by garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (gravel driveway, slabs), herbaceous/shrub borders and mown lawn. There were young trees in the area, the nearest being about 20m distance, but these are unaffected by the proposals. There was no vegetation to be removed within the area of the proposed development, and there were no ponds on the site.
The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences and agricultural land (a mix of arable and permanent grass.

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached two-storey house, with brick walls and a tile roof (interlocking tiles).



Photo 1: showing area to be extended

The roof was at more than one height and was supported by timber trussed rafters. It was in sections with valleys between, had equal pitches and gable ends. The tiles had roof felt backing. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey. It was fully insulated; the insulation was pushed into the eaves.

There were many webs in the loft space, particularly on the ridge board, indicating that nothing had disturbed the space for some time. There were no gaps between the tiles or missing tiles.
There were wooden bargeboards on the gable ends, but the eaves behind these were filled with webs. There were no missing ridge tiles, and no pointing was missing under the ridge tiles. No pointing was missing in the gable ends. There were no gaps under the lead flashing around the chimney.
The other section of roof, which is to be altered, is of a similar construction to the main roof. It to was covered in webs in the eaves and had no missing tiles or pointing. The lead flashing covering the join to the walls of the house were tight fitting with no cavities.



Photo 2: View of 36 Main Road from front

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 be active at this time of year and a detector was on all the time that the survey was taking place, in case the light from the torch disturbed bats.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds would be nesting at the time of the year when the survey was undertaken.

A note was made of any signs of other protected species, or whether there was any appropriate habitat for other 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. The bat detector remained silent throughout the survey, and any access points for bats to gain entry into the building or roof were full of webs.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found in or on the building in the area of the proposed development, and there was no vegetation that would be suitable for birds to nest in.

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 The property not been used by bats as a roost site.

4.2 The area of the building, which would be affected by the proposals, had not been used for birds to nest, and there were no old nests in this area.

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

5) Recommendations and Mitigations

None necessary

References

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

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

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

Heaton, A. (1998) *Rare Wildlife in Leicestershire and Rutland* Kairos Press

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)