curious
ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

The Pines, Dawson's Lane, Barwell, Leicestershire
Biodiversity & Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 24th August 2009

DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES
25 AUG 2009
RECEIVED

Proprietors

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

CURIOUS ECOLOGISTS ABG
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANC

Protected Species Survey at The Pines, Barwell

Name of Client: Mr & Mrs Copeland

Address of Client: The Pines, Dawson's Lane, Barwell, Leicestershire, LE9 8BE

Name of Agent: Mike Perkins

Address of Agent: 9 Thirlmere Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 0PE

Date of Survey: 24th August 2009

Weather Conditions: 100% cloud, slight breeze, dry 18^{0}C

Address of survey site: The Pines, Dawson's Lane, Barwell, Leicestershire, LE9 8BE

Planning Application Number: 09/00639/FUL

Grid Reference of survey site: SP 4499 9684

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

Licence Numbers: Great Crested Newt 20082993 & Bat 20083261 issued by Natural England

CURIOUS ECOLOGISTS ABG
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANCY

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

It is proposed to extend the existing bungalow, which includes joining into the existing roof. 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 on the edge of Barwell, and consisted of a modern detached single-storey bungalow (built in 1981), surrounded by a large garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (slabs, block pavers and gravel) and mown lawn (amenity grass mix). There were a few trees in the near vicinity, and the boundary of the garden was mainly fence panels. There was some hedges in the vicinity, mostly hawthorn *Cretaegus monogyna* but these are unaffected by the proposals. There were no ponds on the site, and there did not appear to be any field ponds within 100m of the proposed development. There was very little vegetation within the area of the proposed extension other than mown grass.
The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences and to the front of the garden was agricultural land (permanent grass).

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached single-storey bungalow. It had brick walls and a tile roof (large composite flat tiles).

The roof to the bungalow was in one section at one height with equal pitches, and had gable ends. It was supported by timber trussed rafters, and the tiles had felt backing throughout. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey. It was insulated, and the insulation was pushed down into the eaves, blocking any access for birds or bats into the loft space. There were many webs in the loft space, particularly on the ridge and spanning the gap between the rafters and beams, indicating that nothing had disturbed the space for some time. There was no light entering the loft space. There were no gaps between or under the tiles. The ridge tiles were all in place and there were no gaps under or between them. The pointing in the roof at the gable ends was all in place. All the windows (mostly wooden and one plastic frame) were tightly fitted with no cavities or gaps that would allow access for bats.

There were wooden soffits and bargeboards supporting the guttering, and there were a few gaps between the wall and the soffits, but these were full of spiders' webs. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs, particularly at the gable ends. There was no chimney, but there was a vent, which had some gaps at its base, these were full of spiders' 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 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 there did not appear to be any access points for bats to gain entry into the building or roof that weren't filled with spiders' webs.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found on or in the bungalow. There was no vegetation in the garden suitable for birds to nest in, which 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.

CURIOUS ECOLOGISTS ABG
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANCY

4) Conclusions

4.1 The bungalow had not been used by bats as a roost site.

4.2 The building had not been used for birds to nest, and there were no old nests 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

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)

CURIOUS ECOLOGISTS ABG
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANCY

Appendix 1: Photograph of Site



Photo 1: The Pines, view from front



Photo 2- The Pines, view from rear

CURIOUS ECOLOGISTS ABG
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANCY