



PRELIMINARY BAT ROOST APPRAISAL

52 GREENMORE ROAD, BURBAGE
LE10 2LT

Date: 10th December 2025

Client: Jamie Towers

Martin Ecology

Mobile: 07752 243194
Email: info@martinecology.co.uk
Web: www.martinecology.co.uk

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Location	3
1.2 Site description	3
1.3 Scope of survey	3
1.4 Planning context	3
1.5 Legislative context - bats	3
1.6 Licensing	4
1.7 Legislative context - birds	4
2. METHODOLOGY	4
2.1 Building inspections	4
3. RESULTS	5
3.1 Building inspection	5
4. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	7
5. RELEVANT LITERATURE	8

1. INTRODUCTION

Location

1.1 The site is located at 52 Greenmoor Road, Burbage, Hinckley LE10 2LT. National Grid Reference: **SP 42652 92575**.

Site description

1.2 The Site is a detached, single storey structure that appeared to have originally been constructed during the mid-twentieth century. Onsite habitats are of low quality for bats and include buildings and developed land, and modified grassland. Wider habitats are predominantly developed land with vegetated gardens and arable and pastoral, although there is connectivity between the Site to better habitat¹ including patches of deciduous woodland, scrub, linear standing water, and a minor water course.

Scope of Survey

1.3 It is understood that a planning application is being prepared to demolish the property and construct a replacement dwelling. A Preliminary Roost Appraisal for bats (PRA) was requested by the LPA to try to assess whether or not the proposals would impact bats and find out whether or not a European Protected Species License (EPSL) would be required for the proposals to go ahead. The survey would also look for the presence of and potential for breeding birds to assess potential impacts.

Legislative context-bats

1.4 All species of bats are protected under *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended by the *Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000*), *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* and it is an offence to:

- deliberately kill, injure, recklessly disturb or take bats;
- obstruct access to their roosts (or place of rest);
- damage or destroy bat roosts;
- Possess or sell bats unless acquired legally

1.4.1 Bats commonly use man-made structures to roost within and when undertaking building work in houses or other structures such as remedial work, extension, renovation or demolition there is potential to contravene the legislation outlined in 1.4.

Planning context

1.5 According to planning policy, prior to planning permission being determined it is expected that all survey work pertaining to protected species (and mitigation scheme if required) should be completed and reported.

1.5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that development should enhance the environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

Licensing

1.6 The presence of bat roosts that will be affected by proposals that would trigger the above legislation (such as removal of a roof / roof tiles or demolition of a building) necessitates the application for EPSL from Natural England. Such licences permit activities

¹ Source: <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx> checked 10/12/2025.

that would otherwise be unlawful. Licences are only issued if three tests are satisfied, and these are:

- there is no satisfactory alternative
- there are overriding reasons of public interest and,
- the favourable conservation status of bat populations is maintained.

Legislative context-birds

1.7 All species of wild bird and their nests and eggs are protected under the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended by the *Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000*). This makes it illegal to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird;
- Intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built; and
- Intentionally take or destroy an egg of any wild bird.

1.7.1 Schedule 1 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* gives some bird species greater protection against disturbance whilst breeding (including barn owl).

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Building inspection

2.1.1 A daytime visit was made to the Site and the interior of the building was searched for bats and evidence of bats (such as droppings, fur, feeding remains and roost exits). All accessible roof void sections were examined, and the inspection was made using a ladder and with the assistance of a one million candlepower torch and a Bosch GIC 120 C endoscope. All accessible potential roosting features (PRFs) where bats might roost were inspected for bats, or evidence of bats.

2.1.2 An inspection was made of the exterior of the building for signs of bats such as: staining, grease marks, urine, fur, feeding remains and droppings on windowsills and walls, or PRFs that might offer access for bats into the building (such as cracks and fissures on or around roof and ridge tiles, soffits, barge boards or brickwork). A one million candlepower torch, an extendable ladder, a Bosch GIC 120 C endoscope and binoculars were used to undertake the external inspection and all accessible features were inspected for bats or evidence of bats.

2.1.3 During the visit signs of breeding birds was also looked for at the exterior. A photographic record was made of the site and some photos are included within Table 1.

2.1.4 Dean Martin (MCIEEM) conducted the survey work on 11th November 2025. Natural England bat licence number: 2015-10605-CLS-CLS.

2.1.5 The building was assessed along with local habitats and their potential for widespread crevice-dwelling and void-seeking bat species was considered. Google maps was used to make a general assessment of the site and local habitats. The government website <https://magic.defra.gov.uk> was checked for European Protected Species (EPS) licences granted by Natural England for bats within 2km of the site which revealed no records.

2.1.6 Constraints

None were identified.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Building inspection

3.1.1 The building appeared to be of mid-twentieth century construction and comprised a detached brick structure. The roof was a pyramid design and clad with concrete interlocking tiles. The roof was in very good condition; all roof tiles, ridge tiles and bonnet tiles were in place and well-sealed to the exclusion of bats and birds and the area around the chimney stacks were sealed. There was a finlock concrete gutter at the soffit area which was sealed.

3.1.2 The single storey section was brick with a flat roof.

3.1.3 No evidence of bats was recorded during the external inspection.

3.1.4 Inside the roof space it was apparent that the roof was supported by a light weight timbers and was lined with bitumen felt. Heavy cobwebbing was noted along the ridge and rafters, and the loft floor was insulated and supported a layer of dust, and a certificate of installation indicated this was done in 2008. No evidence of bats or bat activity was identified within the roof void.



Photo 1 Northern elevation



Photo 2 West elevation



Photo 3 Sealed finlock gutter



Photo 4 Sealed fascia at single storey section



Photo 5 Heavily cobwebbed roof void



Photo 6 Old dust at loft floor

4. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Bats

No evidence of bats or bat activity was recorded during the survey. The building supports no suitable potential roost features or viable ingress/egress points and is therefore considered unsuitable to support bat roosts. As a result, the proposed works are considered unlikely to affect bats. The structure is assessed as having negligible bat roost suitability, and no further bat surveys are recommended at this stage.

4.2 Breeding Birds

No evidence of breeding birds, or features with the potential to support nesting birds, was recorded in association with the building. No specific mitigation for breeding birds is required at this time.

4.3 Validity of Report

If the proposed works do not commence within one year of the survey, an updated ('top-up') bat inspection will be required to ensure the assessment remains current and to confirm the continued absence of bat roosting activity at the site.

5. RELEVANT LITERATURE

Bat Conservation Trust (2023) *Bat Surveys – Good Practice Guidelines*.

CIEEM (2023) UK BAT MITIGATION GUIDELINES. A guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats.

Schober, W and Grimmberger, E. (1993) *Bats of Britain and Europe*. Hamlyn.

Mitchell-Jones, A. (2004) *Bat mitigation guidelines*. English Nature.

Wardhaugh, A. A. (1987) *Bats of the British Isles*. Shire Natural History.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee, (2004) *Bat Workers' Manual*, Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

Stebbing, R. E. (1986) *Bats*. Mammal Society.