TECHAPPR

curious ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

6 Shakespeare Drive, Hinckley, Leicestershire, Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 20th July 2011

Proprietors

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

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

There are plans to extend the existing property, which includes altering the existing roof and converting the garage to residential accomodation. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested to apply for Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a suburban setting, near the centre of Hinckley and consisted of a detached bungalow surrounded by a garden (mown lawn, shrub/herbaceous planting and hardstanding- slabs and tarmac). There were trees in the vicinity of the site, but these are not affected by the proposals. There were no ponds on the site. There was no vegetation to be removed within the area of the proposed site.
The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences and their gardens, plus a Public Park on the opposite side of the road.

1.3 The Buildings



Photo 1: [redacted], front view

The bungalow was detached, with brick walls and with a tile roof (interlocking composite pantiles). It was single-storey in the main house and in the attached garage, with two lofts, one above the garage. The lofts and roof timbers were accessible for survey. The lofts had dormer-type window in them, which made the lofts very light. The roof was in sections and had gable ends, and was at more than one height, with unequal and equal pitches either side of each section. The roofs were supported by purlins, rafters and bracing pieces. The tiles were lined with membrane.



Photo 2: webs on roof timbers

The roof timbers were covered in spiders' webs. There were no missing tiles, or gaps between the tiles, plus the ends of the tiles were blocked. The ridge tiles were all in place with no gaps.

There were wooden soffits and fascias. There were no gaps between the wall and the soffits; also the eaves were covered in spiders' webs. There were no gaps in the pointing under the ridge tiles or in the gable ends, between the tiles. There were wooden soffits and bargeboards on the gable ends. There were no gaps between the wall and the soffits; also these eaves were covered in spiders' webs. The lead flashing on the chimney joints and roof sections was all in place and tight fitting.

There were wooden door and window frames, and there were no gaps or cavities around these. The attached garage was of a similar build.



Photo 3: Rear view of property

2) Survey Methods

The buildings were 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 the time of year that the survey was undertaken, and a bat detector was on at all times, in case light from the torch disturbed bats.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds are likely 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 and dust. There were no gaps or cavities that could allow access for bats.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found in or on the building, and there was no vegetation in the vicinity of the proposed development 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 Bats had not used the buildings as a roost site.

4.2 The buildings had not been used for birds to nest and there was no vegetation suitable for birds to nest in.

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

5) Recommendations

- The proposed development is unlikely to have a negative affect on the biodiversity of the area, as it will only affect an area, which would be classed as of limited wildlife value, i.e. garden and buildings being the habitats present. (England Field Unit 2007).

- Also no evidence of a bat roost was found during the survey, and so there are no further recommendations.

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)