



Darwin Group

Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital

Construction Ecological
Management Plan (CEMP) for
discharge of Condition 20

Contents

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	4
1.0 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Scope & Objectives	5
2.0 SITE CONTEXT	6
2.1 The Site	6
2.2 Permitted Development	6
3.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	6
4.0 METHOD STATEMENT - ENVIRONMENTAL	6
4.2 Biodiversity Protection Zones	8
5.0 METHOD STATEMENT - ECOLOGY	9
5.1 Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW)	9
5.2 Breeding Birds	11
5.3 Roosting Bats	11
5.4 Foraging and Commuting Bats	11
5.5 Hedgehogs	12
5.6 Great Crested Newts	12
5.7 Other Priority and Protected Species	12
5.8 Timing	12
6.0 REFERENCES	13


Appendix A: Site Plan Location

Appendix B:

- Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report' Report No. 784-Bo72688, April 2025
- Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings' Report No. 784-Bo72688, June 2025
- Geosphere Environmental's Letter titled 'Great Crested Newt Presence / Absence eDNA survey

Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital – CEMP

Document and Quality Control

Report Title	Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP)
Site Name & Location	Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 1AE
Site OS Grid Reference (centroid)	SP 42950 93719
Survey Date (s)	N/A
Client Name and Contact	Darwin Group, Richard Bailey, rbailey@darwingroup.co.uk 03331885113 ext: 371/ 07485325702
Report Status	FINAL
Red Kite Project Name & Reference	Hinckley Day Case Unit 699.24
Red Kite File Path	Red Kite Network Ltd - Projects\Hinckley Day Case Unit 699.24\1. Client issue
Principal Report Author/Field Surveyor	Katie Lewis – Principal Landscape Architect
Report Assistant/Field Surveyor	Bea White, BSc (Hons), Graduate Ecologist
Verification and Review	Dr Kirsten L Hunter. BSc (Hons), ACIEEM, Senior Ecologist 
Client Issue Date	8 th August 2025
Issued By	K. Lewis

Revision History

Revision	Date of revision	Revision by	Verified by	Revision description	Date of issue

Disclaimer

Red Kite Network Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and Red Kite Network Limited. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report. Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by Red Kite Network Limited for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested. No part of this report may be copied or duplicated or reassigned without the express permission of the Client or Red Kite Network Limited. Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work. Red Kite Network Limited accepts no responsibility or liability for the use which is made of this document other than by the Client for the purpose of that, which was originally commissioned and prepared. This work has been undertaken in accordance with Red Kite Network Limited's in house management systems, relevant industry best practice and guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)'s *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 2nd edition* (2017). Red Kite Network Limited is a registered practice of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and implements the CIEEM's Code of Professional Conduct.

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Site Context	The Site is approximately 0.46 hectares (ha) and lies in the centre of Hinckley. It is surrounded by residential and commercial units with a line of mature trees adjacent to the site on the Northwestern border and a small area of open greenspace encompassed by the Site's Southern boundary. The permitted development is for the demolition of the former Cottage Hospital and development of new day case surgery building with associated landscaping and parking at Hinckley and District General Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley. Planning application reference: 25/00461/FUL.
Roles and Responsibilities	The site occupier is NHS Property Services. During the construction period and until practical completion, Darwin Group will maintain and manage the site. Post construction and following Post Practical Completion, the Site will be managed by the NHS Property Services.
Aims and Objectives	The aims for the CEMP are to satisfy the requirements of planning condition 20 and are as follows; a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities. b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones". c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements). d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features. e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works. f) Responsible persons and lines of communication. g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person. h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
Implementation	It is anticipated that demolition of the existing structures and infrastructure is to commence November 2025, the soft landscape works to commence July 2026 and completion October 2026.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope & Objectives

1.1.1 This document has been prepared by Red Kite Network Limited (Red Kite), Landscape Architecture, Ecology and Arboriculture Consultants for Darwin Group (hereon referred to as ‘the Client’). The aim of this document to provide a CEMP for the discharge of condition 20 for the permitted development at Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital (hereon referred to as ‘the Site’), planning reference 25/00461/FUL. This permitted development is for the demolition of the former Cottage Hospital and development of new day case surgery building with associated landscaping and parking at Hinckley and District General Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley.

1.1.2 The aim of the CEMP is to set out the responsibilities regarding compliance with legislation and to implement any mitigation measures set out in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal completed by Geosphere Environmental in April 2025.

1.1.3 Planning consent was granted by Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council on 22nd July 2025 (ref: 25/00461/FUL). As part of this planning consent the following planning condition was given:

Condition 20. ‘Prior to commencement of the development a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.*
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".*
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).*
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.*
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.*
- f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.*
- g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECOW) or similarly competent person.*
- h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.*

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species in accordance with Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016) and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and s40 of the NERC Act 2006 (as amended).’

1.1.4 This Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been produced with the intention to discharge planning condition 20. The CEMP will provide proportionate project-specific management measures and is a dynamic document, which should be reviewed if activities or conditions on site change that may influence management measures. It details specific management measures to minimise environmental impact on the wider area from the construction phase and is prepared in accordance with BS: 42020 2013 Biodiversity: Code of Practice for Planning and Development.

1.1.5 This document has been informed by previous work conducted prior to planning consent and should be cross referenced with:

- Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group, dated 22nd April 2025;

- ‘Proposed Site Plan, Hinckley Day Case’ drawing by Darwin Group, dated March 2025;
- ‘Arboricultural Impact Assessment’ by Geosphere Environmental, dated April 2025;
- ‘Tree Constraints Plan’ Drawing No. 7257,EC,AR/001-1/Revo and 7257,EC,AR/001-2/Revo by Geosphere Environmental, dated April 2025;
- ‘Tree Removal and Protection Plan’ Drawing No. 9185,AR/001-1/Revo, 9185,AR/001-2/Revo by Geosphere Environmental, dated April 2025.
- ‘Preliminary Ecological Appraisal’ by Geosphere Environmental, dated April 2025.
- ‘Detailed Planting Plan and Schedule’ Drawing no. PLANT168-ZZ-XX-DR-L-101 revision Po5, by Plantology Landscape Design, dated March 2025.
- ‘Bat Roost Survey Report’ Report No. 784-Bo72688, April 2025, by Tetra Tech
- ‘Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings’ Report No. 784-Bo72688, June 2025 by Tetra Tech
- ‘Great Crested Newt Presence/Absence eDNA Survey’ Report No. 7257,EC,001Ltr,TC,KL,3-07-2023,V3 by Geosphere Environmental, dated July 2023.

1.1.6 For the purposes of this document, the working area is defined as any area where there will be a requirement for temporary or permanent works to facilitate construction. This includes areas required for access, temporary construction, and temporary storage areas.

1.1.7 This document has been informed by relevant industry best practice and guidance set out in British Standard “Biodiversity Code of Practice for Planning and Development” (BS 42020) (2013) and the CIEEM guidance Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development. The period of this document is for 30 years.

1.1.8 The key audience for the document are the Local Planning Authority (LPA), the site operator/landowner and contractors employed to maintain the landscape.

2.0 SITE CONTEXT

2.1 The Site

2.1.1 The Site is approximately 0.46 hectares (ha) and lies in the centre of Hinckley. It is surrounded by residential and commercial units with a line of mature trees adjacent to the site on the northwestern border and a small area of open greenspace encompassed by the Site’s Southern boundary.

2.2 Permitted Development

2.2.1 The permitted development is for the demolition of the former Cottage Hospital and development of new day case surgery building with associated landscaping and parking at Hinckley and District General Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley. Planning application reference: 25/00461/FUL. It is anticipated that demolition of the existing structures and infrastructure is to commence November 2025, the soft landscape works to commence July 2026 and completion October 2026.

3.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 The site occupier is NHS Property Services. During the construction period and until practical completion, Darwin Group will maintain and manage the site. Post construction and following Post Practical Completion, the Site will be managed by the NHS Property Services.

4.0 METHOD STATEMENT - ENVIRONMENTAL

4.1 The proposed construction on Site will be conducted based on the following environmental controls. Table 1 below lists the potential impacts on the environment and the recommended control measures. This should be used alongside Geosphere Environmental’s ‘Arboricultural Impact Assessment’, ‘Tree Constraints Plan’ Drawing No.

7257,EC,AR/001-1/Revo and 7257,EC,AR/001-2/Revo, 'Tree Removal and Protection Plan' Drawing No. 9185,AR/001-1/Revo, 9185,AR/001-2/Revo, 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' and Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings' Report No. 784-Bo72688 and letter titled 'Great Crested Newt Presence / Absence eDNA survey. For reference Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report' and 'Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings' and Geosphere Environmental's Letter titled 'Great Crested Newt Presence / Absence eDNA survey can be found in Appendix B, all other reports and drawings referenced can be found here: <https://pa.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=externalDocuments&keyVal=SVWE31IIG7Loo>.

Table 1. On site control measures

Potential Impact	Control Measures
General	Vehicles and plant equipment should be tracked away from Root Protection Areas (RPAs) as indicated in Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ref: 9185,AR,AIA,TC,SJ,KL,25-04-25, V3) by Geosphere Environmental and located in drawings 7257,EC,AR/001-1/Revo and 001-2/Revo Tree Constraints Plan in Appendix 6 of that report. This includes storage of materials and equipment. No light spill should enter the retained trees and hedgerows. For a logistics plan, see page 8 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Noise & Vibration	The Control of Pollution Act 1974 contains specific provisions for dealing with noise from construction sites. Noise to be kept to a minimum to prevent noise pollution in the community. Working hours to be restricted from Monday to Saturday. Working hours should be 0730-1800hrs Monday to Friday and 0800 -1300hrs Saturday. No work will take place on Sundays and public holidays. See pages 19 and 21 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Pollution	No fires on site. Spill and pollution retention kits to be kept on site. All potentially hazardous material to be stored in a designated area away from drains and at least 10 m from any watercourses present. Soak away for wheel washing should not allow contamination of watercourses or ground water. See pages 14-16 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Material storage and waste management	Loading and unloading of plant and materials shall only take place within the boundaries of the construction site in specific allocated area. Storage of equipment and materials shall be away from any retained trees and tree group Root Protection Areas (RPA) and Construction Exclusion Zones (CEZs). Storage shall be confined away from suitable habitat on hard standing, where possible, to avoid the creation of artificial refugia. All potentially hazardous material to be stored in a designated area away from drains and at least 10 m from any watercourses to prevent contamination. All fuel storage is to be double banded. Spill kits are to be provided next to all sources of fuel. Fuel and waste management need to be contained in a dedicated storage area away from drains and at least 10 m from any watercourses. COSHH assessments must be made available for all materials.

Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital – CEMP

	See pages 16 and 25-26 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Dust	Best Practicable Means (BPM) should be put in place in order to minimise negative impact on local, sensitive receptors (other hospital buildings, existing domestic dwellings, etc.). However, if measures to reduce excessive dust and noise are unsuccessful, work must stop, and an alternative method devised before work can resume. See page 20 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Traffic	All vehicles are expected to keep to designated access points and are to report to the 'responsible person' on arrival. A 5mph speed limit will be in place within the Site. See pages 8 and 13 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Lighting	No working at night. During the months of September – March, there is likely a need to install safety and task lighting within the confines of the site to protect operatives and allow them to carry out their full duties. Measures should be undertaken to avoid overspill of lighting into retained habitat on site and adjacent habitat. See page 21 of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Soil Protection	All stripped soil (topsoil and subsoil) is to be reused on site if possible. Soil should be stored away from contamination sources. To be stripped, handled and prepared in accordance with BS 3882:2015. Soil storage time on Site should be minimised, as soil heaps will become attractive for protected species. See page 18, under the heading 'Waste' of Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), revision Po4 by Darwin Group for more information.
Signage	Site signage will be erected at the vehicular access point (at the site entrance) displaying the Darwin Group® logo and is intended to aid 'wayfinding' of the construction site. The signage will also include basic health and safety information along with the Site Manager's contact details and any out of hours contact information. The site address and routing in will be included on all purchase orders along with a copy of the latest site logistics plan.
Site protection	Solid hoarding / Heras fencing will be installed around all construction areas to ensure general public are kept safe. Fencing will also be used to protect retained trees and hedgerows as indicated in Arboricultural Impact Assessment (ref: 9185,AR,AIA,TC,SJ,KL,25-04-25, V3) by Geosphere Environmental and located in drawings 7257,EC,AR/001-1/Revo and 001-2/Revo Tree Constraints Plan in Appendix 6.).

4.2 Biodiversity Protection Zones

- 4.2.1 As the only habitats to be retained are existing trees and tree groups, Biodiversity Protection Zones (BPZs) will be formed based on the 'Tree Removal and Protection Plan' Drawing No. 9185,AR/001-1/Revo, 9185,AR/001-2/Revo by

Geosphere Environmental to protect sensitive habitats during construction. This drawing can be found in Appendix 6 of the AIA report. Protective fencing to create these Biodiversity Protection Zones and warning signs are to be those given in section 2.4 of Appendix 7 of ‘Arboricultural Impact Assessment’ by Geosphere Environmental, dated April 2025.

5.0 METHOD STATEMENT - ECOLOGY

5.0.1 As best practice, the following measures will be adopted to avoid any injury or killing of protected species and avoid adverse impact on habitats. These working methods should be strictly adhered to. If a situation arises and the contractor is unsure what action to take, advice should be sought from the appointed ECoW. The following statements and protocols should be implemented prior to and during construction.

5.0.2 This section follows recommendations given in ‘Preliminary Ecological Appraisal’ by Geosphere Environmental (dated April 2025) which draws from ecological surveys undertaken in 2025.

5.0.2 This method statement will be provided to all contractors working at the Site. A hard copy of the method statement and supporting drawings will be held by the Site Construction Manager in the appointed Site office or welfare facilities.

5.1 Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW)

5.1.1 An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) has been employed to supervise proposed establishment works as required by condition 19, to oversee the construction period where indicated in Table 2. Experience of ECoW supervision on construction sites is essential. Where tree inspections are required, the ECoW must hold a bat licence.

5.1.2 Red Kite confirm that we have been instructed by our Client, Darwin Group to be the Project Ecologist at Hinckley and District General Hospital for the Day Case Unit project to undertake Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) as required during the construction period. This will be undertaken by our Principal Ecologist, Dean LeFeuvre and his details are as follows:

- **Project Ecologist / ECoW: Dean LeFeuvre**

Company Name: Red Kite Network

Telephone number: 01952 58211

Email address: dean@redkitenetwork.co.uk or the main Red Kite mailbox info@redkitenetwork.co.uk

5.1.3 The role of the ECoW will be to:

- Provide the contractor and site operatives with ‘toolbox’ talks, which will describe the potential for protected or notable species to occur on-site, what to look out for and what to do in the event that an animal is found. The toolbox talk will be provided at the request of the contractor before any works on site commences;
- Where identified, the ECoW will conduct a pre-commencement walkover which will include inspection and hand-search of suitable habitat;
- Provide general advice and support during the pre-construction and construction period to ensure impacts of protected species considered; and
- At the request of the contractor, undertake inspections to ensure CEMP is being implemented appropriately.

Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital – CEMP

Table 2: Summary risk assessment and of mitigation in relation to protected species and habitats

Protected Species	Risk	Summary Mitigation Requirements	ECoW?
Breeding birds: Suitable habitat identified on Site for common breeding birds. All breeding birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.	Low – Mobilisation Period Prior to Works Commencing on Site to commence November – December 2025.	To avoid any potential offence during the construction phase, removal of vegetation which might act as nesting sites for birds will be undertaken outside the bird breeding season (March-August inclusive). If this is not possible, any vegetation to be removed should be checked for active nests by the Project ECoW no longer than 24hrs prior to planned removal. Any active nest found should be retained <i>in situ</i> and suitably buffered by surrounding vegetation. Work should be suspended in this area until subsequent checks have determined that the chicks have fledged, or the nest has become naturally inactive.	Only if vegetation removal or tree works are required in March-August inclusive.
Bats: Following the desk study and PRA Survey by Tetra Tech, the building has been classed as having low bat roost suitability for summer roosting and negligible hibernation suitability.	Low – Due to results of additional survey undertaken by Tetra Tech.	As no bats were found emerging from the building during the survey the demolition can proceed without further bat survey, licensing or mitigation. – Report 784- B072688, Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings by Tetra Tech, June 25.	In the unlikely event a bat is found during works then activities should immediately stop and contact ECoW.
Bats - Foraging & Commuting: Sub-optimal commuting and foraging habitats present.	Low - No working at night. During the months of September – March, there is likely a need to install safety and task lighting within the confines of the site to protect operatives.	Approval of lighting scheme/strategy with bat ecologist. During the construction period it is recommended that no working after dark unless strictly necessary during the summer months. Any lighting used under these circumstances should be downlit and sympathetic to commuting and foraging bats. Scheme should ensure no light spill into retained habitat onsite or adjacent habitat.	Not required.
Hedgehogs: The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Geosphere Environmental identified that there is very limited foraging habitat available for hedgehogs within the	Low – Limited foraging habitat available and limited vegetation clearance required, only 2 small areas of 'Introduced shrub'	Precautionary measures relating to vegetation clearance through Ecological Watching Brief and the provision of mitigation/enhancements as part of the proposals for Condition 21 – Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy. Excavations should be covered overnight.	Site operatives to practice due vigilance when clearance of vegetation suitable for foraging and commuting

Hinckley Day Case Unit, Hinckley and District General Hospital – CEMP

areas of grassland and introduced shrub.	habitat required for removal during the winter months.		hedgehog. Excavations on site should be covered overnight to prevent entrapment.
Great Crested Newts (GCN): Laboratory analysis of the eDNA samples collected returned a negative result for GCN eDNA in the sample water body, indicating that GCN are not present within the local area.	Negligible	None needed.	Contact ECoW in the event of finding GCN.
Other Protected Species	Negligible	The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Geosphere Environmental identified that the Site is not considered suitable for hazel dormice, water vole, otter, badger and reptiles.	Contact ECoW in the event of finding any of those listed.

5.2 Breeding Birds

- 5.2.1 All breeding birds (active nests) are legally protected, and disturbance should be avoided to reduce the likelihood of causing an offence. The breeding bird season is typically defined as March to August inclusive, although certain species are known to also breed outside of this period.
- 5.2.2 Removal of vegetation should be undertaken outside the bird nesting season. If any vegetation is to be pruned or removed during the breeding season, then pre-clearance checks by the Project ECoW will be necessary no longer than 24 hours prior to works taking place. Any active nest found should be retained *in situ* and suitably buffered by surrounding vegetation. Work should be suspended in this area until subsequent checks have determined that the chicks have fledged, or the nest has become naturally inactive.
- 5.2.3 Should any active nests be discovered during the works, then works to the area must immediately cease and a suitably qualified ecologist be engaged to advise on the most appropriate way to proceed.

5.3 Roosting Bats

- 5.3.1 As no bats were found emerging from the building during the survey the demolition can proceed without further bat survey, licensing or mitigation. – Report 784- Bo72688, Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings by Tetra Tech, June 25. However, in the unlikely event a bat is found during works then activities should immediately stop and contact the ECoW.

5.4 Foraging and Commuting Bats

- 5.4.1 During the construction period it is recommended that no working after dark unless strictly necessary during the summer months. Should lighting be required during months of September to March, a lighting scheme should be

approved with a bat ecologist. Any lighting used under these circumstances should be downlit and sympathetic to commuting and foraging bats. Scheme should ensure no light spill into retained habitat onsite or adjacent habitat.

5.5 Hedgehogs

- 5.5.1 Precautionary measures relating to vegetation clearance through Ecological Watching Brief and the provision of mitigation/enhancements as part of the proposals for Condition 21. – Biodiversity Enhancement Strategy. As per table 4 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal by Geosphere Environmental, excavations during the construction or ground investigations works should be covered overnight to prevent entrapment of hedgehogs.

5.6 Great Crested Newts

- 5.6.1 If a great crested newt is discovered, all works must **cease immediately**, and ecological advice sought. Licencing will be required from Natural England before works can lawfully re-commence.

5.7 Other Priority and Protected Species

- 5.7.1 In the event of finding any other priority or protected species during construction, the appointed ECoW should be contacted for advice.

5.8 Timing

- 5.8.1 The following table outlines optimal (✓) and suboptimal (x) timings in which to carry out destructive work relating to each seasonally restricted species.

Table 3: Timings related to ecological matters

Works	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Vegetation clearance (relating to breeding birds)	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓

6.0 REFERENCES

BS 3882:2007 – Specification for topsoil and requirements for use: The British Standards Institution.

BS 4043:1989 – Recommendations for transplanting root-balled trees: The British Standards Institution.

BS 42020:2013 – Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development 2013: The British Standards Institution.

BS 4428:1989 - Code of practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces) : The British Standards Institution.

BS 7370-1:1991 - Grounds maintenance. Recommendations for establishing and managing grounds maintenance organizations and for design considerations related to maintenance: The British Standards Institution.


BS 7370-4:1993 – Grounds maintenance. Recommendations for maintenance of soft landscape (other than amenity turf): The British Standards Institution.

Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. and Treweek, J. (2021). The UK Habitat Classification User Manual Version 2.0 available online at <http://www.ukhab.org/>.

Department of Communities & Local Government, (2021). National Planning Policy Framework, London: DCLG.

UKHabs Ltd., (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0. (Available at <https://www.ukhab.org>).

Appendix A: Site Plan Location



Ordnance Survey, (c) Crown Copyright 2025. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432

Site Location Plan - Planning

1 : 1250

KEY

	NHSPS ownership
	Application Site Area - 4608m² / 0.4608HA
	Proposed Building Footprint - 799m²
	Existing Buildings



0m 25m 50m 75m 100m

VISUAL SCALE 1:1250 @ A3

DarwinGroup

www.darwingroup.co.uk - tel: 0333 188 5113

CLIENT TITLE
NHS Property Services

PROJECT TITLE
Hinckley Day Case

PROJECT ADDRESS
Hinckley District Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley

DRAWING TITLE
Site Plan Location - Planning

DRAWING REFERENCE

180769 — DG — 01 — XX — DR — A — 1210

PROJECT	ORIGINATOR	FUNCTIONAL BREAKDOWN	SPATIAL BREAKDOWN	FORM	DISCIPLINE	NUMBER
---------	------------	----------------------	-------------------	------	------------	--------

06/03/2025	TTN	RB	925 m²
ISSUE DATE	INITIAL ISSUE BY	INITIAL CHECKED BY	GIFA

S2	Information	As indicated	A3	P4
STATUS CODE	STATUS DESCRIPTION	SCALE	SHEET SIZE	REVISION

REV	DESCRIPTION	BY	CHK	DATE
P1	Footprint dimension updated	TTN	RB	10/03/25
P2	OS Map updated	RB		14/04/25
P3	Blue Line Boundary Updated	RB		22/04/25
P4	Blue Line Description Amended.	RB		24/04/25

Appendix B

- Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report' Report No. 784-Bo72688, April 2025
- Tetra Tech's 'Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings' Report No. 784-Bo72688, June 2025
- Geosphere Environmental's Letter titled 'Great Crested Newt Presence / Absence eDNA survey

Hinckley Hospital

784-B072688

Bat Roost Survey Report

NHS Property Services Ltd

April 2025

**Document prepared on behalf of Tetra Tech Limited.
Registered in England number: 01959704**



Tetra Tech Limited. Registered in England number: 01959704

Tetra Tech Manchester, 2nd Floor, 11 York Street, Manchester, M2 2AW
Registered Office: 3 Sovereign Square, Sovereign Street, Leeds, United Kingdom, LS1 4ER

Document control

If you require this document in an alternative format, such as large print or a coloured background, please request this from the author or your Tetra Tech contact.

Document:	Bat Roost Survey Report
Document name:	Preliminary Roost Assessment
Project:	Hinckley Hospital
Client:	NHS Property Services Ltd
Project number:	784-B072688
File origin:	"\\lds-dc-vm-101\Data\Projects\784-B072688_Hinkley_Hospital\60_Output\61_WIP\Hinckley Hospital PRA Survey Report_Issue 070425.docx"



Revision:	1	Prepared by:	Laura Holmes CEcol MCIEEM Associate Director 
Date:	07 April 2025	Checked by:	Jade Armstrong ACIEEM Senior Ecologist 
Status:	Final	Approved by:	Kay Went BSc MCIEEM Associate Ecologist 
Description of Revision:	First Issue		

Table of contents

Executive summary	1
1.0 Introduction	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 Site location	2
1.3 Development proposals	2
1.4 Purpose of the report	3
2.0 Methodology	4
2.1 Previous reports	4
2.2 Desk study	4
2.3 Field surveys	4
2.4 Limitations	8
3.0 Results	10
3.1 Previous reports	10
3.2 Desk study	10
3.3 Field surveys	12
4.0 Discussion & analysis of results	13
4.1 Impact assessment	13
4.2 Compensation and Enhancement	13
5.0 Conclusion	15
6.0 References	16
FIGURES	17
APPENDICES	18

Appendices

Appendix A: Report conditions

Appendix B: Planning policy & legislation

Appendix C: PRA Results

Appendix D: Bat boxes

Appendix E: Bat friendly planting

Acronyms/Abbreviations

Acronyms/Abbreviations	Definition
BCT	Bat Conservation Trust
BSI	British Standard Institute
CEcol	Chartered Ecologist
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management
DEFRA	Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
EPSML	European Protect Species Mitigation Licence
Habitats Regulations	Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)
LBAP	Local Biodiversity Action Plan
MCIEEM	Member of Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management
NERC Act	Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006
NLMS	Non-Licensed Method Statement
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PRA	Preliminary Roost Assessment
PRF	Potential Roost Feature
SAP	Species Action Plan
W&CA	Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

Executive summary

Contents	Summary
Site Location	The site comprises the former Hinckley and District Hospital, located on Mount Road, Hinckley, LE10 1AG.
Proposals	The former hospital building is due to be demolished as part of a planning application for the redevelopment of the site.
Scope of this Survey(s)	• Desk Study including review of previous ecology reports • Preliminary Roost Assessment
Results and Evaluation	The former hospital building was identified as offering low bat roost suitability for summer roosting and negligible suitability for hibernation.
Recommendations	A single dusk emergence survey between May and August inclusive is required in order to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats. Should roosting bats be confirmed then additional surveys may be required and a European Protected Species Licence will be required to allow the lawful demolition of the building. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures will be required in line with legislation, these will be designed based on the results of the subsequent survey(s).

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

Tetra Tech was commissioned by NHS Property Services Ltd on 25th March 2025 to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) survey of the former Hinckley and District Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley, LE10 1AG, hereafter referred to as “the site”.

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

This survey was requested to update the previous bat surveys which were now out of date, in order to support a full planning application including demolition of the building. The previous surveys had been undertaken to allow asbestos removal works to proceed under a non-licensed method statement.

This report has been prepared by Tetra Tech Associate Director Laura Holmes CEcol MCIEEM and the conditions pertinent to it are provided in Appendix A.

Full details of the legal protection relating to bats, including types of offences and policy position, are provided in Appendix B.

1.2 Site location

The site is located off Mount Road in the centre of Hinckley, Leicestershire and is centred at Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference SP 42951 93721 – see Figure 1. It comprises redundant hospital building with multiple sections, set within hardstanding and a small area of overgrown amenity planting.

The immediate surrounding area is predominantly urban, with a small parkland, cemetery and waterbody lying to the north.

The wider landscape provides habitat features including parks, woodland and agricultural fields bounded by hedgerows within 5 km of the site (which encompasses the core sustenance zones of the majority of UK bat species).

1.3 Development proposals

The entire building is proposed to be demolished as part of the redevelopment of the site. Asbestos removal works commenced in December 2024 and are ongoing.

1.4 Purpose of the report

The purpose of this report is to:

- Present the relevant legislation and policy in relation to bats and their roosts;
- Describe the methods used to carry out the desk and field-based assessments for bats;
- Provide any records of bats on or within 2 km of the site;
- Assess suitability of the building on site for roosting bats;
- Identify if any additional surveys are required to inform this assessment; and
- Determine if any potential impacts on bats are likely to arise from the proposals.

Note that scientific names are provided at the first mention of each species and common names (where appropriate) are then used throughout the rest of the report for ease of reading.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Previous reports

The following reports produced by a third party were reviewed as part of the assessment:

- CGO Ecology, 'Updated Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment and Associated Nocturnal Surveys', October 2023; and
- CGO Ecology, 'Non-Licensed Working Method Statement for Bats', November 2023.

2.2 Desk study

The desktop study comprised two elements:

- A data search obtained from Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre in April 2025 of records of bats within 2 km of the site boundary; and
- Online element including a search using: Magic, Defra's interactive, web-based database for statutory designations (<https://magic.defra.gov.uk>) and Ordnance Survey (OS) and Aerial Imagery (<https://www.bing.com/maps>). This included a search for any designated sites within 2 km supporting bats, and 2 km for records of bat roosts or European Protected Species Mitigation Licence(s) (EPSML). The search was conducted in April 2025.

2.3 Field surveys

2.3.1 Biosecurity

All surveys were conducted in accordance with Tetra Tech Biosecurity Policy (2025).

2.3.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)

The survey was undertaken on 1st April 2025 by Tetra Tech Associate Director Laura Holmes CEcol MCIEEM (Natural England Classes 3 and 4 bat survey licence reference numbers 2018-37932-CLS-CLS / 2017-30919-CLS-CLS) assisted by Tetra Tech Field Ecologist Peter Holmes. During the assessment the weather conditions consisted of 11°C temperature, 3 Beaufort wind conditions, no rain and 0/8 oktas cloud cover.

The building on site was assessed from the ground for its suitability to support breeding, resting and hibernating bats using survey methods based on the Bat Conservation Trust's

(BCT) guidelines: *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (Collins, 2023) – hereafter referred to as the ‘BCT Guidelines’. The survey was undertaken in line with BS42020 (BSI, 2013).

The roost assessment was completed to assess the likelihood of bats using the building within the site for summer roosting and winter hibernation.

External inspection

The building was systematically inspected during daylight, and any features suitable for bats were noted such as accessible soffit boxes, gaps in brickwork, cracks, crevices, lifted lead flashing, slipped or broken tiles and missing mortar below tiles. Features located at height were viewed from the ground using binoculars and high powered torches. Any potential bat access points were inspected for signs of bat presence such as:

- Bat droppings on the ground outside, on the floor inside or stuck to walls;
- Other evidence of bats such as feeding remains and urine staining;
- Suitable entry and exit points around cladding, eaves, flashing, under tiles or gaps in mortar;
- Live bats, bat corpses or skeletons; and
- Oily marks (from fur) or localised clean spots around possible access points and roost areas.

Internal inspection

The internal areas of the building were not fully accessed for detailed assessment due to health and safety reasons (ongoing asbestos removal works). Roof areas declared asbestos free were surveyed from the floor below where ceilings had been removed during works. The assessment noted any potential or actual bat presence and noted the presence / condition of the following and the likelihood of use as access / roost location by bats:

- Sarking (wooden / felt / other);
- Insulation;
- Roof construction (e.g. modern truss, king post, queen post);
- Ridge beam and the floor below;

- Any areas of missing mortar on chimney breasts or gable walls; and
- Any gaps in beams / mortice joints / roof timbers / where beams meet.

Many of the UK bat species are crevice dwellers and as such areas between the sarking and tiles cannot be fully inspected without potentially damaging or destroying a possible roost location.

Categorisation

The outcome of this PRA survey was to categorise the building in accordance with the BCT Guidelines given in Table 1.

Table 1: Categories of Bat Roost Suitability (BCT Guidelines)

Suitability	Typical Roosting Features
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices / suitable shelter at all ground / underground levels).
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, condition (for example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.) and / or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool / stable hibernation site, but could be used by individual hibernating bats)
Moderate	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation - the categorization described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).

Suitability	Typical Roosting Features
High	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by large numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions, and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g., maternity, or classic cool / stable hibernation site ding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation - the categorization described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).

Hibernation

The building was also assessed for hibernation suitability using the categories in the BCT Guidelines.

‘Classical sites’ for hibernation would include underground sites such as cellars and caves, that allow stable weather conditions of temperature and humidity (cool and damp) throughout the winter period.

Most buildings and structures come under the ‘non-classical site’ category but should also be considered for hibernation, especially for void dwelling bats such as brown long-eared bats *Plecotus auritus*, which may linger in derelict buildings where conditions may remain stable without heating of the building in winter. In addition, *Pipistrellus* species are crevice-dwelling bats which may also benefit from small gaps within a cavity wall under the same circumstances and are known to use large concrete structures such as tower blocks for hibernation which would be considered a non-classical site.

Table 2 below outlines the rationale taken when assessing hibernation suitability and the requirement for further surveys.

Table 2: Categories of Hibernation Bat Roost Suitability (BCT Guidelines)

Are there Suitable Hibernation Features?	Typical Roost Features
No / very limited	Treat as low. No further surveys required.
Yes – Classical site	Treat as high. Further surveys required between November and March inclusive.
Yes – Non-classical site	Treat as moderate. Further surveys may be required. Need to consider what can be surveyed.

2.4 Limitations

Due to ongoing asbestos removal works only the ground and first floors of the main section (i.e. excluding the flat roofed sections at the rear) of the building were accessible. However, roof voids could be viewed fully where ceilings had been removed or partially where they had holes punctured through. The asbestos works impacting ceilings would most likely have removed any evidence of roosting bats however no roosts were confirmed during previous surveys in 2023 and works were undertaken under a non-licensed method statement so any evidence would have been found at this stage. Lack of full access is considered a minor constraint to the survey's effectiveness, as the works themselves have significantly lowered the suitability for bats by exposing the voids to daylight, this has been taken into consideration.

The basement could be fully visualised as the floor above had been removed and could be viewed from the adjacent intact area.

PRAs can be undertaken at any time of year. Therefore, there were not any constraints associated with survey timing or weather conditions.

Notwithstanding the limitations highlighted above, the survey effort applied is considered sufficient to meet the aims of the survey and this report, in accordance with the aforementioned guidelines.

Validity

The recommendations within this report should be reviewed (and reassessed if necessary) should there be any changes to the red line boundary or development proposals which this report was based on.

Based on the latest guidelines (CIEEM, 2019, CIEEM 2024 & Section 2.6.16-22 of the BCT Guidelines) the details within this report are considered valid for 12 months from the last survey date (until 1st April 2026).

3.0 Results

3.1 Previous reports

A bat roost assessment and presence / likely absence surveys were both completed by CGO Ecology in summer 2023. This survey found the building had 'high' suitability for use by roosting bats in accordance with BCT Guidelines categories. Nocturnal surveys found no confirmed roosts but did note a potential common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* emergence from the northern elevation on one survey. This report was valid until October 2024.

The subsequent non-licensed method statement for removal and soft strip of features with bat roost potential recommended avoidance of works during the maternity period and ecological supervision as needed. This report was valid until May 2024 after which it required a review (should works not have commenced). Asbestos removal works subsequently commenced in December 2024.

3.2 Desk study

Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre returned recent bat records for at least nine bat species within a 2 km radius of the site boundary, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Bat Records within 2 Km Radius of the Site Boundary

Species	Number of Records	Distance and Direction of Nearest Record	Comments
Barbastelle <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i>	4	1.2 km N	Sonogram
Unidentified <i>Chiroptera</i> sp.	3	2km N	Sonogram
Brown long-eared <i>Plecotus auritus</i>	18	0.2 km E	Grounded bat
Common pipistrelle	74	0 km – onsite	Roost (see Section 3.1,

Species	Number of Records	Distance and Direction of Nearest Record	Comments
			where this is reported as a potential emergence only)
Leisler's <i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>	9	1.9 km NE	Sonogram
Unidentified long-eared <i>Plecotus sp.</i>	2	1.9 km S	Sonogram
Unidentified <i>Myotis</i> <i>Myotis sp.</i>	11	1.1 km N	Sonogram
Nathusius' pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>	6	1.1 km N	Sonogram
Noctule <i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	40	0 km	Sonogram
Unidentified <i>Nyctalus</i> <i>Nyctalus sp.</i>	4	1.1 km N	Sonogram
Unidentified pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus sp.</i>	5	1.1 km N	Sonogram
Serotine <i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	4	2 km S	Sonogram
Soprano pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	28	1.1 km N	Sonogram

Magic Maps found no EPSMLs or statutory sites designated for bats within a 2 km radius of the site boundary.

3.3 Field surveys

3.3.1 Preliminary Roost Assessment

The former hospital building was assessed for its suitability to support roosting bats. The building was categorised as offering **low** bat roost suitability as it offered numerous opportunities for roosting by individual or small numbers of bats but no features suitably large or sheltered enough for maternity roosts.

The building had **negligible** hibernation suitability due to lack of suitably thermodynamically stable and humid spaces and limited roosting, foraging and commuting habitat in the surrounding area.

The building comprises a multilevel building constructed circa 1900 of redbrick with a series of pantile hipped roofs and gables and wooden doors and sash windows. Modern, one-storey, flat-roofed extensions have been added at the rear with uPVC doors and windows.

There were numerous lifting, slipped and missing tiles across the roofs. Other Potential Roost Features (PRFs) noted included a broken lintel, holes around protruding purlins and a cracked vent shaft.

The internal roof voids (which had been opened up from below internally) had a simple roof truss structure with bitumastic felting under the tiles. These areas had been cleared of asbestos and fully exposed to daylight so had no suitability for roosting bats. Small sections of roof voids had intact floors but had been cleared of asbestos and had holes punctured through from the ceilings below resulting in decreased suitability due to light and airflow ingress.

The basement ceiling had been removed, and this area is now fully exposed to light and the weather, so lacks suitability for roosting bats.

Photos and full details of PRFs are given in Appendix C. Locations of PRFs and potential access to PRFs are given in Figure 2.

4.0 Discussion & analysis of results

4.1 Impact assessment

Following the desk study and PRA Survey, the building has been classed as having **low** bat roost suitability for summer roosting and **negligible** hibernation suitability. A potential common pipistrelle roost was found during nocturnal surveys in 2023 (CGO Ecology, 2023) and the roosting feature is considered still present as the roof tiles are still in place in the area identified as the likely roost location.

In accordance with BCT Guidance, for this low summer roost category building, a single dusk emergence survey is recommended in order to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats.

If roosting bats are confirmed, then two further roost characterisation surveys will be required to inform a EPSML in order to inform a Natural England application for the legal demolition of the building and destruction of the roost.

If no roosts are found, then works should proceed under a non-licensed method statement (NLMS) to be formulated based on the results of the surveys and including ecological supervision of PRFs in the area of the previously recorded potential roost.

4.2 Compensation and Enhancement

As potential roosting features are being lost as a result of demolition these should be replaced with alternatives as compensation. Furthermore it is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to provide enhancements for biodiversity as part of development.

The following measures are proposed in order to compensate for PRF loss and enhance the site for bats (subject to confirmation of no active bat roosts during the summer activity survey):

- Provision of alternative roosting provision in the form of four bat boxes which are suitable for crevice dwelling species. Suitable models are given in Appendix D, with options for boxes which can be integrated into new buildings and/or mounted on retained walls or trees; and

- Use of bat friendly, native planting in soft landscaping. A list of suitable species in given in Appendix E.

5.0 Conclusion

The former hospital building was identified as offering **low** bat roost suitability for summer roosting and **negligible** suitability for hibernation. A single dusk emergence survey is therefore required in order to determine presence / likely absence of roosting bats in order to comply with legislation. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures will be required in line with legislation, these will be designed based on the results of the subsequent survey(s).

6.0 References

Bat Conservation Trust (2015) Encouraging bats – Gardening for bats

BSI (2013) The British Standards Institution Biodiversity — Code of Practice for Planning and Development

CGO Ecology (2023) Updated Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment and Associated Nocturnal Surveys

CGO Ecology (2023) Non-Licensed Working Method Statement for Bats

CIEEM (2024) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland

CIEEM (2019) Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys

Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines, 4th Edition, The Bat Conservation Trust: London.

Defra (2011) Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services, [online] Available at

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69446/pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-111111.pdf, Accessed May 2021.

Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, (2024), National Planning Policy Framework, [online]


Tetra Tech (2025) Biosecurity Policy (unpublished, but available upon request)

Please note that the legislation which is relevant to this report is not included in the list above, but details are included in Appendix B below.

FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Location Plan

Figure 2: Preliminary Roost Assessment



© Tetra Tech Limited

Site Location Plan

Hinckley Hospital



NHS Property Services Ltd

Legend

- Site boundary
- Ownership boundary

Notes:

Drawn by: Chris.Dawe
Checked by: Laura Holmes

Figure No. 1
Revision No. A
02 April 2025

0 10 20 30 40 Meters
Scale 1:1,000 @A3

British National Grid
NGR: 442941E 293756N

© Crown Copyright All rights reserved. License number: 100019980





TETRA TECH

3 Sovereign Square
Sovereign Street
Leeds
United Kingdom
LS1 4ER

Tetra Tech Limited.
Registered in England
number: 01959704

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Report conditions

Appendix B: Planning policy & legislation

Appendix C: PRA results

Appendix D: Bat boxes

Appendix E: Bat friendly planting

Appendix A: Report conditions

This Report has been prepared using reasonable skill and care for the sole benefit of [NHS Property Services Ltd] (“the Client”) for the proposed uses stated in the report by Tetra Tech Limited (“Tetra Tech”). Tetra Tech exclude all liability for any other uses and to any other party. The report must not be relied on or reproduced in whole or in part by any other party without the copyright holder’s permission.

No liability is accepted or warranty given for; unconfirmed data, third party documents and information supplied to Tetra Tech or for the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report. Tetra Tech does not purport to provide specialist legal, tax or accounting advice.

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections'. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. No investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather-related conditions.

Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions. The “shelf life” of the Report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client’s instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

The whole of the report must be read as other sections of the report may contain information which puts into context the findings in any executive summary.

Tetra Tech reserves the right to share this Report and any related materials, surveys, drawings and/or documents at any time with the relevant Local Ecological Records Centre (LERC), any relevant statutory body or any equivalent organisation as Tetra Tech may reasonably require from time-to-time.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. Tetra Tech accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.

Appendix B: Planning policy & legislation

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)

The 2018 amendments mainly related to the impact of the *People Over Wind* decision and some implications arising for neighbourhood plan development and a range of other planning tools including Local Development Orders and Permission in Principle – see here for full details:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2018/1307/note/made>

The 2019 amendments related to the EU exit. Most of these changes involved transferring functions from the European Commission to the appropriate authorities in England and Wales. All other processes or terms in the 2017 Regulations remain unchanged and existing guidance is still relevant. The obligations of a competent authority in the 2017 Regulations for the protection of sites or species do not change.– see here for full details:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2019/9780111176573>

The Regulations make it an offence to deliberately capture, kill, disturb or trade bats (including dead animals).

Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

This is the principal mechanism for the legislative protection of wildlife in the UK. Since it was first introduced, the Act has been amended several times. All bats are protected through inclusion under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and benefit from various levels of protection. This legislation makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly kill or injure these animals; and
- Sell, offer for sale, possess or transport for the purpose of sale of publish advertisement to buy or sell individual reptiles.

All are also listed under Schedule 5 Section 9.4b and 9.4c which makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally disturb while occupying a structure or place used for shelter or protection; and
- Obstruct access to such a site.

Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Section 41 (S41) of this Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list (in consultation with Natural England) of Habitats and Species which are of Principal Importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal (e.g. planning) functions. The S41 list includes 65 Habitats of Principal Importance and 1,150 Species of Principal Importance.

Seven species of bat are listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006; soprano pipistrelle, brown long-eared bat, greater horseshoe bat, lesser horseshoe bat, barbastelle, Bechstein's bat and noctule.

National Planning Policy Framework - Published the 27 March 2012, updated December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the top tier of planning policy. The Framework provides guidance to local authorities and other agencies on planning policy and the operation of the planning system. Section 15 relates to 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'. Paragraph 187- 201

Relevant policies in relation to planning application include Paragraphs:

"187. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and

other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;

c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and

f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

188. Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework^[1] ; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries

192. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

(a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity [2] ; wildlife corridors and stepping

^[1] Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality

^[2] Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system

stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation [3] ; and

(b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

193. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

(a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

(b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons [4] and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and

(d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

194. The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites:

[3] Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them

[4] For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat

- (a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
- (b) listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and
- (c) sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.

195. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site

^[1] Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality

² Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system

³ Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them

⁴ For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat

⁵ Potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and proposed Ramsar sites are sites on which Government has initiated public consultation on the scientific case for designation as a Special Protection Area, candidate Special Area of Conservation or Ramsar site

see here for full details: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAP) identify habitat and species conservation priorities at a local level (typically at the County level) and are usually drawn up by a consortium of local Government organisations and conservation charities.

Some LBAP's may also include Habitat Action Plans (HAP) and/or Species Action Plans (SAP), which are used to guide and inform the local decision-making process. All bat species are included within the Space for Wildlife: Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Biodiversity Action Plan (LLRBAP).

Local Plan

The Local Plan 2006 to 2026 aims to achieve the following:

- To have the right facilities, housing, and infrastructure in the right places
- To support the local communities by addressing the needs and opportunities of an area
- To help to support the growth of the local economy and tourism

The Local Plan 2006 to 2026 is made up of a series of documents, with supporting maps where relevant, including the four key development plan documents (DPDs). These DPDs outline the council's policies for development within the borough. The DPDs carry the most weight for making decisions on planning applications.

Policy 4.3 covers Biodiversity and Nature Conservation, and this includes Policy 4.3.3 for 'Notable habitats and species which states

"Key protected species that are present within the borough are described by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey carried out by Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (2009). These are identified in the listed below, with the first six included in the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland BAP (Leicester & Rutland Wildlife Trust, 2016).

- *Several bat species including Common Pipistrelle, Brown Long-eared, Soprano Pipistrelle, Whiskered Myotis, and Noctule • Badger • Water Vole • Otter • White-clawed crayfish • Barn Owl • Other bird species including Peregrine Falcon, Kingfisher, Black Redstart, Hobby Falcon, and Marsh Harrier • Great Crested Newt • Reptile species including Grass Snake, Common Lizard, and Slow Worm • Brown Hare"*

Appendix C: PRA results

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
1	Gap between soffit and wall on west facing elevation on southern section	
2	Missing mortar under tile over porch on western side of southern side	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
3	Gap around protruding purlin on southern end	
4	Missing mortar under tile over porch on eastern side of southern side	
5	Eaves gap on southern elevation	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
6	Gaps under hip tiles on southern section	
7	Slipped and missing roof tiles on gable end on southern section	
8	Gaps at base on hip under finials on eastern side of southern elevation	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
9	Missing tile by chimney on southern elevation	
10	Eaves gap on rear of southern section eastern side	
11	Missing mortar on rear of southern section	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
12	Missing tile on rear of southern section	
13	Exposed end of roof at demolished end on western side	
14	Gap in brickwork on western side	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
15	Boarded window on western side	
16	Eaves gap on rear of southern section eastern side	
17	Lifting tiles on eastern side	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
18	Gaps under hip tiles on eastern side	
19	Gaps under hip tiles on eastern side central section	
20	Missing tiles central section	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
21	Missing tile under window in central section eastern elevation	
22	Broken vent on central section eastern elevation	
23	Missing tiles in central section	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
24	Broken lintel over window	 A close-up photograph showing a section of a brick wall above a window. The brickwork is damaged, with a significant portion of the lintel missing or broken, exposing the underlying structure. A vertical pipe runs alongside the wall.
25	Vent tiles into central roof void	 A photograph of a dark, pitched roof against a clear blue sky. Two brick chimneys are visible. A thin, dark vent pipe extends from the roofline towards the center of the frame.
26	Lifting, slipped and missing tiles in central section inward facing elevations	 A wide-angle photograph showing a residential roof with red tiles. In the central section, several tiles are missing or have slipped, revealing the underlying structure. The surrounding area includes other buildings and a clear blue sky.

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
27	Small section of roof void in southern section which is not exposed	
28	Exposed basement (no suitability)	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
		
29	Exposed roof voids (no suitability)	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
		 The image block contains two photographs. The top photograph shows a close-up of a brick chimney or roof structure with a significant hole in the brickwork, revealing the interior. The bottom photograph shows the interior of a room with a high, vaulted ceiling made of exposed wooden timber beams and rafters. There are some red wires hanging from the ceiling structure.

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
30	Small section of roof void which are not fully exposed	

Feature Number	Feature Type	Image
		

Appendix D: Bat boxes

Introduction

The information in this appendix relates to bat boxes that can be easily incorporated into building and landscape plans. The information provided is not exhaustive and provides examples of some of the types of boxes available.

Including bat boxes throughout the development site has a number of benefits:

- Any roosting or resting places lost as a result of the work will be replaced;
- The ecological value of the site will be enhanced;
- Priority species within the UK and local Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) will be encouraged.

Bats

For Buildings

The inclusion of a variety of bat bricks, tubes and boxes for buildings is recommended to encourage a diversity of bat species. Bat bricks and tubes require no maintenance.

Built-in bat box

(can be faced to suit building design)



Bat tube

(can be bricked in or rendered over into the façade)




Bat access block to allow access into a cavity wall



Heated maternity box (operated on a conventional socket, 50watt heater near the base to provide a thermostatically controlled artificially warm roost)



Hibernation box e.g. Schwegler 1WQ



For Buildings and Trees

The following box types are recommended.

Bat Box

The Schwegler 1FF bat box is made of woodcrete and is expected to last approximately 25 years. It has a narrow crevice-like internal space to attract Pipistrelle and Noctule bats. Woodcrete (75% wood sawdust, concrete and clay mixture). It can be mounted on buildings or trees.

Width: 27cm; Height: 43cm; Weight: 8.3kg.



The Harlech woodstone bat box is made from woodstone, the Harlech is a small cavity bat box that offers excellent insulation and minimum condensation for roosting bats. It can be mounted on buildings or trees.

Width: 15cm; Height: 27.5cm; Weight: 4kg.



The Beaumaris woodstone bat box comes in small and large versions and is suitable for mounting on buildings or trees.

Small –29 x 40 x 7cm

Large 38 x 50 x 7cm

Weight: 8kg.



The Vincent Pro bat box is a tried and tested design by the Vincent Wildlife Trust.

Width: 23.5cm; Height: 72cm; Weight: 6.9kg.



Appendix E: Bat friendly planting

Table E1: Trees, shrubs and climbers

Common Name	Scientific Name
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus</i>
Buddleia	<i>Buddleja sp.</i>
Common alder	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>
Dog rose	<i>Rosa canina</i>
Elder	<i>Sambucus sp.</i>
English oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>
Gorse	<i>Ulex sp.</i>
Guelder rose	<i>Viburnum opulus</i>
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus sp.</i>
Hazel	<i>Corylus sp.</i>
Honeysuckle	<i>Lonicera periclymenum</i>
Hornbeam	<i>Carpinus sp.</i>
Ivy	<i>Hedera sp.</i>
Jasmine	<i>Jasminum sp.</i>
Rowan	<i>Sorbus sp.</i>
Silver birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>

Table E2: Flowers for Borders

Common Name	Scientific Name
Aubretia*	<i>Aubrieta sp.</i>
Candytuft*	<i>Iberis sp.</i>
Cherry pie*	<i>Heliotropium arborescens</i>
Corncockle	<i>Agrostemma githago</i>
Cornflower	<i>Centaurea cyanus</i>
Corn marigold	<i>Glebionis segetum</i>
Corn poppy	<i>Papaver rhoeas</i>
Echinacea*	<i>Echinacea sp.</i>
English Bluebell	<i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i>

Common Name	Scientific Name
Evening primrose*	<i>Oenothera sp.</i>
Field poppies	<i>Papaver rhoeas</i>
Honesty*	<i>Lunaria annua</i>
Ice plant 'Pink lady'*	<i>sedum spectabile</i>
Knapweed	<i>Centaurea sp.</i>
Mallow	<i>Malva sp.</i>
Mexican aster*	<i>Cosmos bipinnatus</i>
Michaelmas daisy*	<i>Aster novi-belgii</i>
Night-scented stock*	<i>Matthiola longipetala</i>
Ox-eye daisy	<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i>
Phacelia*	<i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i>
Poached egg plant*	<i>Limnanthes douglasii</i>
Primrose	<i>Primula vulgaris</i>
Red campion	<i>Silene dioica</i>
Red valerian*	<i>Centranthus ruber</i>
Scabious	<i>Scabiosa sp.</i>
St John's wort	<i>Hypericum perforatum</i>
Sweet William*	<i>Dianthus barbatus</i>
Tobacco plant*	<i>Nicotiana</i>
Verbena*	<i>Verbena sp.</i>
Wallflowers*	<i>Erysimum sp.</i>
Wood forget-me-not	<i>Myosotis sylvatica</i>
Yarrow	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>

Plants marked * are hybrids or exotics

Table E3: Herbs

Common Name	Scientific Name
Angelica	<i>Angelica sp.</i>
Bergamot	<i>Monarda sp.</i>
Borage	<i>Borago officinalis</i>
Coriander	<i>Caroiandrum sp.</i>
English marigolds	<i>Calendula officinalis</i>

Common Name	Scientific Name
Fennel	<i>Foenicululm sp.</i>
Feverfew	<i>Tanacetum parthenium</i>
Hyssop	<i>Hyssopus officinalis</i>
Lavenders	<i>Lavandula</i>
Lemon balm	<i>Melissa officinalis</i>
Marjoram	<i>Origanum majorana</i>
Rosemary	<i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i>
Sweet cicely	<i>Myrrhis odorata</i>
Thyme	<i>Thymus vulgaris</i>

Table E4: Wildflowers for Pond Edges and Marshy Areas

Common Name	Scientific Name
Bog bean	<i>Menyanthes sp.</i>
Bugle	<i>Ajuga sp.</i>
Creeping Jenny	<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>
Flag iris	<i>Iris pseudacorus</i>
Hemp agrimony	<i>Eupatorium cannabinum</i>
Lady's smock	<i>Cardamine pratensis</i>
Marsh mallow	<i>Althaea officinalis</i>
Marsh marigold	<i>Caltha palustris</i>
Marsh woundwort	<i>Stachys palustris</i>
Meadowsweet	<i>Filipendula ulmaria</i>
Purple loosestrife	<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>
Water avens	<i>Geum rivale</i>
Water forget-me-not	<i>Myosotis scorpioides</i>
Water mint	<i>Mentha citrata</i>

Based on Bat Conservation Trust (2015) Encouraging bats – Gardening for bats

Hinckley Hospital

784- B072688

Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings

NHS Property Services Ltd

June 2025

Document prepared on behalf of Tetra Tech Limited.

Registered in England number: 01959704



TETRA TECH

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document:	Bat Roost Survey Report – Buildings
Project:	Hinckley Hospital
Client:	NHS Property Services Ltd
Project Number:	784- B072688
File Origin:	M:\784-B072688_Hinckley_Hospital\60_Output\61_WIP\Emergence Survey Report


Revision:	V1	Prepared by:	Eleasha Mayfield Assistant Ecologist 
Date:	12 June 2025	Checked by:	Stephanie Bennett BSc (Hons) ACIEEM Senior Ecologist 
Status:		Approved By:	Tamsin Clark MCIEEM Associate Director 
Description of Revision:			

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Site Location.....	4
1.3 Development Proposals.....	4
1.4 Purpose of the Report	4
2.0 METHODOLOGY	6
2.1 Previous Reports	6
2.2 Field Surveys	6
2.3 Limitations.....	7
3.0 RESULTS.....	9
3.1 Previous Reports	9
3.2 Field Surveys	9
4.0 DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	10
4.1 Impact Assessment	10
5.0 CONCLUSION	11
6.0 REFERENCES	11
FIGURES.....	12
APPENDICES	16

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION PLAN

FIGURE 2: SURVEYOR POSITION PLAN

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: REPORT CONDITIONS

APPENDIX B: PLANNING POLICY & LEGISLATION

APPENDIX C: DARKEST IR CAMERA FOOTAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Contents	Summary
Site Location	The site comprises the former Hinckley and District Hospital, located on Mount Road, Hinckley, LE10 1AG. SP 42952 93724What3Words: handy.stove.bright
Proposals	The former hospital building is due to be demolished as part of a planning application for the redevelopment of the site.
Scope of this Survey(s)	To undertake one dusk emergence survey to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats within the surveyed building.
Results and Evaluation	The dusk emergence survey was carried out on the 15 May 2025. No roosts were identified and bats considered likely absent within the building.
Recommendations	As no bats were found emerging from the building during the survey the demolition can proceed without further bat survey, licensing or mitigation. In the unlikely event a bat is found during works then activities should immediately stop, and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for advice.
Conclusions	The dusk emergence surveys observed low bat activity, but did not identify roosts.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Tetra Tech was commissioned by NHS Property Services Ltd on 25th March 2025 to undertake presence / likely absence bat surveys of former Hinckley and District Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley, LE10 1AG, hereafter referred to as “the site”.

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

This survey was requested in order to support a planning application including demolition of the building.

This report has been prepared by Assistant Ecologist Eleasha Mayfield and the conditions pertinent to it are provided in Appendix A.

Full details of the legal protection relating to bats, including types of offences and policy position, are provided in Appendix B.

1.2 SITE LOCATION

The site is located at Mount Road in the centre of Hinckley, Leicestershire and is centred at Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference SP 42952 93724 – see Figure 1. It comprises of redundant hospital building consisting of multiple sections, set within hardstanding and a small area of amenity vegetation.

Immediately surrounding the site is predominantly urban, with a small parkland, cemetery and waterbody to the north.

The wider landscape provides habitat features including parks, woodland and agricultural fields bordered by hedgerows within 5 km of the site (which encompasses the core sustenance zones of the majority of UK bat species).

1.3 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The entire building is proposed to be demolished as part of redevelopment of the site. In December 2024, works commenced to remove asbestos and works are ongoing.

1.4 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to:

- Present the relevant legislation and policy in relation to bats present
- Describe the methods used to carry out the desk and field-based assessments for bats
- Determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats;
- Ascertain the number and species of bat roosting within the buildings/structures to determine the roost assemblage present;
- Identify if any additional surveys are required to inform this assessment;
- Determine if any potential impacts on bats are likely to arise from the development/proposals;

- Outline strategies to avoid/mitigate/compensate for any likely impacts on bats; and
- Outline a Mitigation Strategy to inform an EPSL license application.

Note that scientific names are provided at the first mention of each species and common names (where appropriate) are then used throughout the rest of the report for ease of reading.

Validity

The details of this report will remain valid **until the 15 May 2026** after which the validity of this assessment should be reviewed to determine whether further updates are necessary. The recommendations within this report should be reviewed (and reassessed if necessary) should there be any changes to the red line boundary or development proposals which this report was based on.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 PREVIOUS REPORTS

The following reports produced by a third party were reviewed as part of the assessment:

- CGO Ecology, 'Updated Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment and Associated Nocturnal Surveys', October 2023; and
- CGO Ecology, 'Non-Licensed Working Method Statement for Bats', November 2023

The following report was produced by Tetra Tech were reviewed as part of the assessment:

- Tetra Tech, 'PRA Survey Report', April 2025

2.2 FIELD SURVEYS

2.2.1 Presence / Likely Absence Nocturnal Surveys – Buildings

In accordance with BCT Guidelines, one dusk emergence survey were undertaken in May 2025. The dusk emergence surveys commenced 15 minutes before sunset and continued for 1.5 - hours after sunset. Survey dates, timings and weather conditions are detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Surveyors, date and weather conditions for bat emergence surveys.

Wind speed uses Beaufort scale. Cloud cover uses Oktas Scale

Date of survey	Sunrise / sunset	Start (S)	Finish (F)	Temperature (in °C) S/F	Rain S/F	Wind speed S/F	Cloud cover S/F
15 TH May 2025	20.55	20.35	22.25	13/12	0/0	4/4	8/8
Surveyor names and survey licence number where applicable	Senior Ecologist Stephanie Bennett BSc (Hons) ACIEEM (Class 2 Licence no: 2020-45364-CLS-CLS) Senior Ecologist Tom Cumberland BSc (Hons) (Class 1 Licence no: 2024-12309-CL17-BAT) Zoe Spicer Field Ecologist Jonathan Carter Field Ecologist Sarah Newey Field Ecologist Leiya Ordish-Wykes Field Ecologist						
Number of IR cameras used	11 IR cameras used. Screenshots of darkest points of survey are shown in Appendix C						

During the surveys, surveyors and Night Vision Aids (NVAs) in the form of infra-red (IR) cameras (and associated IR lights) were positioned to view the PRFs identified on the building for any bats emerging from (or returning) to the roost, in line with BCT Guidelines. Incidental bat activity was also recorded (e.g., roosting at neighbouring properties). Surveyor and Infrared Camera (IR) positions are shown in Figure 2

During the surveys, any potential bat emergences would be recorded by the IR cameras and their calls recorded using Elekon Batlogger Ms or M2s. Bat calls were analysed, where necessary, by Tetra Tech Emily Francey Assistant Ecologist and checked by Stephanie Bennett BSc ACIEEM (Class 2 Licence no: 2020-45364-CLS-CLS) using Bat Explorer software (Version 2.1.10.1). Bat surveys were completed during the period when bats are active, within the optimum survey season and within suitable weather conditions (above 10°C, dry and with calm winds).

Surveyors used Elekon Batlogger M detectors. This detector uses a broad-spectrum microphone and uses a heterodyne mode to make bat calls audible while recording full spectrum data for subsequent analysis.

Night Visual Aids (NVA) were used in lieu of a surveyor on all vantage points, in line with the BCT Guidelines. The cameras used were Canon XA40 IR cameras with additional IR illuminator lights. Cameras were positioned in such a way to viably cover the desired features of a property and were paired with static detectors such as Anabat Express and Anabat Swifts to record bat calls. The cameras were set to record the duration of the survey, with the same timings as stated in Table 2. Footage analysis by Motion Meerkat (Weinstein, 2015) was used to identify motion events which were subsequently analysed manually. The following settings were used: Background variation 3; organism speed 3; minimum object size 0.01% (parameters were tested against known activity before analysis). The subsequent images were reviewed and cross referenced with time of the movement to the sound files obtained by the Anabat Express / Swift set alongside the camera to identify any bats recorded.

The survey lead was bat licensed and all bat surveyors had bat survey training in line with BCT Professional Training Standards for Professional Ecologists Working with Bats (2020) Level 1 in line with BS42020.

Survey was by licensed Ecologist Stephanie Bennett BSc ACIEEM (Class 2 Licence no: 2020-45364-CLS-CLS).

2.3 LIMITATIONS

The optimal period to undertake bat presence/likely absence surveys is between May and August, although surveys in April and September may aid in identifying pre-maternity gathering roosts or transitional roosts. The survey was completed in May 2025 which is inside the optimal survey window and are therefore compliant with the levels of survey effort required for the suitability assigned to this building. The weather conditions were suitable for the entirety of the survey. Therefore, there were not any constraints associated with survey timing or weather conditions.

The surveys were completed with the assistance of bat detectors. All survey techniques are subject to bias, and bat detector surveys may under-record species with weak echolocation calls, such as brown long-eared bats. However, these biases were considered when interpreting the results. (It is also of note that Batloggers are very effective at picking up quiet calls from brown long-eared bats). Some bat calls are

variable dependent on the habitats they fly in and on their activity (commuting, foraging, social interaction, etc) and extremely similar between species. In these cases, it is accepted that species are identified to genus level or group level (e.g. *Myotis*, *Myotis* / *Plecotus* and *Nyctalus* / *Eptesicus*) (Collins, 2016). Where call parameters are inconclusive the species has been labelled as 'unknown'. This allows the dataset to be interpreted accurately and transparently.

Based on the latest guidelines (CIEEM, 2024 & Section 2.6.16-22 of the BCT Guidelines) the details within this report are considered valid for 12 months from the last survey date (until May 2026).

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 PREVIOUS REPORTS

A bat roost assessment and presence/ likely absence surveys were completed by CGO Ecology in summer 2023. This survey found the building had high suitability for roosting bats in accordance with BCT Guidelines categories. Nocturnal surveys found no confirmed roosts but did find a potential *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* emergence on the northern elevation on one survey. This report was valid until October 2024.

The subsequent non-licensed method statement for removal and soft strip of features with bat roost potential recommended avoidance of works during the maternity period and ecological supervision as needed. This report was valid until May 2024 after which it required a review (should works not have commenced). Asbestos removal was carried out in December 2024.

A PRA survey was completed by Tetra Tech in April 2025. This survey found the former hospital building was categorised as offering low bat roost suitability, due to no features large enough to support a maternity roost, however there were numerous features for roosting individual or small number of bats. Furthermore, the building was classified as negligible for hibernation suitability because of a lack of suitably thermodynamically stable and humid spaces and limited roosting, foraging and commuting habitat within the surrounding area.

3.2 FIELD SURVEYS

3.2.1 Presence / Likely Absence Nocturnal Surveys – Buildings

The activity was low throughout the survey, with surveyors noting occasional common pipistrelle passes on the west side of the former hospital building.

4.0 DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

4.1 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Following the nocturnal survey, roosting bats have been confirmed as being likely absent.

Low bat activity was observed during the dusk emergence surveys. The proposed works pertain to only the demolition of the building, therefore no habitats or commuting routes will be impacted.

Roosting bats are therefore considered likely absent from this building and the development can proceed without further survey, licensing or mitigation.

In the unlikely event bats or evidence of roosting bats (e.g. droppings) is discovered prior to or during these works, then works must cease immediately to avoid an offence being committed and a licensed bat ecologist consulted to determine an appropriate course of action.

If works do not begin by **June 2026** an update bat building inspection and / or nocturnal surveys may be needed to update site conditions, under the guidance of a licensed bat ecologist.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The former hospital building was identified as offering low bat roost suitability for summer roosting and negligible suitability for hibernation. The dusk emergence surveys observed low bat activity, but confirmed no roosts were present. No further surveys, licensing or mitigation are required.

6.0 REFERENCES

Bat Conservation Trust (2020) Professional Training Standards for Professional Ecologists Working with Bats

Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government, (2019), National Planning Policy Framework, [online] Available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/779764/NPPF_Feb_2019_web.pdf, Accessed May 2021.

Statutory Instrument 2017 No. 1012; The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), HMSO

Weinstein, B. G. (2015), MotionMeerkat: integrating motion video detection and ecological monitoring. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 6: 357–362. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12320


Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended), HMSO.

Please note that the legislation which is relevant to this report is not included in the list above, but details are included in Appendix B below.

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: SITE LOCATION PLAN

FIGURE 2: SURVEYOR LOCATION PLAN



© Tetra Tech Limited

Site Location Plan

Hinckley Hospital



NHS Property Services Ltd

Legend

- Site boundary
- Ownership boundary

Notes:

Drawn by: Chris.Dawe
Checked by: Laura Holmes

Figure No. 1
Revision No. A
02 April 2025

0 10 20 30 40 Meters
Scale 1:1,000 @A3

British National Grid
NGR: 442941E 293756N

© Crown Copyright All rights reserved. License number: 100019980






TETRA TECH

3 Sovereign Square
Sovereign Street
Leeds
United Kingdom
LS1 4ER

Tetra Tech Limited.
Registered in England
number: 01959704



Preliminary Roost Assessment
Hinckley Hospital



NHS Property Services Ltd


Legend

- Site boundary
- Ownership boundary
- Potential Access or Roost
 - ★ Potential Roost Feature
 - ▲ Potential Access

Notes:

Drawn by: Chris.Dawe
Checked by: Laura Holmes

Figure No. 2
Revision No. A
02 April 2025



British National Grid
NGR: 442941E 293756N

© OpenStreetMap (and) contributors, CC-BY-SA, Maxar, Microsoft




TETRA TECH

3 Sovereign Square
Sovereign Street
Leeds
United Kingdom
LS1 4ER

Tetra Tech Limited.
Registered in England
number: 01959704

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: REPORT CONDITIONS

APPENDIX B: PLANNING POLICY & LEGISLATION

APPENDIX C: DARKEST IR CAMERA FOOTAGE

APPENDIX A: REPORT CONDITIONS

This Report has been prepared using reasonable skill and care for the sole benefit of NHS Property Services Ltd (“the Client”) for the proposed uses stated in the report by [Tetra Tech Limited] (“Tetra Tech”). Tetra Tech exclude all liability for any other uses and to any other party. The report must not be relied on or reproduced in whole or in part by any other party without the copyright holder’s permission.

No liability is accepted or warranty given for; unconfirmed data, third party documents and information supplied to Tetra Tech or for the performance, reliability, standing etc of any products, services, organisations or companies referred to in this report. Tetra Tech does not purport to provide specialist legal, tax or accounting advice.

The report refers, within the limitations stated, to the environment of the site in the context of the surrounding area at the time of the inspections'. Environmental conditions can vary and no warranty is given as to the possibility of changes in the environment of the site and surrounding area at differing times. No investigative method can eliminate the possibility of obtaining partially imprecise, incomplete or not fully representative information. Any monitoring or survey work undertaken as part of the commission will have been subject to limitations, including for example timescale, seasonal and weather-related conditions. Actual environmental conditions are typically more complex and variable than the investigative, predictive and modelling approaches indicate in practice, and the output of such approaches cannot be relied upon as a comprehensive or accurate indicator of future conditions. The “shelf life” of the Report will be determined by a number of factors including; its original purpose, the Client’s instructions, passage of time, advances in technology and techniques, changes in legislation etc. and therefore may require future re-assessment.

The whole of the report must be read as other sections of the report may contain information which puts into context the findings in any executive summary.

The performance of environmental protection measures and of buildings and other structures in relation to acoustics, vibration, noise mitigation and other environmental issues is influenced to a large extent by the degree to which the relevant environmental considerations are incorporated into the final design and specifications and the quality of workmanship and compliance with the specifications on site during construction. Tetra Tech accept no liability for issues with performance arising from such factors.

APPENDIX B: PLANNING POLICY & LEGISLATION

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended)

This legislation transposes the European Union's Habitat Directive (Directive 92/43/EEC) into UK law. All bat species are listed as European Protected Species under the Habitats Directive, and Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The Regulations make it an offence to:

- deliberately capture, injure or kill a wild bat;
- deliberately disturb wild bats; 'disturbance of animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely:
 - to impair their ability —
 - to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or
 - in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
 - to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong'; or
- damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place used by a bat.

Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

All bats are protected through inclusion under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and benefit from various levels of protection. This legislation makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly kill or injure a bat;
- Possess any live or dead wild bat; or anything derived from such an animal; or
- Sell, offer for sale, possess or transport for the purpose of sale or publish advertisement to buy or sell individual bats.

All bats are also listed under Schedule 5 Section 9.4 which makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally or recklessly damage or destroy, or obstruct access to, any structure or place which a bat uses for shelter or protection; or
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose.

Under Schedule 5 Section 9.5a, it is an offence to knowingly cause or permit any of the above acts.

Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Section 41 (S41) of this Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list (in consultation with Natural England) of Habitats and Species which are of Principal Importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal (e.g. planning) functions. The S41 list includes 65 Habitats of Principal Importance and 1,150 Species of Principal Importance.

Seven species of bat are listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006; soprano pipistrelle, brown long-eared bat, greater horseshoe bat, lesser horseshoe bat, barbastelle, Bechstein's bat and noctule.

National Planning Policy Framework - Published the 27 March 2012, updated December 2024

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the top tier of planning policy. The Framework provides guidance to local authorities and other agencies on planning policy and the operation of the planning system. Section 15 relates to 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'. Paragraph 187- 201

Relevant policies in relation to planning application include Paragraphs:

"187. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
- b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
- c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;
- e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
- f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

188. Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework^[1]; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries

192. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

- (a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity [2]; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation [3]; and
- (b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

193. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- (a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- (b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- (c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons [4] and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- (d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

194. The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites:

- (a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
- (b) listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and
- (c) sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.

195. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site

^[1] Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality

² Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system

³ Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them

⁴ For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat

⁵ Potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and proposed Ramsar sites are sites on which Government has initiated public consultation on the scientific case for designation as a Special Protection Area, candidate Special Area of Conservation or Ramsar site

see here for full details: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP)

Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAP) identify habitat and species conservation priorities at a local level (typically at the County level) and are usually drawn up by a consortium of local Government organisations and conservation charities.

Some LBAP's may also include Habitat Action Plans (HAP) and/or Species Action Plans (SAP), which are used to guide and inform the local decision-making process.

^[1] Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality

^[2] Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system

^[3] Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them

^[4] For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat

APPENDIX C: DARKEST IR CAMERA FOOTAGE

Table 2: showing screenshots of infrared cameras at darkest point of survey.

Surveyor position	Screenshot of Infrared camera at darkest point of survey
Infrared camera 1, located at surveyor position 1	 This infrared image shows a dark scene at night. In the foreground, there is a metal fence and some dense foliage. In the background, a building with several windows is visible. The image is very dark, with only the outlines of the fence and the building's structure being discernible.
Infrared camera 2, located at surveyor position 2	 This infrared image shows a dark scene at night. In the foreground, there is a metal fence and some dense foliage. In the background, a building with several windows is visible. The image is very dark, with only the outlines of the fence and the building's structure being discernible.

Infrared camera 3,
located at
surveyor
position 3



Infrared camera 4,
located at
surveyor
position 4



Infrared camera 5,
located at
surveyor
position 5



Infrared
camera 6,
located at
surveyor
position 6



Infrared
camera 7,
located at
surveyor
position 7



Infrared
camera 8,
located at
surveyor
position 8



Infrared camera 9,
located at
surveyor
position 9



Infrared camera 10,
located at
surveyor
position 10



Infrared camera 11,
located at
surveyor
position 11



Our Ref: 7257,EC,001Ltr,TC,KL,31-07-23,V3

NHS Property Services Ltd
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
E14 4PU

Date: 31 July 2023

For the attention of Anna McComb

By Email:
- anna.mccomb@property.nhs.uk

Dear Anna,

GREAT CRESTED NEWT PRESENCE/ABSENCE EDNA SURVEY – HINCKLEY & DISTRICT HOSPITAL, MOUNT ROAD, HINCKLEY, LE10 1AG

1. Introduction

Geosphere Environmental Ltd. has undertaken a Great Crested Newt (GCN) eDNA survey. The survey was undertaken following the recommendations provided in report reference 7257,EC,AR,PEA,TC,KL,07-06-23.V1 (**Ref. 1**).

Report limitations and exceptions applicable to this report are detailed in Appendix 1 and full details of references are included in Appendix 2.

2. Methodology

The eDNA samples were collected by Tom Cox HND, TechArborA Great Crested Newt class survey licence ref. 2021-19003-CLS-CLS, on 12 June 2023.

A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) was undertaken at the same time as the eDNA sample collection, following the relevant HSI guidance (**Ref. 2**). The results of the HSI can be found in Appendix 3.

The eDNA sampling kits (one per water body sampled) were received in April 2023, from SureScreen Scientifics. Water samples were collected from the water body on 12 June 2023, following SureScreen Scientifics' instructions for the sampling of Great Crested Newt eDNA. This collection method is in line with the guidance within DEFRA's 'Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt – WC1067 Appendix 5' (**Ref. 3**).

One eDNA kit was used for each water body during eDNA sampling. Water samples were collected from 20 sampling points. Sampling points were as evenly distributed as possible considering areas of reduced accessibility such as edges with dense scrub preventing access.

Samples collected did not contain significant suspended sediment or other particular matter, and water clarity was almost entirely clear within the whirly-pak (bag in which all water samples are mixed together during sample collection).

GEOSPHERE ENVIRONMENTAL LTD

Brightwell Barns, Ipswich Road, Brightwell, Suffolk, IP10 0BJ

T: 01603 298076 | 01473 353519 | E: info@geosphere-environmental.co.uk | W: geosphere-environmental.co.uk

Following the collection of the samples, they were stored in a cool, dark cupboard for no more than 24 hours until dispatched via courier to SureScreen Scientifics on 13 June 2023. Kits were received by the lab on 16 June 2023.

Artificial DNA is placed into the eDNA kits when they are created, to ensure that once samples have been collected and returned to the laboratory for analysis, the DNA within the samples has not suffered degradation to the point that any GCN DNA can't be detected. All laboratory work undertaken on the eDNA samples are in accordance with DEFRA's 'Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt - WC1067 Appendix 5' (**Ref. 3**).

Waterbodies sampled within 250m of site are shown on Figure 1, below:



Figure 1. Locations of Ponds within 500m of indicative site boundary. Map source: © Open Streetmap Contributors

Selected photos of the waterbody are shown overleaf:



Photo 1: Pond 1 with wildfowl

3. Limitations

The eDNA sampling was first attempted on 17 May 2023, however at the time of the survey, the pond was undergoing chalking. It is considered that, given the time lapsed from the initial attempt to the second successful attempt on 12 June 2023, any sediment would have settled to enable a clear water sample to be obtained.

4. Results

The detailed results of the eDNA sample laboratory analysis are attached to this report as Appendix 4. Table 1, below, provides an overview of the results:

Table 1 – Overview of the Results						
Date Sample Collected	Pond Ref.	HSI Score	Positive/Negative	No. of positive replicate reactions	Inhibition control	Degradation control
12/06/2023	1	Average	Negative	0	Pass	Pass

Based upon the results tabulated above, Great Crested Newt DNA is absent within pond 1.

5. Evaluation

The samples were taken from twenty locations around the bank and 100% of the bank could be accessed for Pond 1. No inflows or outflows were noted for any of the water bodies. All of the samples collected passed the degradation control.

6. Recommendations

Laboratory analysis of the eDNA samples collected returned a negative result for Great Crested Newt eDNA in the water body, indicating that Great Crested Newt are not present within the local area.

7. Conclusions

GCN has not been confirmed within the pond sampled. As there are no other nearby ponds it is considered likely that GCN are absent from the local area and the risk the GCN within this development is extremely low. As such the development should be allowed to continue without GCN being a material consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Tom Cox
Senior Ecological and Arboricultural consultant
Geosphere Environmental Ltd
Tom.cox@geosphere-environmental.co.uk

Checked By:



Katie Linehan
Technical Director of Ecology
Geosphere Environmental Ltd

Enclosures:

- Appendix 1 – Report Limitations and Conclusion
- Appendix 2 – References
- Appendix 3 – HSI Results
- Appendix 4 – eDNA Lab Analysis
- Appendix 5 - Drawings



APPENDICES

GEOSPHERE ENVIRONMENTAL LTD

Brightwell Barns, Ipswich Road, Brightwell, Suffolk, IP10 0BJ

T: 01603 298076 | 01473 353519 | **E:** info@geosphere-environmental.co.uk | **W:** geosphere-environmental.co.uk

Registered Office: Brightwell Barns, Ipswich Road, Brightwell, Suffolk, IP10 0BJ | Registered in England and Wales | Registered NO. 7107630 | VAT NO. 985 4247 79

Appendix 1 – Report Limitations and Conditions

This report refers, within the limitations stated, to the condition of the site at the time of the inspections. No warranty is given as to the possibility of future changes in the condition of the site.

This report has been prepared for the sole use of the Client for the purposes described and no extended duty of care to any third party is implied or offered. Third parties using any information contained within this report do so at their own risk.

This report is prepared and written for the use stated herein; it should not be used for any other purposes without reference to Geosphere Environmental Limited. The report has been prepared in relation to the proposed end-use should another end-use be intended a further re-assessment may be required. It is likely that over time practises will improve and the relevant guidance and legislation be amended or superseded, which may necessitate a re-assessment of the site.

The accuracy of any map extracts cannot be guaranteed. It is possible that different conditions existed onsite, between and subsequent to the various map surveys appended.

Whilst the report may express an opinion on possible configurations of strata between or beyond exploratory holes discussed or on the possible presence of features based upon visual, verbal or published evidence, this is for guidance only and no liability can be accepted for its accuracy.

GEOSPHERE ENVIRONMENTAL LTD

Brightwell Barns, Ipswich Road, Brightwell, Suffolk, IP10 0BJ

T: 01603 298076 | 01473 353519 | **E:** info@geosphere-environmental.co.uk | **W:** geosphere-environmental.co.uk

Registered Office: Brightwell Barns, Ipswich Road, Brightwell, Suffolk, IP10 0BJ | Registered in England and Wales | Registered NO. 7107630 | VAT NO. 985 4247 79

Appendix 2 – References

1. Geosphere Environmental Limited (2023) Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Report reference 7257,EC,AR,PEA,TC,KL,07-06-23.V3
2. Oldham R.S., Keeble J., Swan M.J.S. & Jeffcote M. (2000). Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*). Herpetological Journal 10 (4), 143-155.
3. Biggs, J. et al (2014) Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the great crested newt. Defra Project WC1067, Freshwater Habitats Trust: Oxford



Appendix 3 – HSI Results

HSI SCORES



Project Number: 7257,EC,AR

Surveyor: TC

Project Name: Hinckley & District Hospital, Mount Road, Hinckley, LE10 1AG

Date: 20/04/2023

Pond Ref:	SI1	SI2	SI3	SI4	SI5	SI6	SI7	SI8	SI9	SI10	HSI	Suitability
	Location	Pond Area	Pond Drying	Water quality	Shade	Fowl	Fish	Ponds	Terr'I Habitat	Macrophytes		
1	1	1	0.9	0.33	80	0.67	0.67	0.01	0.33	0.3	0.63	Average

HSI Score	Pond suitability
<0.5	Poor
0.5-0.59	Below average
0.6-0.69	Average
0.7-0.79	Good
>0.8	Excellent



Appendix 4 – eDNA lab analysis

Folio No: E18106
Report No: 1
Purchase Order: 2529
Client: GEOSPHERE
ENVIRONMENTAL
Contact: Tom Cox

TECHNICAL REPORT

ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DNA IN POND WATER FOR THE DETECTION OF GREAT CRESTED NEWTS (TRITURUS CRISTATUS)

SUMMARY

When great crested newts (GCN), *Triturus cristatus*, inhabit a pond, they continuously release small amounts of their DNA into the environment. By collecting and analysing water samples, we can detect these small traces of environmental DNA (eDNA) to confirm GCN habitation or establish GCN absence.

RESULTS

Date sample received at Laboratory: 16/06/2023
Date Reported: 27/06/2023
Matters Affecting Results: None

Lab Sample No.	Site Name	O/S Reference	SIC	DC	IC	Result	Positive Replicates
5247	Great Billing - 7302/P7	SP 8246 6164	Pass	Pass	Pass	Negative	0

If you have any questions regarding results, please contact us: ForensicEcology@surescreen.com

Reported by: Chris Troth

Approved by: Jennifer Higginbottom



METHODOLOGY

The samples detailed above have been analysed for the presence of GCN eDNA following the protocol stated in DEFRA WC1067 'Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt, Appendix 5.' (Biggs et al. 2014). Each of the 6 sub-sample tubes are first centrifuged and pooled together into a single sample which then undergoes DNA extraction. The extracted sample is then analysed using real time PCR (qPCR), which uses species-specific molecular markers to amplify GCN DNA within a sample. These markers are unique to GCN DNA, meaning that there should be no detection of closely related species.

If GCN DNA is present, the DNA is amplified up to a detectable level, resulting in positive species detection. If GCN DNA is not present then amplification does not occur, and a negative result is recorded.

Analysis of eDNA requires scrupulous attention to detail to prevent risk of contamination. True positive controls, negative controls and spiked synthetic DNA are included in every analysis and these have to be correct before any result is declared and reported. Stages of the DNA analysis are also conducted in different buildings at our premises for added security.

SureScreen Scientifics Ltd is ISO9001 accredited and participate in Natural England's proficiency testing scheme for GCN eDNA testing. We also carry out regular inter-laboratory checks on accuracy of results as part of our quality control procedures.

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

- SIC:** **Sample Integrity Check** [Pass/Fail]
When samples are received in the laboratory, they are inspected for any tube leakage, suitability of sample (not too much mud or weed etc.) and absence of any factors that could potentially lead to inconclusive results.
- DC:** **Degradation Check** [Pass/Fail]
Analysis of the spiked DNA marker to see if there has been degradation of the kit or sample between the date it was made to the date of analysis. Degradation of the spiked DNA marker may lead indicate a risk of false negative results.
- IC:** **Inhibition Check** [Pass/Fail]
The presence of inhibitors within a sample are assessed using a DNA marker. If inhibition is detected, samples are purified and re-analysed. Inhibitors cannot always be removed, if the inhibition check fails, the sample should be re-collected.
- Result:** **Presence of GCN eDNA** [Positive/Negative/Inconclusive]
Positive: GCN DNA was identified within the sample, indicative of GCN presence within the sampling location at the time the sample was taken or within the recent past at the sampling location.
Positive Replicates: Number of positive qPCR replicates out of a series of 12. If one or more of these are found to be positive the pond is declared positive for GCN presence. It may be assumed that small fractions of positive analyses suggest low level presence, but this cannot currently be used for population studies. In accordance with Natural England protocol, even a score of 1/12 is declared positive. 0/12 indicates negative GCN presence.
Negative: GCN eDNA was not detected or is below the threshold detection level and the test result should be considered as evidence of GCN absence, however, does not exclude the potential for GCN presence below the limit of detection.





Appendix 5 – Drawings

Proposed Site Plan – Drawing Ref. 1782-DBC-22-00-DR-A-0100 P06

Site Address

Hinckley and District Hospital
Mount Road
Hinckley
LE10 1AG

N

North

Produced on 27 February 2023 from the Ordnance Survey National Geographic Database and incorporating surveyed revision available at this date.
This map shows the area bounded by 442857 791620, 442857 791620, 442857 791620, 442857 791620.
Crown copyright and database rights 2023 OS 100054125. Supplied by copula ltd trading as UKPlanningMaps.com a licensed Ordnance Survey partner OS 100054125.
Data licence expires 27 February 2028. Unique plan reference: xu/918517/1234527

Key

Application Site Area:
4042.89 sq m
0.404 ha

Land owned/controlled by the
trust



Notes:

This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all other consultants engineers and specialist sub contractors drawings.
All items are to be cross referenced throughout design, tender & construction.

Any discrepancies whatsoever discovered must be reported to the Main Contractor or Contract Administrator (CA) as soon as they become apparent.

The Main Contractor is responsible for checking all dimensions prior to commencement of work.

All specified manufacturers are OSA (or similar approved) OEA (or equal approved) whether stated or not. Any equivalent product or manufacturer must be approved in writing by the CA before use.

All structure shown on these drawings is based on structural philosophy & is to be fully designed, detailed & dimensioned by 'Others'. Refer to Structural Engineers plans for current structural design.

All drawings are to be read in conjunction with project specific NBS (national building specification)

P06	12/07/2023	Building layout updated in line with latest plans	BCP
P05	16/05/2023	Updated building shape to reflect current proposal	BCP
P04	12/04/2023	Car park layout updated to factor in refuse lorry swept path analysis	BCP

Rev	Date	Revision Details	Author
Status	Purpose For Issue		
S0	Initial Issue		

design
buro

The Design Buro (Coventry) Ltd
5 Euston Place,
Leamington Spa,
Warwickshire,
CV32 4LN

01788 555350
www.thedesignburo.co.uk

Client		NHS Property Services	
Job		Hinckley CDC & Endoscopy	
Title		Proposed Site Plan	
Drawn BCP	Date Feb 2023	Checked MH	Date Feb 2023
Scale:Size	1:500	@	A2
Drawing Number			Revision
1782-DBC-ZZ-00-DR-A-0100			P06

The copyright of this drawing is vested in the Architect/ Designer and must not be copied or reproduced without his written consent. Figured dimensions only to be taken from this drawing. All contractors and / or specialists must visit the site and be responsible for taking and checking all dimensions relative to this work.

End of Report.



RED KITE NETWORK LIMITED
The Old Church, Park Avenue, Madeley, TF7 5AB
t 01952 582111 **e** info@redkitenetwork.co.uk **w** www.redkitenetwork.co.uk
Registered in England & Wales No: 8169295