



Preliminary Roost Assessment

Survey site:

Lord Nelson, 54 Wood Street, Earl Shilton, Leicester LE9 7ND

Client:

Vault Pubs Ltd

Survey date:

07/04/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council. This proposal can be described as the change of use to create a 5 bed HMO to the first floor and self contained flat to second floor. To include two storey rear extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers and the addition of solar panels and a single storey rear extension to pub to provide additional seating with new staircase access.

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion

Executive Summary

The following is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission and to comply with legislation. Further information, along with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, are outlined in Tables 1, 3 & 4 of this report.

Key Findings
The PRA assessed the building B1 to have moderate roosting suitability for bats. Two bat emergence/re-entry survey will be required on B1 during the active bat season (May – September) to confirm presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building.

Contents

Introduction and Context.....	3
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Limitations	3
Results, Impacts and Recommendations	4
Site Location and Landscape Context	4
Fauna	5
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan.....	12
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan	13
Appendix 3: PRA/BERS Plan	14
Limitations and Copyright.....	15
Version Control	15

Introduction and Context

Introduction

The aim of the PRA was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how bats could use the site for roosting, foraging or commuting.

No previous ecology reports have been produced for this site by Arbtech Consulting Ltd or, to the author's knowledge, by any other consultancy.

Methodology

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024](#).

Limitations

Whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report is a preliminary assessment and does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. Nor does it represent a full botanical assessment. It assesses the likelihood of protected, notable and important habitats and species being present, based on a site and landscape level habitat value-based risk assessment. This is based upon the ecology, biology and known distribution of species as currently understood.

A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.

Results, Impacts and Recommendations

Site Location and Landscape Context

Table 1: Site location and landscape context

Site Location
The site is located at National Grid Reference SP 46286 97765 and has an area of approximately 0.012ha comprising one building.
Priority Habitats and Designated Sites
Summary of Survey Findings <u>Priority Habitats</u> There are 4 priority habitats located within 2 km of the site. These comprise deciduous woodland, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, lowland fens and traditional orchard. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located ~95 m NW of the site. This habitat parcel was separated from the site by urban habitats. <u>Designated Sites</u> There are no other statutory sites within 2 km of the site. There are no statutory sites within 10 km of the site. The site does fall within the impact risk zone for Burbage Wood And Aston Firs SSSI however, the proposed development type is not listed as possible high risk with regard to this designation. The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the local records centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environs of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designable quality.
Impacts

No direct impacts to any designated sites will occur as a result of the proposed development, due to the small scale and low overall impact of the development from such sites (where known), alongside additional factors such as distance in combination with connectivity disrupting barriers.

Recommendations

No recommendations.

Fauna

The site survey was undertaken by Consultant Ecologist Nicholas Smith who holds a FISC Level 3, a GCN Level 1 Licence and is an accredited agent of Natural England Bat Licence (licence details can be provided upon request).

Table 2: Survey weather conditions

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
07/04/2026	13.9	63	0	3.2	None

Table 3: Fauna

Fauna: Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations

This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

Roosting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

Buildings

Building B1 Description

B1 is a two-storey, detached, brick-built public house. The main roof structure is gabled and constructed of slate. Internal voids were recorded within the building. No bat evidence was found during the survey. In line with Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, J (Ed) 2023), B1 is assessed to have moderate habitat value for roosting bats due to due to the frequent gaps between the roof tiles allowing direct access into the loft void for bats, in addition to more features that could be used by roosting bats.			 B1	
Feature	Materials	Condition/Suitability		

	Roof	Slate	The slate roof has some defects, including local gaps or damage. Areas of lifted tiles and gaps were present throughout the roof structure, with areas of missing mortar along the ridge tiles. Areas of lifted lead flashing were present throughout the roof structure and chimney.	 <i>Lifted tiles</i>  <i>Lifted lead flashing and tiles</i>	
--	------	-------	--	--	--

	Voids	None	A loft void measuring 12m in length, 6m in width, and 2m in height, with an approximate area of 72m², was recorded. Gaps were observed throughout the loft void which provided direct access into the loft void for bats. Suitable roosting locations within the loft void included at the ridge convergence points.	 <i>Loft void</i>  <i>Gaps between tiles</i>
--	-------	------	--	---

Impacts

Buildings 1 will be renovated as part of the proposed works. This could and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats.

Recommendations

Two bat emergence/re-entry survey will be required on B1, requiring 3 surveyors and to provide full coverage of the building's elevations. If bat roosts are confirmed in the building one additional survey may be required to characterise the roost and to inform an EPSL application to Natural England.

These surveys must take place during the active bat season (May – September) to confirm presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building.

These survey visits should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August inclusive and the survey visits should be at least three weeks apart. Completing surveys in the sub-optimal season, early May and September, would require greater justification of timing e.g., weather conditions, known local bat activity.

One of the surveys could be a dawn re-entry survey, or all three can be at dusk if supported by night vision aids (NVA).

Every surveyor should be equipped with an infrared camera as part of the survey to determine specific roost locations.

Lighting mitigation may be required based on the outcome of the night bat survey(s).

If any bat roosts are confirmed from this survey schedule, a bat licence would be required to rennovate the buildings as it would involve the destruction/disturbance of roosts. This is applied for with the help of a class 2 licensed bat ecologist after planning permission is granted, but before commencement of works.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

There are no habitats on site which could be used for foraging bats. There are no strongly connected linear features present that may provide cohesive commuting routes between the site and features in the urban landscape.

Impacts

The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats.

Recommendations

None.

Birds**Summary of Survey Findings**

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1, however the building provides suitable shelter and could be used by common nesting birds.

No evidence of nesting swifts were observed during the survey however, the building offered suitable nesting habitat for swifts.

Impacts

Building B1 will be renovated during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local bird populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, the proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests.

Recommendations

Any building removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the building should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.

Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests, depending on species present, until the young have fledged.

Enhancements

The installation of a minimum of three bird boxes on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g.

Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings)

Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings)

Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.

[illegible]

Appendix 2: Site Location Plan



Appendix 3: PRA/BERS Plan



Limitations and Copyright

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version Control

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Final	1.0	Consultant Ecologist Nicholas Smith	14/05/2026