curious
ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

Chapelfield House, Witherley, Leicestershire
Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 18th May 2009

Proprietors

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

Protected Species Survey at Chapelfield House, Witherley

Name of Client: Mr & Mrs Shorrock

Address of Client: Chapelfield House, Chapel Lane, Witherley, nr. Atherstone, Warwickshire CV9 3LR

Name of Agent: Tim Bailey

Address of Agent: 104 Main Road, Sheepy Magna, nr Atherstone, Warwickshire, CV9 3QU

Date of Survey: 18th May 2009

Weather Conditions: 100% cloud, windy, dry, 15^0C

Address of survey site: Chapelfield House, Chapel Lane, Witherley, nr. Atherstone, Warwickshire CV9 3LR

Planning Application Number:

Grid Reference of survey site: SP 3301 9752

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

Licence Numbers: Bat 20083261 issued by Natural England

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

It is proposed to extend the existing property; this does not involve joining the extension roof into the existing roof. The existing roof is not to be altered in any way. A bat survey was requested as a condition of the Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a rural setting, and consisted of a detached three-storey house, surrounded by garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (slabs and gravel), herbaceous, vegetable and shrub borders and mown lawn. There was a Leyland hedge *xCupressocyparis leylandii* on the boundary of the house, and beyond this several deciduous trees. There was no vegetation to be removed within the area of the proposed development.
The surrounding area consisted of agricultural land (mainly permanent grassland).

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached three-storey house, with brick walls and a tile roof (flat tiles).
The roof had a gable ends, and was supported by timber purlins and rafters. The tiles had insulated backing throughout. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey. There were many webs in the loft space, particularly on the ridge board and between the rafters, indicating that nothing had disturbed the space for some time. There was no light entering the loft space, and there were wooden boarding in the space between the wall plate and the tiles, in the eaves. There were no gaps between the tiles, but some had lifted slightly leaving some gaps, and there were some broken tiles. The ridge tiles were all in place and there were no gaps under or between them.
There were wooden bargeboards supporting the guttering. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. There were no gaps under the lead flashing around the chimney.

2) Survey Methods

The building was searched in a systematic pattern, all available spaces were searched, looking for signs of bats, in particular droppings, insect remains (where bats have fed), lack of spiders' webs (where bats have roosted), the bats themselves and body oils stains (where bats have squeezed through gaps). Particular attention was paid to undisturbed surfaces, walls (where bat droppings sometimes stick) and window sills (both inside and outside the buildings). The search was carried out with a high power torch inside the building and binoculars on the outside (particularly searching under eaves and ridge tiles). All cavities were checked using an endoscope to establish if anything was within them. Bats would be active at this time of year and a bat detector was on all the time that the survey was taking place, in case the light from the torch disturbed bats.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds are likely to be nesting at the time of the year when the survey was undertaken.

A note was made of any signs of other protected species, or whether there was any appropriate habitat for other protected species.

3) Results

3.1 Bats – There were a few old bat droppings found during the survey in the loft space, however there were no recent signs found, all surfaces and cavities were covered in spiders' webs. No evidence of bets was found in the areas, which are affected by the proposed development. The bat detector remained silent throughout the survey.

3.2 Birds – There were no active or old nests found during the survey, either on or in the building.

3.3 There was no evidence of any other protected species on the site, and there did not appear to be any habitat suitable for other protected species.

4) Conclusions

4.1 Bats had not used the area of the property, which will be affected by the proposed development, as a roost site. They had foraged in the loft spaces of the house at some time in the past, but this area will not be affected by the proposals. Also the evidence did not indicate that the lofts were used as a roost, just as a foraging area.

4.2 There were no active birds' nests on the proposed site.

4.3 There were no indications of any other protected species on the site, and there was no suitable habitat for any protected species on the proposed site.

5) Legislation

Bats: Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRoW Act 2000), and by the European Habitats Regulations 1994. To summarise; it is an offence to damage or destroy any place of shelter and protection used by bats (their roosts); deliberately, intentionally or recklessly obstruct a bat roost; deliberately, intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat; or intentionally kill, injure or take any bat.

6) Recommendations

None necessary

References and Bibliography

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. [ed.] (1999) *The Bat Workers' Manual* JNCC

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004) *Bat Mitigation Guidelines)* English Nature

K.Parsons (ed.) (2007) *Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines* Bat Conservation Trust

Hill, D., Fasham, M., Tucker, G., Shewry, M. & Shaw, P. (Eds) (2006) *Handbook of Biodiversity Methods: Survey, Evaluation & Monitoring* Cambridge

Heaton, A. (1998) *Rare Wildlife in Leicestershire and Rutland* Kairos Press

Betts, C.J. (2001) *Checklist of Protected British Species* Christopher Betts Environmental Biology

Report Produced by

Alan Bernard Gibney BSc (Hons), MIEEM - Ecologist (Curious Ecologists)

Appendix 1: Photographs of Site



Photo 1- Property to be extended in this area



Photo 2- Property also to be extended in this area