curious ECOLOGISTS

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

Biodiversity Report for

Land off Station Road, Bagworth, Leicestershire

Extended Phase 1 (including Protected Species) Survey

Date of Report – 19th July 2010

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

Report Contents:

Page	Title
3	Details
4	Proposed Development
4	Site Description
4	Aim of Study
5	Survey Methodology
6	Results
7	Conclusion
7	Recommendations
8	References

Proposed Development at Land off Station Road, Bagworth
Extended Phase 1 (including Protected Species) Survey

Name of Client: Farland Trading Ltd

Name of Agent: Landmark Planning Ltd, contact- Peter Wilkinson

Address Of Agent: 10 Salisbury Road, Leicester, LE3 7QR

Date of Survey: 19th July 2010

Weather: 20% cloud, breezy, dry, warm, 20°C

Address of survey site: Land on corner of Station Road and Maynard Close, Bagworth, Leicestershire, LE9

Planning Application Number:

Grid Reference of survey sites: SK 4454 0849

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

Licences: Great Crested Newt 20093452, Bat 20093453 & Barn Owl 20093399 issued by Natural England

1) Proposed Development

It is proposed to develop the site off Station Road, Bagworth for residential and Commercial use. There are no trees affected by the development, as there are no trees on the site or on land directly adjoining the site.

2) Site Description

The site is in the centre of the village of Bagworth, in Hinckley and Bosworth Borough, Leicestershire. It consists of an area of land, which is roughly square in shape, with an area of approximately 625m^2. The boundaries of the site were tarmac road on the northern, southern and eastern boundary, and mown amenity grass on the western border. Beyond the boundaries were residential properties on all sides, and beyond that agricultural land and amenity land. There were no trees on the site, the nearest trees were an ash *Fraxinus excelsior* on the opposite side of Maynard Close, plus some Leyland cypress *xCupressocyparis leylandii* in the gardens of the terraced houses on Station Road, all the trees are unaffected by the proposals. The proposed site was industrial derelict land, less than twenty years old. There was a thin layer of soil on a base of hardstanding (compacted gravel and tarmac).
There did not appear to be any field ponds shown on the local maps or aerial photographs, within 500m of the site, and there were none on site. However there were some dried up damp areas on the site.
There were no buildings present on the proposed site.

3) Aims of Study

The Curious Ecologists had been commissioned to produce a biodiversity report for the area to include protected species and phase 1 surveys as part of Planning Application for a proposed development of new dwellings.

4) Survey Methodology:

4.1 Site Survey

The site was searched systematically for any signs of protected species. In particular:

1. The site was walked over and the habitats were described using Phase 1 Habitat Survey methodology.

2. The grounds were searched for signs of reptiles or great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*), by searching under logs, rocks and any other appropriate refuges, and a note was made of any appropriate reptile or newt habitat types.

3. Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nest sites, throughout the whole site. Birds (in the main) are building nests, brooding eggs or feeding young, and so if any nests were found, it would be possible to establish if they were active ones

4. Badgers- The area was searched for badger field signs. In particular grassland areas were searched for footprints, dung pits, snuffle holes and runways through the vegetation. Boundary hedges, walls and fences were searched for latrines. Runways under boundary fences were searched for stray hairs. Hedgerows and earth banks were searched for signs of sett building activity, including dung pits and hairs close to the sett entrance, footprints, discarded bedding and recent spoil heaps.

5. The ground was searched for tracks, trails or signs (particularly droppings and food/feeding signs) of protected species.

6. Evidence of any other protected species was also noted.

5) Results

5.1 Extended Phase 1 Survey Results



Photo 1- the site was mown grass on a derelict industrial site- I2.3

The species list for this area was difficult to identify as it had been closely mown, but the following species were identified perennial rye grass *Lolium perenne,* Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus*, creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens,* white clover *Trifolium repens,* dock *Rumex* sp., black medic *Medicago lupulina*, twitch *Agopyron repens*, great willowherb *Epilobium hirsutum*, sow thistle *Sonchus arvensis,* dandelion *Taraxacum officinale* agg., and red clover *T. pratense*, plus some rushes *Juncus* sp. and reedmace *Typha* sp. in the damp areas..

5.2 Protected Species Survey Results

Great Crested Newt – There were no ponds on the site, and there did not appear to be any field ponds shown within 500m of the proposed site on the local maps or aerial photos. No evidence of Great Crested Newts was found on site when the terrestrial searches were undertaken.

Badgers - There was no evidence of badgers found during the survey.

Birds – There were no active nests found on the site, during the survey, and there did not appear to be any suitable nest sites for birds.

Other Protected Species - There was no evidence of any other protected species and the habitats found on the proposed site would generally be considered of limited wildlife value (England Field Unit 2007).

6) Conclusion

1. The site was of limited wildlife value (England Field Unit 2007).
2. Great Crested Newts – There were no GCN found on the site and there were no suitable breeding ponds within 100m of the site.
3. Badgers – There was no evidence of badgers found during the survey.
4. Birds – There were no active birds nests found during the survey, and there were no suitable nesting sites present, at the time of the survey.
5. There was no evidence found of any other protected species on the proposed site.

7) Recommendations

1. The proposed development is unlikely to have a negative affect on the biodiversity of the area, as it will only affect an area, which would be classed as of limited wildlife value, i.e. industrial derelict land, less than twenty years old (England Field Unit 2007).

2. No protected species are likely to be affected by this proposed development, as far as could be ascertained. Although if the site is left undeveloped for some time, both scrub and bramble could develop on the site, which could provide suitable nesting opportunities for birds. It should therefore be noted that if there is any doubt as to whether birds are nesting in the near vicinity of any proposed works, it is advised to get the area checked by a suitably qualified ecologist. Should an active nest be found, the nest must remain undisturbed until the young birds have fledged, which may cause a delay in the proposed works. Nesting Birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or take, damage or destroy its nest whilst in use or being built, or take or destroy its eggs. It is recommended that any works to remove any vegetation are scheduled outside the bird nesting season (normally considered to be March-August).

References and Bibliography

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

Gent,T. & Gibson,S. [Eds] (2003) *Herpetofauna's Workers' Manual* JNCC

Langton, T., Beckett, C. & Foster, J. (2001) *Great Crested Newt Conservation Handbook*. Froglife, Halesworth

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

England Field Unit (2007) *Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey – a technique for environmental audit* JNCC

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

Report Produced by

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