curious
ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

49 Stamford Drive, Groby, Leicestershire Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 3rd February 2010

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 49 Stamford Drive, Groby

Name of Client: Mr S. Dempsey

Address of Client: 49 Stamford Drive, Groby, Leicestershire LE6 0YD

Name of Agent: ADT Ltd, contact Peter Thompson

Address of Agent: Providence House, 49 Leicester Road, Broughton Astley, Leicestershire, LE9 6QE

Date of Survey: 3rd February 2010

Weather Conditions: 100% cloud, breezy, dry, cold -1^{0}C

Address of survey site: 49 Stamford Drive, Groby, Leicestershire LE6 0YD

Planning Application Number:

Grid Reference of survey site: SK 5293 0679

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

Licence Numbers: Bat 20093453 issued by Natural England

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

It is proposed to extend the existing house, to include joining the extension roof to the existing roof. Also the property is to be extended above the single-storey garage. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested for Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a suburban setting, and consisted of a detached two-storey house, surrounded by garden. The garden was a mix of hardstanding (block pavers, gravel & slabs), herbaceous planting and mown lawn. Surrounding the garden was a mix of wooden panel fencing and Leyland hedges *xCupressocyparis leylandii*. To the north of the property was an open closely mown grass field. There were no large trees in the vicinity of the site. There were no ponds on the site. There was no vegetation to be removed within the area of the proposed development. The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences, plus the grass field.

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached two-storey house, plus a single storey attached garage, with brick walls and a tile roof (interlocking composite pan tiles).
The roof was in several sections and had gable ends, and was supported by timber trussed rafters. The tiles had felt backing throughout. The roof was at several heights sections having equal pitches and some were lean-too. There were two loft spaces, one above the house and one above the garage, which were both fully accessible for survey. They were insulated. 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 spaces. There were no gaps between the tiles. The pointing in the gable ends was all in place. The ridge tiles were all in place and there were no gaps under or between them. The gaps at the ends of the interlocking pan tiles were blocked. There were wooden fascias and soffits supporting the guttering, and there was no gap between the wall and the soffits. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. There were bargeboards on the gable ends, but there was no gap between these and the walls, these eaves were also covered in webs. There were no gaps under the lead flashing around the chimney or between the roof joins.
There was a mix of plastic and wooden window and door frames, and any gaps around these were filled with silicon.

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 not be active at this time of year when the survey was undertaken.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds would not 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 was no evidence of bats found during the survey, there were no droppings or other signs, all surfaces and cavities were covered in spiders' webs. There did not appear to be any access points for bats to gain entry into the building or roof.

3.2 Birds – There were no old nests found in or on the building, or in garden, which is affected by the extension, and there was no vegetation that would be suitable for birds to nest in.

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

4) Conclusions

4.1 The house and garage had not been used by bats as a roost site.

4.2 The building had not been used for birds to nest, and there were no old nests in or on the building or in the area of garden affected by the proposals.

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

5) Recommendations and Mitigations

- 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

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

Report Produced by

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

Appendix 1: Photographs of Site



Photo 1- 49 Stamford Drive, view from front



Photo 2- House to be extended in this area, view from rear