curious ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

4 School Lane, Stapleton, Leicestershire
Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 15th August 2011

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 4 School Lane, Stapleton

Name of Client: Mrs D. Maloney

Address of Client: 4 School Lane, Stapleton, Leicestershire, LE9 8JJ

Name of Agent: Mr D. Wilkinson, Architect

Address of Agent: 18 Webbs Way, Stoney Stanton, Leicestershire, LE9 4BW

Date of Survey: 15th August 2011

Weather Conditions: 20% cloud, breezy, dry, warm, 19^0C

Address of survey site: 4 School Lane, Stapleton, Leicestershire, LE9 8JJ

Planning Application Number: 11/00530/FUL

Grid Reference of survey site: SP 4353 9880

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

Licence Numbers: Great Crested Newt 20103624, Bat 20103625 & Barn Owl 20103623 issued by Natural England

1) Background

1.1 Reason for survey

There are plans to build an extension on the rear of the building, to replace the existing conservatory. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested to apply for listed building Planning Permission to carry on the development.

1.2 Description of site

The site was in a village setting, and consisted of a detached house surrounded by a garden (mown lawn, gravel/slab hardstanding and shrub/herbaceous planting). There were some trees in the near vicinity of the site, the nearest being about 5m away. There was no vegetation to be removed from the building.
The surrounding area consisted of agricultural land, (mostly arable) and domestic residences and their gardens.

1.3 The Building



Photo 1: The area of the house, showing area of extension

The house was a converted bungalow with an upper floor, which had brick walls and a tile roof (interlocking composite tiles). It had plastic soffits and fascias, but there were no gaps between these and the walls, as any gap had been sealed with silicon, the eaves were also covered in webs. The roof was simple, with gable ends, and equal pitches. The roof was supported by rafters and purlins. The tiles were lined with roof felt on the reverse of the tiles. There was also insulation pushed into the eaves, which blocked any gap in the eaves. The conservatory had plastic frames and roof and would be unsuitable for bats to roost.



Photo 2: showing webs on roof timbers

There were several small loft spaces, which were at the eaves of the building, these were accessible and open for survey. The roof timbers were covered in spiders' webs. There were no gaps under the tiles, and no missing tiles, also there was moss on the roof, which covered any potential gaps between the tiles. The ridge tiles were all in place, with no gaps between them. There were no gaps in the pointing under the ridge tiles or in the gable ends, between the tiles. There were no bargeboards on the gable ends.



Photo 3: Front view of property

The building had plastic framed windows and doors, all gaps being sealed with silicon. There were roof lights to the upper floor, which were fully sealed, and the chimney had all flashing in place, with no gaps.

2) Survey Methods

The buildings were 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 are likely to be active at the time of year that the survey was undertaken, and a bat detector was on at all times, in case 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 year that the survey took place.

The ground was searched for tracks, trails or signs (particularly droppings and food/feeding signs) of 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 and dust. All potential entry points were sealed with silicon and/or insulation .

3.2 Birds – There were no nests found on the building. There was no vegetation in the vicinity of the proposed extension 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 Bats had not used the buildings as a roost site; and there were no access points for bats to get under the tiles.

4.2 The buildings had not been used by birds as nesting sites.

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

5) Recommendations:

5.1 The proposed development is unlikely to have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the area, as it will only affect an area, which would be classed as of limited wildlife value, i.e. garden and buildings being the habitats present. (England Field Unit 2007).

5.2 There are no other recommendations for this proposed development.

References

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

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

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

Report Produced by

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