curious
ECOLOGISTS

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

Report for

42 Ashby Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire Protected Species Survey

Date of Report – 30th September 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 42 Ashby Road, Hinckley

Name of Client: Mr T. Poulton

Name of Agent: Mr S. Cheshire, Chartered Town Planner

Address of Agent: 34 Adrian Drive, Barwell, Leicestershire, LE9 8GA

Date of Survey: 29th September 2009

Weather Conditions: 50% cloud, breezy, dry, 17^0C

Address of survey site: 42 Ashby Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE10 1SL

Planning Application Number: 09/00739/OUT

Grid Reference of survey site: SP 4300 9490

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 demolish the existing house and detached garage. A protected species (particularly bats) survey was requested to apply 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 (slabs) and lawn, and was very overgrown. There were trees in the vicinity of the proposed site, at the nearby cemetery.
The surrounding area consisted of domestic residences, and it was on a busy main road.

1.3 The Building

The building was a detached two-storey house, with brick walls and a slate roof (welsh slates).
The roof had gable ends, and was supported by timber purlins and rafters, and the tiles no backing, but there was some cement torching remaining. The roof was at one height with equal pitches. There was a loft space, which was fully accessible for survey. It was insulated, and the insulation was pushed into the eaves, blocking any access into the loft void. 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, and the loft space was very dusty. There was no light entering the loft space. There were no gaps between the slates. The ridge tiles were all in place and there were no gaps under or between them. There were wooden soffits and fascias supporting the guttering, and there were no gaps between the wall and the soffits. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs. There were no bargeboards on the gable ends. There were no gaps under the lead flashing around the chimney.
The garage was single storey brick walled building, with a flat roof, which was covered with plastic sheeting. The roof covering was tarred felt over a concrete slab. There was no lining or loft space, the roof space being fully open and accessible for survey. The eaves were covered in spiders' webs.

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 are likely to be active at this time of year, and a bat detector was on at all times, in case a bat should be disturbed while the survey was taking place.

Signs of birds were also noted, particularly old nests. Birds are unlikely 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 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. The bat detector remained silent throughout the survey, and any access points by which bats could gain entry into the building or roof were webbed up.

3.2 Birds – There no old nests found in or on the building.

3.3 There was no evidence of any other protected species in or on the building, or in the near vicinity of the building.

4) Conclusions

4.1 Bats had not used the house and garage as a roost site.

4.2 The buildings had not been used for birds to nest, and there were no old nests on the building or in the near vicinity of the buildings.

4.3 There were no indications of any other protected species on or in the buildings, or in the near vicinity.

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

Report Produced by

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

Appendix 1: Photograph of Site



Photo 1- House, which is to be demolished, viewed from front



Photo 2- House, which is to be demolished, view from rear, garage to left of picture