



Ecological Scoping Survey on Land off Town Dam Lane, Donington, Lincolnshire.



Client: Ashwood Homes

March 2017

Hillier Ecology Limited
127 Fletton Avenue, Peterborough, PE2 8BX
Office: 01733 894979 Mobile: 07730 758439
howardwhillier@btinternet.com

Contents

1.0	Summary	3
2.0	Introduction	4
3.0	Site Details	4-8
4.0	Survey Methodology	9-11
5.0	Survey Results	12-13
6.0	Conclusions	14-15
7.0	Recommendations	15
8.0	Legal Protection	16-17
9.0	References	18
10.0	Appendices	19-23

1.0 Summary

1.1 An ecological scoping survey covering the following species; bat *Chiroptera* sp., bird *Aves*, badger *Meles meles*, reptiles, water vole *Arvicola amphibius* and flora has been carried out on land off Town Dam Lane, Donington, Lincolnshire.

1.2 The site has been assessed as to its suitability to support bats, there are no suitable roosting features within the survey area.

1.3 No further surveys are required.

1.4 No birds were recorded during the survey.

1.5 There is no suitable nesting habitat on the site.

1.6 No further surveys are required.

1.7 The survey for badgers produced a negative result with no evidence of badgers being recorded.

1.8 No further surveys are required.

1.9 The survey for reptiles produced no evidence to suggest that reptiles are present on the site.

1.10 No further surveys are required.

1.11 No evidence of water voles having used or using the dyke were recorded, although the dyke has some potential to support water vole.

1.12 Recommendations are made to minimise disturbance to the dyke.

1.13 No further surveys are required.

1.14 Thirteen common and widespread plants were recorded during the survey.

1.15 No further surveys are required.

1.16 Overall the site is of low ecological value.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 Hillier Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Ashwood Homes carry out an ecological scoping survey out on land off Town Dam Lane, Donington, Lincolnshire.

2.2 The survey was carried out to assess the ecological impact of the proposed development of the site.

3.0 Site Details

3.1 The site is located at NGR TF 2089035257 (Appendix 1).

3.2 The site is situated in the village of Donington; the site and its surrounds are made up of the following habitats:

- Assorted buildings
- Dwellings
- Mature gardens
- Mature trees
- Arable
- Standing water
- Dry ditch

3.3 The diversity of habitats is thought to be capable of supporting protected species.

3.4 The survey area is shown in the photographs below and (Appendix 2).



Plate 1 Survey Area



Plate23 Survey Area



Plate 3 Survey Area



Plate 4 Dry Dyke



Plate 5 Wet Dyke

4.0 Survey Methodologies

Bats (Buildings)

4.1 The site was assessed as to its potential to hold bat roosts.

4.2 Any building will be assessed using the criteria below.

Assessment of Potential to Support Roosting Bats - Categories for Buildings	
Negligible potential	Buildings with no features capable of supporting roosting bats. Often these buildings are of a 'sound' well-sealed nature, or have a single skin and no roof void. They tend to have high interior light-levels, and little or no insulation. Buildings without any roofs may also fall into this category.
Low potential	Buildings with limited features for roosting bats (e.g. shallow crevices where mortar is missing between building blocks/bricks). They may have open locations which may be subject to large temperature fluctuations and bat-access points may be constrained. No evidence of bats found (e.g. droppings / staining). Buildings may be surrounded by poor or sub-optimal bat foraging habitat. No evidence of bats found.
Moderate potential	Buildings with some features suitable for roosting bats. Buildings usually of brick or stone construction with a small number of features of potential value to roosting bats e.g. loose roof / ridge tiles, gaps in brickwork, gaps under fascia boards, and/or warm sealed roof-spaces with under-felt. Evidence of bats found a small scattering of droppings or urine staining. Could be suitable for summer day roost.
High potential	Buildings with a large number of features or extensive areas of obvious potential for roosting bats. Generally, they have sheltered locations, with a stable temperature regime and suitable bat-access points. Evidence of bats found droppings/urine staining. Could be suitable for a maternity roost or summer day roost.
Confirmed roost	Bats discovered roosting within the building, or recorded emerging / entering the building at dusk / dawn. A confirmed record (as supplied by an established source such as the local bat group) would also apply to this category.

Bats (Trees)

4.3 Any trees will be assessed using the criteria below.

Assessment of Potential to Support Roosting Bats - Categories for Trees	
Negligible potential	Tree contains no suitable features for roosting bats. These can include young trees without ivy and without loose bark and obvious cracks / fissures. Usually saplings, semi-mature specimens with a small girth or mature trees which do not tend to form fissures as readily such as sycamore.
Low potential	Tree contains limited features suitable for roosting bats. Usually young (sapling or semi-mature) trees with some ivy or some loose bark ⁶ but no obvious cracks or fissures. No evidence of bats found (e.g. droppings / staining).
Moderate potential	Tree contains some features suitable for roosting bats. Trees with some cracks or fissures and/or large amounts of ivy / loose bark. Usually semi-mature or mature specimens. Trees tend not to have large splits, hollow trunks or woodpecker holes. No evidence of bats found.
High potential	Tree contains features that are highly desirable for roosting bats. Trees with woodpecker holes / large cracks and/or crevices. Often with a hollow trunk. May support very dense ivy. No evidence of bats found.
Confirmed roost	Bats discovered roosting within the tree, or recorded emerging / entering a tree at dusk / dawn. Trees found to contain conclusive evidence of occupation by bats, such as bat droppings. A confirmed roost record (as supplied by an established source such as the local bat group) would also fall into this category.

Birds

4.4 All birds seen and heard have been recorded.

4.5 An assessment of the site to support nesting birds has been carried out

Badgers

4.6 A walkover survey of the site has been carried out to search for the following signs (Harris et al 1989):

- Setts
- Latrines
- Dung
- Badger Hair
- Footprints
- Pathways

4.7 Evidence of badger activity if found will be recorded.

Reptiles

4.8 A habitat assessment has been made to assess the sites potential for reptiles.

4.9 A walkover of the site has been carried out to assess if the habitat is suitable to sustain a population of reptiles. The following habitats are looked for:

- Bare Ground
- Variety of Sward Heights
- Natural Refugia
- Basking Areas

Water Vole

4.10 The standard methodology for water vole (Strachan et al 2011) was used.

4.11 A metre by metre search of all watercourses to look for the following signs:

- Latrines
- Feeding Signs
- Footprints
- Burrows
- Runways in Vegetation
- Live Sightings

Flora

4.12 A walkover the site will be carried out to record all native plant species

5.0 Survey Results

5.1 The surveys were carried out by Deborah Hillier assisted by Terence Cater.

5.2 The surveys were carried out on the following date 24th February 2017, in the following weather conditions overcast, light breeze and a temperature of 6.0°C.

Bats

5.3 The assessment of the site produced a negative result with no suitable structures or trees within the site boundary.

Birds

5.4 No birds were recorded during the survey.

Badgers

5.5 The survey did not record any badger setts or evidence of badgers using the site.

Reptiles

5.6 The habitat assessment of the site did not meet the criteria as suitable reptile habitat.

Water Vole

5.7 The survey for water vole produced a negative result, with no evidence of water voles using the wet dyke recorded.

5.8 The dyke did have the potential to support water vole.

5.9 The habitat data recorded is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Habitat Data

Watercourse Field Dyke	Width 1m	Depth <0.5-1m	Shore/Bank Type Earth	Current Static
Habitat Standing water	Bordering Land Use Arable/Urban	Bank Profile Steep >45°	Vegetation: (DAFORN Scale) Bankside trees N Bushes N Herbs R Submerged weed N Reeds/Sedges D Tall Grass F Short Grass N	

5.10 The other dyke was dry at the time of the survey.

5.11 The location of both dykes is shown in (Appendix 3).

Flora

5.12 Thirteen species of common and widespread plants were recorded.

5.13 A full species list is shown in (Appendix 4).

6.0 Conclusions

Bats

6.1 The assessment of the site produced a negative result with no structures or trees present on the site.

6.2 No further bat surveys are required.

Birds

6.3 No bird species were recorded during the survey.

6.4 No evidence of suitable nesting habitat was recorded.

6.5 No further bird surveys are required.

Badgers

6.6 No evidence of badger setts or badger activity was found to suggest that badgers are using the site.

6.7 No further badger surveys will be required.

Reptiles

6.8 The habitat assessment of the site did not meet the criteria as suitable reptile habitat; the site comprising in the main of arable land and lacking in a variety of sward heights, natural refugia and basking areas.

6.9 No further reptile surveys will be required.

Water Vole

6.10 No evidence of water vole was found; the habitat in the wet dyke did have the potential to support water voles, the habitat in the dry dyke is sub-optimal for water voles.

6.11 Recommendations are made to mitigate the disturbance to the wet dyke.

6.12 No water vole further surveys are required.

Flora

6.13 All plants recorded were common and widespread species.

6.14 No further flora surveys will be required

General

6.15 Overall the site is of low ecological value.

7.0 Recommendations

Birds

7.1 To enhance the sites biodiversity a selection of bird boxes should be erected.

Water Vole

7.2 To minimise disturbance to the wet dyke a 5m buffer zone should be put in place.

8.0 Legal Protection

Bats

8.1 The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (amended 2010) (the Habitats Regulations) transpose into UK law Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 1992 (often referred to as the Habitats Directive). All bats are listed under Annex IV and some (horseshoe bats, Bechstein's and Barbastelle) are also listed under Annex II which relates to Special Areas of Conservation. These Regulations make it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat.
- Deliberately disturb bats in a way as to be likely significantly to affect the ability of any significant groups of bats to survive, breed or rear or nurture their young, or to affect the local distribution or abundance of that species.
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a bat.
- Keep, transport, sell or exchange, or offer for sale or exchange a live or dead bat or any part of a bat.

8.2 In addition the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) makes it an offence to:

Intentionally or recklessly

- Disturb any bat whilst it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection.
- Obstruct access to any structure or place which any bat uses for shelter or protection.

8.3 Penalties are fines of up to £5000 per bat and up to 6 months custodial sentence.

Birds

8.4 All bird's nests are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), which makes it an offence to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built.

Badgers

8.5 The badger receives legal protection under The Protection of Badgers Act 1992.

8.6 The following is a summary of the offences contained in the act. It is a criminal offence to commit any of the following:

- To interfere with a sett by damaging or destroying it.
- To obstruct access to, or any entrance of a badger sett.
- To disturb a badger when it is occupying a sett.

8.7 A badger sett is defined by the legislation as “any structure or place, which displays signs indicating current use by a badger” and this is taken by Natural England to include seasonally used setts.

Reptiles

8.8 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) make it an offence to intentionally or recklessly kill or injure reptiles.

Water Vole

8.9 Water vole receives full protection through its inclusion in Section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

8.10 Full legal protection under the act makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take water voles.
- Possess or control live or dead water voles.
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb water voles whilst occupying a structure or place used for that purpose.
- Sell water voles or offer or expose for sale or transport for sale.

9.0 References

Anon. (1998). Herpetofauna Groups of Britain and Ireland. Evaluating Local Mitigation/Translocation Programmes, Froglife, Halesworth, Unpubl.

Collins J (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologist – Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition), Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Dean, M, Strachan, R, Gow, D and Andrews, R. (2016) The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook. Eds: Fiona Matthews and Paul Chanin. Mammal Society, London.

Gent T and Gibson S. (2003). Herpetofanua Workers Manual, JNCC, Peterborough.

Harris S, Cresswell P, and Jefferies D (1989). Surveying Badgers, The Mammal Society, London.

Harris S, Jefferies D, Cheeseman C and Booty C 1994. Problems with Badgers. RSPCA. West Sussex.

HMSO (1981). Wildlife and Countryside Act. HMSO, London.

HMSO (1994). Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations. HMSO, London.

HMSO (2000). Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act. HMSO, London.

Macdonald, D. W, Mace, G & Rushton, S 1998 Proposals for Future Monitoring of British Mammals, DETR, London.

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

Mitchell-Jones, A. J & McLeish, A. P (1999). The Bat Workers Manual, JNCC, Peterborough.

Strachan, R Moorhouse, T and Gelling, M (2011). Water Vole Conservation Handbook (Third Edition), Wildcru, Oxford.

Appendix 1 Site Location



Based on the Ordnance Survey Map with Permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office Crown Copyright Reserved. Licence No 10045706

Appendix 2 Survey Area



Appendix 3 Species Location of Dykes



Appendix 4 Species List -Flora

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i>	False Oat-grass
<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	Spear Thistle
<i>Galium aparine</i>	Cleavers
<i>Geranium robertianum</i>	Herb Robert
<i>Lamium album</i>	White Dead-nettle
<i>Phragmites australis</i>	Common Reed
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	Ribwort Plantain
<i>Rubus fruticosus</i>	Bramble
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Curled Dock
<i>Ranunculus repens</i>	Creeping Buttercup
<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>	Lesser celandine
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	Dandelion
<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Common Nettle

Appendix 5 Bird Boxes



Suitable for robins



Suitable for starlings, thrushes, doves



Suitable for blue tit, great tit



Suitable for wrens



Suitable for house/tree sparrow