Camden Lock Village

Building and Tree Inspection Surveys 2014

September 2014

Waterman Energy, Environment & Design Limited
Merchants House, Wapping Road, Bristol BS1 4RW, United Kingdom
www.watermangroup.com

Camden Lock Village

Building and Tree Inspection Surveys 2014

Client Name:	Stanley Sidings Ltd
Document Reference:	EED14664-100_R_1_1_6_SD
Project Number:	EED14664

Quality Assurance – Approval Status

This document has been prepared and checked in accordance with
Waterman Group's IMS (BS EN ISO 9001: 2008, BS EN ISO 14001: 2004 and BS OHSAS 18001:2007)

Issue	Date	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
First	September 2014	Simon Dowell Consultant	Lee Mantle Principal Ecologist	Paul Shelley Technical Director

Comments

Our Markets

Property & Buildings

Transport & Infrastructure

Energy & Utilities

Environment

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by Waterman Energy, Environment & Design Ltd, with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the client, incorporation of our General Terms and Condition of Business and taking account of the resources devoted to us by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at its own risk.

Contents

Tables

Figures

Appendices

1. Introduction

1.1. This report has been prepared by Waterman Energy, Environment & Design Ltd (Waterman EED) on behalf of Stanley Sidings Ltd. It is intended to discharge conditions of an application for the redevelopment of an area of land, located within the administrative boundary of London Borough of Camden (LBC), north London (hereafter referred to as the 'Site').

The Site

1.2. The Site is located at Ordnance Survey (OS) Grid Reference TQ 2878 8420 and has an area of approximately 2 hectares. The majority of the Site consists of hard standing and buildings with limited areas of vegetation (Figure 1).

1.3. The Site is bound by:

- Hawley Road to the north;
- The rear of the properties along Kentish Town Road, and Kentish Town Road itself to the east;
- Regent's Canal (including Hawley Lock) to the south; and
- Chalk Farm Road and Castlehaven Road to the west.

Previous Surveys

1.4. A previous planning application for the Site was submitted in 2011. As part of the application, an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (refer to Waterman report EED30222E-103_R_1.1.2_RH_Ecological_Appraisal) was undertaken in September 2010. This survey highlighted the Grade II Listed Number 1 Hawley Road (see Figure 1) as the only building on the-Site as having potential to support roosting bats. As such an internal and external inspection of this building for bats was undertaken in combination with the 'Extended' Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken in 2010. No evidence of bats was found during the inspection; however it was assigned a low potential rating to support roosting bats. Subsequent bat surveys, comprising an evening emergence and dawn re-entry survey were undertaken on 15th and 16th September, 2010. No bats were recorded emerging or entering Number 1 Hawley Road. A single common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* was however noted commuting along Hawley Road heading west during the evening emergence survey, approximately one hour after sunset.

1.5. Updated bat surveys by Waterman EED were also undertaken on Number 1 Hawley Road in 2012 (E30222E-109-R-1-1-2-HMB). Although bats were recorded as foraging within the local area, no bats were seen to be using Number 1 Hawley Road as a roost at the time of survey.

Development Proposals

1.6. The proposed development includes employment, residential, retail, educational and leisure uses. An outline planning application was submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the development of a school on the north section of the Site. Several planning conditions have been attached to this planning application including Condition 30 **(2012/4640/P)** relating to bats. The second part of the Site which is to be developed for residential housing also has a condition relating to bats (condition 47) **(2012/4628/P)**. Condition 30 & 47 state;

"Should more than one year pass between the most recent bat survey and the intended commencement of demolition and/or any tree works, an updated bat survey must be undertaken immediately prior to demolition tree works by a licenced bat worker. Evidence that the survey has been undertaken shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of demolition and/or tree works"

Aims and objectives of this assessment

1.7. Owing to the time that has lapsed since the previous bat surveys were undertaken at the Site, the mobile nature of bats and the publication of the second edition of The Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) good practice guidelines[1], it was considered necessary to update the bat surveys previously undertaken at the Site in order to discharge planning condition 30 for the school site and condition 47 of the main site. As such the following update bat surveys were undertaken in 2014:

- An internal and external building inspection of all buildings within the redline boundaries that are to be impacted upon by the development; and
- A ground based assessment of trees within the redline boundaries.

1.8. This report details the findings of the above updated bat surveys. This report also sets out any recommendations for further surveys for bats to ensure that current planning policy and legislation requirements are met.

[1] Bat Conservation Trust (2012). Bat Surveys – Good Practice Guidelines. Bat Conservation Trust, London

2. Relevant Legislation

Legislation

2.1. In summary specific species of relevance to the Site receive legal protection in the UK under various pieces of legislation, including:

- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)[2];
- The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)[3];
- The Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2004;
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006[5];
- Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996[6]; and

2.2. Where relevant, this report takes account of the legislative protection afforded to specific species.

Bats

2.3. In summary all UK bat species are protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Taken together it is an offence to:

- deliberately kill, injure or capture a bat;
- deliberately disturb bats in such a way as to be likely to significantly affect (i) the ability of any significant group of bats to survive, breed, or rear/nurture their young; or (ii) the local distribution of that species;
- damage or destroy any breeding or resting place used by bats; or
- intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any place used by bats for shelter or protection.

[2]HMSO (2010) 'The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended)'
[3]HMSO (1981) 'Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended)'
[4] HMSO (2000) 'The Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act'
[5] ODPM (2006) 'Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act '
[6] HMSO, 1996 'The Wild Mammals (Protection) Act.

3. Methodology

Building Inspection

3.1. All buildings within the red line boundaries of the Site were subject to an external and internal inspection (where access was available) for bats on the 13th August 2014, in accordance with the aforementioned current BCT best practice guidelines.

3.2. During the inspection of the buildings, the external perimeter was walked (where access allowed) and the exterior assessed with the aid of binoculars (where required). The internal part of the inspection searched through each room/compartment and roof space, where present and accessible, for evidence of bats (e.g. droppings, scratch marks, staining, carcasses and sightings of live bats themselves) using a high-powered torch.

3.3. Based on the findings, a potential rating for the buildings to be used as a bat roost was assigned. **Table 1** provides a summary of the bat roost potential rating categories.

Table 1: Summary of the bat roost potential rating categories

Category (potential to support roosting bats)	Description
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. These buildings may be used as occasional or transient roosts in the summer, but are unsuitable for large colonies. No evidence of bats found.
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. Could be suitable for a maternity roost. No evidence of bats found.
Confirmed roost	Bats discovered roosting within the building, or recorded emerging / entering the building at dusk / dawn. Building found to contain conclusive evidence of occupation by bats, such as bat droppings. A confirmed record (as supplied by an established source such as the local bat group) would also apply to this category.

Tree Surveys for Bat Roost Potential

3.4. A preliminary ground based visual inspection assessment of the trees within the Site was undertaken in combination with the building inspections, based on current best practice guidelines (BCT 2012).

3.5. The trees were scored according to the following criteria during the Site survey to identify their potential to support roosting Bats (as shown in Table 2).

Table 2: Bat Conservation Trust Tree Guidelines, 2012

Tree Category and Description
Known or Confirmed bat roost Trees with field evidence of the presence of Bats, e.g. droppings, scratch marks, grease marks or urine staining.
Category 1* Trees with multiple highly suitable features capable of supporting larger roosts.
Category 1 Trees with definite bat potential, supporting fewer suitable features that category 1 * trees or with potential for use by single Bats.
Category 2 Trees with no obvious potential, although the tree is of a size and age that elevated surveys may result; in cracks or crevices being found; or the tree supports some features which may have limited potential to support Bats.
Category 3 Trees with no potential to support bat roosts.

3.6. During the inspection, potential features of value to roosting bats such as holes, woodpecker holes, crack/splits in limbs, loose bark, dense ivy and cavities were recorded.

4. Results

Building Inspections

4.1. In total, twenty three buildings were assessed during the Site survey and eight were deemed to have potential for roosting bats. A full description of buildings and their ratings for roosting bats is given in **Appendix A**.

4.2. Eight buildings on Site were deemed to have low potential to support roosting bats and it is considered necessary to carry out a single dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey on each building with low potential to determine presence or likely absence of bats. Presence/absence surveys should be undertaken at an appropriate time of year when the bats are most active (May to September).

Tree Surveys for Bat Roost Potential

4.3. All trees within the Site were subject to a ground based visual assessment for roosting bats. All trees located within the redline boundaries were found to have negligible potential for roosting bats and were rated as Category 3 (see **Table 2**). Trees identified on Site were in good condition with no suitable holes, cracks/crevices suitable for roosting bats. Trees identified within the Site and especially along the Regents Canal may be utilised by bats for foraging only. It is considered that no further surveys with regard to bats in trees is required.

4.4. Trees within the redline boundaries do have potential to be used by nesting birds and works impacting upon trees should be carried out outside of the bird breeding season (April – August). If works cannot be carried out outside of this time period, then a pre-works check by an ecologist for nesting birds should be carried out at most 24hrs before works commence. If birds are found to be nesting (including building the nest) a buffer zone should be erected around the nest and the nest left in situ until the young have fledged.

5. Conclusions & Recommendations

5.1. All buildings within the red line boundaries of the Site were subject to an external and internal (where access allowed) inspection for bats on the 13th August 2014, in accordance with the aforementioned current BCT best practice guidelines.

5.2. Eight buildings were deemed to have low potential for roosting bats (See **Appendix A**). Although the Site is located within London, habitats such as the Regents Canal, Camden Gardens and Castle Haven Open Space which are all located adjacent to the Site, provide suitable foraging habitat for bats. Given the low potential rating, a single dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey on each building with low potential should be carried out to determine presence or likely absence of bats. Presence/absence surveys should be undertaken at an appropriate time of year when the bats are most active (May to September).

5.3. A preliminary ground based visual inspection assessment of the trees within the Site was undertaken in combination with the building inspections, based on current best practice guidelines (Bat Conservation Trust 2012). All trees located within the redline boundaries were found to have negligible potential for bats and were rated as Category 3 (see **Table 2**). Trees identified along the Regents Canal may be utilised by bats for foraging only. It is considered that no further surveys with regards to bats on trees is required.

5.4. Trees within the redline boundaries do have potential to be used by nesting birds and works impacting upon trees should be carried out outside of the bird breeding season (April – August). If works cannot be carried out outside of this time period, then a pre-works check by an ecologist for nesting birds should be carried out at least 24hrs before works commence. If birds are found to be nesting (including building the nest) a buffer zone should be erected around the nest and the nest left in situ until the young have fledged.

5.5. The results of the recommended additional surveys will confirm the presence or likely absence of notable or legally protected species and determine how these species are using the Site. If bats are found to be roosting within any of the buildings to be impacted upon by the development then an EPS licence from Natural England will be required to carry out the works. Licences can take up to 30 working days to process and so may delay development.

5.6. Appropriate measures will be required to compensate for a loss of a roost if recorded. Any mitigation would seek to provide no net loss of roosting opportunities that the building currently provides to bats.

5.7. As detailed above, on the basis of the survey findings, the demolition of buildings would need to be carried out under an EPS licence if bats are found during further surveys. NE requires objective evidence that the activity proposed fits the purpose set out in Regulation 53(2) (e) of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). Therefore, an EPS licence would only normally be granted if it could be demonstrated that the proposed activities meet the following three criteria (known as the 3 derogation tests):

- the works must be in the interest of preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;
- that there is no satisfactory alternative; and

- that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

The EPS Licence application will need to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that all three criteria are met before a licence can be issued. It should also be noted that licenses may only be granted once demolition consent has been granted (and a copy supplied) and that **NE can take up to thirty working days to respond to a license submission**.

FIGURES



waterman
Energy, Environment & Design

Planning Application Boundary

Building with Low Bat Roost Potential

N

Project Details	EED14664-100: Camden Lock Village
Figure Title	Figure 1: Buildings with Bat Potential Site Plan
Figure Ref	EED14664-100_GR_EC_1A
Date	August 2014
File Location	\\nt-lncs\weedl\projects\eed14664\100\graphics\ec\issued figures

www.watermangroup.com

APPENDICES

A. Building Descriptions and Bat Roost Potential

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*	Further Survey
Results for buildings located at Camden Lock Village				
B1	Single storey brick garage with flat roof.	All brick work and roof sheets in good condition. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B2a	Single storey brick building with pitched asbestos sheet roof.	Gap in ridge tile has potential to be used by roosting bats.	Low	Yes
B2b	Brick workshop with asbestos sheet roofing and wooden frieze boards, no internal roof space present.	Brick work in good condition and no obvious roosting features for bats are present. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B3	47 Kentish Town Road is a four storey brick office building with a tiled pitched roof. A roof space is present at the top of this building and comprised of sheeting underneath tiles, no fibreglass insulation laid on the floor, gable ends are breeze block that are in good condition	All brick work and tiles in good condition. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B4	No.1 Water Lane is a four storey brick office building with a tiled pitched roof and an open plan top floor office space (no roof space).	All brick work and tiles in good condition. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B5	No.2 – No.6 Water Lane are four storey brick apartments. Tiled pitched roofs with windows indicating internal bedrooms filling the roof space.	All brick work and tiles in good condition. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B6	Four storey flat roof brick building comprising retail shops and apartments.	All brick work in good condition. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
B7	Wooden shed with flat metal roofing sheets, with bitumen overlay.	None. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*	Further Survey
No.1 Hawley Road	Three storey brick building with painted render. The building was derelict at the time of survey. Tiled pitched roof, with bitumin felf underlay, no insulation present. Areas of brick work in poor condition.	Numerous gaps and holes allowing access into the roof space. Lots of bird faeces present indicating nesting birds. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.3 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with windows indicating internal bedrooms filling the roof space.	Gaps in soffit boards on the north west side and within the apex of the soffit on the east side. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.5 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms filling the roof space. Tiles and stone work in good condition.	Raised lead flashing and gaps behind frieze board at the south of the building. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.7 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms filling the roof space.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen around the roof at the time of survey. A large gap within the porch roof does allow access for bats. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.9 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms filling the roof space. Tiles and stone work in good condition.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No Signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
No.11 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms filling the roof space. Tiles and stone work in good condition.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
No.13 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms filling the roof space. Tiles and stone work in good condition.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No Signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
No.15 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with dorma windows and internal bedrooms	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*	Further Survey
	filling the roof space. Tiles and stone work in good condition.			
No.17 Hawley Road	Four storey brick building with painted render comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with plastic soffit box. Internal roof space with Loosefill insulation and bitumen felt underneath tiles	A single gap suitable for bats was seen in the soffit box. Evidence of old bird nests were found within Internal roof space and so access for bats is possible. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.4 Torbay Street	Two storey brick building comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with wooden frieze boards. Internal roof space with no insulation laid to the floor and sark boarding under the tiles.	Roof space is cluttered and no obvious access points for bats. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
No.6 Torbay Street	Two storey brick building comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with wooden frieze boards.	No internal access, one potential gap see under end ridge tile on the roof hip.	Low	Yes
No.8 Torbay Street	Two storey brick building comprising flats. Tiled pitched roof with wooden frieze boards. Internal roof space with insulation laid to the floor and old bitumen felf under the tiles	Large gap in the frieze boarding at the front of the building where pipes lead out, some areas of the bitumen felt were ripped and accessible for bats, a few gaps were seen within the roof space to allow bats in. No signs of bats found during survey.	Low	Yes
No.14 Castlehaven Road	Three storey brick building comprising apartments with ‘v’ shape tiled roof. Exterior brickwork was clearly weathered. Internal roof space comprised plastic sheeting underneath the tiles with no insulation laid on the floor	Internal roof space felt damp and was heavily cluttered. A large amount of spider webs are present and there were no obvious access points for bats to enter the roof. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
No.16 Castlehaven Road	Three storey brick building comprising apartments with ‘v’ shape tiled roof. Exterior brickwork was clearly weathered. Internal roof space comprised half sark boarding half bitumen felt underneath the tiles, with insulation laid on the floor. Brick gable walls are in good condition	Internal roof space felt damp and was heavily cluttered. A large amount of spider webs are present and there were no obvious access points for bats to enter the roof. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*	Further Survey
Cameron House	Brick office building in good condition with flat roof.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No
Viaduct and associated retail units	Brick viaduct with associated arches filled with retail units.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of survey. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible	No

UK and Ireland Office Locations