Camden Lock Village

Bat Emergence/Re-entry Surveys 2014

October 2014

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

Camden Lock Village

Bat Emergence/Re-entry Surveys 2014

Client Name:	Stanley Sidings Ltd
Document Reference:	EED14664-100_R_2_1_3_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	October 2014	Simon Dowell Consultant	Niall Machin Associate Director	Niall Machin Associate 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

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 and commuting within the local area, no bats were seen to be using Number 1 Hawley Road as a roost at the time of survey.

1.6. Update building and tree surveys (EED14664-100_R_1_1_6_SD) were carried out in August 2014 and found eight buildings on Site to have low bat roosting potential. Although no signs of bats were recorded during internal inspections, it was recommended that a single dusk emergence or single dawn re-entry survey is carried out within the bat survey season (May – September) to determine whether bats are present within the buildings.

Development Proposals

1.7. 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). Conditions 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

1.8. 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:

- A single dusk emergence and dawn re-entry survey of eight properties within the Site boundary.

1.9. This report details the findings of the above updated bat surveys 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]; and
- Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996[6].

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

Dusk Emergence & Dawn Re-entry Surveys

3.1. To confirm the presence or likely absence of roosting bats within the buildings on the Site, dusk emergence and dawn re-entry surveys were undertaken at those buildings identified as having potential to support roosting bats (see Appendix A).

3.2. The emergence and re-entry surveys were undertaken using Pettersson D240x recorded to solid-state MP3 recorders. An appropriate number of surveyors were used upon each building to ensure complete coverage.

3.3. All evening emergence surveys commenced 15 to 30 minutes prior to sunset and extended 1½ to 2 hours thereafter. All dawn re-entry surveys commenced 1.5 hours before sunrise and extended to sunrise. A record of all bat activity (i.e. commuting, foraging, social calls) during the surveys was also noted and mapped. Bat calls were analysed (Russ, 1999)[7] where appropriate using bat sound 4.2 software. All surveys were undertaken during optimum weather conditions and at a suitable time of year.

3.4. A summary of the bat surveys undertaken on buildings within the Site is provided below in Table 1.

Table 1: Survey Summary Table.

Building	Survey Type	Date(s)
No.1 Hawley Rd	Evening Emergence	17/09/2014
No.3 Hawley Rd	Evening Emergence	17/09/2014
No.5 Hawley Rd	Dawn Re-entry	18/09/2014
No.7 Hawley Rd	Dawn Re-entry	18/09/2014
No.17 Hawley Rd	Evening Emergence	24/09/2014
No.6 Torbay Street	Evening Emergence	18/09/2014
No.8 Torbay Street	Evening Emergence	18/09/2014
B2a	Evening Emergence	18/09/2014

Constraints/Limitations

Emergence/Re-entry Surveys

3.5. Dawn re-entry surveys on the 18/09/2014 of No.5 and No.7 Hawley Road were abandoned due to health and safety concerns. It is considered that dusk emergence surveys on No.3 Hawley Road

[7] Russ (1991). The Bats of Britain and Ireland: Echolocation Calls, Sound Analysis and Species Identification. Alana Books.

suitably covered these buildings during the survey on the 17/09/2014. And so repeat surveys of these two buildings is considered not to be required.

4. Results

Emergence & Re-entry Surveys

4.1. In total, eight buildings were deemed to have low potential for roosting bats. A full description of buildings and their ratings for roosting bats is given in Appendix A.

4.2. Based on the results of the building inspections, emergence / re-entry surveys were undertaken at Buildings No.1, No.3, No.5, No.7 and No.17 Hawley Rd and No.6, No.8 and Building 2a Torbay Street, Camden.

4.3. One species of bat was recorded during the emergence / re-entry surveys; the bat passes consisted of foraging and commuting common pipistrelle bats. No bats were seen emerging from or re-entering any buildings which were assessed as having low potential within the Site. The level of activity recorded at the Site was low, with most activity associated with the vegetation within gardens.

4.4. The habitats at the Site have not significantly changed since the 2010 assessment and as such the value of habitats to foraging and commuting bats is considered to be the same as recorded in 2010.

5. Conclusions & Recommendations

5.1. Given the findings of the 2014 bat emergence / re-entry surveys and internal and external building inspection surveys, combined with the survey results from 2010 and 2012, the Site is considered to be of value within the **boundary of the Site** only to bats. Although no bats were recorded utilising buildings within the Site for roosting, common pipistrelle bats were seen to commute and forage within rear gardens of properties within and immediately adjacent to the Site.

5.2. Precautionary mitigation measures, including the timing of works affecting bats should be timed to avoid disturbance to foraging and commuting bats (e.g. no night time working). Due to the mobile nature of bats (i.e. temporal nature of use of buildings as roosts) and the buildings potential to support bats within the Site, it is recommended that demolition works are carried out at a time of year when bats are least likely to be utilising the Site (e.g. October – March).

5.3. Provision of bat roosting opportunities, such as the erection of bat boxes and the inclusion of native landscape planting should be incorporated into the master plan design. Brown and green roofs can also be included within the scheme to attract invertebrates which will in turn attract foraging bats.

5.4. The above mitigation measures would ensure that the favourable conservation of these species concerned can be maintained. Therefore, the information within this report satisfactorily discharges conditions 30 and 47 of the planning application.

FIGURES

waterman
Energy, Environment & Design

- Planning Application Boundary
- Building with Low Bat Roost Potential
- Bat Flight Paths
- Surveyor Positions

N

Project Details	EED14664-100: Camden Lock Village
Figure Title	Figure 4: Bat Survey Plan
Figure Ref	EED14664-100_GR_EC_4A
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*
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
B2a	Single storey brick building with pitched asbestos sheet roof.	Gap in ridge tile has potential to be used by roosting bats.	Low
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
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
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
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
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
B7	Wooden shed with flat metal roofing sheets, with bitumen overlay.	None. No signs of bats found during survey.	Negligible
No.1 Hawley Road	Three storey brick building with painted render. The building was derelict at the time of survey.	Numerous gaps and holes allowing access into the roof space. Lots of bird faeces	Low

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*
	Tiled pitched roof, with bitumin felf underlay, no insulation present. Areas of brick work in poor condition.	present indicating nesting birds. No signs of bats found during survey.	
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
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
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
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.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.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.15 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

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*
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
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.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
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
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.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
Cameron House	Brick office building in good condition with flat roof.	No suitable holes/crevices were seen at the time of	Negligible

Building Number/ Photograph	Building Description/Construction	Potential Bat Access and Roosting Opportunities	Bat Roost Rating*
		survey. No signs of bats found during survey.	
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

UK and Ireland Office Locations