

ECOLOGY REPORT

Bayham Street - Ecological Impact Assessment

Client: Camden Lifestyle (UK) Ltd

Reference: I&BPB7760R001D0.1

Revision: 0.1/Final

Date: 23 July 2018

HASKONINGDHV UK LTD.

2 Abbey Gardens
Great College Street
London
SW1P 3NL
Industry & Buildings
VAT registration number: 792428892

+44 207 2222115 **T**
info.london@uk.rhdhv.com **E**
royalhaskoningdhv.com **W**

Document title: Bayham Street - Ecological Impact Assessment

Document short title:

Reference: I&BPB7760R001D0.1
Revision: 0.1/Final
Date: 23 July 2018
Project name: 7ABC Bayham Street
Project number: PB7760
Author(s): Charlotte Clements

Drafted by: Charlotte Clements

Checked by: Claire Smith

Date / initials: 30/04/2018 CS

Approved by: Marc Pieris

Date / initials: 23/07/2018 MP

Classification

Internal use only



Disclaimer

No part of these specifications/printed matter may be reproduced and/or published by print, photocopy, microfilm or by any other means, without the prior written permission of HaskoningDHV UK Ltd.; nor may they be used, without such permission, for any purposes other than that for which they were produced. HaskoningDHV UK Ltd. accepts no responsibility or liability for these specifications/printed matter to any party other than the persons by whom it was commissioned and as concluded under that Appointment. The integrated QHSE management system of HaskoningDHV UK Ltd. has been certified in accordance with ISO 9001:2015, ISO 14001:2015 and OHSAS 18001:2007.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	1
3	Project Description	1
3.1	Proposed development	1
4	Assessment Methodology	1
4.1	Scope of the EclA	1
4.2	Study area	2
4.3	Characterising the existing environment	2
4.4	Impact assessment methodology	2
4.5	Field survey methodology	4
5	Existing Environment	5
5.1	Statutory designated sites	5
5.2	Non-statutory designated sites	5
5.3	Habitats	6
5.4	Species	7
5.4.1	Flora	7
5.4.2	Bats	7
5.4.3	Birds	7
5.4.4	Other species	7
5.4.5	Invasive non-native species	8
6	Impacts and Mitigation during Construction	8
6.1	Statutory designated sites	8
6.2	Non-statutory designated sites	8
6.3	Habitats	8
6.4	Species	8
6.4.1	Birds	8
7	Impacts and Mitigation during Operation	9
7.1	Statutory designated sites	9
7.2	Non-statutory designated sites	9
7.3	Habitats	9
7.4	Species	9
7.4.1	Birds	9

8	Summary	9
9	References	10

Table of Tables

Table 4.1	Ecological baseline data sources	2
Table 4.2	Sensitivity of an Ecological Receptor	3
Table 4.3	Magnitude of Effect	3
Table 5.1	SINCs within 2km of the survey area	5

Appendices

Appendix A	Figures
Appendix B	Legislation
Appendix C	Plates

1 Introduction

This Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) presents ecological information obtained during a desk-study and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (EP1HS) undertaken in April 2018.

This EcIA report is produced on behalf of Camden Lifestyle (UK) Ltd in support of a full planning application for a proposed development in Camden, London (herein referred to as the application site) at 7ABC Bayham Street. Further details on the proposed development can be found in **Section 3.1**.

This report evaluates the nature conservation value of any ecological features present within the application site (denoted by the solid red line on **Figure 1** in **Appendix A – Figures**) and assesses the significance of any effects of the proposed development on these features, and sets out proposed mitigation and enhancement measures if required.

2 Legislation, Policy and Guidance

This EcIA has been undertaken with reference to current best practice and in particular the *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal* (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), 2016).

A full summary of the relevant ecological legislation is included within **Appendix B – Legislation** and contains details of how individual habitats, site and species are protected (or controlled) by UK legislation, what the penalties are in relation to these species and what the licensing requirements are for individual species. This summary is provided for information only, and does not constitute formal legal advice.

3 Project Description

3.1 Proposed development

The proposed development comprises:

“Full Planning Application for the demolition of existing buildings (B1a Use Class) and erection of a part 3, part 4, part 5 storey building (with two basement levels), comprising co-working office floorspace (B1a Use Class), hotel accommodation (C1 Use Class) and an ancillary café/bar and fitness facilities; works to the existing access and associated works”

The development comprises planted areas on the fourth and fifth floor totalling 235m² and a green roof of 240m².

4 Assessment Methodology

4.1 Scope of the EcIA

The scope of this EcIA includes:

- Data gathering of existing ecological information within and up to 2km from the application site's boundaries from Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL);
- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey of land within the application site, and up to 30m from its boundaries;

- Evaluation of the area of land within and adjacent to (within 30m) the application site with regards to its nature conservation value;
- Identification of potential impacts on ecological features within the application site;
- Enhancement measures to increase the biodiversity value of the land within the application site; and
- Assessment of the significance of potential ecological impacts from the proposals and where required the identification of appropriate mitigation measures.

4.2 Study area

The study area for the gathering of information during the desk study is defined as the application site's footprint (i.e. the current buildings) plus a 2km zone around its boundary. For the field survey, the application site's footprint (i.e. the current buildings) plus a 30m zone around its boundary is the defined study area. The field survey study area (herein referred to as the 'survey area') is denoted by the solid green line on **Figure 1, Appendix A**.

4.3 Characterising the existing environment

Ecological data of the study area was collected in April 2018. Data collected included a desk-based assessment and an EP1HS. A summary of all of the baseline ecological data obtained to date is provided in **Table 4.1**.

Table 4.1 Ecological baseline data sources

Data source	Date	Content
Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey	April 2018	This survey followed Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC, 2010) guidance which was extended to include a search for evidence of the presence of, or potential to support, notable and protected species in or adjacent to the application site, as recommended by CIEEM.
Ecological Desk Study	April 2018	The Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website, Ordnance Survey (OS) maps and Google Earth aerial photographs were used to identify all statutory designated nature conservation sites and notable habitats (i.e. Ancient woodlands) within, and up to 2km from the application site. Alongside this data search, a request was submitted to Greenspace in April 2018 for any records of protected species within a 2km search area of the application site.

4.4 Impact assessment methodology

This EcIA has been undertaken with reference to current best practice and in particular the *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal* (CIEEM, 2016).

Table 4.2 summarises the nature conservation value, or sensitivity, of an ecological feature and how it is determined within a defined geographic context.

Table 4.2 Sensitivity of an Ecological Receptor

	Sensitivity of ecological feature
Very High	Features of international importance (e.g. Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA), Ramsar sites, or species directly linked to the designation of these sites).
High	Features of national importance (e.g. National Nature Reserve (NNR), site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), protected species).
Medium	Features of regional importance (e.g. Environment Agency regional biodiversity indicators, important features in Natural England Natural Areas) or of county importance (e.g. Local Nature Reserve (LNR), County Wildlife site (CWS)).
Low	Habitats and species important within the district.
Negligible	Features of local (parish) importance or importance within the site and immediate environs only (e.g. ditches, hedgerows, ponds).

The assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development needs to take into account both onsite impacts and those that may occur to adjacent and more distant ecological features. Impacts can be positive or negative. Negative impacts can include:

- Direct loss of wildlife habitats;
- Fragmentation and isolation of habitats;
- Disturbance to species from noise, light or other visual stimuli;
- Changes to key habitat features; and
- Changes to water quality and/or air quality.

Negative and positive impacts on nature conservation features have been characterised based on predicted changes as a result of the proposed works (as shown in **Table 4.3**). Magnitude also considers duration of effect, whether temporary or permanent. In order to characterise the impacts on each feature, the parameters set out in **Table 4.3** are taken into account.

Table 4.3 Magnitude of Effect

Magnitude	Definition examples
Major (Beneficial/Adverse)	Major impacts on the feature / population, which would have a sufficient effect to alter the nature of the feature in the short to long term and affect its long-term viability. For example, more than 20% habitat loss or damage.
Moderate (Beneficial/Adverse)	Impacts that are detectable in short and long-term, but which should not alter the long-term viability of the feature / population. For example, between 10 - 20% habitat loss or damage.
Minor (Beneficial/Adverse)	Minor impacts, either of sufficiently small-scale or of short duration to cause no long-term harm to the feature / population. For example, less than 10% habitat loss or damage.
Negligible	A potential impact that is not expected to affect the feature / population in any way, therefore no effects are predicted.
Neutral	No change

The assessment identifies those positive and negative impacts which would be 'significant', based on the value or sensitivity of the ecological feature and the magnitude of the impact. Impacts are unlikely to be significant where features of local value or sensitivity are subject to low magnitude or short-term impacts. However, where there are a number of low magnitude impacts that are not significant alone, cumulatively, these may result in an overall significant impact.

CIEEM (2016) provides a definition of significant effects which has been applied to this EcIA. The CIEEM (2016) definition of significant effects is provided below:

“Significant effects encompass impacts on structure and function of defined sites, habitats or ecosystems and the conservation status of habitats and species (including extent, abundance and distribution).” (CIEEM, 2016).

4.5 Field survey methodology

An EP1HS was undertaken by a Royal HaskoningDHV ecologist on 5th April 2018. The weather conditions were dry and the temperature was approximately 10°C.

The EP1HS followed the ‘Extended Phase 1’ methodology as set out in *Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment* (Institute of Environmental Assessment, 1995). This method of survey provides information on the habitats in the survey area and assesses the potential for legally protected species to occur in or adjacent to the survey area. Habitats were recorded within the surveyed area using the system set out within the Joint Nature Conservation Committees’ (JNCC) *Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey: A technique for environmental audit* (2010).

The main habitats within the survey area were noted and mapped, and are shown on **Figure 1, Appendix A**. Target notes (TN) are used to provide details of characteristic habitats and species composition and highlight any features of ecological interest.

Preliminary investigations were undertaken in respect of the presence of legally protected species as follows:

- searching for suitable habitats for breeding populations of great crested newts within the survey area and up to 250m from its boundaries. Also searching for suitable terrestrial habitat within the survey area;
- searching for signs of badger activity including setts, tracks, snuffle holes and latrines within the survey area;
- searching for suitable habitat for water voles, otters and white clawed crayfish within any water bodies located within the survey area;
- searching for signs of potential roosting sites for bats, particularly within, buildings and mature trees within the survey area;
- searching for suitable habitats for common reptile species within areas of bare ground, debris piles, woodland and ecotones within the survey area;
- searching for signs of bird nests and identifying any suitable nesting habitats within structures and habitats within the survey area, for both common and Schedule 1 nesting bird species;
- searching for suitable habitat for any other protected species including dormice within the survey area; and
- the presence of invasive species. The list of invasive plant species included on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) is extensive and these plants are found in a range of different habitats. The ecological constraints survey checked, in particular, for the presence of Japanese knotweed *Fallopia japonica*, giant knotweed *Fallopia sachalinensis*, hybrid knotweed *Fallopia x bohemica*, giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum*, Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera*, rhododendron and cotoneaster spp.

Any suitable structures, including buildings and/or trees, were categorised based on a four-point scale for their potential to support roosting bats, in line with the Bat Conservation Trust’s good practice guidelines (BCT, 2016):

- **Negligible potential** – no features present which could offer bats the opportunity to roost;
- **Low potential** – only minor crevices or cracks present considered to offer poor roosting spaces for bats;
- **Medium potential** – features present such as small cavities and gaps leading to small enclosed spaces, which offer some form of protection for either individual bats or small numbers of bats; or
- **High potential** – significant holes, cracks or crevices in roof or building structures, which are considered very suitable to be used by bats for roosting and could support large or important roosts such as maternity roosts.

5 Existing Environment

5.1 Statutory designated sites

The survey area is not situated within any sites with European or National statutory designations, and there are no such sites within the additional 2km desk study buffer.

There are two Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) within the 2km buffer of the survey area, namely;

- **Barnsbury Wood** – 1.6km north east of the survey area
 - This site comprises a broadleaved semi natural woodland with open areas of semi-improved neutral grassland; noted for the range of fungi present as well as invertebrates and birds; and
- **Camley Street Nature Park** – 800m east of the survey area
 - This is an area of urban wild space used primarily as an educational resource with a range of habitat examples created on former vacant land.

5.2 Non-statutory designated sites

The survey area is not situated within any non-statutory designated sites, however there are a total of 34 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) within the 2km desk study buffer. These areas are recognised by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and borough councils as important wildlife sites, of which there are three tiers:

- Sites of Metropolitan Importance;
- Sites of Borough Importance; and
- Sites of Local Importance.

Table 5.1 below lists the 34 SINCs within 2km of the survey area.

Table 5.1 SINCs within 2km of the survey area

SINC Name	Tier	Approximate distance from survey area
London's Canals	Metropolitan	500m (at its closest point)
Camley Street Nature Park	Metropolitan	800m
Regents Park	Metropolitan	800m
St Pancras Gardens	Borough	500m

SINC Name	Tier	Approximate distance from survey area
North London Line	Borough	900m
Copenhagen Junction	Borough	1.2km
London Zoo	Borough	1.3km
Park Square Gardens	Borough	1.4km
Caledonian Park	Borough	1.5km
Barnsbury Wood	Borough	1.6km
Primrose Hill	Borough	1.6km
Market Road Garden	Borough	1.7km
Chalk Farm Embankment and Adelaide Nature Reserve	Borough	1.8km
Claremont Square Reservoir	Borough	1.9km
Kentish Town City Farm, Gospel Oak Railsides and Mortimer Terrace Nature Reserve	Borough	1.9km
Holloway Road to Caledonian Road Railsides	Borough	1.9km
North London Line to Islington	Borough	1.9km
Culpeper Community Garden	Borough	1.9km
St James's Garden	Local	800m
Rochester Terrace Gardens	Local	1km
Bingfield Park	Local	1.1km
Gordon Square	Local	1.2km
Winton Primary School Garden	Local	1.3km
Bemerton Estate - Garden	Local	1.3km
St George's Gardens	Local	1.6km
Thornhill Square	Local	1.6km
Calthorpe Community Garden	Local	1.7km
Russel Square	Local	1.7km
Coram's Fields	Local	1.7km
Barnard Park	Local	1.7km
St Andrew's Gardens	Local	1.8km
Paddington Street Gardens	Local	1.9km
Lloyd Square	Local	2km
Barnsbury Square	Local	2km

5.3 Habitats

Habitats within the survey area were recorded and mapped during the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, undertaken in April 2018. The key habitats noted comprise:

- hard standing;

- buildings, and
- scattered decorative plants such as Buddlea spp and palm.

There are no BAP priority habitats located within the survey area. The nearest BAP priority habitat consists of Broadleaved Woodland, which is located approximately 500m east of the application site.

5.4 Species

5.4.1 Flora

The survey area consists wholly of hardstanding and buildings, with scattered decorative plants such as palm trees. No legally protected flora species were noted at the time of the survey.

Within the desk study records obtained from Greenspace, several notable and protected flora species have been recorded within the wider 2km desk study buffer, but none within the survey area. As such they are not considered further within this report and therefore no further surveys and/or mitigation measures are required

5.4.2 Bats

Records of several bat species were returned within the data from Greenspace, but none are located within the survey area.

All suitable buildings, structures and/or trees within the survey area were externally surveyed from the ground and using binoculars, for their potential to support roosting bats.

All buildings within the survey area were assessed as having **negligible** potential for roosting bats, primarily due to a lack of visible cracks and/or crevices. As such they are not considered further within this report and therefore no further surveys and/or mitigation measures are required.

5.4.3 Birds

Several species of birds have been recorded in the wider 2km desk study buffer and up to 500m from the survey area.

The EP1HS was conducted in April, which is within the optimal nesting bird season (March to September, dependant on weather conditions), however it should be noted that the temperatures either side of the EP1HS were unseasonably low. No nesting birds were observed on site at the time of surveying. Furthermore, no birds other than feral pigeons were observed during the EP1HS.

5.4.4 Other species

No suitable habitat within the survey area is present for the following species, and as such they are not considered further within this report and therefore no further surveys and/or mitigation measures are required:

- Badger;
- Water vole;
- Otter;
- Dormice;
- White-clawed crayfish;
- Reptiles; and

- Great crested newt.

5.4.5 Invasive non-native species

No invasive non-native species were observed during the EP1HS. Records obtained from Greenspace indicate that several invasive non-native species have been recorded within the wider 2km desk study buffer but not within the survey area. As such, invasive species are not considered further within this report and therefore no further surveys and/or mitigation measures are required.

6 Impacts and Mitigation during Construction

6.1 Statutory designated sites

The survey area is not situated within any sites with European or National statutory designations, and there are no such sites within the additional 2km desk study buffer. There are two LNRs within a 2km buffer of the survey area, however these are formed of distinct areas that are not functionally connected to the application site and therefore **no impact** to any statutory designated sites are anticipated during construction of the proposed development.

6.2 Non-statutory designated sites

The survey area is not situated within any non-statutory designated sites, however there are a total of 34 SINCs within the 2km desk study buffer. The closest of these SINCs is located approximately 500m from the survey area, and is not considered to be functionally connected. Therefore, **no impact** on any non-statutory designated sites is predicted during construction.

6.3 Habitats

The habitat types found within the site consist of buildings, hard standing and scattered decorative plants such as Buddleia and palm and are considered to be of negligible ecological value, and no BAP habitat was noted during the survey, therefore **no impact** upon the habitats is predicted during construction.

6.4 Species

6.4.1 Birds

Although the data retrieved from the desk study indicate that several species of birds have been recorded within the 2km search buffer, they have not been recorded to be within the survey area itself. There are suitable features (i.e. the rooftops of the surrounding buildings) for nesting birds within the survey area for which common bird species could use for nesting opportunities. However, it should be noted that feral pigeons were the only species noted during the EP1HS.

Should the proposed development include the demolition of existing buildings within the survey area, potential nesting features will be lost, however given the availability of alternative features within the adjacent buildings the impact would be negligible and therefore **no impact** is predicted during construction. Any building demolition should be conducted outside the nesting bird season (typically March to August, but weather dependent) to ensure **no impact** to nesting birds during construction of the proposed development.

7 Impacts and Mitigation during Operation

7.1 Statutory designated sites

As stated in **Section 6**, no impacts to statutory designated sites are anticipated during the construction phase of the proposed development, therefore no impacts are anticipated during the operation phase of the proposed development.

7.2 Non-statutory designated sites

As stated in **Section 6**, no impacts to non-statutory designated sites are anticipated during the construction phase of the proposed development, therefore no impacts are anticipated during the operation phase of the proposed development.

7.3 Habitats

The habitat types found within the survey area are considered to be of negligible ecological value, and no BAP habitat was noted during the survey. **No impact** during construction is anticipated. The proposed design includes the creation of a green roof and planted areas which would result in a net gain in habitat of an ecological value of 475m², which in turn is considered to be of a **minor beneficial impact** during operation.

7.4 Species

7.4.1 Birds

Data retrieved from the desk study suggest that reports of several species of birds have been recorded within the 2km search buffer, but not within the survey area itself. Suitable features for nesting birds are present within the survey area, comprising of the rooftops of the surrounding buildings. However it should be noted that only feral pigeons were noted during the EP1HS. Due to the availability of alternative nesting features within the area surrounding the proposed development, **no impact** is predicted during operation.

8 Summary

An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and desk study were undertaken in April 2018 in order to inform this EclA. The existing environment within the application site is described in **Section 5** and consists of buildings, hard-standing and introduced shrubs (such as Buddleia and palm) that are considered to be of negligible ecological value. No BAP habitats or species were recorded.

The desk study results concluded that although there are records of notable and protected species within the wider 2km search area, there were no records returned of such species within the survey area. There are also no statutory or non-statutory sites within the footprint of the survey area, or that could be considered as functionally connected to the survey area. Therefore, as there is a distinct lack of features present to support any protected or notable species, or any records of such species, it is concluded that there will be **no impact** during the construction phase. During operation, a **minor beneficial impact** is anticipated due to a net gain in habitat of an ecological value associated to the 475m² green roof.

9 References

Bat Conservation Trust (2016). Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2006). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal. Second Edition, January 2016.

Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2012). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Assessment.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2010) Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey – a technique for environmental audit.

Appendix A – Figures

Appendix B – Legislation

Species	Legislation	Offences	Licensing procedures and guidance (England)
Birds	Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) S.1	<p>Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird; intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built; intentionally take or destroy the nest or eggs of any wild bird.</p> <p>[Special penalties are liable for these offences involving birds on Schedule 1 (e.g. most birds of prey, kingfisher, barn owl, black redstart, little ringed plover).]</p> <p>Intentionally or recklessly disturb a Schedule 1 species while it is building a nest or is in, on or near a nest containing eggs or young; intentionally or recklessly disturb dependent young of such a species.</p>	<p>No licences are available to disturb any birds in regard to development.</p> <p>Licences are available in certain circumstances to damage or destroy nests, but these only apply to the list of licensable activities in the Act and do not cover development.</p> <p>General licences are available in respect of 'pest species' but only for certain very specific purposes e.g. public health, public safety, air safety.</p>
Local Nature Reserves	National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949	Protected under byelaws specific to each LNR	

Appendix C – Plates

A selection of photographs taken during the EP1HS undertaken in April are shown in the table below:



Plate 1: External view of the application site



Plate 2: Internal view of the application site



Plate 3: Introduced shrubs/decorative plants within the application site



Plate 4: External view of the application site



Plate 5: Entrance to application site and decorative plants



Plate 6: View of buildings/hard-standing within application site.