SYNTEGRA CONSULTING

Endoscope Survey Brief

Highgate Newtown Community Centre, 25 Bertram Street, London, N19 5DQ

December 2018

Ref: 18-4442

QUALITY STANDARDS CONTROL

The signatories below verify that this document has been prepared in accordance with our quality control requirements. These procedures do not affect the content and views expressed by the originator.

This document must only be treated as a draft unless it is has been signed by the originators and approved by a director.

Revision	-
Date	12/12/2018
Prepared by	P. Holden MSc MCIEEM
Checked by	S. Prior
Authorised by	P. Holden

Validity of Data

The findings of the site survey are valid for a period of 24 months from the date of the survey. If approved works have not commenced by this date, then an updated site survey could be required to inform any changes to the habitats present on site in order to inform any updated mitigation and or precautionary measures required on site.

LIMITATIONS

Syntegra Consulting Ltd ("SC") has prepared this report for the sole use of the **client, London Borough of Camden Development Division,** in accordance with the agreement under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by SC.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by SC has not been independently verified by SC, unless otherwise stated in the report.

The methodology adopted and the sources of information used by SC in providing its services are outlined in this report. The work described in this report was undertaken in **2018** and is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the said period of time. The scope of this report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Where assessments of works or costs identified in this report are made, such assessments are based upon the information available at the time and where appropriate are subject to further investigations or information which may become available.

SC disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the report, which may come or be brought to SC's attention after the date of the report.

Certain statements made in the report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. SC specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this report.

Where applicable, costs may vary outside the ranges quoted. Whilst cost estimates are provided for individual issues in this report these are based upon information at the time which can be incomplete. Cost estimates for such issues may therefore vary from those provided. Where costs are supplied, these estimates should be considered in aggregate only. No reliance should be made in relation to any division of aggregate costs, including in relation to any issue, site or other subdivision.

No allowance has been made for changes in prices or exchange rates or changes in any other conditions which may result in price fluctuations in the future. Where assessments of works or costs necessary to achieve compliance have been made, these are based upon measures which, in SC's experience, could normally be negotiated with the relevant authorities under present legislation and enforcement practice, assuming a pro-active and reasonable approach by site management.

Forecast cost estimates do not include such costs associated with any negotiations, appeals or other non-technical actions associated with the agreement on measures to meet the requirements of the authorities, nor are potential business loss and interruption costs considered that may be incurred as part of any technical measures.

Contents

Appendices

Syntegra Group
Syntegra House, 63 Milford Road, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8LG

T: 0118 402 8520

E: mail@syntegragroup.com
VAT Registration No. 980016044
Registered Company No. 06408056

1.0 Introduction and Aims

1.1 Syntegra Group was commissioned by the applicant, London Borough of Camden Development Division to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) and endoscope survey at Highgate Newtown Community Centre, 25 Bertram Street, London, N19 5DQ (Grid ref: TQ 2880 8648).

1.2 This report has been prepared in support of the Section 73 application being submitted by the London Borough of Camden Development Division ('the Applicant') to the London Borough of Camden ('the Council') for the redevelopment of the Highgate Newtown Community Centre, 25 Bertram Street, London, N19 5DQ ('the site').The Section 73 application seeks to modify extant planning application 2016/6088/P for the following revised description of development:

> "Redevelopment of the existing Highgate Newtown Community Centre and Fresh Youth Academy and the change of use of the People's Mission Gospel Hall to provide replacement community facilities (Use Class D1) and 41 residential units (Use Class C3) together with associated public open space, landscaping, cycle storage, plant and other associated infrastructure."

1.3 The objectives of the PRA and endoscope survey were to:

- survey the former cottage on site, and identify the presence or likely absence of bats and nesting birds;
- obtain more information on the potential crevice spaces and their ability to support bats by a detailed endoscopic survey;
- identify any legal and planning policy constraints relevant to nature conservation which may affect the development;
- determine any potential further ecological issue;
- determine the need for further surveys and mitigation.

1.4 The site survey was undertaken by suitably qualified licenced ecologists, Patricia Holden MSc MCIEEM and Lawrence Armstrong BSc (Hons) on the 12th December 2018. The weather conditions were suitable with 50% overcast with a slight breeze.

1.5 The site has had a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) survey and PRA carried out in October 2018. The December survey was required as access to the internal and external former cottage was not available to the ecologist during the October survey. Given the noted crevice roosting features of three buildings on site (referred to as building 1, 2 and 3 in the PEA Report), further endoscope surveys were recommended to identify any potential use by roosting bats.

2.0 Methodology

Preliminary Roost Assessment

2.1 The surveys were carried out by Patricia Holden MCIEEM, an experienced ecologist who has undertaken numerous bat and nesting bird surveys and has undergone professional training in bat surveying techniques (Bat Licence # 2016-20365-CLS-CLS). The survey followed guidelines by the Bat Conservation Trust (2016) Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines 3rd edition.

Endoscope Survey

2.2 The endoscope surveys were carried out by Lawrence Armstrong (CL-19 licence holder) and assisted by Patricia Holden. All crevices and other likely roosting areas were methodically searched for signs of bat occupation, such as droppings, feeding remains, marks and or stains. A Voltcraft BS-10 USB endoscope was used to investigate any accessible cracks, gaps, recesses or crevices.

3.0 Constraints

3.2 The building inspections were undertaken during a time when bats are inactive and have moved into hibernation roosting sites (Collins 2016). Whilst evidence of roosting can be confirmed by a daytime inspection, very often features that could support bats cannot be searched thoroughly to confirm whether bats are indeed roosting.

3.2 No endoscope inspection could be completed on the ridge tile on the community centre roof (referred to as building 2 in PEA Report, October 2018) as the ladder provided did not allow for the ecologists to safely survey the area.

3.3 The client is responsible for reading and understanding the advice given in this report. The client must ensure that, where recommended, mitigation is followed through.

4.0 Results

Preliminary Roost Assessment

4.1 The daytime internal and external inspections consisted of one building, the former care takers, set within hard standing. The exteriors of the building were inspected for access points, and evidence of bats and nesting birds. The internal inspection of the building examined features of interest, potential bat roost sites and bird nesting areas.

4.2 In summary, the former caretaker is a detached derelict building (referred to as building 1 in the PEA Report, October 2018). With access obtained to the surveyor, the gaps noted during the October survey at a distance, now noted that the gaps between the brick wall and soffits were less than 15mm and considered unlikely to support crevice potential. The walls were in a good state of repair with no notable holes, gaps or cracks noted.

4.3 The internal inspection consisted of one loft space within the building. The roof space had a ridge height of 2 metres. The roof space consisted of bitumen felt with timber battens and timber trusses. The loft space noted two brick gable walls. The floor space consisted of insulated floors. Potential access points were noted with three rips in the felt, these were fully inspected, and one tear, located on the southern roof slope, had nesting debris, likely house sparrow. No further crevice spaces were found during the survey and the loft space noted significant amounts of cobwebs within the ridge space. No signs of bats in the form of droppings, marks, stains and or debris were noted during the inspection.

Endoscope Results

4.4 The crack/recess that runs along the joining wall for the gymnasium and the wood workshop (known as building 3 in the PEA Report, October 2018), noted little to no potential crevice potential. Some of the ingress points extended through to the room on the opposite side resulting in the internal area filed with light from the windows on the either side of the building rendering it unsuitable for use as daytime roosts. The majority of the crack ingress points found cobwebs suggesting no recent disturbance. Two of the ingress points did lead to dead ends

providing some suitability for use by single roosting bats, however no signs of bats in the form of marks, stains, droppings and or debris was noted. The wall space was solid with no internal wall cavity available for use by roosting bats.

4.5 The ridge tile on the community centre roof (building 2) was not accessible to the surveyors due to health and safety reasons.

4.6 Building 1's soffit boards noted limited to no crevice roosting spaces and no further endoscope survey was required. The internal loft space of the building noted three areas of potential access and crevice spaces, these were inspected and nesting debris, likely from house sparrow were noted in one of the sections of sagged felt. No signs of bats in the form of marks, stains, droppings and or debris was noted.

5.0 Recommendations

Bats

5.1 The results of the endoscope inspection of the joining wall for the gymnasium and wood workshop (building 3) has confirmed likely absence of a bat roost and no further bat surveys are recommended for this building. It is recommended that precautionary measures are in place for the demolition of this building and the crack/recess section of the building undergoes soft demolition**.** Should demolition works be delayed beyond the 1st May 2018, then a further endoscope survey will be required, to inform the mitigation measures.

5.2 The loft space of building 1 found potential access points and crevice spaces. The detailed endoscope inspection of the potential areas has found no evidence of bats and it can be assumed that the spaces are unlikely to support roosts, however in the absence of a dusk/dawn survey to confirm likely absence, mitigation measures will be required. The ecologist must be on site for the demolition of the building and a soft strip will be required of the roof space.

5.3 Building 2 ridge space did not have a detailed endoscope inspection. It is recommended that prior to works starting, scaffolding is placed in the area and the ecologist carries out the endoscope survey. Should evidence of roosting bats be found during the endoscope inspection then further echolocation surveys will be required. Should no signs of roosting bats be found,

it is recommended that the ridge space and roof tiles directly adjacent to this area (up to two metres in each direction) are stripped under the ecologists direction.

5.4 The following enhancement measures will be required on site. Two of the buildings will incorporate crevice roosting features into the southern wall spaces. Bat tubes (Schwelger 1FR) will be incorporated into the design of the walls, at a height of 3-5 metres. No lighting will be directed at or within close proximity to the new crevice features. Lighting on site will avoid vegetated boundaries and be direct, low lux, and ensure low light spill. Motion sensors if used should be on short interval timers.

Birds

5.5 Building 1's roof space had a remnant nest site, likely to be house sparrow. This building must be demolished outside of the nesting bird season (generally March to August inclusive), unless first checked by a suitably qualified ecologist.

5.6 As mentioned in the PEA Report, the nest boxes on site must be removed prior to the nesting bird season. Site clearance of vegetation must be carried outside of nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) or unless first checked by a suitably qualified ecologist.

5.7 The loss of the likely house sparrow nest site within building 1 will require compensation. It is recommended that (2) WoodStone Build-in House Sparrow Nest Boxes are incorporated into eastern walls, at a height of at least three metres.

Appendix I: Photos


visible light noted during inspection of the crack in wall building 3


ingress with cobwebs noted


loft space of building 1 – heavy cobwebs within ridge space


sag in felt with visible light – no signs of bats noted during inspection of area


nesting debris noted in torn/sag felt area in loft (building 1)


limited gaps noted between brick wall and soffit boards in building 1