

ST PAUL'S SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

SECTION 73 ES SCOPING – ECOLOGICAL SURVEYS: CONSULTATION DRAFT

23 April 2017

Rev 4.0



on behalf of

St Paul's School

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| All fauna and habitats | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various (see below those relevant). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2004: An extensive desk study, including consultation with of the Greater London Authority, English Nature, The London Wildlife Trust, The London Mammal Group, The London Essex and Hertfordshire Amphibian and Reptile Group, the Middlesex Bat Recorder, The London Bat Group and the Environment Agency, was undertaken in 2004. 2011: Desk study repeated, the main source of data then having become Greenspace Information for Greater London. | <p>No records of particular interest for The School Site itself were obtained.</p> <p>Records of protected, London BAP or NERC S41 species of relevance to the site included (distance to closest record in brackets):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stag Beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i> (ca. 400m) Common Toad <i>Bufo bufo</i>, (>1km) Common Lizard <i>Zootoca vivipara</i> (ca. 500m) Grass Snake <i>Natrix natrix</i> (c.900m) Hedgehog <i>Erinaceus europeaeus</i> (ca. 400m) Bats: Daubenton's Bat <i>Myotis daubentonii</i>, Natterer's Bat <i>Myotis nattereri</i>, Noctule <i>Nyctalus noctula</i>, Leisler's Bat <i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>, Common Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>, Soprano Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>, Nathusius's Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>, and Serotine <i>Eptesicus serotinus</i> (majority >1km). Numerous birds – predominantly wetland species associated with the Barn Elms wetland. <p>In the wider context Barn Elms wetlands, the Leg-'O-Mutton Reservoir LNR and the banks of the Thames (Site of Metropolitan Importance) are all important bat foraging and commuting areas.</p> | Update Desk Study requesting records from Greenspace Information for Greater London (GIGL) and other records holders as indicated by GIGL. | late April 2017 |

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|----------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Habitats | <p>Private Gardens, Parks and Greenspaces and Woodland are listed as a Priority Habitats in the London BAP and Built Structures and Meadows amongst the 'Other Important habitats'.</p> <p>Broadleaved Woodland and hedges are listed as Priority Habitats under the London Borough of Richmond BAP.</p> <p>All of these habitats occur on the School site.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nicholas Pearson Associates (2004). <i>St Paul's School Existing Ecological Conditions: Preliminary Assessment</i>. NPA Bath. Grant Associates. (2009). <i>St Paul's School Tree Report</i>. GA, Bath. Biodiversity by Design (June 2012). <i>Botanical Survey of Playing Field Margins</i>. BbD, Bath. Biodiversity by Design. (April 2014). <i>General Teaching Building and Associated Buildings and Works: Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Net Ecological Effects</i>. BbD, Bath. Biodiversity by Design. (June 2014). <i>General Teaching Building and Associated Buildings and Works: BREEAM Baseline Botanical Survey</i>. BbD, Bath. | <p>The habitats were unexceptional and in the main very poor (high nutrient-enriched and herbicide-treated playing fields), though small patches of grassland particularly at the site fringes had greater diversity and the northern fringe woodland belt (and the adjacent towpath) which includes some significant trees, particularly hybrid poplars with general faunal value, including deadwood.</p> <p>In March 2017 various deadwood piles were noted around the northern and western fringes developing fungal and faunal value.</p> <p>The original tree survey was from 2009 and repeat surveys of selections of trees have been undertaken since in relation to site management.</p> | <p>An update Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey would be undertaken to identify and map habitats present within the planning redline boundary and the ecologically relevant surroundings, and to provide an updated assessment of the potential for the Site to support protected or notable species.</p> <p>The ecologically relevant surroundings include the Thames towpath margin habitats next to the northern boundary of the Site and River Thames.</p> <p>This would follow standard methodology as set out in Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010). <i>Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey – a technique for environmental audit</i>. JNCC, as extended to cover protected or notable species by Institute of Environmental Assessment (1995) <i>Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment</i>. E & FN Spon. London.</p> <p>Data from previous tree surveys would be used in creation of the habitat (and botanical, see below) survey base map.</p> | April 2017 |
| Flora | <p>None of the species of plant known to be or likely to be present on site is legally protected.</p> <p>Some less common species in a London context that have potentially present.</p> <p>Black Poplar specimens of which along the towpath have branches overlapping the School Site are a London BAP Priority Species.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All surveys listed under habitat surveys (above). | <p>No plant species of conservation importance have been recorded to date. The only reasonable floristic diversity was along the northern boundary where Meadow Clary <i>Salvia verbenacea</i> was noted in abundance in 2006 in long grass by the peripheral fence. Many basal rosettes of this species were also visible in the nearby short grass.</p> <p>Since the original surveys there have been successful attempts at floristic enhancement along the Lonsdale Road boundary and with the creation of the New Science Building biodiverse Roof.</p> <p>Certain trees have been felled in keeping with consented planning proposals and other trees have been lost due to natural causes (senescence and windblow).</p> | <p>Considering the location and nature of remaining redevelopment works, no adverse effects on any areas of floristic interest are predicted and hence surveys are not required in relation to habitats within development parcels.</p> <p>The landscape of the fringes of the site, within the red line boundary, have been and remain the subject of various landscape and ecological enhancement proposals, some of which have been undertaken and some not at this stage.</p> <p>To provide a proper updated baseline in relation to the School's goals of achieving net botanical enhancement full higher plant listings and quadrat surveys of the habitats within School boundary but outside the playing field areas is proposed.</p> | late April 2017 |

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Riparian Invertebrates | Habitat along the sites riverine fringe was assessed as potentially suitable (though suboptimal) for two species of uncommon riverine snail, the Two-lipped Door Snail <i>Lacina biplicata</i> and the German Hairy Snail <i>Perforatella rubiginosa</i> . Although neither of these species has protected status, both are London BAP Priority Species. The Two-lipped Door Snail is classified as Rare (RDB3) and is currently restricted in the UK to the lower Thames corridor. Its habitat is the soil surface (usually with Ivy cover) of occasionally-flooded riparian land in the shade of closed canopy woodland. The German Hairy Snail is classified as Vulnerable (RDB2) and is currently restricted in the UK to the catchments of the Thames and the Medway. It inhabits strandline detritus in the shade of closed canopy woodland and riparian vegetation. | Biodiversity by Design. (October 2009). <i>Ecological Surveys in Relation to Proposed Outfall. Bats, Herpetofauna, Riverine Snails.</i> BbD, Bath | Survey was focussed on the potential for uncommon riparian snails to be present within habitats potential affected by the proposed outfall. No uncommon riverine snails were noted. | Habitat conditions along the river edge /towpath do not appear to have greatly changed since last survey. | No survey proposed to support S73 Application. |
| Terrestrial Invertebrates | Stag Beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i> is listed on s41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) and is a Priority Species on both the London Biodiversity Action Plan and the London Borough of Richmond on Thames Biodiversity Action Plan. Habitat creation and enhancement proposals for this species are included in the redevelopment proposals. Various other London BAP Priority Species could be attracted to the recently created biodiverse habitats such as the New Science Building Living Roof. | No baseline survey of terrestrial invertebrates has ever been undertaken on Site as the quality and nature of potentially affected habitats has not warranted such survey. Incidental observations of more apparent fauna have been made during other surveys. | In general observations and habitat surveys Holly Blue Butterfly <i>Celastrina argiolus</i> (London BAP Garden Flagship species) was noted in the vicinity of what is now the Service Yard. During the redevelopment of this area, species were included that are of value to this species (Holly and Ivy). New deadwood piles have been put in place along the north-western and western boundaries, which may develop some value to saproxylic invertebrates over time but no Stag Beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i> loggeries have as yet been installed. The biodiverse living roof of the New Science Building has developed well as a habitat and my now harbour important invertebrate species as intended. Over time fringe habitat enhancements should increase value to terrestrial invertebrates. | Considering the location and nature of remaining redevelopment works, there should be no significant direct adverse effects on newly existing or recently created habitats of value to 'important' terrestrial invertebrates. Lighting design will be as invertebrate-sensitive and bat-sensitive as reasonably possible. In order to assess the success of the previously installed Science Block living roof, invertebrate survey is to be carried out within this habitat in June 2017. Survey will extend to the best habitats for invertebrates around the periphery of the School Grounds (e.g. around the northern wooded fringe and the floristically enhanced grassland areas). Analysis of samples would be undertaken overwinter to keep costs to the School at an acceptable level. Findings are not considered necessary for the assessment of adverse ecological impacts. The data gathered would inform the assessment in terms of the potential value of proposed ecological mitigation and enhancement elsewhere. | No survey proposed to support S73 Application. Survey to be undertaken in June 2017 with lab identification in the winter and reporting in Spring 2018. |

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Herpetofauna (reptiles and amphibians) | <p>The common reptile species that have any potential to occur are legally protected against killing or injury under the terms of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended.</p> <p>No amphibians that are protected against killing and injury have appreciable potential to occur on site.</p> <p>Common Toad, Common Lizard <i>Zootoca vivipera</i>, Slow-worm <i>Anguis fragilis</i>, and Grass Snake <i>Natrix natrix</i> are all listed as are all listed on S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) and as Priority Species in the London Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Morgan, K. (2006). <i>Herpetofauna and Bird survey of St Paul's School Castelnau London SW13</i>. Reported in Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners May 2007. St Paul's School Environmental Statement May 2007. NLP, London. Biodiversity by Design. (October 2009). <i>Ecological Surveys in Relation to Proposed Outfall. Bats, Herpetofauna, Riverine Snails</i>. BbD, Bath | <p>Surveys were undertaken by the herpetofaunal expert, Kevin Morgan on behalf of Nicholas Pearson Associates in 2006 and again in 2009. Standard methods of Artificial Cover Object (ACO) deployment were used in all key potentially suitable areas of The School grounds, allowing bedding in time before five surveys in good conditions in summer and autumn. Further survey using the same methods was undertaken along a localised section of the northern boundary over three visits in September and October 2009. No reptiles were detected.</p> <p>Since this time enhancements to the north-western edge of the grounds have been undertaken in the form of shrub planting and establishment of deadwood piles. This increases habitat potential for common reptiles and potentially terrestrial amphibians. Pending enhancements elsewhere along the fringes should also further enhance attractiveness to these species (as intended) though it is to be noted that previously proposed wetland areas along the norther fringe are now no longer part of the School requirements and will not be implemented.</p> | <p>Considering the location and nature of remaining redevelopment works, and the previous negative survey findings, no reptile or amphibian surveys are considered necessary in relation to the avoidance of potentially significant adverse effects. Any works that impinged upon the northern fringe of the grounds would be undertaken in precautionary fashion with habitat being made unsuitable for reptiles or amphibians in advance of works.</p> | <p>No survey proposed to support S73 Application.</p> |

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Breeding Birds | <p>All birds, their nests and young are protected against killing or injury under the terms of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended.</p> <p>Certain species listed on Schedule 1 of the act are protected against disturbance while nesting. These species include the Black Redstart <i>Phoenicurus ochruros</i> for which habitat creation in the scheme on roofs is being targeted. Black Redstart is also a London Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species.</p> <p>Song Thrush <i>Turdus philomelos</i> and Dunnock <i>Prunella modularis</i> and Starling <i>Sternus vulgaris</i> are listed on s41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) and as Priority Species in the London Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>Song Thrush is listed as a Priority Species in the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morgan, K. (2006). <i>Herpetofauna and Bird survey of St Paul's School Castelnau London SW13</i>. Reported in Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners May 2007. St Paul's School Environmental Statement May 2007. NLP, London. • Biodiversity by Design. (December 2010). <i>Bird Breeding Activity: Monitoring Method Statement Before Vegetation Removal</i>. BbD, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (June 2011). <i>Breeding Bird Site Check</i>. BbD, Bath. | <p>A survey of breeding birds was undertaken by Kevin Morgan MCIEEM, Ecologist (and bird survey expert) in April to June 2006. Red List species present, as might be expected from the habitats were Song Thrush and Common Starling with the following Amber List: Barn Swallow, House Martin, Dunnock, Mistle Thrush and Green Woodpecker. Breeding Great Spotted Woodpecker and Blackcap in the northern boundary tree belt were noted as of local interest.</p> <p>There are proposals for installation of many refuges for birds across the site fringes and on certain buildings, but to avoid potential conflicts with redevelopment activity, these have not yet been implemented.</p> | <p>On the basis of the past survey findings, and very limited changes to suitable habitat that would be caused by the remaining redevelopment proposals (and predominantly positive through landscape planting), breeding bird surveys are not considered strictly necessary in terms of ES assessment of significant adverse impacts.</p> <p>However, given the time elapsed, and habitat creation measures such as the Science Block green roof which have been implemented, an update to the previous survey would be undertaken. Methods would be based on a modified Common Bird Census (CBC) methodology (Bird Census Techniques: (Marchant, 1983; Gilbert, Gibbons & Evans, 1998), but adapted to the urban conditions the relatively limited habitat extent on site, and the very low probability of significant impacts (see above). Accordingly survey would entail 3 survey visits to the site between late April and mid- May, undertaken by one of most experienced ornithological field surveyors in London. Should the surveys demonstrate the presence of significant species then further investigations might be required (e.g. to locate possible nest site).</p> <p>Incidental records of breeding birds would also be compiled from other ecological site visits.</p> | Survey to be undertaken between end of April and mid-May 2017 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Bats: Foraging and Commuting</p> | <p>All bats are fully protected under the terms of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) and under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012 (as amended). This protection means that it is an offence to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat 2. Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturb a group of bats 3. Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time) 4. Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat 5. Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost <p>Common Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>, Soprano Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i> Noctule <i>Nyctalus noctua</i>, Leisler's <i>Nyctalus leisleri</i>, Daubenton's <i>Myotis daubentonii</i>, Serotine <i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>, Natterer's <i>Myotis nattereri</i>, Whiskered <i>Myotis mystacinus</i> and Brandt's <i>Myotis brandtii</i> bats are listed as Priority Species on the London Biodiversity Action Plan (as our Whiskered and Brandt's Bat but these are not likely to occur.</p> <p>All bats are priority species on the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicholas Pearson Associates. (June 2004). <i>Preliminary Assessment of On-Site Buildings for Potential to Support Roosting Bats</i>. NPA, Bath • Nicholas Pearson Associates. (May 2005). <i>Walkover Assessment of Trees and Internal Inspection of On-Site Buildings for Potential to Support Roosting Bats</i>. NPA, Bath. • Nicholas Pearson Associates. (May 2006). <i>Bat Emergence, Foraging and Commuting Survey</i>. NPA, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (June 2009). <i>Building and Tree Assessment, Transect and Emergence Survey for Bats</i>. BbD, Bath. • Biodiversity by Design. (October 2009). <i>Ecological Surveys in Relation to Proposed Outfall. Bats, Herpetofauna, Riverine Snails</i>. BbD, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (2011). <i>Tree Assessment for Bats</i>. May 2011. BbD, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (September 2012). <i>Bat and Badger Survey in Relation to New Drama Centre</i>. BbD, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (2014). Winter Bat Survey of Buildings and Trees in Relation to the General Teaching Building and Associated Buildings and Works. BbD, Bath. • Biodiversity by Design. (June 2014). <i>St Paul's School, Hammersmith, London. Spring 2014 Bat Emergence & Dawn Re-Entry: Surveys of Buildings & Trees</i>. BbD, Bath. • Biodiversity by Design. (December 2014). <i>St Paul's School, London: Colet Court Pavillion Bat Building Inspection</i>. BbD, Bath • Biodiversity by Design. (March 2017). <i>Update Assessment of Bat Roost Potential of General Teaching Building, Link Building and Drama 2 Building</i>. BbD, Bath | <p>Bat Activity:</p> <p>Bat Activity surveys between 2004 and 2014 recorded foraging and commuting bats, principally along the offsite footpath adjacent to the River Thames.</p> <p>Species recorded included Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Noctule and Daubenton's. Levels of activity over the site away from the Thames Corridor have been consistently very low, with only occasional passes.</p> <p>No bats have been recorded at times considered suggestive of a roost in close proximity to the site.</p> <p>Construction of the New Science Building biodiverse roof was completed in summer 2013 and it has since evolved into a valuable habitat as intended. From studies of biodiverse living roofs elsewhere in London increased bat foraging activity in the airspace over this roof is to be expected, but largely confined to species of pipistrelle (and high-flying Noctule) that are relatively light-tolerant.</p> | <p>Bat Activity:</p> <p>Based on the results of activity surveys undertaken over a 10-year period to date, and the proposed masterplan amendments reducing the proximity of proposals to the River Thames corridor, the potential for the remaining redevelopment proposals to result in significant adverse effects on foraging or commuting bats is considered to be extremely low. Habitat creation measures can reasonably be expected to result in an increase in foraging habitat availability and quality.</p> <p>The overall value of the School Site, away from the narrow northern habitat fringe near the river footpath, for foraging and commuting bats is considered to be 'Low', and only occasional bat passes have been recorded in these areas during many historic surveys.</p> <p>Current 'good practice guidance' for understanding bat foraging and commuting use of sites of Low value is to undertake foraging commuting surveys by walked transect and static detector once in spring, once in summer and once in autumn. Given the history of surveys on the Site, the very low risk of adverse effects on bats, and the distribution of habitats on site (mainly confined to the property and the living roof of the New Science Building) it is not considered necessary to undertake walked transect surveys. Rather it is considered that an adequate picture of bat use of the Site can be obtained by deploying multiple static detectors. It is proposed that two static detectors be deployed on the northern boundary (one opposite the School building complex and one away from this), one on the New Science Building biodiverse roof and one along the Lilian Road hedgeline side of the School grounds. See plans at end of this document.</p> <p>Deployment would be over 5 nights in late April / early May, mid-summer and autumn 2017.</p> <p>The data obtained would be used to fine tune habitat creation / enhancement proposals for foraging / commuting bats. These static detector activity surveys would also contribute to the objectives of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to achieve net gain for biodiversity.</p> | <p>Bat Activity (static detector survey): Late April / early May 2017, and post ES submission: Summer 2017 and Autumn 2017.</p> |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Bats: Roosting Potential</p> | | | <p>Bat Roost Potential</p> <p><u>Buildings:</u> Bat roost potential surveys undertaken between 2004 and 2014 identified the vast majority of buildings across the site to be of no more than Low potential to support roosting bats. A small number were assessed to be of Low/Medium (3) or Medium (5) potential, and a single electricity sub-station assessed to be of medium/high potential. A number of these Low/medium and Medium potential buildings (subject to further emergence surveys) have already been demolished as a part of the ongoing redevelopment works.</p> <p>It should be noted that the most recent best practice guidance on grading buildings for their bat roost potential differs somewhat from that used in the previous building assessments. The greater emphasis on habitat connectivity made in the latest guidance is likely to lead to lower bat roost potential assessments for certain buildings within the site.</p> <p><u>Trees:</u> The majority of trees identified to have potential to support roosting bats are located offsite, along the Thames Footpath. Of trees scheduled for removal, none has been assessed to date to be of greater than 'Low' potential.</p> <p>Emergence surveys of buildings and trees undertaken in relation to various building demolitions and works between 2011 and 2015 have not detected any roosting bats, and only very low levels of activity within the site have been recorded. The timing of bat passes recorded has not been suggestive of roosts in close proximity.</p> <p>There are proposals for the installation of bat refuges on trees on</p> | <p>Bat Roost Potential</p> <p>Updated Bat Roost Potential Survey of all buildings and trees within the Redline would be undertaken.</p> <p>Should evidence of roosting bats be detected within buildings, they would be subject to a number of emergence surveys dependant on the bat roost potential assessment. Any such surveys would be reported on as supplementary information following the submission of the ES.</p> <p>Bat emergence surveys would continue to be undertaken prior to demolition of any buildings assessed to be of Low or higher bat roost potential.</p> <p>Bat emergence surveys of any trees with bat roost potential that could be affected by works directly or indirectly would be undertaken prior to removal / potential disturbance occurring.</p> <p>All bat roost potential surveys would be undertaken in line with the latest best practice guidance: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) <i>Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn)</i>. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.</p> | <p>Bat Roost Potential Survey: late April/ early May 2017.</p> |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

| Taxa / feature | Protection and Policy status | Previous Surveys | Summary of previous survey findings | Proposed approach and methods for S73 ES | Timing of proposed surveys for S73 Application |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>the western and north-western periphery of the school site and on one of the school Buildings. These installations have not yet taken place in order not to interfere with completion of the School redevelopment works, but will be scheduled in due course when such works are completed.</p> | | |
| Badgers | <p>Badgers and their setts are fully protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Protection extends to protection against disturbance when in their setts.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nicholas Pearson Associates. (2004). <i>St Paul's School Existing Ecological Conditions: Preliminary Assessment</i>. NPA, Bath. Biodiversity by Design. (September 2012). <i>Bat and Badger Survey in Relation to New Drama Centre</i>. BbD, Bath | <p>No signs of Badger activity have hitherto been noted on-Site. Badgers, however, are highly mobile animals with frequent changes to patterns of behaviour and dispersal.</p> | <p>Update inspections for signs of Badger would be undertaken as a part of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. If a Badger sett were found, further investigations might be necessary and would be added to the scope at that point.</p> | late April 2017 |
| Hedgehog <i>Erinaceus europaeus</i> | <p>Hedgehogs are not legally protected but are considered species of conservation concern for which special conservation measures should be taken through listing on Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006).</p> <p>The Hedgehog is also a London Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Species.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All surveys listed above. | <p>No signs of Hedgehog (e.g. dropping) or sightings of Hedgehog have been made on site during Phase 1 Habitat or other surveys. Over time with the gradual realisation of School ground fringe enhancements potential for use of the Site by Hedgehogs should increase (which would be an ecologically important outcome).</p> | <p>It is not impossible that Hedgehog use the School grounds (habitat is suitable) but considering the location and nature of remaining redevelopment works, and the overall intention to improve habitat for this species, no Hedgehog surveys are considered necessary in relation to the avoidance of potentially significant adverse effects.</p> <p>Any works that impinged upon any feature that might be used as refuge by a Hedgehog would be undertaken in precautionary fashion with such features investigated and being made unsuitable for Hedgehogs in advance of any works. Any excavations would be either covered or fitted with escape ramps in case Hedgehogs were to be on site and become victims of pitfall.</p> <p>However some neighbouring residents wish to enhance the connectivity between adjacent properties and the School and for the School to enhance habitat potential in the area generally for Hedgehogs. The School therefore plans to survey to find out if this species is already using the School grounds or not and hence to guide enhancement measures in management/ boundary modifications etc. Five footprint tunnels will be deployed at suitable locations around the School site fringes (see attached plan).</p> | Hedgehog footprint tube survey for 5 nights in late April/early May around the site periphery. |



Figure 1: Proposed locations for Hedgehog footprint tunnels and static detectors for bats for survey shown on the most recent tree location plan (from 2016).

Impact Assessment:

The impact assessment methodology would follow the recently revised Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater and Coastal, 2nd edition, prepared by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2016), and be in line with the British Standard 42020: Biodiversity — Code of practice for planning and development (2013).



JOB NAME: St Paul's School
CLIENT: St Paul's School
REPORT TITLE: Ecological Scoping for s73 Application Consultation Draft
STATUS: Rev 4.0

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| PREPARED BY: | PRINT NAME Dr Mike Wells | POSITION Director | SIGNATURE |
| | PRINT NAME Oliver Prudden | POSITION Director | SIGNATURE |
| | PRINT NAME | POSITION | SIGNATURE |

REVISIONS:

| Rev No. | Comments | Date |
|---------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| 0.1 | For internal review | 20/03/2017 |
| 1.0 | For client review, comment and action | 22/03/2017 |
| 2.0 | Minor amendments. | 25/03/2017 |
| 3.0 | Minor amendments. | 01/04/2017 |
| 4.0 | Minor amendments. | 23/04/2017 |

Disclaimer:

This report was prepared by Biodiversity by Design Ltd at the instruction of, and for sole use by, our client. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Biodiversity by Design Ltd excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.