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INTRODUCTION

1.1 AECOM Infrastructure and Environment UK Ltd (AECOM) have been instructed by Danescroft Land Ltd, on behalf of the group of landowners (Danescroft Land Ltd, Lindhill Properties Ltd, British Land PLC, Vastint Holding B.V, Southern Housing Group, LLDC), to undertake an ecological assessment in relation to the redevelopment of the Bromley by Bow (South) site (herein referred to as the ‘the Site’), allocated as Sub Area 4.1 of the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) Local Plan 2015 to 2031 (Ref. 1).

1.2 It is the intention of the landowners to submit an illustrative masterplan to the Planning and Policy Decisions Team (PPDT) of the LLDC. This illustrative masterplan has been subject to environmental testing, and this report forms part of a series of Environmental Impact Topic Reports which have been produced to form a separate evidence base identifying any potential significant environmental effects of the operation of the maximum extents/parameters of the illustrative masterplan, and where further work might be required to support a planning application for development of the Site, or any part thereof.

1.3 Both the illustrative masterplan and Environmental Impact Topic Reports will provide the basis upon which a series of redevelopment parameters and design guidelines will be developed for the Site. These parameters and guidelines will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Site. Both the illustrative masterplan and Environmental Impact Topic Reports will be appended to the SPD.

1.4 The Site is approximately 6ha in size and lies between the A12 to the west, the River Lea to the east and the railway line to the south. The Bow River Village (Bromley by Bow North) development borders the Site to the north. The illustrative masterplan consists of the construction of residential, retail, workspace, education and community buildings. The Site is located with the London Borough of Tower Hamlets (LBTH) and falls under the planning jurisdiction of the LLDC.

1.5 This report presents an assessment of the operational impacts of the illustrative masterplan with respect to Ecology. The report presents an ecological baseline, which is informed by a desk study exercise and extended Phase 1 habitat survey undertaken in March 2016. An assessment of impacts is made using best practice guidelines, following the ‘mitigation hierarchy’ of avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement.

Planning History

1.6 Two planning permissions have previously been granted which cover the Site in part or whole and are summarised below. Where relevant, reference is made in this report to the information within these two planning applications:

- Hybrid planning permission (with some elements approved in detail) was granted for the Tesco application PA/09/02574 by the GLA in July 2010 for a mixed-use development, including a District Centre and a superstore. The area covered by the Tesco application sits entirely within the Site.
- Hybrid planning permission (with detailed planning permission for Phase 1) was granted for the Bromley by Bow (North) planning application PA/11/02423 by the GLA in July 2012 for a residential led mixed-use development. The Bromley by Bow (North) site comprises the area directly to the north of the Site, and includes the northern most portion of the Site.
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Introduction

2.1 This section reviews the legislative and planning policy context in relation to Ecology.

Relevant Legislation

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

2.2 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) (Ref. 2) are the principal means by which the European Union Directive on the Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) (EC Habitats Directive) (Ref. 3) is transposed in UK law.

2.3 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) provide for the designation and protection of ‘European sites’ known as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), the protection of ‘European protected species’ (including bat species), and the adaptation of planning and other controls for the protection of European Sites. As well as sites designated under European nature conservation legislation, UK Government policy states that internationally important wetlands designated under the Ramsar Convention 1971 (Ramsar sites) are afforded the same protection as Special Protection Areas (SPAs) (classified under Article 4 of the EC Birds Directive 1979) (Ref. 4) and SACs for the purpose of considering development proposals that may affect them.

2.4 In addition, the need for an assessment of impacts on Natura 2000 sites is set out within Article 6 of the EC Habitats Directive 1992 (Ref. 5), and interpreted into British law by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The ultimate aim of the Directive is to “maintain or restore, at favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest” (Habitats Directive, Article 2(2)). This aim relates to habitats and species, not the European sites themselves, although the sites have a significant role in delivering favourable conservation status.

2.5 The Habitats Directive applies the precautionary principle to European sites. Article 6 (3) states that ‘Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives.’

2.6 Projects can only be permitted having ascertained that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the site(s) in question. Projects with predicted adverse impacts on European sites may still be permitted if there are no alternatives to them and there are Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI) as to why they should go ahead. In such cases, compensation will be necessary to ensure the overall integrity of the site network.

2.7 The Regulations also amended the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (Ref. 6), updating Schedules 5 and 8 to consider provisions made by the Habitat Regulations 1994 in relation to the protection of European Protected Species. They also offered further clarification to Part 4 of Section 9 considering “reckless” offences on wild animals, which was previously amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (Ref. 7) (CRoW).

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

2.8 All species of wild bird in the UK are protected under Part 1 Section 1(1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (WCA). They are protected against intentional killing, injuring or taking, as well as taking, damaging or destroying nests in use or being built, and taking or destroying eggs.

2.9 In addition to general protection for birds, certain species listed in Schedule 1 of the WCA are afforded special protection. These birds are either: rare, endangered, declining or vulnerable species. In
addition to the protection afforded to all bird species it is an offence to cause ‘reckless’ or ‘intentional’ disturbance to the specially protected Schedule 1 listed species when they are building nests.

2.10 The Secretary of State may also designate Areas of Special Protection (subject to exceptions to provide further protection to birds).

2.11 The WCA makes it an offence (subject to exceptions) to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild animal listed on Schedule 5, and prohibits interference with places used for shelter or protection, or intentionally disturbing animals occupying such places.

2.12 The WCA makes it an offence (subject to exceptions) to intentionally pick, uproot or destroy any wild plant listed in Schedule 8.

2.13 The WCA contains measures at Schedule 9 for preventing the establishment of non-native species which may be detrimental to native wildlife.

The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW)

2.14 Schedule 12 of the CRoW amends the species provisions of the WCA, strengthening the legal protection for threatened species. The provisions make certain offences ‘arrestable’, create a new offence of reckless disturbance, confer greater powers to police and wildlife inspectors for entering premises and obtaining wildlife tissue samples for DNA analysis, and enable heavier penalties on conviction of wildlife offences.

Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006

2.15 Section 41 of the NERC Act (Ref. 8) requires the listing of habitats and species that are considered to be of principle importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England, including habitats and species in England that have been identified as priorities within the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP).

2.16 The NERC Act requires that the Section 41 list be used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 ‘to have regard’ to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.

Eels (England and Wales) Regulations (2009)

2.17 The Eels (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 (Ref. 9) establish measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel (Anguilla anguilla). The Regulation requires Member States to implement a number of short- and long-term measures to achieve a target of ensuring that at least 40% of the potential production of adult eels return to the sea to spawn on an annual basis.

2.18 The requirement includes notifying the Environment Agency of the construction, alteration or maintenance of any structure likely to affect the passage of eels. Where any such structure exists, there is a requirement to construct and operate an eel pass to allow the free passage of eels. There is also a requirement for the use of eel screens to exclude eels from water abstraction and discharge points.

National Planning Policy


2.19 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref. 10) states in paragraph 109 that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ‘minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures…’

2.20 When determining planning applications, paragraph 118 of the NPPF advises that local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying, inter alia, the following principles:
• If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

• Development proposals on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effect on a SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSI; and

• Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

2.21 The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14 of the NPPF) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined.

Regional Planning Policy


2.22 The London Plan (Ref. 11) highlights the importance of protecting biodiversity outside of designated sites. Paragraph 7.60 states that “priority should be placed on connecting fragmented habitat and increasing the size of habitat areas to increase resilience to climate change”.

2.23 Policy 2.18 of the London Plan states that development proposals should “incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into the wider development” and “encourage the linkage of green infrastructure…to the wider public realm”.

2.24 Policy 5.3 discusses sustainable design and construction, and states that development proposals should “demonstrate that sustainable design standards are integral to the proposal, including its construction and operation”.

2.25 Policy 5.10 discusses urban greening and states that development proposals should “integrate green infrastructure from the beginning of the design process to contribute to urban greening” and that this can include “tree planting, green roofs and walls, and soft landscaping”.

2.26 Policy 5.11 discusses green roofs and states that major development proposals “should be designed to include roof, wall and site planting, especially green roofs and walls where feasible”.

2.27 Policy 7.19 discusses biodiversity and access to nature and states that development proposals should “make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity” and “prioritise assisting in achieving targets in biodiversity action plans”, and “not adversely affect the integrity of European sites”.

2.28 Policy 7.21 discusses trees and woodland and states that “existing trees of value should be retained and any loss as the result of development should be replaced”, and that “wherever appropriate, the planting of additional trees should be included in new developments, particularly large-canopied species”.

The Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy (2002)

2.29 The Mayor’s Biodiversity Strategy (Ref. 12) outlines the Mayor’s detailed policies for London’s biodiversity. Chapter 4: Policies and Proposals states that the Mayor will give priority to the “protection of biodiversity, positive measures to encourage biodiversity action, promoting the management, enhancement and creation of valuable green space, incorporating biodiversity into new development, and access to nature and environmental education”.

2.30 Policy 1 states that “The Mayor will work with partners to protect, manage and enhance London’s biodiversity”. This will be implemented through a no net loss of important wildlife habitat, and a net increase in habitat through enhancement and habitat creation.
2.31 Policy 2 explains that the Mayor has set up the concept of a “Blue Ribbon Network” for the Thames, London’s waterways and the land alongside them. The Mayor will and boroughs should “protect and enhance the biodiversity of the Blue Ribbon Network by resisting development that results in a net loss of biodiversity and designing new waterside developments in a way that increases habitat value”.

2.32 Policy 5 states that “The Mayor will seek to ensure that opportunities are taken to green the built environment within development proposals”.

The London Biodiversity Action Plan

2.33 The London Biodiversity Action Plan (Ref. 13) details habitats and species that are of importance for biodiversity in London. These are incorporated into the London Plan. Those of relevance to the Site are “Wasteland”, which develops on previously developed land and can house a wide diversity of species, and “bats”, which within London are increasingly relying on buildings to roost.

Local Planning Policy

LLDC Local Plan 2015 to 2031

2.34 The Mayor of London established the London Legacy Development Corporation (LLDC) in 2012, to promote regeneration of the Olympic Park and its surrounding area. The LLDC Local Plan sets out the strategy for the sustainable development of the area, including policies that applications for planning permission should conform to which are of relevance for any future planning applications submitted for redevelopment of the Site, or any part thereof.

2.35 Strategic Policy SP.3: Integrating the built and natural environment states that the LLDC will “create a high-quality built and natural environment that integrates new development with waterways and green space”. This will be achieved by protecting and providing “green infrastructure, complementing local ecology” and connecting existing green infrastructure and facilitating safe access to waterside and green environments.

2.36 Strategic Policy BN.2: Creating distinctive waterway environments states that development proposals that affect the waterway environment should “improve the ecological potential, drainage and flood resilience capacity of the waterway” and “improve access to and along the waterway as appropriate”.

2.37 Strategic Policy BN.3: Maximising biodiversity states that development proposals will be required to “maximise opportunity to protect and enhance biodiversity, provide a net gain in the extent of habitat suitable for species to thrive, integrate habitat and other measures that will support biodiversity and retain trees and contribute to tree-planting”.

2.38 Strategic Policy SP.5: A sustainable and healthy place to live and work states that the LLDC will work to include “urban greening through planting in the public realm and private spaces and green and brown roofs”.

2.39 Policy S.4: Sustainable design and construction states that proposals for major development will be required to “include evidence that the following have been taken into account within the development of the scheme”, including living roofs, and that “residential development proposals will be required to demonstrate that they will be capable of achieving at least a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 score (or any future nationally recognised equivalent”.

2.40 Policy S.7: Overheating and urban screening states that “opportunities to introduce planting of trees in private and public spaces, along with those for including green roofs, green walls and other planting opportunities should be taken”.

2.41 Specifically in the Bromley-by-Bow area, Policy 4.1 states that the LLDC will support a new District Centre at Bromley-by-Bow. Proposals for development will need to demonstrate that they “respond positively to the adjacent waterways and listed buildings at Three Mills”.

Tower Hamlets Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2014-2019

2.42 The Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) (Ref 14.) for Tower Hamlets identifies priority habitats and species within the borough, and includes targets to ensure their conservation. The LBAP also provides guidance to developers on biodiversity enhancements expected in new developments.
Habitat action plans have been created within the LBAP. Of relevance to the Proposed Development is the priority habitat ‘rivers’. The River Lea flows adjacent to the Site, and forms the boundary of the borough of Tower Hamlets. The borough objectives for rivers include “controlling invasive species, providing marginal vegetation on river walls, and encouraging schemes to improve water quality”.

Priority species plans have also been created within the LBAP. Of relevance to the Proposed Development are “bats”. Objectives for bats include “provide roost sites for bats, such as bat boxes or bat bricks in new developments, housing estates, parks and schools in parts of the borough where bats are likely to use them” and “to encourage nocturnal insect by planting night-scented plants in landscaping schemes in parts of the borough where bats are likely to forage”.

Within the ‘Built Environment Action Plan’, the LBAP states that “Green roofs are the easiest place to replace our disappearing brownfield (open mosaic) habitats”, and that “green walls can provide nectar for bees and nesting sites for our declining house sparrows, and streets can be greened with trees, hedges and planters”.
METHODOLOGY AND IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA
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Introduction

3.1 This section of the report presents the following:

- Relevant standards and guidance which have been reviewed and referenced throughout preparation of this report;
- Identification of information sources which have been used throughout preparation of this assessment;
- Details of any consultation undertaken with respect to ecology;
- The methodology used in the assessment of ecological effects, including the criteria for the determination of sensitivity of receptor/importance of resource and magnitude of change from the existing or ‘baseline’ conditions;
- An explanation as to how the identification and assessment of potential ecological effects has been reached; and
- The significance criteria and terminology for assessment of the residual effects to ecology.

3.2 The following sources of information that define the illustrative masterplan have been reviewed and form the basis of the assessment of likely significant effects on ecology:

- Bromley By Bow South Masterplan Vision 17th March 2016; and
- Bromley By Bow South Masterplan - Quality Review Panel Presentation 14th January 2016.

Standards and Guidance

3.3 The ‘Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland’ issued by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2016) (Ref. 15) (‘the CIEEM EcIA guidelines’) provide guidance on the process of identifying the value of ecological features, characterising impacts upon them and assessing whether these impacts are significant. The ‘mitigation hierarchy’ of avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement underpin the CIEEM EcIA guidelines.

3.4 As per the CIEEM EcIA guidelines, the following definitions are used for the terms ‘impact’ and ‘effect’:

- Impact – ‘Actions resulting in changes to an ecological feature’.
- Effect – ‘Outcome to an ecological feature from an impact’

Assessment Methodology

Methodology for Determining Baseline Conditions and Sensitive Receptors

Desk Study

3.5 A desk study was carried out to identify nature conservation designations, and protected and notable habitats and species potentially relevant to the illustrative masterplan.

3.6 The desk study identified international nature conservation designations within 10km of the Site boundary; other statutory nature conservation designations within 2km of the Site boundary; and local non-statutory nature conservations, and protected and notable habitats and species within 1km of the Site boundary.

3.7 The desk study was carried out using data from the Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website and Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL).
Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey

3.8 A Phase 1 habitat survey of the Site was undertaken in accordance with the standard survey method (JNCC, 2010) (Ref. 16). The survey was ‘extended’ to record target notes on protected, notable and invasive species.

3.9 The survey was undertaken on 9th March 2016 by two AECOM ecologists who recorded and mapped all habitat types present within the Site, along with any associated ecological features observed. The survey area encompassed all safely accessible parts of the Site and adjacent habitats where applicable from publicly accessible areas. This included the adjacent River Lee to check for any features associated with the aquatic habitat that might be impacted by the illustrative masterplan.

3.10 A note was also made of any visible instances of invasive non-native plant species listed under Schedule 9 of the WCA, including Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*).

3.11 Typical and notable plant species were recorded for different habitat types and reflect the conditions at the time of survey. This was not intended to be a detailed inventory of the plant species present in the survey area, as this is not required for the purposes of the Phase 1 habitat survey.

Bat Roost Suitability External Inspection

3.12 An external inspection of the Bromley by Bow Tesco building, an electrical building and three buildings within the Danescroft landholding was undertaken on the 9th March 2016 by two AECOM ecologists. The survey was conducted in line with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) survey guidelines (Collins, 2016) (Ref. 17).

3.13 Close focussing binoculars were used to conduct an external assessment of the building. All potential access/egress points and features with the potential to support roosting bats (e.g. cracks, crevices, roof voids) were identified and recorded along with any evidence which may have indicated the location of roosts, such as;

- Stains around entrance holes (resulting from the deposition of oil secretions in bat fur);
- Scratch marks around entrance holes (resulting from bat claw holds);
- Bat droppings;
- Feeding remains; and
- Odours or noise characteristic of bats.

3.14 On the basis of the external survey the overall suitability of the building to support roosting bats was classified according to the scale outlined in Table 3-1.

3.15 No internal inspection was undertaken as the buildings within the Danescroft land were derelict and unsafe to enter, the electrical building was not safe to enter and the Tesco building was not accessible.

3.16 Trees with a diameter at breast height of more than 0.25m were also assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats. Any potentially suitable roost features were recorded, making reference to Table 3-1.
### Table 3-1: Criteria Used to Describe Bat Roost Suitability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Bat Roost Suitability</th>
<th>Type of Roost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Presence of bats or evidence of bats. Confirmation of roost status may require further survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Feature with multiple roosting opportunities for one or more species of bat. With good connectivity to high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature with multiple roosting opportunities for breeding bats (size, temperature). With proximity and connectivity to high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large site that offers cool stable conditions with multiple roosting opportunities. With proximity and connectivity to high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Feature with some roosting opportunities. With connectivity to moderate or high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature providing some roosting opportunities. With some connectivity and proximity to moderate or high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium sized feature with some roosting opportunities. With some connectivity and proximity to moderate or high quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Feature with a limited number of roosting opportunities. With poor connectivity to foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature with a limited number of roosting opportunities for breeding bats. With low proximity and connectivity to low or moderate quality foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small sized feature or feature which may be subject to disturbance or environmental variations, with a limited number of roosting opportunities. With poor connectivity to foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Feature with no or very limited roosting opportunities for bats or where the feature is isolated from foraging habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature with no suitable roosting opportunities for breeding bats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature with no suitable roosting opportunities for hibernating bats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology for Determining Operational Effects

**Characterising Potential Ecological Impacts**

3.17 The potential ecological effects of the Illustrative masterplan have been identified and characterised. This took into consideration the following criteria:

- Positive or negative – whether the effect will result in net loss or degradation of an important ecological feature or whether it would improve or enhance it.
- Magnitude – the size and intensity of the effect measured in relevant terms, e.g. number of individuals lost or gained, area of habitat lost or created, or the degree of change to existing conditions.
- Extent – the spatial scope of the effect.
- Reversibility – the extent to which effects were reversible either spontaneously or through active mitigation.
- Duration – the length of time over which the effect occurred.
- Timing and frequency – consideration of the timing of events in relation to ecological change; some effects might be of greater significance if they took place at certain times of year.
3.18 Potential impacts will be characterised initially in the absence of any mitigation, except where this was integral to the design of the illustrative masterplan. A sequential process will be applied to avoid, mitigate and compensate for any significant impacts. Any additional mitigation or compensation proposed will be subsequently identified and its likely effectiveness assessed.

Significance Criteria

Methodology for Determining Significance of Effects

3.19 The significance of the predicted impacts on important ecological features arising from the potential impacts associated with the illustrative masterplan, including designed-in and additional mitigation measures, will be assessed. The significance of the effects will be assessed as negative, positive or not significant.

3.20 The CIEEM 2016 EcIA guidelines (Ref. 15) state that ‘A significant effect is simply an effect that is sufficiently important to require assessment and reporting so that the decision maker is adequately informed of the environmental consequences of permitting a project... A significant effect does not necessarily equate to an effect so severe that consent for the project should be refused planning permission. For example, many projects with significant negative ecological effects can be lawfully permitted following EIA procedures as long as the mitigation hierarchy has been applied effectively as part of the decision making process. In broad terms, 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).’

3.21 The valuation of sites made will use established value systems (e.g. SSSIs are all of national importance), and reflect the geographical context of the valuation. The categories shown in Table 3-2 will be applied to give geographic context. Although the categories differ from those recommended within CIEEM (2016) EcIA guidelines, they are considered appropriate to ensure consistency of approach with the other topic reports.

Table 3-2: Examples of Criteria used to Evaluate Important Ecological Features in a defined Geographical Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical level at which ecological feature is important</th>
<th>Examples of criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International (Very high)</td>
<td>An internationally important site, e.g. Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or Ramsar; a regularly occurring population of an internationally important species (listed on Annex IV of the Habitats Directive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (High)</td>
<td>A nationally designated site, e.g. SSSI, or a site considered worthy of such designation; a large regularly occurring population of a nationally important species; an ecological feature identified as of priority within Section 41 of the NERC Act (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (Medium)</td>
<td>An ecological feature identified in the local BAP. A smaller area of local BAP habitat which are essential to maintain the viability of a larger whole; non-statutory designated sites; a regularly occurring, locally significant number of a nationally important species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (Low)</td>
<td>Ecological features that are scarce within the district or borough or which appreciably enrich the district or borough habitat resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Very low)</td>
<td>A good example of a common or widespread ecological feature that in the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>No or very limited ecological value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adverse Effects

3.22 For habitat areas and species, an effect is considered significant if the favourable conservation status of an important ecological feature would be compromised by the project. Conservation status is defined by CIEEM (2016) as being:

- **Habitats** – ‘conservation status is determined by the sum of the influences acting on the habitat that may affect its extent, structure and functions as well as its distribution and its typical species within a given geographical area.’

- **Species** – ‘conservation status is determined by the sum of influences acting on the species concerned that may affect its abundance and distribution within a given geographical area.”

3.23 The decision as to whether the favourable conservation status of an important ecological feature is likely to be compromised was made using professional judgement through consideration of multiple factors in relation to the predicted effects of the project.

3.24 A similar procedure was adopted for designated sites that would be affected by the project, except that the focus in this case will be on the effects on the integrity of each site, defined by ODPM Circular 06/2005 and Defra Circular 01/2005 Biodiversity and geological conservation - statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system as ‘the coherence of ecological structure and function, across a site’s whole area, that enable it to sustain the habitat, complex of habitats and/or levels of populations of species for which it was classified.’ This assessment will be made with reference to the features for which a site has been classified/ notified and will involve combining assessments of the effects on the conservation status of each of these features.

3.25 For non-statutory sites, such features may not have been formally defined and would need to be agreed with the designating authority (e.g. local authority or county wildlife trust).

Beneficial Effects

3.26 As per CIEEM 2016 EcIA guidelines, a positive effect will be considered significant if it results in ‘a change that improves the quality of the environment e.g. by increasing species diversity, extending habitat or improving water quality. Positive impacts may also include halting or slowing an existing decline in the quality of the environment’.

3.27 Effects could be permanent or temporary, direct or indirect, and could be cumulative. These factors will be brought together to assess the magnitude of the impact on particular important ecological features and, wherever possible, the magnitude of the impact will be quantified.

Magnitude of Potential Impacts

3.28 Professional judgement will be used to assign the impacts on the important ecological features to one of four classes of magnitude (see Table 3-3). This approach deviates from that advocated by the CIEEM EcIA guidelines, but allows for comparison across ES chapters within the EIA.

3.29 Major or moderate effects are regarded as significant. Minor or negligible effects are considered not significant. Where significant effects occur, the scale of the effect is also considered on a geographical scale (i.e. international, national, regional, county, district or local). For example, effects on habitats within a SSSI (a feature of high/national importance) may not always be significant at a national scale, but may be significant at regional, county or district level.
### Table 3-3: Definition of Magnitude of Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>A permanent or long-term effect on the extent or integrity of a site, habitat, species assemblage or community, population or group. If adverse, this is likely to threaten its sustainability; if beneficial, this is likely to substantially enhance its conservation status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>A permanent or long-term effect on the extent or integrity of a site, habitat, species assemblage or community, population or group. If adverse, this is unlikely to threaten its sustainability; if beneficial, this is likely to be sustainable but unlikely to enhance its conservation status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A permanent or long-term reversible effect on a site, habitat, species assemblage or community, population or group whose magnitude is detectable but will not threaten its integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>A short-term but reversible effect on the extent or size or integrity of a site, habitat, species assemblage or community, population or group that is within the normal range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significance of Potential Impacts

3.30 Impacts and effects could be permanent or temporary, direct or indirect, and could be cumulative.

3.31 For this assessment a matrix approach will be used where ecological value/importance and magnitude of impact are cross referenced to identify a level of significance. Table 3-4 presents the categorisation of the significance of effects, which is based on the matrix presented in Chapter 2 of this ES.

### Table 3-4: Significance of Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Sensitivity</th>
<th>Magnitude of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and National (High)</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (Medium)</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough (Low)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Borough (Very low)</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.32 With reference to Table 3-4, in accordance with CIEEM (2016) EcIA guidelines, a clear distinction between evidence-based and value-based judgements will be made so that decision-makers and other stakeholders are aware of the level of subjective evaluation that has been used.

### Terminology

3.33 In order to provide consistency of terminology in the conclusions of the assessment the residual effects of the illustrative masterplan are translated to a significance level on a scale of negligible, minor, moderate and major as outlined in Table 3-5. In addition, Table 3-5 converts these conclusions an equivalent conclusion based on the CIEEM 2016 EcIA guidelines.
Table 3-5: Relating CIEEM Assessment terms to those used in other assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Significance Terminology</th>
<th>Equivalent CIEEM assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant (Beneficial)</td>
<td>Beneficial effect on structure/function or conservation status at regional, national or international level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Beneficial</td>
<td>Beneficial effect on structure/function or conservation status at county level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td>Beneficial effect on structure/function or conservation status at Site or local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td>Beneficial effect on structure/function or conservation status at Site or local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td>Adverse effect on structure or conservation status at Site - local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant (Adverse)</td>
<td>Adverse effect on structure/function or conservation status at county level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Adverse</td>
<td>Adverse effect on structure/function or conservation status at county level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Adverse</td>
<td>Adverse effect on structure/function or conservation status at regional, national or international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation

3.34 AECOM submitted a Scoping Opinion request to the LLDC PPDT setting out the proposed approach, methodology and scope of the Environmental Impact Topic Reports, including this Ecology Impact Topic Report, on the 10th March 2016. The Scoping Opinion request also set out the committed developments to be included within the assessment of cumulative effects for each environmental impact topic report. The LLDC PPDT did not request any changes to the approach set out in the Scoping Opinion Request.

3.35 Subsequent to the submission of the Scoping Opinion Request, and a further review of the committed developments in the area, those currently under construction are taken to be in the baseline scenario (rather than assessed cumulatively) as these developments are likely to be completed and occupied prior to any works for the redevelopment of the Site getting underway. Table 3-6 and Figure 1 below sets out the list of committed developments and where these are considered within this report.

Table 3-6: Committed Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/00191/FUL</td>
<td>Cooks Road</td>
<td>Bellway Homes</td>
<td>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two blocks ranging from five (5) to eight (8) storeys above ground level with a maximum parapet height of 30m AOD to provide: 349 residential units including affordable housing (Use Class C3), 3,113 sq. m of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1-A3/B1/D1/D2), together with podium level, car parking including blue badge parking, cycle parking, refuse areas, plant room, servicing, open space, landscaping. Considered in the assessment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00422/FUL</td>
<td>Marshgate</td>
<td>Workspace 14 Limited</td>
<td>Land at Marshgate Lane, Pudding Mill, Stratford, London, E15 2NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/90619 FUMODA</td>
<td>68-70 Stratford High Street</td>
<td>Lancaster PLC</td>
<td>68-70 Stratford High Street, London, E15 2NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/90011 FUMODA</td>
<td>80-92 Stratford High Street</td>
<td>Manser Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Stratford Edge, 80-92 Stratford High Street, London, E15 2NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/90519/FUMODA</td>
<td>2 - 12 High Street, Stratford, London, E15 2PW</td>
<td>Capital Towers</td>
<td>Galliard Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Scheme</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/90621/OUTO DA/PDZ8 <em>Newham</em></td>
<td>Pudding Mill</td>
<td>LLDC</td>
<td>Pudding Mill Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/08/1161 <em>Tower Hamlets</em></td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>Barratt Homes</td>
<td>St Andrews Hospital, Devas Street, E3 3NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/11/02423</td>
<td>Bow River Village</td>
<td>Southern Housing Association</td>
<td>Thames Gateway (East London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/00336/LTGO UT</td>
<td>Strand East</td>
<td>Vastinct LandProp</td>
<td>Strand East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.36 In addition, Natural England, The Environment Agency and the Tower Hamlets Biodiversity Officer will be consulted in due course.

**Limitations and Assumptions**

3.37 No access was possible to land within the Site in the ownership of LLDC, Vastint, SHG and Lindhill. These areas were viewed from other accessible or public areas of the Site. Further survey of these four areas is recommended.

3.38 Thirteen buildings were present throughout the Site. Six of these buildings were surveyed externally for their suitability for roosting bats. The remaining eight buildings were not accessed, and so no assessment of their suitability to support roost bats could not be made. Further survey of these buildings areas is recommended prior to a planning application being submitted.

3.39 Internal inspections were not undertaken of the buildings, as they were not accessible during the survey. The buildings within the Danescroft land are derelict and unsafe to enter. Consequently, it is recommended that these buildings will be subject to emergence survey prior to demolition.
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BASELINE CONDITIONS

Introduction
4.1 This section of the report provides a description of the current baseline conditions present at the Site in relation to ecology.

Baseline Conditions

Desk Study

Designated Sites
4.2 Lee Valley SPA / Ramsar site and Epping Forest SAC are around 5.5km and 5.9km respectively from the Site. There are no other Natura 2000 sites within 10km of the three sites.

4.3 There are no SSSI within 2km of the Site. Tower Hamlets Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is around 0.9km of the site. Ackroyd Drive LNR is around 1.2km from the Site.

4.4 The Site is located within a network of non-statutory designated sites. Lee Valley Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Site. In addition, River Thames and Tidal Tributaries Metropolitan SINC, Bow Back Rivers Borough Grade I SINC and Railside Land in Newham Borough Grade II SINC are within 0.1km of the Site. There are six other SINCs within 2km of the Site (see Appendix 1).

Protected Species
4.5 Records of protected and notable species within 2km of the Site were obtained from GiGL (see Appendix 1). European eel which is a Species of Principal Importance on Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and a Tower Hamlet BAP species have been recorded within 0.1km of the site. Stonechat (Saxicola rubicola) (listed in the GiGL desk study data as being a local species of Conservation Concern) was recorded within the Site in 2003. There are also previous records of three bat species being present within 1km of the Site.

4.6 Black redstart (Phoenicurus ochruros) has been recorded within 2km of the Site, with the most recent record from 2011. This species is specially protected by Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and is a priority species in the Tower Hamlets BAP.

Non-native Invasive Species
4.7 GiGL data obtained includes records of Japanese knotweed being present in the wider area along the Channelsea River. It was also recorded to 0.1km north of the Site in 2011. Floating pennywort (Hydrocotyle ranunculoides) was been recorded within the Site in 2003 and 1.0km west of the Site in 2008. Chinese mitten crab (Eriocheir sinensis) was recorded 0.1km east of the Site in 2012.

Phase 1 Habitat Survey
4.8 The habitats present throughout the Site are detailed below, and shown on Figure 1. Target notes are given in Appendix 2, and site photographs are given in Appendix 3.
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4.9 The majority of the Site is comprised of Buildings and associated roads, car parks and pathways. Thirteen buildings were present throughout the Site. Six of these buildings were surveyed externally for their suitability to support roosting bats. The remaining eight buildings were not accessible.

4.10 Tesco Bromley by Bow is in the centre of the Site; this is a two storey, brick building with a mansard style, tiled roof. A small, single storey brick building with a flat roof housing electrical plant is located in the centre of the Site, to the south-west of the Tesco building. Four buildings are present within the Danescroft land, in the south-west corner of the Site. The first is a five storey brick building, with a flat roof. The second is a two storey brick building with a flat roof. The third is a metal storage shed that is open on three sides, containing a small single storey brick building with a flat roof. All three of these buildings are derelict and are open, with missing windows or wall sections. A single storey temporary office structure is also present within the Danescroft land.

Amenity Grassland

4.11 Amenity grassland is present in the north-west of the Site (Plate 1), and outside the Site boundary to the east of the River Lee. Plant species present include annual meadow grass (*Poa annua*), perennial rye grass (*Lolium perenne*), dandelion (*Taraxacum* sp.), and daisy (*Bellis perennis*). These species are all typical of amenity grassland habitat.

Poor Semi-improved Grassland

4.12 A small area of poor semi-improved grassland is present within the south-west of the Site (Plate 2). Plants species recorded included cock’s-foot grass (*Dactylis glomerata*), annual meadow grass, cleavers (*Galium aparine*), common mouse-ear (*Cerastium fontanum*), creeping cinquefoil (*Potentilla reptans*), ragwort (*Jacobaea vulgaris*) and Canadian fleabane (*Conyza canadensis*). These plant species present are common and widespread grass and wildflowers characteristic of disturbed urban habitats.

Ornamental Shrubs and Trees

4.13 Ornamental shrubs and trees are present throughout the Site, in particular within the centre and in the west of the Site (Plate 3). Species include cotoneaster species, acacia species and false acacia (*Robinia pseudoacacia*).

Scattered Scrub

4.14 A small stand of scattered buddleia (*Buddleja davidii*) scrub is present in the south-west of the Site, adjacent to the Site boundary.

Single Broadleaved Trees

4.15 Single broadleaved trees are present within the centre and east of the Site (Plate 4), and outside the Site boundary to the east of the River Lee. Species include cherry (*Prunus* sp.), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*), silver birch (*Betula pendula*) and willow (*Salix* sp.).

Tall Ruderal

4.16 A stand of tall ruderal vegetation is present to the east of the River Lee, outside the Site boundary (Plate 5). Species include common nettle (*Urtica dioica*), bramble (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.), common mallow (*Malva neglecta*), cow parsley (*Anthriscus sylvestris*) and burdock (*Arctium lappa*).

Running Water

4.17 The River Lee is directly adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Site (Plate 6). The banks of the River where it is adjacent to the Site boundary are comprised of corrugated metal or sloped cement. There are also lengths of artificial reed bed containing common reed (*Phragmites australis*) present.

Invasive Species

4.18 A stand of Japanese knotweed is present outside the Site boundary on the western bank of the Channelsea River, to the east of the Site (Plate 7).
Refuse Tip

4.19 An area in the south of the Site contains refuse with no vegetation (Plate 8).

Protected Species

Bat Roost Suitability - Buildings

4.20 Six buildings within the Site were assessed externally for their suitability to support roosting bats. Three of these were assessed as having low suitability to support roosting bats, and three were assessed as having negligible value to roosting bats. These are detailed below. Site photographs are given in Appendix 3.

British Land

4.21 The Tesco Bromley by Bow building is a two storey brick building with a mansard style tiled roof. Missing, lifted and cracked tiles were observed on all roof faces, providing potential roosting features for crevice dwelling species such as pipistrelle bats (Pipistrellus sp.). Some ridge tiles on the east, south and west roof faces had missing mortar. These potential roosting features are shown in Plate 9 to 12.

4.22 Overall the Tesco Bromley by Bow Superstore building was assessed as having a low suitability to support roosting bats.

4.23 A small, single storey brick building with a flat roof is present in the south of the British Land parcel, and in the centre of the overall Site. This is thought to house electrical plant. Vents are present on all faces but do not allow access into the building (Plate 13).

4.24 Overall this building was assessed as having a negligible suitability to support roosting bats.

Danescroft Land

4.25 Four buildings within the Danescroft site were assessed externally for their suitability to support roosting bats.

4.26 The first building is a five storey derelict building, brick built with a flat roof (Plate 14). The building is open, with missing windows. All visible roof voids were open due to missing and collapsed ceiling tiles. On the southern face of the building, three holes are present under a ridge (Plate 15), with a further hole present in the wall. There is also an area of lifted roof felt.

4.27 Overall this building was assessed as having a low suitability to support roosting bats.

4.28 The second building is a two storey derelict building, brick built with a flat roof (Plate 16). The building is open, with missing windows. Cracked mortar is present on the western and southern faces, providing a potential roosting feature for crevice dwelling bat species (Plate 17). An area of lifted wood at roof height on the eastern face of the building provides another crevice (Plate 18).

4.29 Overall this building was assessed as having a low suitability to support roosting bats.

4.30 The third building is a metal storage shed, which is open on three sides. An enclosed area is present to the south (Plate 19). Within the storage shed is a small single storey brick building with a pitched roof. One wall is missing.

4.31 Overall this building was assessed as having a negligible suitability to support roosting bats.

4.32 The fourth building is a small, single storey temporary office structure (Plate 20). There were no visible features on this structure. Overall this building was assessed as having negligible suitability to support roosting bats.

Lindhill, Vastint, LLDC and SHG Land

4.33 These areas of land all contain buildings. However they could not be fully accessed so could not be assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats.

Bat Roost Suitability – trees
4.34 One willow tree to the east of the River Lee, outside the Site boundary, has a western facing hole in the trunk. This was assessed as having low suitability to support roosting bats. Assuming this tree will not be affected by any redevelopment of the Site, no further survey work is required.

4.35 All other trees within and adjacent to the Site were assessed as having negligible suitability to support roosting bats.

*Nesting birds*

4.36 Scattered scrub, ornamental shrubs and trees within the Site have the potential to support nesting birds. A pair of magpies (*Pica pica*) was observed actively nesting in a silver birch tree within the Tesco car park. Pigeons were present within the five storey brick building within the Danescroft site. The Site lacks potential roost sites for black redstart, but there are desk study records for this species within 2km. In addition, the River Lee adjacent to the Site may provide foraging habitat for this species.

**Evaluation**

4.37 Making reference to Table 3-2, on the basis of the desk study and field work undertaken to date the important ecological features considered within this assessment are evaluated in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1: Evaluation of Ecological Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Importance Category</th>
<th>Further consideration required</th>
<th>Rationale for inclusion/non-inclusion in further assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley SPA / Ramsar site and Epping Forest SAC</td>
<td>International (Very high)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lee Valley SPA / Ramsar site and Epping Forest SAC are around 5.5km and 5.9km respectively from the Site. Distance from the Site means impacts on these LNR are unlikely, in the urban context of the illustrative masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Nature Reserves</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tower Hamlets LNR is around 0.9km of the site. Ackroyd Drive LNR is around 1.2km from the Site. Distance from the Site means impacts on these LNR are unlikely, in the urban context of the illustrative masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan SINCs</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lee Valley Metropolitan SINC and River Thames and Tidal Tributaries Metropolitan SINC are adjacent/within 0.1km to the Site. Adjacency increases potential for impacts on these sites as a consequence of the illustrative masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough SINCs</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Bow Back Rivers Borough Grade I SINC and Railside Land in Newham Borough Grade II SINC are adjacent/within 0.1km of the Site. Adjacency increases potential for impacts on these sites as a consequence of the illustrative masterplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitats within the Site</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Habitats have very limited ecological value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Importance Category</td>
<td>Further consideration required</td>
<td>Rationale for inclusion/non-inclusion in further assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings assessed to have low potential to support roosting bats</td>
<td>Local (Very low)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Absence of a bat roost will need to be confirmed prior to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other buildings within Site</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Buildings have no ecological value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species – black redstart</td>
<td>County (medium)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Although the Site currently holds no potential to support roosting, this species could forage along the adjacent River Lee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species – breeding birds (excluding black redstart)</td>
<td>Local (Very low)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Absence of nesting birds will need to be confirmed prior to demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species – bats</td>
<td>County (medium)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Although the Site currently holds no potential to support roosting or foraging bats, the design of lighting could affect bat species using the adjacent water courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species – European eel</td>
<td>County (Medium)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Potential impacts on adjacent water courses could affect European eel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF THE ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN
DESCRIPTION OF THE ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN

Introduction

5.1 This section provides a description of the illustrative masterplan in relation to Ecology. This section also outlines the redevelopment parameters which are applicable to the assessment of a worst-case scenario for Ecology.

Review of Illustrative Masterplan

5.2 The illustrative masterplan comprises the following uses and quantum of development:

- 1,690 residential units;
- 4,160m² gross internal area (GIA) workspace;
- 2,324m² GIA retail (excluding the new Tesco store);
- 1,341m² GIA retail store (Tesco);
- 727m² GIA social infrastructure;
- 2,844m² GIA primary school;
- Parking; and
- Public open space, public realm, communal courtyards and play areas.

5.3 The following elements of the Illustrative Masterplan have been reviewed to inform this assessment:

- Karakusevic Carson Architects (KCA) illustrative floor plans dated 29/02/2016 (KCA drawings 266-A-D-100-00, 266-A-D-100-05 and 266-A-D-100-Roof); and
- Open space provision, including new planting.

5.4 A plan (provided by KCA) showing the illustrative ground floor open space and block layouts is provided in Figure 3.

Environmental Design and Management

5.5 Design measures which are included within the design of the illustrative masterplan which will aid in reducing environmental effects / provide enhancements and include.

- Provision of a canal side park;
- Provision of brown roofs; and
- Provision of formal and informal open spaces, including pocket parks and communal courtyards within the built development.
Figure 3 – Illustrative Open Space
POTENTIAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Introduction

6.1 This section outlines the significance of likely operational effects of the illustrative masterplan in relation to ecology and provides mitigation measures and further considerations recommended for later detailed design associated with any future planning application for the Site, or any part thereof.

Operational Effects

Lighting

Bats

6.2 The illustrative masterplan has potential to increase the levels of illumination along the adjacent River Lee Metropolitan SINC. Desk study data indicates that bat species are likely to use the Lee as foraging and commuting habitat. However, it is assumed that as good practice lighting design would aim to minimise light pollution onto the River Lee though good design (use of capped, directional or cowled light units and no lighting proposed in the water or directed towards to water). Therefore, this is considered to be a very low magnitude adverse impact on a feature of County (medium) value, resulting in a negligible effect on conservation status of bat species overall.

Eels

6.3 The illustrative masterplan has potential to increase the levels of illumination along the adjacent River Lee. Desk study data indicates that European eel species are likely to be present within the River Lee. It is assumed that lighting would be designed to avoid light pollution (see paragraph 6.2). This would consider the aquatic environment and avoid direct lighting of watercourses, where reasonably practical, to avoid inhibiting movements of photophobic species such as eel.

6.4 Therefore, this is considered to be a very low magnitude adverse impact on a feature of County (Medium) value, resulting in a negligible effect on conservation status of European eel.

Landscaping

River Lee and other Metropolitan SINCs

6.5 Creation of new green spaces along the River Lee Metropolitan SINC will enhance the function of this water course as a habitat corridor. Once established, brown roofs and new areas of green space within the development will also help encourage habitat connectivity between the Site and the the wider landscape (including River Thames and Tidal Tributaries Metropolitan SINC and London’s Canals Metropolitan SINC). Overall, establishment of new areas of planting and green space is considered to be a low magnitude beneficial effect on SINC sites of County (Medium) value resulting in a non-significant minor beneficial effect on ecosystem function at a local level.

Tower Hamlets LBAP Species

6.6 Creation of brown roofs and green spaces will provide habitats for pollinator species, including bee species such as the brown-banded carder bee (Bombus humilis) which is a Tower Hamlets LBAP species. Privision of nest boxes in suitable areas of the Site also has potential to provide habitat for swift (Apus apus) and house sparrow (Passer domesticus) which are both Tower Hamlets LBAP species (house sparrow is also listed on Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006). Brown roof habitat will provide additional foraging habitat for black redstart. This is considered to be a low magnitude beneficial effect on a bird species of County (Medium) value resulting in a non-significant minor beneficial effect on conservation status of black redstart at a local level.
Additional Mitigation and Monitoring

Operational Phase Mitigation

Tower Hamlets LBAP Species

6.7 It is recommended that use of the brown roofs and green spaces within any future development proposals submitted for planning permission within the Site is monitored annually. The monitoring should aim to compare the annual survey data against a set of targets (for example, use of brown roofs by black redstart within 5 years). If habitats are not seen to be supporting target species, then it will be possible to take steps to address this.

Further Considerations for Detailed Design and Future Planning Applications

6.8 Site clearance works prior to construction will need to consider the potential presence of protected species including bats and nesting birds. Buildings assessed to have low potential to support roosting bats. Dusk emergence and dawn re-entry surveys should be undertaken by suitability qualified ecologists following the current best practice guidelines at time of works. If absence of a roost is confirmed, demolition works can proceed. If a roost is confirmed, a mitigation licence will be required to allow for demolition to take place. This licence will be informed by the guidelines issues by the licensing body (currently Natural England). Mitigation measures may be required, including provision of alternative roosting sites such as bat boxes.

6.9 Prior to demolition or site clearance, a suitability qualified ecologist will need to confirm the absence of any active bird’s nests.

6.10 It will be necessary to prepare a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) which would then be implemented during construction. This CEMP will include best practice measures to control noise and dust generated as a consequence of site clearance and development works, and also minimise the potential for pollution to enter the adjacent River Lee.

6.11 The non-native invasive plant species Japanese knotweed and floating pennywort have been recorded in close proximity to the Site. It will be a requirement to avoid spreading invasive species during site clearance works. Prior to works commencing, a suitability qualified ecologist will need to confirm the absence of invasive non-native weed species within the Site.
RESIDUAL EFFECTS
AND CONCLUSIONS
RESIDUAL EFFECTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

7.1 This section provides a summary of the residual effects for ecology.

Residual Effects

7.2 A summary of residual effects, which are both non-significant but minor beneficial, is given in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Summary of Residual Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Effect</th>
<th>Sensitivity of resource / receptor</th>
<th>Magnitude of impact (incorporating environmental design and management)</th>
<th>Initial classification of effect and statement of significance</th>
<th>Mitigation and Monitoring</th>
<th>Residual Effect and (re)statement of significance (incorporating mitigation and monitoring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed and Occupied Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Lee and other Metropolitan SINC</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor beneficial (not significant)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minor beneficial (not significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets BAP Species</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor beneficial (not significant)</td>
<td>Annual monitoring of Site</td>
<td>Minor beneficial (not significant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

7.3 The Site is currently of limited ecological value, as it is comprised mainly of buildings and hardstanding. The adjacent River Lee Metropolitan SINC is part of the Blue Ribbon Network of water ways. As such, it is an important ecological feature on the local context and also in the context of the wider landscape. The illustrative masterplan includes a several new areas of green space including parks, courtyards and brown roofs. Along with any new areas of green space included in the masterplan for the adjacent Bromley by Bow North development, these will help link the River Lee Metropolitan SINC and other SINC sites within the proximity of the Site with the wider landscape, and help create a network of sites of ecological value in line with national and local planning policy listed in Section 2.
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

Introduction

8.1 This section provides an assessment of cumulative effects in relation to ecology.

Assessment of Type 1 Interaction Effects

8.2 Given the urban context of the Site and the limited ecological value of the baseline situation, no interaction effects are anticipated.

Assessment of Type 2 In-Combination Effects with Committed Developments

8.3 As described in Section 7, there are potential for minor (non-significant) ecological benefits as a consequence of the illustrative masterplan, associated with the provision of new areas of green space and brown roofs. Assuming other proposed new developments listed in Table 3-6 (in particular Stand East) also provide new areas of green space as part of these developments, this will help enhance the connectivity between the River Lee and other SINC sites and the wider landscape.
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## Appendix 1 - Desk Study Data from Greenspace Information for Greater London

### Statutory Sites within 2km of the Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Reason(s) for Designation</th>
<th>Relationship to the Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park LNR</td>
<td>This 19th Century cemetery comprises ancient broadleaved woodland, wildflower meadows and three ponds. The site supports 25 butterfly and 40 bird species.</td>
<td>0.9km west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackroyd Drive Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</td>
<td>This site forms a green corridor between the Cemetery Park LNR and Mile End Park LNR. The site comprises woodland and wildflower meadows and supports birds, butterflies and plants uncommon in London.</td>
<td>1.2km west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation</td>
<td>This site represents Atlantic acidophilous beech forests in the north-eastern part of the habitat's UK range. There is a long history of pollarding and a large number of veteran trees. The site is also rich in fungi and dead-wood invertebrates. Epping Forest supports the Annex II species stag beetle (<em>Lucanus cervus</em>).</td>
<td>5.5km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Ramsar and Special Protection Area</td>
<td>This site comprises a series of wetlands and reservoirs. The site supports 6% of the wintering population of bittern (<em>Botaurus stellaris</em>) in Great Britain, as well as gadwall (<em>Anas strepera</em>) and shoveler (<em>Anas clypeata</em>).</td>
<td>5.9km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-statutory Sites within 2km of the Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Reason(s) for Designation</th>
<th>Relationship to the Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Valley Metropolitan Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)</td>
<td>This site includes the River Lee Navigation, River Lea and associated watercourses. These support a diverse aquatic flora, including the nationally rare and specially-protected creeping marshwort (<em>Apium repens</em>) within Walthamstow Marshes, the second of only two sites remaining in the country. The site is also importance for its avifauna and invertebrates.</td>
<td>Adjacent to the east of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Thames and Tidal Tributaries Metropolitan SINC</td>
<td>This site comprises a number of valuable habitats not found elsewhere in London, and is of particular importance for wildfowl and wading birds. There are also over 100 species of fish present.</td>
<td>&lt;0.1km east of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London’s Canals Metropolitan SINC</td>
<td>The canals support a wide range of aquatic flora, including a number of locally uncommon species. The canals also support an important invertebrate fauna and breeding waterfowl.</td>
<td>0.4km south of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets Cemetery Park and the Soanes Centre Metropolitan SINC</td>
<td>A large Victorian cemetery containing woodland, scrub, grassland and several ponds.</td>
<td>0.9km west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Back Rivers Borough Grade I SINC</td>
<td>This site comprises artificial channels connected to the River Lea, and areas of wasteland beside these. The rivers support a good diversity of fish and some wetland vegetation.</td>
<td>&lt;0.1km east of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley-by-Bow War Memorial Wood</td>
<td>This site contains one of the few areas of woodland in Newham.</td>
<td>0.3km south of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Reason(s) for Designation</td>
<td>Relationship to the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Borough Grade I SINC              | **The Greenway and Old Ford Nature Reserve**  
Borough Grade I SINC  
**The Greenway** comprises grassland, scrub and sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*) woodland. The site supports some uncommon plants and a good range of invertebrates.  
**Old Ford Nature Reserve** comprises grassland, tall herb vegetation and scrub, and supports breeding birds and butterflies. | 0.7km north-east of the Site                           |
| Railside Land in Newham           | **Borough Grade II SINC**  
**This site** comprises a network of railways with strips of undisturbed habitat that supports birds, reptiles, mammals and invertebrates.                                                                                   | 0.1km east of the Site                                 |
| Old Railway at Fairfoot Road       | **Local SINC**  
**This embankment** is mainly covered in dense woodland that supports a good selection of common birds. The east of the site comprises grassland.                                                                     | 0.8km west of the Site                                 |
| Perring Community Garden          | **Local SINC**  
**This community garden** comprises vegetable and herb beds with low hedges of box (*Buxus sempervirens*) and yew (*Taxus baccata*). Numerous trees are scattered around the site. The site supports common bird species, butterflies and bats. | 0.9km south-west of the Site                           |

**Protected and Notable Species Records within 2km**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Legally Protected</th>
<th>Species of Principal Importance?</th>
<th>Other Notable Species?</th>
<th>Present on Site?</th>
<th>Possibly Present on Site?</th>
<th>Present / Potentially Present in Wider Zone of Influence?</th>
<th>Supporting Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cornflower</strong> (<em>Centaurea cyanus</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European eel</strong> (<em>Anguilla Anguilla</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.1km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingfisher</strong> (<em>Alcedo atthis</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Osprey</strong> (<em>Pandion haliaetus</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0km north-west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House sparrow</strong> (<em>Passer domesticus</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4km north-west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green sandpiper</strong> (<em>Tringa ochropus</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2km south-west of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stonechat</strong> (<em>Saxicola rubicola</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recorded within the Site in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skylark</strong> (<em>Alauda arvensis</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reed bunting</strong> (<em>Emberiza schoeniclus</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Legally Protected</td>
<td>Species of Principal Importance</td>
<td>Other Notable Species</td>
<td>Present on Site?</td>
<td>Possibly Present on Site?</td>
<td>Present / Potentially Present in Wider Zone of Influence?</td>
<td>Supporting Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brambling (<em>Fringilla montifringilla</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curlew (<em>Numenius arquata</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree sparrow (<em>Passer montanus</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwing (<em>Turdus iliacus</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldfare (<em>Turdus pilaris</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapwing (<em>Vanellus vanellus</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 1km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black redstart (<em>Phoenicurus ochruros</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 2km of the Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noctule bat (<em>Nyctalus noctula</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.8km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common pipistrelle (<em>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.2km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano pipistrelle (<em>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.6km north of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey tiger (<em>Euplagia quadripunctaria</em>)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Within 10km of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese knotweed (<em>Fallopia japonica</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present in the wider area along the Channelsea River. Also recorded to 0.1km north of the Site in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating pennywort (<em>Hydrocotyle ranunculoides</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Recorded within the Site in 2003 and 1.0km west of the Site in 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese mitten crab (<em>Eriocheir sinensis</em>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>0.1km east of the Site in 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to symbols: ✓ = yes, see Supporting Comments for further rationale

Legally protected species are those listed under Schedules 1, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); and, Schedules 2 and 4 of The Conservation of Habitat & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).

Species of Principal Importance as those listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006. Planning Authorities have a legal duty under Section 40 of the same Act to consider such species when determining planning applications.

Other notable species include native species of conservation concern listed in the LBAP (except species that are also of Principal Importance), those that are Nationally Rare, Scarce or Red Data List, and non-native controlled weed species listed under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Also bird species listed as being of local conservation concern by GiGL.
Appendix 2 - Phase 1 Habitat Survey – Target Notes

See Phase 1 habitat map, Figure 1

1. Hard standing with scattered buddleia and patches of ephemeral vegetation, species include black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), Yorkshire fog (*Holcus lanatus*), dandelion and acacia saplings.

2. A small single storey portacabin type structure with negligible bat roost potential.

3. A five storey derelict brick building with a flat roof. The building is open as there are no windows. The roof voids are open due to missing and collapsed ceiling tiles. On the southern face are 4 holes and lifted felt providing roosting features for bats. The building has been assessed as having low potential to support for roosting bats.

4. A two storey derelict brick building with a flat roof. The building is open as there are no windows. On the western and southern faces lifted and missing mortar provides crevices, as does lifted wood on the eastern face. This building has been assessed as having low potential to support roosting bats.

5. A single storey metal storage shed, open on three sides, with a small single storey brick building within it. The brick building is open on one side. The structure has been assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats.

6. A derelict corrugated metal warehouse with no windows and a pitched roof. Roof void is not accessible. Some crevices but this building was not fully accessed so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.

7. A single storey brick building with a flat roof. This building was not accessed and so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.

8. A two storey brick building with a flat roof. This building was not accessed and so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.

9. A single storey brick building with a flat roof thought to contain electrical plant. This building was assessed as having negligible potential to support roosting bats.

10. Tesco Bromley by Bow superstore: a two storey brick building with a mansard style tiled roof. Features such as missing and broken tiles are present on all roof faces. This building was assessed as having low potential to support roosting bats.

11. Ornamental planters with newly planted immature non-native trees.

12. A two storey brick building with a flat roof. This building was not accessed and so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.

13. A two storey brick building with a flat roof. This building was not accessed and so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.

14. A two storey brick and metal building with a pitched roof. This building was not accessed and so cannot be assessed for its potential to support roosting bats.
15. An area of ornamental non-native shrubs and trees

16. The River Lee with an area of artificial reed bed containing common reed. The banks of this river are a mix of corrugated metal and sloping concrete. To the east of the River (near the south of the Site) is an area of amenity grassland with some trees.

17. A silver birch tree containing an active magpie nest.

18. A willow tree outside the Site boundary with a western-facing hole. This tree was assessed as having a low potential to support roosting bats.

19. A stand of Japanese knotweed on the bank of the Channelsea River, approximately 10m². Some canes have been snapped.
Appendix 3: Site Photographs

Plate 1. Amenity grassland present in the north-west of the Site.

Plate 2. Poor semi-improved grassland in the south-west of the Site.
Plate 3. Ornamental shrubs within the Tesco car park

Plate 4. Broadleaved trees within the Tesco car park. Note active magpie nest.
Plate 5. An area of tall ruderal vegetation outside the Site boundary

Plate 6. The River Lee running alongside the Site, with an artificial reed bed.

Plate 8. Refuse tip in the south of the Site
Plate 1. The Tesco Bromley by Bow Superstore looking south-west.

Plate 2. Missing tile on the southern roof face of the Tesco Bromley by Bow Superstore
Plate 3. Broken tile on a single storey overhang of the Tesco Bromley by Bow Superstore

Plate 4. Broken and missing tiles on the western roof face of the Tesco Bromley by Bow Superstore

Plate 5. Single storey building with negligible suitability to support roosting bats.
Plate 6. Five storey derelict building with low suitability to support roosting bats.

Plate 7. Holes beneath a ridge on the southern face of the building.
Plate 8. Two storey derelict building with low suitability to support roosting bats

Plate 9. Lifted mortar providing a crevice on the southern face of the building
Plate 10. Lifted wooden board providing a crevice on the eastern side of the building

Plate 11. Metal storage shed containing a small single storey brick building with negligible suitability to support roosting bats.
Plate 12. Small temporary office structure with negligible suitability to support roosting bats
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