

ECOLOGICAL SURVEY OF LAND AT
EDF SITE,
STANLEY ROAD, SOUTH HARROW

Prepared for:
ZED Homes Ltd
Congress house
Suit 2, Third Floor
Lyon Road
Harrow, Middlesex
HA1 2EN

Prepared by:
Jaquelin Fisher Associates Ltd
4 Yukon Road
London
SW12 9PU

Oct 2006

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND	2
2. METHODOLOGY	2
DESK STUDY	2
FIELD SURVEYS	2
3. DESK STUDY RESULTS	3
DESIGNATED SITES	3
PROTECTED SPECIES AND BAP SPECIES	3
4. RESULTS OF THE FIELD SURVEYS	4
RUDERAL SCRUB/SEMI-IMPROVED GRASSLAND	4
BATS	4
BADGERS	5
BIRDS	5
REPTILES AND AMPHIBIANS	5
5. DISCUSSION	5
HABITATS	5
SPECIES	5
ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION METHODS	6
6. CONCLUSIONS	6

1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

- 1.1 Jaquelin Fisher Associates Ltd (JFA) was commissioned by ZED Homes Ltd to undertake an ecological survey on the EDF Site, Stanley Road, South Harrow, Middlesex in October 2006. This report has been required to support a planning application for the site.
- 1.2 The proposed development site currently consists of an area (2034 Sqm) of wasteland situated approximately 0.5 km north west of South Harrow Tube Station, just off the A312. Green Avenue borders the site to the north west, a sub station is situated directly to the west and there is light industry to the east. Demolition works were in progress to the south of the site.
- 1.3 At the time of the survey the site consisted of an area of poor semi-improved grassland with patches of scrub and numerous trees on the north and eastern boundaries. Trees in the central and eastern part of the site had been felled and scrub cleared.
- 1.4 Section 2 of this report sets out the methodology of JFA's survey. In section 3 the results of the desk survey are presented. The field results are presented in section 4. Discussion and implications for development is found in section 5. Conclusions are given in section 6.

2. METHODOLOGY

Desk Study

- 2.1 A desk study and field surveys were undertaken to obtain baseline information. The methods used are presented below. Biological records for statutory and non-statutory designated wildlife sites, ancient woodland, specially protected species, and species of conservation concern at the site and surrounding 1 km were researched from the following:
 - Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL)

Field Surveys

- 2.2 Rosalind Salter BSc (Hons) MSc AIEEM undertook a Phase 1 habitat survey on 18th October 2006. The surveyor identified the habitats present, following the standard 'Phase 1 habitat survey' auditing method developed by the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC). The site was surveyed on foot and the existing habitats and land uses were recorded on an appropriately scaled map (NCC 1990). In addition, the dominant plant species in each habitat were recorded, as was any

evidence of protected species. The potential for the site to support protected species was also assessed.

3. DESK STUDY RESULTS

Designated Sites

3.1 The desk study results did not reveal any statutory or non-statutory or ancient woodland designation for any part of the proposed development site. No statutory sites were recorded within 1 km of the site boundary, however, five non-statutory sites were recorded. These include Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), listed below, which have been identified by the Greater London Authority on account of their flora and fauna. They are of greater London or regional importance.

Designated Sites	Approximate distance to proposed development site (km)	Site description
Non- Statutory Sites		
Halsbury Road Railway Cutting SINC (Grade I)	0.67	Relatively undisturbed mixed woodland in a railway cutting
Wood End Railway Crossing SINC (Grade I)	0.67	Mixed grassland, secondary woodland, tall herbs.
Rayners lane Railsides SINC (Grade II)	0.45	Mix of grassland, scrub and developing woodland.
Newton Park and Newton Park Ecology Centre (SINC)	0.60	Mix of grassland, wetland, secondary woodland.
Orley Farm School Nature Conservation area (SINC)	0.85	Pond/Lake, Secondary woodland, semi-improved neutral grassland.

3.2 No direct or indirect impacts are predicted on any of the SINC sites through the proposed development and are therefore not considered further in this report.

Protected Species and BAP Species

3.2 There are three Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) bird species recorded within 1 km of site. These are as follows; Starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) and the Bullfinch (*Pyrrhula pyrrhula*). All are priority species for London.

3.3 The desk study did not reveal any records of bat sightings or bat roosts within 1 km of the site boundary.

- 3.4 No other protected species, such as badgers, dormice or great crested newts were identified as inhabiting the immediate area through the desk study.

4. RESULTS OF THE FIELD SURVEYS

- 4.1 A total three habitats were recorded within the red line boundary of the proposed development site, namely: (1) Ruderal scrub; (2) Semi-improved grassland; and (3) Trees, as presented on Figure 2.
- 4.2 The habitats found on site are all of low ecological value with habitats that are both common and widespread. The proposed development site is on a Brownfield site which has been previously disturbed.

Ruderal Scrub/Semi-improved grassland

- 4.3 Scrub was recorded around the boundary of the site. The central and eastern section of the site had previously been covered in scrub, however, at the time of the survey this had been cleared and piled in the centre of the surveyed piece of land. Species found included; Common Bent (*Agrostis tenuis*), Nettles (*Urtica dioica*), Bramble (*Rubus fruticosus*), Redleg (*Persicaria amplexicaulis*), Michaelmas Daisy (*Aster sp.*), Creeping Buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*), Vetch (*Vicia sp.*). Cleavers (*Galium aparine*), Clover (*Trifolium sp.*) and Bindweed (*Convolvulus sp.*). These species are common on damp waste ground.

Trees

- 4.4 Some mature trees were located on the north and eastern borders. Other trees found in the centre of the site had recently been felled. Mature tree species included; Cherry (*Prunus sp.*), Oak (*Quercus sp.*), Copper Beech (*Fagus sylvatica 'purpurea'*), Common Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) and Cypress (*Chamaecyparis sp.*). A large Weeping Willow (*Salix x sepulcralis*), with its roots off site to the east, has grown over into the site by approximately 5m. Immature trees and saplings included Ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), Holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), Birch (*Betula sp.*), Hawthorn and Oak.

Bats

- 4.5 Trees on site were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats. No evidence of bats was found on the site and the trees were deemed to have very low potential to support roosting bats.

Badgers

- 4.6 No evidence of badgers foraging or badger setts were found on site or within 30 meters of the site boundary.

Birds

- 4.7 The site has some potential to support nesting birds, especially in some of the more mature trees found on site. A Black bird and Robin were recorded during the survey. No BAP species were found using this site.

Reptiles and Amphibians

- 4.8 No reptiles or amphibians were found on site. However, the north east corner of the site has the potential to support reptiles and amphibians, such as the common toad (*Bufo bufo*). Over grown rubble and dead wood found here was evaluated as having some potential to support common reptile species such as the slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*) (Figure 2 – Target note 1). Rubble and dead wood serves as a refuge for the slow worms and the open nature of parts of the site provides a suitable basking environment.
- 4.9 No water bodies were present, on or close to the site, therefore this site is not deemed suitable habitat to support great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*).

5. DISCUSSION

- 5.1 In this section the results of the field survey are discussed. The habitats and species found within the redline boundary for the proposed development are discussed followed by the implications of the development on these. Possible opportunities for enhancement at the site are given at the end of this section.

Habitats

- 5.2 The habitats found at this site are all common, widespread and previously disturbed. These habitats are of low ecological value. No specially protected species were recorded as using the site.
- 5.3 The development aims to maintain as many of the mature border trees as possible. Open spaces incorporated within the design should be enhanced through the planting of species of local provenance which will encourage and increase the foraging opportunities for birds and insect species.

Species

- 5.4 No evidence of roosting bats was found during this survey.

5.5 No evidence of badgers using the site was found. The site is therefore not constrained by badgers.

5.6 No evidence of reptiles or amphibians was found on the site. However, the site does hold some potential to support these species.

Enhancement and Mitigation Methods

5.7 Bird boxes could be erected on retained trees within the development site to encourage birds to nest and breed within the area.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Overall this site is of low ecological value. The habitats that are found at the site are unexceptional and common. No ecological features were found during this survey to constrain the principle of the development at this site.