CASSEL HOTELS (CAMBRIDGE) LIMITED



Part of the ES Group

HOTEL FELIX, WHITEHOUSE LANE, CAMBRIDGE

Biodiversity Net Gain Report

February 2021 9153.BNGreport.vf

ecology solutions for planners and developers

COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this document remains with Ecology Solutions The contents of this document therefore must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of Ecology Solutions.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	BIODIVERSITY METRIC 2.0	2
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF METRIC	3
4	EVALUATION	5
5	POLICY AND LEGAL CONTEXT	8
6	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	10

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1	Topographical Survey, Drawing No.: 36289_T Rev 0
APPENDIX 2	Landscape General Arrangement, Drawing No.: LD-PLN-200- 201

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background & Proposals

- 1.1.1. Ecology Solutions was commissioned by Cassel Hotels (Cambridge) Limited to undertake work to ascertain that the proposed development at Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge delivers a long-term net gain for biodiversity through the application of the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 Calculation Tool¹.
- 1.1.2. The current proposals for the site are for the development of an 80-bed residential care home with associated access, car park and landscaping (including residents' gardens, a formal courtyard and a sensory garden). The proposals require the demolition of the existing buildings.

1.2. Site Characteristics

- 1.2.1. The site comprises the existing built form of Hotel Felix, alongside associated buildings and significant areas of car parking and access. Areas of established amenity planting and amenity grassland are present across the site alongside scattered trees and amenity hedgerows. Further hedgerows and semi-mature trees are present on the margins of the site.
- 1.2.2. The site is located in the northwest of the city of Cambridge; Whitehouse Lane separates the site from residential dwellings, which also lie to the west of the site and form the village of Girton. Immediately north and south lie arable fields, and further to the north and west lie the M11 motorway and the A14 trunk road approximately 1.1km west and 0.9km north of the site respectively.

1.3. Biodiversity Net Gain Report

1.3.1. This document assesses the level of Biodiversity Net Gain within the site. This report has been prepared with due consideration to the guidance published by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)²³ in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain. This assessment has been based around the results of the 2020 habitat surveys.

¹ Natural England (2019). The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 – Calculation Tool – Beta Test December 2019.

² CIEEM (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain. Good Practice Principles for Development, A Practical Guide.

³ CIEEM, CIRIA, IEMA (2016). Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development.

2. BIODIVERSITY METRIC 2.0

2.1. The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 uses habitat features as a proxy measure for capturing the value and importance of nature. It uses calculations to assess the importance of each habitat based on its size, ecological condition, location and its connectivity.

2.2. Methodology

- 2.2.1. Measurements for habitats pre-development were calculated using the Topographical Survey (Drawing No.: 36289_T Rev 0, see Appendix 1). Information regarding the habitats present as well as their condition were based on survey results obtained in 2020. The Biodiversity Technical Supplement⁴, as well as professional judgment, was used to inform the habitats' condition criteria, as well as any connectivity score.
- 2.2.2. Preliminary calculations were undertaken using LUC's (Land Use Consultants) Landscape General Arrangement, Drawing No.: LD-PLN-200-201 (see Appendix 2). Final figures for the proposed habitats were later provided by LUC.

⁴ Natural England (2019). *The Biodiversity Metric 2.0, Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity, Technical Supplement, Beta Edition.* Natural England Joint Publication JP029.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF METRIC

3.1. This section should be read in conjunction with the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool which can be viewed below.

3.2. Baseline Habitat (Pre-Development)

3.2.1. Table 3.1 below summarises the habitats present on site.

Baseline habitat	Baseline Biodiversity Units	Ecological Features	Impact	After works
Urban - Amenity Grassland	1.370	A small area of grassland is present throughout the site. The grassland is currently not subject to any management regime; however, it does support a good range of common grassland species.	Some areas of grassland will be retained as part of the development, whilst the incorporation of new wildflower grassland will compensate for the loss of some of this habitat.	0.13 units retained, 1.25 units lost
Urban - Street Tree	0.770	A number of semi-mature trees are present across the site, associated with amenity planting, the site boundaries, amenity grassland adjacent to the main hotel building and along the roadside.	The majority of the trees within the site (62) will be retained, whilst 9 are proposed for relocation and 13 will be removed. Additional trees, including native and fruit-bearing species, will be planted throughout the site post development.	0.66 units retained, 0.11 units lost
Urban - Introduced Scrub	0.380	Areas of amenity planting are present along the boundaries of the site as well as within the car park areas.	Areas of amenity planting will be lost as part of the development. However, the loss of this habitat will be compensated by the planting of new native species, as well as the planting of other amenity species.	0.1 units retained, 0.28 units lost
Urban - Developed Land; Sealed Surface	0.000	A significant proportion of the site comprises hardstanding. Buildings are also present in the centre of the site and to the northwest.	The buildings will be demolished and replaced whilst a variety of hardstanding (i.e. gravel, paving, tarmac) will replace current surfaces.	N/A
Native Hedgerow	0.706	Amenity hedgerows are present throughout the site, separating the car park, adjacent road and amenity planting and grassland areas.	Lengths of amenity hedgerows will be lost as part of the development. However, the losses will be compensated by the planting of new native hedgerows.	0.312 units retained, 0.394 units lost
Native Species Rich Hedgerow with Trees	6.584	Hedgerows are present throughout the site, primarily associated with the site boundaries in the north and south.	Additional native hedgerows are proposed as part of the development.	6.584 units retained, 0 units lost

3.3. **Post-Development**

- 3.3.1. Table 3.2 below summarises the habitats that will be present on-site postdevelopment.
- 3.3.2. Overall, there is an increase of 1.88 habitat biodiversity units, which results in a gain of 74.49% for habitat units.
- 3.3.3. There is also a gain in linear features i.e., hedgerows. A gain of 2.82 hedgerow units has been achieved through the provision of ornamental and native hedgerows, a gain of 38.72%.

		Newly Created Habitats
Newly Created Habitat	Biodiversity Units Delivered	Ecological Features
Urban - Amenity Grassland	0.18	Grasslands will be sown a shade tolerant mix, e.g. Emorsgate EG23 Shade Tolerant Lawn Grass Mixture or similar, and will be frequently managed grassland which is likely to be subject to moderate to heavy disturbance.
Grassland - Other Neutral Grassland	2.41	Areas of wildflower meadow are proposed throughout the site, and will be sown with a mix, e.g. Emorsgate EM1 General Purpose Meadow Mixture, Emorsgate EM5 Meadow Mixture for Loamy Soils or Emorsgate EL1 Flowering Lawn Mixture or similar.
Urban - Introduced Shrub	0.86	A diverse range of introduced and native species will be included within this habitat.
Urban - Intensive Green Roof	0.00	The development includes areas of species-rich biodiverse roof. The green roofs will comprise a number of wildflowers, herbs and flowering perennials.
Urban – Ground Based Green Wall	0.01	A mix of climbing plants, including Honeysuckle, Jasmine and Clematis 'Jackmanii' will be trained against building facades or pergolas within the development.
Urban - Street Tree	0.05	A diverse mix of native and fruit-bearing trees will be widespread throughout the development.
Hedge Ornamental Non Native	0.00	The hedgerows will be planted throughout the development, and will comprise a mixture of native species and non-native ornamental species.
Native Hedgerow	3.22	The hedgerows will be planted around the proposed sensory garden and arrival courtyard, and will compose of the native species Beech, to compliment the hedgerows already present.
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	0	Includes the new buildings and associated parking areas, footpaths and access roads.

 Table 3.2 Summary of Post-development Habitats.

4. EVALUATION

4.1. The Principles of Evaluation

Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principle for Development

- 4.1.1. CIRIA, CIEEM and IEMA have developed principles of good practice to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain. These principles provide a framework that helps improve the UK's biodiversity by contributing towards strategic priorities to conserve and enhance nature through sustainable development. There are ten principles in total, and all principles must be applied together as one approach. The ten principles are set out below.
- 4.1.2. **Principle 1. Apply Mitigation Hierarchy.** Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensation for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature conservation, then offset biodiversity losses by gains elsewhere.
- 4.1.3. **Principle 2. Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere.** Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity; these impacts cannot be offset to achieve no net loss or net gain.
- 4.1.4. **Principle 3. Be inclusive and equitable.** Engage stakeholders early, and involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluation the approach to net gain. Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible and share the benefits fairly among stakeholders.
- 4.1.5. **Principle 4. Address risks.** Mitigate difficulty, uncertainty and other risks to achieving Net Gain. Apply well accepted ways to add contingency when calculating biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and the gains being fully realised.
- 4.1.6. **Principle 5. Make a measurable net gain contribution.** Achieve a measurable, overall gain for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing towards nature conservation priorities.
- 4.1.7. **Principle 6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity.** Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly-justified choices when:
 - Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses.
 - Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation.
 - Achieving net gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regional and national levels.
 - Enhancing existing or creating new habitat.

- Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity.
- 4.1.8. **Principle 7. Be additional.** Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. do not deliver something that would occur anyway).
- 4.1.9. **Principle 8. Create a net gain legacy.** Ensure net gain generates long-term benefits by:
 - Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure net gain in perpetuity.
 - Planning for adaptive management and securing dedicated funding for long-term management.
 - Designing net gain for biodiversity to be resilient to external factors, especially climate change.
 - Mitigating risks from other land uses.
 - Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another.
 - Supporting local-level management of net gain activities.
- 4.1.10. **Principle 9. Optimise sustainability.** Prioritise Biodiversity Net Gain and, where possible, optimise the wider environmental benefits for a sustainable society and economy.
- 4.1.11. **Principle 10. Be transparent.** Communicate all net gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders.

Lawton's Principle

- 4.1.12. Principles for enhancing England's wildlife sites were developed as part of the Lawton Review⁵. Across the UK, these principles can be used to design Biodiversity Net Gain activities to boost wildlife sites. They are:
 - Improving the quality of wildlife sites;
 - Increasing the size of the wildlife sites;
 - Enhancing connections between, or joining up wildlife sites;
 - · Creating new wildlife sites; and
 - Reducing pressure on wildlife sites.

4.2. **Post-Development Evaluation**

- 4.2.1. The site's contribution to Biodiversity Net Gain has been assessed with due regard to the principles outlined and discussed above.
- 4.2.2. The site delivers a net gain of 74.49% in habitat units; there is also a gain in linear feature i.e. a net gain of 38.72% in hedgerow units.
- 4.2.3. The site delivers significant gains for biodiversity through the provision of new wildflower meadows, grassland, introduced native shrubbery, trees and biodiverse roofs.

⁵ Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2010). *Making Space for Nature: A Review of England's Wildlife Sites*. DEFRA.

4.2.4. In addition to the landscaping and enhancement of existing habitats, a number of bat and bird boxes will also be installed across the site and on suitable trees to increase nesting / roosting opportunities, whilst the installation of invertebrate boxes and the establishment of log piles for saproxylic species could also provide further enhancements on site for invertebrates.

5. POLICY AND LEGAL CONTEXT

- 5.1. The planning policy framework that relates to Biodiversity Net Gain at the site is issued nationally through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and locally through the local planning policies of the Cambridge Local Plan.
- 5.2. On 15 October 2019, the government introduced a new Bill to Parliament, the Environment Bill. This Bill is expected to become law in 2023.

5.3. National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

- 5.3.1. Guidance on national policy for Biodiversity Net Gain is provided by the NPPF, published in March 2012, revised on 24 July 2018 and updated on 19 February 2019. The following sections of the policy relate to Biodiversity Net Gain:
- 5.3.2. Paragraph 170(d) states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current future pressures.
- 5.3.3. Paragraph 174(b) states that to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and purse opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.
- 5.3.4. Paragraph 175(b) states that when determining planning application, local planning authorities should apply the following principle; development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.

5.4. Local Planning Policy

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (Adopted 2018)

- 5.4.1. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan was adopted on 27 September 2018 and is the principal development plan document guiding development in South Cambridgeshire. It updates and replaces the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework which was adopted between January 2007 and January 2010 and covered the period up to 2016. The Local Plan's policies and proposals cover the period 2011 to 2031. It contains five policies of particular relevance to nature conservation issues.
- 5.4.2. **Policy NH/4: Biodiversity** is concerned with permitting developments where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity through maintenance, enhancement, restoration or addition to achieve positive gain through the form and design of development.

- 5.4.3. **Policy NH/5: Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance** is concerned with developments which may have an adverse impact on land within or adjoining a Site of Biodiversity or Geological Importance. Exceptions to this may be made only where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse impacts.
- 5.4.4. **Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure** will aim to conserve and enhance green infrastructure within the district. The policy also states that proposals which cause loss or harm to the green infrastructure network will not be permitted unless the needs for and benefits of the development demonstrably and substantially outweigh any adverse impacts. All new developments are also required to contribute towards the enhancement of the green infrastructure network within the district. These contributions will include the establishment, enhancement and the on-going management costs.
- 5.4.5. Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development In and Adjoining the Green Belt states that developments within the Green Belt must not have an adverse effect on the openness and rural character of the Green Belt. Where development proposals are permitted, landscaping conditions will be attached to the planning permission to safeguard, and mitigate impacts upon, the Green Belt. The policy also states that "developments on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality".
- 5.4.6. Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt states that redevelopments within the greenbelt will be considered inappropriate unless the buildings are re-used, replacements are not proportionally larger than the original, infilling is limited, and the redevelopment does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

5.5. Environment Bill

5.5.1. A Government statement made on 23 July 2019 outlines further details about how the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement will be defined. The Government proposes that the requirement will come into force after a two-year transition period after the new Environment Bill for England receives royal assent.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1. Ecology Solutions was commissioned by Cassel Hotels (Cambridge) Limited to undertake work to assess whether the proposed site plan for Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge, delivers long-term net gain for biodiversity.
- 6.2. The proposals for the site are for the development of an 80-bed residential care home with associated access, gardens, car park and landscaping (including residents' gardens, a formal courtyard and a sensory garden). The proposals require the demolition of the existing buildings.
- 6.3. The site is currently dominated by a large building and several areas of hardstanding, with small areas of amenity planting, amenity grassland and hedgerows also present. No notable or protected plant species were recorded within the site.
- 6.4. The landscape scheme has been designed to ensure that gains for biodiversity are achieved. Proposals will increase the floristic diversity across the site, which in turn will attract a greater diversity and density of invertebrates and subsequently provide additional resources for foraging bats and birds. The proposed habitats also provide opportunities for nesting birds.
- 6.5. Overall, when based against the Biodiversity Metric version 2.0, the site delivers a net habitat gain of 74.49% and a net hedgerow gain of 38.72%.

Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 2.0 for Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge – Headline Results

	Habitat units	2.53
On-site baseline	Hedgerow units	7.29
	River units	0.00
On-site post-intervention	Habitat units	4.41
(Including habitat retention, creation, enhancement &	Hedgerow units	10.11
succession)	River units	0.00
	Habitat units	0.00
Off-site baseline	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Off_site post_intervention	Habitat units	0.00
On-site post-intervention	Hedgerow units	0.00
(Including habitat retention, creation, enhancement &	River units	0.00
Total net unit change	Habitat units	1.88
Total field affic change	Hedgerow units	2.82
(including all on-site & off-site habitat retention/creation)	River units	0.00
Total net % change	Habitat units	74.48%
Total fiel // change	Hedgerow units	38.72%
(including all on-site & off-site babitat creation + retained babitats)	River units	0.00%

Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 2.0 for Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge – Site Baseline

Hote A-1	l Felix Site Habitat Base	line															
	Condense / Show Columns	Condense / Show Rows															
	Main Menu	Instructions															
		Habitats and areas		Habitat distinctiveness	Habitat condition	Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance	Suggested action to address	Ecological baseline			Re	tention cate	gory biodi	versity value		
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance	habitat losses	Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Area succession	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Baseline units succession	Area lost	Units lost
1	Urban	Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	0.602	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local	Compensation Not Required	0.00				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.60	0.00
2	Urban	Urban - Introduced shrub	0.095	Low	Moderate	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	0.38	0.026			0.10	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.28
3	Urban	Urban - Amenity grassland	0.687	Low	Poor	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	1.37	0.063			0.13	0.00	0.00	0.62	1.25
4	Urban	Urban - Street Tree	0.1935	Low	Moderate	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	0.77	0.166			0.66	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.11
5											Ī						
6											ļ						
7														$ \longrightarrow$			
9																	
10																	
11																	
12																	
		Total site area ha	1.38					Total Site baseline	2.53	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.89	0.00	0.00	1.32	1.63

Hotel Felix																
A-2 Site Habitat Creation																
Condense / Show Columns	Condense / Show	w Rows)													
Main Menu	Instruction	ns)													
						Post deve	elopment/ post interventi	on habitats								
							Ecological connectivity		Strategic sign	ificance		Temporal r	nultiplier	Difficulty	multipliers	
Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Ecological connectivity	Connectivity	Connectivity multiplier	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic position multiplier	Time to target condition/years	Time to target multiplier	Difficulty of creation category	Difficulty of creation multiplier	Habitat units delivered
Urban - Amenity grassland	0.092	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Low	1	0.18
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	Urban - Developed land; sealed surface 0.407 V.					N/A	Assessment not appropriate	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	0	1.000	Low	1	0.00
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	0.431	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0.700	Low	1	2.41
Urban - Street Tree	Low	2	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	27	0.382	Low	1	0.05	
Urban - Introduced shrub	0.363	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Low	1	0.70
Urban - Introduced shrub	0.047	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Low	1	0.09
Urban - Introduced shrub	0.007	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Low	1	0.01
Urban - Introduced shrub	0.029	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Low	1	0.06
Urban - Intensive green roof	0.001	Low	2	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0.837	Low	1	0.00
Urban - Ground based green wall	0.006	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0.965	Medium	0.67	0.01
Totals	1.38														Total Units	3.52
	Check Ar	eas- Area of d	evelopmen	t and habit	at creation	must match t	the area of habitat	s lost								

Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 2.0 for Hotel Felix, Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge – Hedge Baseline



		UK Habitats - existing habitats		Habitat distinctiver	: ness	Habitat condi	ition		Ecological connectivity		Strategic sign	ificance			Ecological baseline		Retention	category bi	odiversity v	alue	
Baselin e ref	Hedge number	Hedgerow type	length KM	Distinctivenes s	Scor e	Condition	Scor e	Ecological connectivity	Connectivity	Connectivity multiplier	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic position multiplier	Suggested action to address habitat losses	Total hedgerow units	Length retained	Length enhanced	Units retained	Units enhanced	Length lost	Units lost
1	Amenity	Native Hedgerow	0.353	Low	2	Poor	1	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.706	0.156		0.312	0	0.197	0.394
2	Native	Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees	0.823	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Like for like or better	6.584	0.823		6.584	0	0	0
3																					
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
		Total Site length/KM	1.18											Total Site baseline	7.29	0.98	0.00	6.90	0.00	0.20	0.39

		Hotel Felix	(
B-2	Site He	dge Creation																
	Condense	/ Show Columns	Condense / Show Rows)														
	Ma	ain Menu	Instructions									Multipliers						
_												Spatial quality						
	Proposed habitats				Habitat Habitat condition			Ecological connectivity Strategic significance				Temporal multiplier		Difficulty of	Hadaa unita			
Baselin ref	e New hedge number	Ha	bitat type	Length km	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Ecological connectivity	Connectivity	Connectivity multiplier	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic position multiplier	Time to target condition/years	Time to target multiplier	multiplier	delivered
1		Hedge Orna	mental Non Native	0.05	V.Low	0	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0.837	1	0.00
2		Nativ	e Hedgerow	0.961	Low	2	Moderate	2	Low	Unconnected habitat	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0.837	1	3.22
3																		
4																		
6																		
7																		
	Creation Length/KM			1.01														3.22

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Topographical Survey, Drawing No.: 36289_T Rev 0





Station Information:

Station	Easting (m)	Northing (m)	Level (m)
GH1	543240.372	260521.406	21.332
GH2	543214.176	260486.528	21.912
GH3	543186.968	260455.676	22.482
GH4	543191.841	260556.872	21.197
GH5	543153.871	260580.873	21.959
GH6	543105.889	260606.595	22.014
GH7	543082.200	260564.485	22.232

OS Note: Some services may have been omitted due to parked vehicles

Surveyed Buildings

In survey has been containated to the Umbance survey (US) National (not OGEBSIG) val Clobal Nerglanda Sate Systems (ONS) and the O.S. Active Network (OS Net) A true OSCB35 coordinate has been established near to the site contro via a transformation using the OSTM15GB & OSCM15GB transformation models. The survey has been correlated to this point and a further on or more OSCB36 (15) points established to create a true O.S.

No scale factor has been applied to the survey therefore the coordinates shown are arbitrary & not true O.S. Coordinates which have a scale factor applied. Please refer to Survey Station Table to enable establishment of the on-site grid and datum.

o, the on one gradu	in outern	Lege	nc	1:						
Buildings Overhead Co		Inspection chamber	Bo	Bolard						
Wall Concrete ed	ge Play	Pipe invest	15	Illuminated bolland						
Keb line Tarmac edg	e Gy	Gully	Bin	Rubbish bin						
Line marking Grass veg		Back guily	Vp							
Centre line Verse	Pos		Lbox	Letter box						
Top of bank Boltom of br	nk MH	Manhole	Strep							
1 Station and Na	w.	Water level	Sty	510						
100.000 Station Level	11	Flood light	IFL.	Internal floor level						
No.×	Lp	Lamp post	THE.	Threahold level						
Com Tree / Bush / S	lapling Tp	Telegraph post	Sp	Sign post						
Area of Under	powth T	Exercise post	101	Traincia						
Woodland		Trans. ages	ELC.							
Ridge Level	Sv		вт							
Enves Level	2	Stop top	C'box	Control bax						
Flat Roof Level	Dr.	Earth rod	TT	Tactile						
Cate	Wm	Water meter	BP	Brick paved						
v	Gas	Gas valve	CPS	Concrete paving slabs						
there the	Av	Airvahe	CVR	Cover						
Fon Hailings	ICU	Unidentified inspection	R/wall	Retaining wall						
Wee Meah	Wo	Wash out	TWL	Top of Wall Level						
Post & Rail	Re	Rodding eye	TCL	Tree canopy level						
W Post & Wire	66	Belisha beacon	G:	Gith						
Chain Link	CTV		MG IC	Multi girth Inspection chamber						
P Wooden Pane	in Greier		CL:	Cover level						
Close Boarder	50	Soft	1.1	Invest level						
Steel Palizade	Ph.	Fire hydrant	UTL	Unable to 18						
greenhatch										
Topographical Su Site Engineeri Utility / CCTV Su	irveys ng rveys	Measur 3D Rev	ed B Lase it & E	uilding Surveys r Scanning 3IM Models						
Duffield Road Little Eaton Derby DE21 5DR Tel (01332) 83004 admin Greenhath - group.co.uk www.greenhath-group.co.uk										
it Albans it B, The Courtyard Alban Park St Albans Hertfordshire AL4 0LA t. (01727) 854481	Newcastle 24 Rivers Ameth Newcast Newcast Newcast NE t. (0191	side Studios iyst Road le Bus. Park tle-U-Tyne 4 7YL 2) 736391	Lond 27, Co t. (on rnwall Terrace Me Regents Park London NW1 SLL 02072) 241806						
LIENT										

Management Ltd

Hotel Felix Huntingdon Road Girton, Cambridge, CB3 0LX

Topographical Survey

 SCALE
 DATE

 A1@1:500
 03.03.20

 DRAWN
 OUALITY REF

 JK2
 GH7099

 evel datum
 See note

 ind orientation
 See note

 ob number
 32289

0

36289_T

2604505

This plan should only be used for its original purpose. Greenhatch Group accepts no responsib for this plan if supplied to any party other than the original client.

All dimensions should be checked on site prior to design and construction. Drainage information (where applicable) has been

risually inspected from the surface and therefor should be treated as approximate only.

APPENDIX 2

Landscape General Arrangement, Drawing No.: LD-PLN-200-201





lard Lands	cape
PT1	PT1 - Buff coloured bound surface - Vehicular
PT2	PT2 - Concrete Block paving - Vehicular
PT3	PT3 - Granite setts - Vehicular
PT4	PT4 - Natural stone paviors, large unit - Pedestrian
PT5	PT5 - Concrete block paving - Pedestrian
PT6	PT6 - Resin bound gravel - Pedestrian
PT7	PT7 - Bonded rubberised surface -
PT8	PT8 - Natural Stone - Private terraces -
PT9	Processman
	Pedestrian
Condo	<u>cape</u> Existing Tree Retained
H008	Existing hedge retained
\odot	Root protection areas (See arborists information)
+	Proposed Tree
(\mathbf{P})	Proposed Fruit Tree
	Existing tree relocated See landscape chapter for further information
-+	Pleached tree
SLOT	Woodland understory and shrub planting
772) 177772	Proposed 0.5m high hedges
77772	Proposed 1.2m high hedges
	Proposed 1.8m high hedges
0	Proposed clipped specimen shrub
SL02	Shrub and herbaceous planting
SL03	Turf
SL04	Wildflower meadow
	Biodiverse roof
Boundaries	<u>•</u>
B1	B1 - 1.8m high timber close board fence
B2	B2- 1.8m high metal railing
В3	B3 - 1.2m high picket fence
B4	B4 - 1.2m high chestnut cleft fencing
G1	G1 - Garden Gate
Other Featu	ires
RP	RP - Hazel hurdle
[EG]	EG - Existing gazebo retained and relocated
۳	P - Pergola
ТВ	TB - Timber Bench
¢} _{GC}	GC - Garden Chair
GH	GH - Greenhouse
12.21 For planning	عم ا جم ا
ate Description	Dm Ch
	$\mathbf{\hat{C}}$
UC	LUC London
	+44 (0)20 7383 5784 london@landuse.co.uk www.landuse.co.uk
ct el Felix	
1	
@A1	Status
U.	Planning

Issue A