

GN40: Reporting template for ecology assessment issues in BREEAM and HQM

Introduction

This guidance note is primarily aimed at BREEAM UK New Construction 2018 and Home Quality Mark (HQM). Please refer to the most up to date version of the relevant technical manual being assessed against to ensure that this guidance note can be used.

Where the term 'Assessor' is used in this document this refers to the BREEAM or HQM Assessor as appropriate.

Purpose and scope

The purpose of this guidance note is to help Assessors relate the information generated during the project, to the BREEAM or HQM ecology assessment issues in the scheme being used for assessment. The guidance in this document has been produced to support the assessment of these issues and should not be interpreted as criteria. This guidance note should be read alongside the corresponding technical manual being assessed against to ensure all criteria are met and the methodology section has been followed.

Use of this document as a template is optional. If the Assessor chooses to use the template provided within this guidance note as evidence, all relevant sections must be completed.

The completed document can be used by the Assessor along with all relevant project documentation to demonstrate compliance with the BREEAM or HQM criteria.

Evidence guidance

Evidence does not need to be prepared specifically for the purpose of the BREEAM or HQM assessment. Wherever possible the Assessor should source readily available project information to demonstrate compliance. For this reason, BREEAM is generally not prescriptive on the type of evidence required, although some issues do require specific documents to be provided.

The Assessor and project team will find that many assessment issues require more than one piece or type of information to demonstrate compliance with one criterion. However, in some instances, a single piece of information may be enough to demonstrate compliance with multiple criteria.

To help project teams and the Assessor understand how the different types of building information documentation they collate can be used as evidence at each stage of assessment, the evidence types are grouped broadly into three categories:

1. General evidence type
2. Specific evidence type
3. Other evidence type

For some assessment issues, the Assessor will require a mix of general and specific evidence types. For more guidance see the Evidence sections of the relevant technical manual.

Supporting notes

1. There are four core assessment issues which relate to ecology (exact titles may vary according to scheme):
 - a. Ecological risks and opportunities
 - b. Managing impacts on ecology
 - c. Ecological change and enhancement
 - d. Long term ecology management and maintenance
2. Only the appointed qualified and licensed Assessor can confirm if a credit, or equivalent, is met for a BREEAM or HQM assessment.
3. If the Assessor assists in the completion of this document, the project team member (for Foundation route) or the ecologist (for Comprehensive route) must complete and sign the Signature of Validation to confirm the contents are accurate.
4. In some instances, this guidance note refers to actions that have already been taken. However, for design stage assessments, some of these actions may not have been taken yet (e.g. mitigation measures before construction has started). Where this is the case, answers should reflect what will happen based on commitments and plans in place, with evidence submitted to support this as referred to in the Evidence sections of the relevant technical manual being assessed against.

Schedule of changes

Version	Release date	Description of change
0.0	Aug 2018	First issue.
0.1	Jun 2020	Updated to align with issue 3.0 of BREEAM UK New Construction 2018 (SD5078).
0.2	Jul 2022	Fixed multi-line text input boxes to allow scrolling. Minor updates to headings and content to improve navigation.

Find the latest version of this guidance note at: kb.breeam.com/knowledgebase/gn40

Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose and scope	1
Evidence guidance	1
Supporting notes	2
Schedule of changes	2
Contents	3
Section A: Assessment details	4
A1: Project details	4
A2: Contact details	4
A3: Prerequisite – Statutory obligations	5
A4: Assessment route	5
Section B: Foundation route assessments (Route 1)	6
B1: Recognised local ecological expertise	6
B2: Criteria checklist for Foundation route assessments	6
a. Ecological risks and opportunities	6
b. Managing impacts on ecology	9
c. Ecological change and enhancement	11
d. Long term ecology management and maintenance	12
B3: Signature of validation	14
Section C: Comprehensive route assessments (Route 2)	15
C1: Ecologist's qualifications	15
C2: Criteria checklist for Comprehensive route assessments	16
a. Ecological risks and opportunities	16
b. Managing impacts on ecology	21
c. Ecological change and enhancement	23
d. Long term ecology management and maintenance	26
C3: Signature of validation	28

Section A: Assessment details

A1: Project details

1. Please enter the full name of the scheme being assessed against, including the version and issue (e.g. BREEAM UK New Construction 2018, issue 3.0)

BREEAM UK New Construction Version 6.1

2. Please add the project details

BRE project reference number (if known): 425.064874.00001

Development name: Royston Refinery (3CR) Building

Development address: Gate 9, Orchard Road, Royston, UK, SG8 5HE

A2: Contact details

Project team member details (Foundation route) or Ecologist details (Comprehensive route)

Company name: SLR Consulting Limited.

Company address: Floor 3, The Cursitor Building, Chancery Lane, London, UK, WC2A 1EN

Contact name: Richard Arnold

Project team member or ecology report reference (where applicable):

Developer or client details

Company name: Johnson Matthey

Company address: Gate 2, Orchard Road, Royston, UK, SG8 5HE

Contact name: Mick Linighan

A3: Prerequisite – Statutory obligations

To proceed with the assessment please ensure the client or designated representative (e.g. contractor) has confirmed that compliance is being monitored against all relevant UK and EU or international legislation relating to the ecology of the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details on all relevant current UK and EU legislation that relates to the site:

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended.
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, as amended.
The Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Other than possible nesting by birds in a tree which overhangs the Site, there is no suitable habitat for protected or priority species present within or adjacent to the Site. The tree will be retained and not trimmed. Therefore, the above legislation will be complied with.

If no, the points below are not applicable as none of the assessment issues referred to in this guidance note can be achieved.

A4: Assessment route

Which assessment route is being used for the project or development?

- ☐ Foundation route (Route 1 – Project team member) – GO TO SECTION B
- ☒ Comprehensive route (Route 2 – Ecologist) – GO TO SECTION C

Section B: Foundation route assessments (Route 1)

This section asks for information to support the assessment of the ecology issues using the Foundation route (Project team member).

B1: Recognised local ecological expertise

Please list the names and websites of the organisations who provided recommendations, specialist input or guidance which supported the assessment of the site:

B2: Criteria checklist for Foundation route assessments

a. Ecological risks and opportunities

LE 02 (New Construction); 2.1 (HQM)

Survey and evaluation

1. Has the 'Ecology risk evaluation checklist for BREEAM and HQM' (GN34) been completed?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Determining the ecological outcomes for the site

2. Have the survey and evaluation criteria been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

3. During Concept Design, did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Guidance Note 40

V0.2 July 2022

4. Was the Survey and evaluation of the site carried out prior to the project preparation and brief, allowing time for the outcome to influence the planning of the project/site ensuring maximum ecological outcomes specified in the relevant technical manual?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

5. Was this done in accordance with the following hierarchy of actions for those applicable for the foundation route?

5a. Avoidance 5b. Protection

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please provide a brief statement for each action explaining how this was done/each point in the hierarchy was achieved:

Hierarchy of actions	How was this done?
Avoid	
Protect	

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Wider site sustainability

Exemplary level criteria (New Construction); Only available for Comprehensive route (HQM)

6. Where the assessor has determined that the related set of criteria is applicable, were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcomes for the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

b. Managing impacts on ecology

LE 03 (New Construction); 2.2 (HQM)

Prerequisite – Ecological risks and opportunities

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the Ecological Risks and Opportunities assessment issue been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Planning and measures on-site / Liaison, implementation, and data

2. Were roles and responsibilities clearly defined, allocated and implemented to support successful delivery of project outcomes at an early enough stage to the ecological outcomes on the site by influencing the project brief and concept design stages?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

3. Were site preparation and construction works planned for and implemented at an early project stage to optimise benefits and outputs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

4. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, to implement actions and selected measures, during site preparation and construction works?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

Managing negative impacts

5. Were negative impacts from site preparation and construction works managed according to the hierarchy set out within the methodology for the relevant assessment scheme via one of the following?

Avoidance of negative impacts on habitats and features of ecological value on the site.

☐ Yes ☐ No

OR: Avoidance of negative impacts, protection of habitats and features of ecological value from damage in accordance with best practice guidelines during development works.

☐ Yes ☐ No

For the option selected, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

c. Ecological change and enhancement

LE 04 (New Construction); 2.3 (HQM)

Project/site overview

1. Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats:

Prerequisite – Managing impacts on ecology

2. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the managing impacts on ecology site assessment issue been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Change and enhancement of ecology / Liaison, implementation, and data

3. Did the project team, liaising and collaborating with representative stakeholders and taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement locally relevant measures/actions to enhance the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Were the measures/actions adopted based on recommendations from recognised 'local' ecological expertise and specialist input and guidance?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please briefly summarise the recommendations made and measures/actions implemented:

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

d. Long term ecology management and maintenance

LE 05 (New Construction); 2.4 (HQM)

The layout of assessment content varies depending on the scheme therefore this part of the guidance note captures the key issues assessed and supports the inclusion of information relevant to demonstrate compliance against this issue.

Prerequisite – Planning and site implementation

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the Change and Enhancement of Ecological Value assessment issue been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Management and maintenance throughout the project

2. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, with respect to the measures and actions implemented to:

2a. Monitor and review implementation and the effectiveness

2b. Develop and review management and maintenance actions or measures

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

--

3. Taking into consideration the assessment criteria in the scheme technical manual which the project is being assessed against please:

3a. Summarise the monitoring and reporting arrangements/actions in place for the project/site (e.g. monitoring mitigation and enhancement measures taken during site clearance and construction)

3b. Show how these demonstrate compliance against the criteria

3c. Include justifications about why these were deemed appropriate to the nature and scale of the project

--

4. As part of the tenant or building owner information supplied, has a section been included on Ecology and Biodiversity to inform the owner or occupant of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements?

--

Landscape and ecology management plan

5. Was the Landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, developed in accordance with BS 42020:2013 section 11.1 covering as a minimum the first five years after project completion?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

B3: Signature of validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of project team member: _____

Signature of project team member: _____

Date: _____

Section C: Comprehensive route assessments (Route 2)

This section asks for information to support the assessment of the ecology issues using the Comprehensive route (Suitably Qualified Ecologist).

General note: When completing this section of the document, the level of detail and information provided should be appropriate to the scale, size and type of project undergoing the assessment.

Completing text fields in 'Justification / Explanatory / Why' boxes: Where the information is available within an existing document, simply reference the relevant section of that document (including page number, section and clause, as applicable). There is no need to repeat the content if this already exists elsewhere.

C1: Ecologist's qualifications

1. Do you hold a degree (or equivalent qualification, e.g. N/SVQ level 5) in ecology or a related subject?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details:

Richard Arnold, Technical Director Ecologist, SLR Consulting has a BSc (Hons) in ecology from the University of East Anglia and an MRes in Environmental Science from Lancaster University.

Note: The following degrees might be considered relevant: Ecology, Biological Sciences, Zoology, Botany, Countryside Management, Environmental Sciences, Marine and Freshwater Management, Earth Sciences, Agriculture, Forestry, Geography, Landscape Management.

2. Are you a practicing ecologist with a minimum of 3 years relevant experience within the last 5 years?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details:

Richard Arnold, Technical Director Ecologist, SLR Consulting, has over 25 years of relevant experience including the last 5 years. This includes ecological impact assessments, preliminary ecological appraisals, biodiversity net gains assessments and habitats regulations assessments for major developments in the UK and Ireland.

Note: Relevant experience must clearly demonstrate a practical understanding of factors affecting ecology in relation to construction and the built environment; including, acting in an advisory capacity to provide recommendations for ecological protection, enhancement and mitigation measures. Examples of relevant experience are ecological impact assessments; Preliminary Ecological Appraisals (PEA); Phase 2 habitat and fauna surveys; and habitat creation.

3. Are you bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review*?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details including which organisation you are a full member of:

Richard Arnold is a member of the Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and is bound to the institute's code of professional conduct. He is required to complete and submit Continuous Professional Development records to the Institute and may be subject to audits. He is also a Chartered Environmentalist.

*Note: a full member of one of the following organisations is bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review: Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM); Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM); Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA); Landscape Institute (LI); Institute of Environmental Sciences (IES); Royal Society of Biology; Institute of Environmental Sciences.

Peer review is defined as the process employed by a professional body to demonstrate that potential or current full members maintain a standard of knowledge and experience required to ensure compliance with a code of conduct and professional ethics.

If 'no' has been answered for any question in this section (C1), the requirements for carrying out an assessment using the comprehensive route have not been met and no credits or points can be awarded for any ecology assessment issues under the comprehensive route. Please refer to Section B2 and follow the process for the foundation route (Route 1) if a suitably qualified ecologist has not been appointed.

C2: Criteria checklist for Comprehensive route assessments

a. Ecological risks and opportunities

LE 02 (New Construction); 2.1 (HQM)

Survey and evaluation

1. Was an appropriate individual(s) appointed at a project stage that ensured early involvement in site configuration and, where necessary, could influence strategic planning decisions?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, briefly describe the role and relevance of the individual(s) to the project and project stage in meeting the above point:

In August 2023, SLR Consulting Limited (SLR) completed a habitat classification (UKHab) survey on behalf of Johnson Matthey, to identify and assess the baseline ecological conditions of the Site at the beginning of the proposed development project. The method of the survey was extended to include preliminary checks for notable, protected, or rare species of fauna and flora. The findings of the survey were compiled into a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report, which detailed the habitats located within the Site and its potential to support protected, priority or otherwise notable species, statutory and non-statutory designated sites

Guidance Note 40

V0.2 July 2022

2. Was there an appropriate level of survey and evaluation carried out to determine the ecological baseline of site considering the zone of influence to establish:

2a. Current and potential ecological value and condition of the site, and related areas within the zone of influence.

2b. Direct and indirect risks to current ecological value.

2c. Capacity and feasibility for enhancement of the ecological value of the site and, where relevant, areas within the zone of influence.

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report was produced and submitted to the client (Johnson Matthey Chemical Products) on the 15th September 2023, following a UK Habitat survey and preliminary assessment of the baseline conditions of the Site that was conducted on the 31st August 2023. The PEA report identified potential ecological constraints to the proposed development as well as recommendations for further ecological assessments of the Site and enhancement. This BREEAM assessment has been conducted prior to the commencement of any demolition or construction works.

3. Was the Survey and evaluation of the site carried out early enough to influence the planning of the project/site ensuring maximum ecological outcomes specified in the relevant technical manual?

☒ Yes, and before project preparation and brief
☐ Yes, but not before project preparation and brief
☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The baseline ecological survey works for this project were conducted by SLR Consulting in August 2023 which informed a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal report, Biodiversity Net Gain calculations. The findings and results of the above assessments will assist in the design in the landscaping scheme, ensuring that the landscaping scheme of the proposed development results in a biodiversity net gain.

Note: if 'yes but not before project preparation and brief', please refer to the [BREEAM Knowledge Base](#) for further guidance.

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to point 3 above, deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

4. Were data collated and shared with the project team to inform the site preparation, design or construction works?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

SLR Consulting completed a Preliminary Ecological Assessment in September 2023 and identified the baseline ecological conditions of the Site, which informed recommendations for any changes to be considered in the final design of the landscaping scheme for the proposed development. These reports have been submitted to the developer, Johnson Matthey, upon final completion. Alongside this, Biodiversity Net Gain calculations have been conducted in order to identify the baseline ecological value of the site pre-development and post-development which will provide a biodiversity metric value of biodiversity loss or gain as a result of the proposed

Determining the ecological outcomes

5. Have the survey and evaluation criteria been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not available, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

6. During Concept Design, did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

SLR Consulting was commissioned by Johnson Matthey (the client) to conduct ecological assessments for the proposed development at Gate 8 and 9 of their Royston site. At the current stage the assessments that have been conducted for the Site includes a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA), where the results have been compiled into a PEA report addressing the findings of the assessment and recommendations for further ecological assessments. The report has been issued to the client in order to advise on enhancements for the landscaping scheme design of the proposed development.

7. Was the identification, appraisal and selection of specific actions/measures at a stage that allowed for the early influence of key project planning decisions?

☒ Yes ☐ No

8. Was this done in accordance with the following hierarchy of actions:

8a. Avoidance

8b. Protection

8c. Reduction or limitation of negative impacts

8d. On-site compensation

8e. Enhancement, considering the capacity and feasibility within the site, or where viable, off-site.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please provide a brief statement for each action explaining how this was done/each point in the hierarchy was achieved:

Hierarchy of actions	What was done?
Avoid	There is one urban tree that is situated adjacent to the Site pre-development and is to be retained within the landscape design of the proposed development.
Protect	As part of the proposed scheme, tree root protection zones are to be implemented in order to avoid negative impacts to the tree that is to be retained.
Reduce/limit negative impacts	None required, as there are no negative impacts.
On-site compensation	None required, as there are no habitats designated for removal.
Enhancement	Creation of neutral grassland on site to increase Biodiversity value and achieve a net gain.

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to point 9 above deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

9. Briefly describe the agreed ecological outcome for the site:

The Site is currently (pre-development) utilised as a car park (Johnson Matthey) covering approximately 4720m² in area. The Site is predominantly made up of sealed surface (approximately 98.3% of the Site), and an Ash tree (approximately 1.7%). The proposed landscaping scheme incorporates the retention of the tree that is situated at the west of the Site and will include the creation of small areas of neutral grassland.

Wider site sustainability

Exemplary level criteria (New Construction); Only available for Comprehensive route (HQM)

10. Where the assessor has determined that the related set of criteria is applicable, were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcome for the site?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

b. Managing impacts on ecology

LE 03 (New Construction); 2.2 (HQM)

Prerequisite: Ecological risks and opportunities

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) from the Identifying and understanding the risks and opportunities assessment issue been met for the project or site?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Planning and measures on-site / Liaison, implementation, and data

2. Were roles and responsibilities clearly defined, allocated and implemented to support successful delivery of project outcomes at an early enough stage to the ecological outcomes on the site by influencing the project brief and concept design stages?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Johnson Matthey commissioned SLR Consulting in July 2023 to undertake baseline ecological surveys of the Site, which included a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA). This survey identified the baseline ecological value and conditions of the Site in order to indicate the potential requirement for further ecological assessments to be undertaken. The baseline and potential further ecological assessments can be utilised to advise the inclusion of further ecological enhancements and mitigation measures within the master-planning and landscaping scheme of the proposed development.

3. Were site preparation and construction work planned for and implemented at an early project stage to optimise benefits and outputs?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Prior to the commencement of construction works at the Site, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) was conducted to assess the ecological value of the Site. This assessment identified any ecological constraints present that could result in negative impacts being caused to protected or notable species.

At the time of the completion of this BREEAM construction works have not commenced.

4. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement measures/actions selected, during site preparation and construction works?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

SLR Consulting was commissioned by Johnson Matthey (the client) to conduct ecological assessments for the proposed development at Gate 8 and 9 of their Royston site. At the current stage the assessments that have been conducted for the Site includes a Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA), where the results have been compiled into a PEA report addressing the findings of the assessment and recommendations for further ecological assessments. The report has been issued to the client in order to advise any enhancements that could be made to the landscaping scheme design of the proposed development.

Managing negative impacts

5. Were negative impacts from site preparation and construction works managed according to the hierarchy set out within the methodology for the relevant assessment scheme via one of the following?

No overall loss of ecological value has occurred

☒ Yes ☐ No

OR: The loss of ecological value has been limited as far as possible

☐ Yes ☐ No

For the option selected, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Site preparation and construction works have not yet commenced at the Site, and proposed construction does not include removal of the tree canopy over the Site.

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Report including the Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA)	425.064874.00001 Royston PEA Report
Proposed Landscape Plan of the Site	X2JM-220-000-PLN-001-0003-01_0B_Site Plan Proposed

c. Ecological change and enhancement

LE 04 (New Construction); 2.3 (HQM)

Project/site overview

1. Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats:

The Site that is subject to this BREEAM assessment covers approximately 0.47ha, with the approximate centroid Nation Grid Reference: TL 34758 41318. This area of land currently comprises a developed sealed surface, specifically a car park, and a single section of urban tree canopy (0.002ha) from one tree outside the western Site boundary. There is a metal fence surrounding the Site boundary. There are no watercourses or hedgerows located within or adjoining the Site.

2. Which change in ecological value methodology has been used for the site?

- ☒ Full
☐ Simplified

Where the simplified route was used please provide a brief explanation of why, including any assumptions made:

The Farm Environment Plan Manual (Natural England 2010) should generally be used to assess the condition of the habitats but this will not cover all habitat types and so will be inappropriate in some instances. If a different method has been used the SQE should explain why this has been selected and provide evidence to demonstrate its appropriateness for the site in question.

Prerequisite: Managing impacts on ecology

3. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in 'Managing the negative impacts on ecology' been achieved?

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

4. Where appropriate avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation measures have been agreed with the relevant statutory bodies for any potential impacts on legally protected species, SSSIs, ASSIs (Northern Ireland only), SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites or irreplaceable habitats please briefly provide information about this:

No impacts have been identified for statutory designated sites or irreplaceable habitats and therefore no avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures are required to address impacts on such sites/habitats. The application site contains no sites of specific conservation designations. The EIA screening report confirms that the Proposed Development is not anticipated to have a significant effect on air quality (which could then affect designated sites) either during either the construction or operational phases.
 The closest statutory designated site in proximity to the application Site is Therfield Heath Local Nature Reserve

Ecological enhancement

5. Did the project team, liaising and collaborating with representative stakeholders and taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement the measures/actions, selected in a way that enhances ecological value, in the following order:

5a. On site, and where this is not feasible,

5b. Off site within the zone of influence?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please indicate what was pursued:

☒ On site enhancement

☐ Off-site enhancement

6. Has relevant data been offered to the local environmental records centres nearest to, or relevant for, the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable

If not applicable, please explain why:

The site does not contain any features of ecological value or protected species. No relevant records were present to be submitted to the local environmental records centre.

Change and enhancement of ecology / Liaison, implementation, and data

7. Where the calculation of the change in ecological value has been carried out in line with GN36 ('Ecology calculation methodology for BREEAM, CEEQUAL, and HQM – Route 2'), please confirm the 'Change in ecological value tool for BREEAM, CEEQUAL, and HQM' has been completed and submitted as evidence.

☒ Yes ☐ No

8. In addition to completion of the calculation tool please confirm the following:

Habitat losses and gains relating to legally protected species are included in the calculations and have been clearly identified.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Linear and area biodiversity units have been calculated separately and losses and gains calculated for the Pre-Development and Post-Development scenarios are reported separately, i.e. per habitat type.

☒ Yes ☐ No

All site survey information and the data associated with the calculations are included within evidence provided. This may include date stamped photographs and GIS layers containing data on the habitat types.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Report	425.064874.00001 Royston PEA Report
Proposed Landscape Plan of the Site	X2JM-220-000-PLN-001-0003-01_0B_Site Plan Proposed

d. Long term ecology management and maintenance

LE 05 (New Construction); 2.4 (HQM)

The layout of assessment content varies depending on the scheme therefore this part of the guidance note captures the key issues assessed and supports the inclusion of information relevant to demonstrate compliance against this issue.

Prerequisite: Planning and site implementation

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the change and enhancement of ecological value assessment criteria been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Management and maintenance throughout the project

2. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, on measures/actions implemented to:

2a. Monitor and review implementation and the effectiveness.

2b. Develop and review management and maintenance measures/actions.

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

Due to the low ecological value of the pre-development site, no statutory or non-statutory bodies would have interest in the site, for example Natural England or the local Wildlife Trust. Therefore, it was not considered appropriate to consult with these organisations. The end client (Johnson Matthey) have been, and will continue to be, consulted throughout with regard to the habitats and enhancements created.

3. Taking into consideration the assessment criteria in the scheme technical manual which the project is being assessed against please:

3a. Summarise the monitoring and reporting arrangements/actions in place for the project/site.

3b. Show how these demonstrate compliance against the criteria.

3c. Include justifications about why these were deemed appropriate to the nature and scale of the project.

The proposed development project is small scale, with the habitats being created being of a non-specialist nature, predominantly neutral grassland created on approximately 0.007ha of Site land. Specialist management and monitoring of habitats will not be required and the management can be undertaken by standard grounds maintenance company.

Guidance Note 40

V0.2 July 2022

4. As part of the tenant or building owner information being supplied, has a section been included on Ecology and Biodiversity to inform the owner or occupant of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements?

The owner of the building will be in receipt of all documents supporting the ecology and biodiversity values and considerations of the development.

Landscape and ecology management plan

5. Was the Landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, developed in accordance with BS 42020:2013 covering as a minimum the first five years after project completion?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
LEMP	Given the nature of the site, there is no requirement to produce a LEMP.

Evidence submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue (see "Evidence guidance" on page 1 for more information about acceptable types of evidence to submit).

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as an ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Report	425.064874.00001 Royston PEA Report
Proposed Landscape Plan of the Site	X2JM-220-000-PLN-001-0003-01_0B_Site Plan Proposed
Proposed Site BNG Assessment	BNG Proposed Grassland

C3: Signature of validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of ecologist: **Richard Arnold**

Signature of ecologist: **rarnold** Digitally signed by rarnold
DN: cn=rarnold,
email=rarnold@slrconsulting.com
Date: 2023.09.15 17:24:09 +01'00'

Date: **15/09/2023**