Rainger, Angela

From: Boyd, Sarah
Sent: 05 December 2018 17:29
To: Grandfield, Andy
Subject: RE: O/18/84191:- GE Aviation Proposal for 141 units and the alterations to sports pitches and highway

Hi Andy

Sorry, this is a fairly note-like response… I see your meeting is in the afternoon so that gives me time to look at GIS in the morning when I'm in the office. I need to check a few layers. Is this site is within the Local Plan? We'll also have to undertake a HRA.

Surveys:
The ecological reports so far are very thorough and clear. Summary of species status (bold= still to be undertaken):

- Badgers – no evidence found
- Dormice – no evidence found
- **Bat roosts** – **Many trees with roost potential (full inspections have not taken place yet).**
  Confirmed roosts in two buildings - **I'm wondering why emergence and re-entry bat surveys were not undertaken at Sydney Lodge which is a confirmed brown long-eared roost (from the prelim roost report). Is the existing roost in the original house and therefore will not be affected by the extensions which are to be removed?**
- Commuting and foraging bats - present
- **Breeding birds** – present. **Black redstart survey not yet undertaken.**
- Reptiles – medium population of slow worm present
- **GCN – DNA analysis of the one pond within 500m of the site is still required**
- **Invertebrates – survey still required** – assumed presence of stag beetle, **white-letter hairstreak butterfly may be present, survey at woodland edge**
- **Wintering birds – Application site itself is of limited interest to wintering birds. However, why weren't the fields to the north of the application site surveyed? There's probably a good reason for this but I'd like to chat this through with the ecologist. There may be impacts on wintering birds in the fields to the north if development takes place at this site.**

General:

1. The development must provide net gain for biodiversity in line with national and local policy.

2. I have concerns regarding proximity of development to the ancient woodland West Wood SINC at the western boundary of the application site. The Local Plan is stating 50m buffers to ancient woodland from residential development so any buffer requested will be in this ballpark.

3. All existing green networks must be retained and enhanced. The surveys to date have shown that these areas are of value to reptiles, birds and bats (roosting, foraging and commuting). Enhancement of these networks should comprise the strengthening of hedgerows by planting up gaps with suitable native species and also increase the existing width of the green corridors (as recommended in the reptile report). Widths to be determined through the BMEP (see point 6) and must be of adequate width to provide a functioning corridor. A mosaic of habitats (e.g. wildflower, scrub, refugia etc) should be provided in these green corridors.

4. A green corridor should be provided in the south of the site where it is currently lacking. This created habitat should link existing habitats (including trees) which have been identified as of value to reptiles, bats and birds (as surveyed) to prevent their isolation and create a robust ecological network around the site. This leads me onto the next point.

5. Access is the only aspect being considered at outline. I am unclear of the extent of loss or other adverse impact on biodiversity which may occur as a result of the access. Can the extent of any loss please be quantified? The development must aim to minimise biodiversity loss, conserve and enhance existing ecological features and integrate them into the development. This must be done in a way that ensures the features can still function well ecologically and therefore be physically linked to wider biodiversity network. The layout of the access may therefore need to be adjusted.

6. Following on from this point, the applicant must submit a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP) as early in the application process as possible. The BMEP must specify and quantify the different habitats that will be unavoidably lost or adversely affected as a result of the proposals. This should include the number and species of trees, area and species of scrub, any length of hedgerow and area of grassland that will be affected. Any loss of habitat or impact on retained habitat needs to be mitigated within the BMEP. This can be delivered in the buffer zones and expanded green networks. The use of the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric is recommended to assist with this. Mitigation measures already outlined in the ecological reports for habitats and species should be included in the BMEP.

   The BMEP needs to be accompanied by a plan showing the landscaped areas of the whole site and the mosaic of habitats and features that will be created within them, e.g. scrub, woodland, hedgerow strengthening, wildflower / unimproved grassland areas and species specifications. It is recommended that any SuDS features to be used are determined at this point and included in the landscaping proposals. The BMEP also needs to describe how these habitats will be managed for biodiversity and demonstrate how they link into the wider ecological network.

   Prescriptive management actions would need to be provided either in the BMEP or in a separate Landscape and Ecology Management Plan. This would need to include the management of any SuDS features.

7. A SuDS will have to be incorporated to address run-off rates and WQ.

Hope that's clear enough for tomorrow. I'll get back to you regarding my GIS finds in the morning.

Thanks
Sarah

Sarah Boyd
Ecology Specialist
Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Environment
Ext: 8064
Mobile: 07876151586

From: Grandfield, Andy
Sent: 04 December 2018 18:35
To: Scott, Neil; Boyd, Sarah
Subject: RE: O/18/84191:- GE Aviation Proposal for 141 units and the alterations to sports pitches and highway
Importance: High

Dear all,

Further to last week's email I really could do with your comments on this scheme please even if it's a high level assessment / review of the info provided. I am happy to meet up with you to talk through if that helps?

Andy

From: Grandfield, Andy
Sent: 27 November 2018 19:14

To: Scott, Neil; Strand, Matthew; Suatt, Liz; Austin, Ian; Boyd, Sarah; Lee, Harry
Subject: O/18/84191:- GE Aviation Proposal for 141 units and the alterations to sports pitches and highway

Dear all,

I am sending a plea through please for you to send me through your comments / thoughts on the above development that we have consulted you on. I am meeting the development team on Thursday 6th December and wish to be able to provide them with a full update on consultee responses in advance so we can have a productive meeting.

The scheme is scheduled to go to Committee at the end of January, therefore the development team will need to responds to any requests you have pre Christmas

https://planning.eastleigh.gov.uk/s/papplication/a1M1v0000041GS0/o1884191

Many thanks

Andy

Andy Grandfield
Housing and Development Lead Specialist
Service Delivery - Specialist Services - Housing & Development
Ext: 8267