

Ecology response for F/22/93703 HAMPSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
LEIGH ROAD, EASTLEIGH, SO50 9SJ

Replacement modular building over two-storeys with associated car parking and fencing and removal of live fire training metal container units (revised scheme to planning permission F/20/88055).

David Huckfield

Ecology

I have reviewed the Ecological desk-based assessment by Hampshire County Council Ecology Team (August 2022). This report and the planning statement section on ecology will need to be amended.

Although this report states that *No records of protected species were returned within the site boundary*, the Reptile Survey and Mitigation Strategy Report by Ecosupport (16 September 2022) for F/22/93473 has found a low population of slow worms this summer in the adjacent grassy/scrubby area immediately to the south of this application site. This area is connected to the vegetated area along the western site boundary, the northern site boundary, and the railway corridor. The HBIC March 2022 protected and notable species GIS layer contains records of slow worms 100 m to the south-west between Manor Way and the M3 and additional records between 350 and 700 m to the east, all of which are to the north of Leigh Road and to the south of the railway line. Another application site in this vicinity (F/19/85332 Eastleigh Police Station) had a large population of slow worms (155), and there are known populations in the cemetery and allotments to the east. The reptile reports for these applications and related correspondence can be found on the planning applications section of our website. I am not sure why these records were not returned when the HCC Ecology team searched.

Therefore, reptiles are a constraint to this development proposal and mitigation for loss of potential reptile habitat is required.

Temporary parking spaces 15-21 are proposed to the north of the access road. This would affect the scrub along the northern boundary which could also be used by reptiles, particularly the slow worms which would be displaced from the grassy area to the north for F/22/93473 if permission is granted for that application. This parking will need to be located elsewhere and the area to the north of the access road will need to be protected by reptile fencing.

Biodiversity enhancement is required.

My ecology response to the previous application F/20/88055 (copied below) also noted that mitigation for habitat loss and biodiversity enhancements were required. This was written prior to reptiles being found on site.

There is very little potential wildlife habitat on site, but an area of scrub and amenity grassland will be lost with this proposal. As mitigation, additional soft landscaping is proposed to be added to this plan. The Ecological Desk-Based Assessment by Hampshire County Council (May 2020) suggests planting native woody species which would provide fruit or nuts for wildlife, and herbaceous species

to attract insect pollinators. Bird nesting boxes are also suggested, either integrated into the building or on trees nearby. This may be difficult with a prefabricated modular building. Raised beds can be constructed if there is not an appropriate area available for planting. Native plants of native provenance are preferred for all plant species. A soft landscaping/ecological mitigation plan is required that will demonstrate these suggestions. There may be eco-friendly modular office buildings that incorporate green roofs or other ecological features, and these should be investigated.

Although each of the applications for this Hampshire Fire and Rescue application site are separately quite small, the wider site does have some areas which can be enhanced for wildlife and planted for pollinators, as demonstrated by the mitigation and enhancement proposals for F/22/93473. I am happy to discuss this on a Teams video call.

Surface water drainage

This site is close to Monks Brook, a tributary of the protected waters of the River Itchen.

Section 6.9.1 Drainage of the planning statement states that the existing drainage network can accommodate the foul and surface drainage water. This also needs to be explained in greater detail.

The surface water drainage plan shows two existing surface drainage channels that appear to discharge somewhere across the access road to the north of the site. What is the path of the surface water discharged from the site and where does it end up?

Section 5.25 of the planning statement mentions a vehicle cleaning bay, which is shown connected to the proposed new foul sewer connection in section 5.8.

There is no information about the surface water drainage from the roof of the proposed modular building and whether there will be any increase in the volume of water proposed to be discharged off site.

There is no information about filtration of the surface water drainage from the car parking areas or the roof of the proposed building. The Ciria SuDS manual pollution mitigation indices should be used to demonstrate that the surface water drainage leaving the site is properly filtered and will not cause any pollution to nearby waters.

5.3.4 The parking bays will utilise the existing concrete hard standing. The proposal will be fully connected to the existing drainage network to manage both foul and surface water sustainably, as shown on submitted plan E05246-HCC-ZZ-ZZ-DR-B-7700. This needs to be explained in greater detail. How is this water planned to be managed?

Lisa Malter

Ecologist