

Ecology response for F/22/94108 BROADWAY FARM, BROAD OAK, BOTLEY

Proposed construction of a Warehouse for storage and distribution (Class B8) together with a relocation of existing parking apron for first response vehicles and ancillary works.

Gary Osmond

27/1/23

Documents reviewed

Design and Access Statement by Boyle and Summers (October 2022)

Landscape Design and Access Statement by Fabrik (rev 02, October 2022)

Map legend by Fabrik (rev 03, October 2022)

Hard/Soft Landscape General Arrangement by Fabrik (rev 03, October 2022)

Ecological Impact Assessment by Lizard (September 2022)

Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement by Lizard (September 2022)

Surface Water Drainage Strategy by Pitman Associates Ltd (Rev B, October 2022)

Planning Statement by Luken Beck (October 2022)

Ecology

The plan for this application has improved over the previous applications (F/22/93195 and F/21/91859) in the provision of a 20 m semi-natural buffer to protect the adjacent ancient woodland Gully Wood SINC. However, this must be a buffer free of all development (as explained in the ecology response for F/22/93195, dated 28 June 2022) and it appears that the SuDS attenuation pond (with a permanent water level of 12.000- is that 12 m deep??) has been planned within this buffer zone. This would have an unacceptable impact on the ancient woodland. For a SuDS attenuation pond to be considered as a habitat feature it must be planted with appropriate wetland pond species and a variety of levels. An attenuation pond should also have a less linear flow path to slow down the flow of water through the pond. Therefore I continue to raise an objection to this application due to potential adverse effects on Woodhouse Gully Wood SINC.

If the application is permitted the following information will be required.

A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be required. It must contain specific measures to protect Woodhouse Gully Stream from pollution and include the precautions in sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4 and 5.2.3 of the Ecological Impact Assessment report by Lizard (September 2022). This will include the precautionary vegetation clearance approach to protect reptiles outlined in section 5.3.2. The CEMP must also contain measures to protect

the SINC boundary and stream from disturbance during removal and disposal of tarmac and any other paving within the 20 m SINC buffer zone. A 76 m hedgerow consisting of cherry laurel, *Prunus laurocerasus*, is also scheduled to be removed. Although it is not listed as an invasive plant on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, cherry laurel spreads easily, crowding out native species. It must be disposed of off-site and not be allowed to spread into the SINC during removal. Cherry laurel stumps or much must not be used for habitat enhancement. Disposal of tarmac and cherry laurel must be specified in the waste disposal section of the CEMP.

Vegetation clearance must not be done during bird nesting season (which is usually March through September depending on the weather). If this is not possible then clearance can only be done immediately after a check for active nests by a suitably qualified ecologist. If nesting birds are found, the nest must remain undisturbed with a suitable 5 m buffer and clearance cannot take place until the young have fledged and left the nest.

A Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (BEMP) will be required, to include the biodiversity enhancements recommended in section 6.1 of the Ecological Impact Assessment report. This will include a habitat management schedule, planting scheme and the locations of the recommended habitat enhancements for birds, bats, invertebrates, reptiles and amphibians. Management of the native species hedgerow must be done on a 3-year cycle, with top and alternate sides pruned in successive years to maintain a continuous supply of flowers, fruit and seeds available for wildlife.

A lighting plan will be required to demonstrate illumination of no more than 1 lux on any wildlife habitat features and the ecological buffer to the SINC.

Surface Water Drainage

The Surface Water Drainage Strategy by Pitman Associates Ltd (Rev B, October 2022) states that

Post-development it is proposed to discharge runoff from the new warehouse to the ditch immediately to the north of the site as shown on DR-001 in Appendix A. The ditch flows into a stream which is a tributary of the river Hamble. What is the proposed distance that the water would travel in this ditch before it reaches the stream?

The report states that infiltration is not possible on this site due to seasonally wet soils with impeded drainage, ground water within 1 to 2 m of ground level and failed percolation tests in October 2021 (Drainage Philosophy report by RJ Watkinson).

Section 14 outlines the treatment train which includes a filter drain and a pond, but not the ditch. The pollution mitigation indices were shown to be equal to the pollution indices (when figures were rounded).

Section 14.6 states that *it is proposed to construct the vehicle storage area as a permeable surface*, with drainage moving into the filter drain and then into the proposed attenuation pond. If infiltration is not possible in this area and the ground water is high, I don't see how this surface or the proposed permeable parking surfaces would function.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist