

Ecology response for X/23/95488 LAMBERT BROTHERS HAULAGE LTD, WOODSIDE AVENUE, EASTLEIGH, SO50 4ZR

Variation of Conditions 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 28 and 29 of F/21/91183 for the Erection of a building for flexible industrial use (Use Classes B2 and B8) and erection of a building for builders' merchant and external storage, including storage, distribution and ancillary trade counter (Sui Generis Use)

Rachael Morris

27/7/23

Condition 15 FRA and Finished Floor levels

All finished floor levels appear to be at 16.10 m (as required by the condition) or above except the NW corner of unit 5 (16.05) the southern edge of unit 5 (at 16.006 and 16.090), and eastern side of unit 5 (which is labelled 16.050, 15.920 and 16.035 from N to S).

Condition 16 Drainage

The difference in drainage plans is not obvious to me. Please could you highlight any changes made to these plans in an email or a word document and I will then provide a response.

Condition 17 Parking

No ecological concerns

Condition 18 Materials

No ecological concerns

Condition 19 External Lighting Plan

I have reviewed the Proposed External Lighting Layout (P05) by CPW and the External Lighting Strategy by Couch Perry Wilkes (Rev P7 December 2022). Section 4.0 states that the illuminance along the perimeter walkway is meant to be limited to 5 lux. The perimeter walkway includes the walkway at the southern boundary of this site. The lighting at the rear of the warehouse buildings (Units 1, 2 and 3) shared fire escape path has an average level achieved of 22 Lux. This is still quite bright for a green infrastructure area. The lights (type F) are proposed to be mounted at 4 m high, which might illuminate the green infrastructure on the site boundary and on the other side of the palisade fence. Is it possible to provide the same level of security and lower the height at which these lights are mounted? Are they designed to be on every night or only when motion activated or to illuminate an escape route? If the model is extended to the line of vegetation would there be one lux or less shining on this vegetation? If not, then this lighting is too bright for this area.

In section 6.0 the key receptors are only considered as a residential property, but the green infrastructure in the railway corridor is a key receptor for wildlife in this area and much closer than the residential property to the south of the rail line and to the east of Woodside Avenue (shown on p. 9).

Lisa Malter

Ecologist