

Ecology consultation for DC/25/99595 Land at Netley Firs, Kanes Hill, SOUTHAMPTON, SO19 6AJ

11 (Dust Assessment and Mitigation), 13&14 (Tree Protection and Arboriculture Method Statement), 15 (Levels), Condition 16 (Pedestrian Link Construction Detail), Condition 17 (Invasive Plant Assessment), Condition 18 (Habitat Enhancement and Management), Condition 19 (Lighting), Condition 20 (Remediation), and Condition 23 and 24 (Foul and Surface Water Drainage) and 25 (Noise Mitigation) and 31 (Acoustic Barriers) of Outline Planning Permission O/18/82750 (Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 23 employment units (up to 5,905 sq.m.) with units 12-20 for Use Class B1 (b) and (c) and units 1-11 and 21-23 for Use Class B2, with associated car parking and access. Detailed matters considered: Access and layout) approved March 2021.

Greg Chapman

23/2/26

Condition 17 Invasive Plant Assessment

I have reviewed the Invasive Plant Assessment and Removal technical note by MJA Consulting (February 2026). It is not clear who has written this strategy for removal of invasive plants, what their qualifications are or during what year and when in the season any update walkovers have been done.

The technical note states that Rhododendron (which is listed as an invasive species by the GB non-native species secretariat) has been identified as the only invasive species present and a watching brief will be in place during tree clearance work. It is not clear who will be involved in the watching brief and whether or not they are qualified to identify invasive plant species.

Rhododendron was identified in a 2017 Phase 1 ecological assessment by Pro Vision, with the site visit done in June, which is a suitable time for invasive species to be identified, however this survey is over 8 years old. I cannot find any update surveys for invasive species done by suitably qualified ecologists since that time. Since development has not started, the strategy must contain an update walkover by a suitably qualified ecologist to determine whether any additional invasive species have appeared since 2017. It must also specify where the Rhododendron is located now, specifically how it will be removed, how to prevent spreading on and off site, the methods used to dispose of invasive plant material and how regrowth will be prevented. The latest guidance from Natural England, DEFRA and the Environment Agency must be followed, available at: [How to stop invasive non-native plants from spreading - GOV.UK](#). Condition 17 cannot be discharged without this information.

Condition 18 Habitat Enhancement and Management

I have reviewed the Habitat Enhancement and Management Plan (HEMP) by Pro Vision (January 2026). There are three bird boxes (1B Nest Box or similar) planned for the retained woodland edge which is designated for Rhododendron removal. To avoid disturbance to nesting birds, the Rhododendron should be removed before the nest boxes are installed and outside of bird nesting season (ie removed between September and February). If this is not

possible, then a nesting bird check must be done immediately before work. Any active nests must be protected from disturbance by a 5 m buffer until after the young have fledged and left the nest.

Condition 19 Lighting

I have reviewed the Lighting Strategy (rev PL2, January 2026) together with the Habitat Enhancement Management Plan. The relevant guidance has been listed on the Lighting Plan notes but lux levels have only been provided for the roadway through the development and not the woodland areas or bat box/tube locations. There are three lighting columns shown along the northern roadway next to the retained woodland edge but it is not clear that the light only shines on the roadway. There are also some red, blue and green lines but no key to show what they indicate.

Condition 24 Surface Water Drainage

I have reviewed the Foul and Surface Water Technical Note and the Response to LLFA Consultation by MJA Consulting.

In the outline application, permeable surfacing with underground soakaways were initially proposed.

The results of the infiltration testing show that an infiltrating surface water drainage strategy will not be possible due to high groundwater levels and reduced infiltration rates. However, the latest Surface Water Drainage Strategy (PL3, 06.08.2025 by MJA Consulting) shows deep infiltrating cellular storage. Please explain why this is considered possible with high groundwater levels and reduced infiltration rates.

The technical note states that Surface water falling on the roads, parking areas and roofs of buildings will be directed towards the road sub-bases for treatment and attenuation. The water will be directed into two attenuation tanks under the access road and then discharged at a rate of 2 l/s into a new surface water sewer which will connect to the existing surface water sewer in Kinsbourne Way. The pollution hazard mitigation index has been used to demonstrate that the permeable paving will provide sufficient treatment prior to discharge however this alone is not compliant with Eastleigh Borough Council local plan policy DM6.

The site area given on the application form is 2.05 ha.

DM 6 states New development (excluding extensions to dwellings and changes of use), will only be permitted if it incorporates Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Wherever feasible, naturalised filtration should be included within the treatment train as follows: a. On sites of 1 hectare or more, or within 100m of the River Itchen SAC or Solent Maritime SAC, SuDS schemes should include **at least three forms of naturalised filtration**.

To comply with DM,6 additional forms of filtration are required for all surface water before discharge off site.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist