

Ecology response for F/23/96573 Boundary Lakes Golf Club, Moorhill Road, Eastleigh, SO30 3XH

Erection of golf course clubhouse and ancillary facilities, car parking area, together with internal access roads, landscaping, and SuDs.

Summer Sharpe

14/2/24

This application is a modification of the previous proposal F/20/88655, which was permitted, with a smaller building footprint, and a larger interior space.

Overall, this proposal would be acceptable subject to similar conditions as approved in the previous application. The following information is requested and some changes may be required.

Ecology

The mitigation and biodiversity enhancements must accord with the recommendations in sections 5.2 Mitigation and 5.3 Enhancements in the Ecological Appraisal report for redesign by Johns Associates (version 2.0, December 2023).

In 5.2.8 MIT of this report, it states that bat and bird boxes will only be checked, cleaned and maintained every year for the first 5 years, but this should be done in perpetuity, not only for five years as stated in the report.

The Ecological Appraisal report states that *No vegetation is proposed for removal however if any vegetation is required to be carried out it will be conducted outside the bird nesting season (February – September inclusive) or preceded by a nesting bird check from a suitably qualified ecologist.*

However, trees T1209, 1208, 1215, 1213, 1212, 1211 and 1210 are proposed to be removed at the site entrance (to provide a better visibility splay?) according to the Landscape Masterplan by Johns Associates (rev E, November 2023). Have these trees already been removed or are they still in place?

The placement of the putting green area next to the attenuation basin to east of building and the proposed chipping, putting and professionals' lessons area to the west of car park are different from the previous application. I object to the locations of golf activities in both areas because they would need increased fertiliser and herbicide/pesticide usage to maintain them, and they are located next to areas which would be ecologically vulnerable to these products. Most of the area around T15 in this plan would be putting green with the proposed wildflower area squeezed into the area around the much smaller attenuation basin and around T14. In the previous plan the wildflower grassland was much larger and there were no golf course features located within the red line boundary.

Biodiversity Net Gain

As some of the biodiversity net gain features of the previous plan do not seem to be the same as this plan, it is not clear that net gain will be achieved with this layout. The substitution of a putting green for a larger area of wildflower meadow habitat and the apparent reduced area of the attenuation pond, swale and related plantings

Lighting

The External Lighting Environmental Statement by Ollio (rev 4, December 2023) is not of the same quality or depth as the previous lighting report (rev 3, June 2021) by the same company but issued by C. Murphy rather than E. Murphy. Parts of it appear to have been photocopied rather than printed and are blurry, not readable. I was impressed with the information in rev 3 and rev 4 is not at all acceptable.

Rev 4 refers to an earlier 2020 lighting guidance note which has now been superseded. The most recent ILP lighting guidance note is GN08/23. The report should be updated to reflect the latest guidance. The lighting model view in Figure 3 should be superimposed upon the site plan, clearly showing all areas of vegetation, the proposed building and SuDS pond.

Grid 1 shows the building and the car park but not the vegetation along the southern boundary. There is black and yellow text is not legible in these diagrams, in the area to the west of the car park for example. A key for the coloured lines in each diagram and an explanation of what each of the diagrams is showing is also required. Sometimes the lux values are visible and sometimes they are missing. The first three diagrams are both labelled Grid 1 but there is no explanation of how they are different. It is not clear what the Grid 2 diagrams are showing at all. The Grid 3 diagrams are also unclear.

I don't see a caretaker's flat in the revised site plan, but it is still mentioned in the lighting report. The revised SuDS pond is not shown in these lighting diagrams. It would attract foraging bats and should be kept dark all night. The line of trees along the entrance road would also attract foraging bats and should be kept dark. The chipping and putting area is located along the woodland edge. Is this designed to be used only during daylight hours? If so, why does it need any lighting as shown in fig 3 Lighting Model View?

A lighting strategy and lighting model of the potential light spill from the operational building along with a monitoring survey following the completion of the building is required. The lighting strategy must demonstrate light spill of no more than 1 lux on any area which might be used by bats. This would include the SuDS/wildlife pond, wildflower meadow plantings and woodland edges. Potential light spill from the operational building must be shown clearly to demonstrate whether any ecological features might be affected.

SuDS

The SuDS attenuation basin appears reduced in size with steeper sides compared to the previous application. The swale was also longer, providing longer water treatment before

discharge off site. The wording of the conditions recommended in the LLFA consultation response is acceptable with the following amendments:

Local plan policy currently requires attenuation for storm events up to and including 1 in 100 plus 45% for climate change. This should be specified.

Pollution hazard and mitigation calculations using the simple index approach from the Ciria SuDS Manual C753 must be shown to demonstrate that all potential water quality hazards will be mitigated.

A surface water drainage plan showing the direction of flow of surface water drainage and exceedance flows using arrows is required.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist