

Ecology response 14 7 25 for F/24/98678 Land East of Chickenhall Lane, Eastleigh, SO50 6AF

Construction of a 70-bed care home (Use Class C2), with associated parking, landscaping, access, drainage, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.

Rebecca Altman

14/7/25

I have reviewed the amended documents submitted since 12/6/25 and the email explaining the updates. The email states that *the solar shadow drawings show next to no discernible impact on the riparian zone between the trees and the river*, which addresses the previous concern. Although I am unhappy with this development due to proximity to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI and the buffer to the SAC varying from 8 to 15 m which is less than we require, I am no longer able to object to this application on ecological grounds.

I can see an amended Ecological Impact Appraisal rev C, an amended Flood Risk Assessment with appendices, and amended Statutory BNG metric Rev B, and amended proposed site plan and a range of shading diagrams. It is not clear what has been changed in the other amended documents. When this information is provided so that any additional review can be done efficiently, I will provide an updated Ecology response.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist

12/6/25

I have reviewed the additional documents submitted on 28/5/25. Although I am unhappy with this development due to proximity to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI and the buffer to the SAC varying from 8 to 15 m which is less than we require, I am no longer able to object to this application on ecological grounds.

Should you decide to permit this application, the following information must be considered:

HRA

The shadow HRA by FPCR (May 2025) has screened out potential effects on the River Itchen SAC other than water pollution, siltation, hydrological changes and inappropriate water levels. Water pollution must be assessed at the Appropriate Assessment stage for the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar and the Solent Maritime SAC.

The nutrient offset mitigation scheme is proposed to mitigate the effects of nutrients from this scheme.

The SuDS mitigation is proposed to show no net increase in pollution from surface water runoff. Section 5.10 states that the filtration systems proposed would provide >0.95 pollution indices. This should be corrected to pollution mitigation indices (as opposed to pollution hazard indices) well in excess of the 0.5 index level required by Ciria SuDS guidelines. The measures proposed in sections 5.12 through 5.17 seem appropriate to mitigate dust and

sediment during construction and must be incorporated into the drainage strategy and the CEMP.

The planting proposed in the buffer zone to the River Barton is mostly appropriate, however pendulous sedge spreads very easily, becoming invasive and out-competing other plants. A different sedge species should be used. The use of plastic guards is not recommended as these could possibly enter the river. If any guards at all are required to allow new planting to establish, they should be cardboard, wood or metal and carefully monitored and removed when damaged or no longer needed. The landscape management plan and the habitat monitoring and management plan must include assessments for invasive species and removal of tree guards.

Shadowing

The Shadowing Technical Note by Harris Irwin Architects (April 2025) addresses potential shadowing of north facing accommodation for the residents, but the potential effects of shading from the building onto the SAC buffer zone have not been addressed.

SuDS

Section 5.9 lists three SuDS stages (a hydro-filter channel drain, a permeable sub-base, and; a SPEL Smartcepter), these SuDS components are filters. They are not above ground naturalised filtration as required by EBC policy DM6, however given the constraints of the site, this will be acceptable.

Updated CEMP by Highwood Construction (V4, 2005)

The following requests were made in the previous Ecology response dated 5/2/25, to update the previous CEMP V3. I don't see this information in V4. If it is there, please submit a highlighted version demonstrating this or detailed notes on which sections contain this information.

The locations of the silt barriers and bunds around the eastern perimeter of the site adjacent to the Barton River must be added to the site logistics plan in Appendix 1.

A named site manager must be identified to inspect, repair and replace silt barriers and bunds daily. Replacement supplies for silt barriers must be kept on site and always available All site operatives must understand the importance of keeping the silt barriers intact and functional.

All excavations and open pipes must either be covered at night or fitted with a small animal escape ramp to allow any animals to escape if they fall in. These areas must be checked by the site manager every morning before the ramps are removed.

Specific precautionary working method statements for each protected species must be conditioned in a separate document (ECEMP) as proposed by the Ecological Impact Assessment report.

The dust-suppression recommendations for the CEMP listed in 5.15 and 5.16 are appropriate.

The site logistics plan shows that material storage has been located as far from the river as possible. Any construction refuse must be sufficiently enclosed to prevent any waste from escaping and from being blown about and into the River Itchen SAC.

Amended Landscape General Arrangement Plan by Deacon Design (Rev F, May 2025)

The main changes I can see in the Landscape General Arrangement Plan are the addition of more trees along the eastern boundary, removal of a tree in the garden opposite the garden room, and removal of a rain garden area in the centre of the path in the southern-most corner. These changes are acceptable from an ecological perspective.

Lisa Malter

Ecologist