

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Survey site:

32-36 Bournemouth Road, Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh, SO53 3ZL

Client:

Portakabin Ltd.

Report date:

25/07/2025

Project:

This report has been produced to support a planning application with Eastleigh Borough Council. The proposal is described as: *'demolition of an existing office building and replacement with associated landscaping.'*

PEA Survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Site context.....	4
Habitats and flora	4
Designated Sites.....	6
Invasive / non-native species	7
Invertebrates	7
Bats	8
Birds	11
Reptiles.....	11
Amphibians.....	12
Badger.....	13
Otters and Water Voles	14
Hazel dormouse.....	14
Other species - hedgehog	14
Appendix A: Site Location Plan	16
Appendix B: UKHabs Habitat Plan	17
Appendix C: Site Photographs	18
Appendix D: Legal and Report Version.....	19

The field survey was undertaken by Laurence Wills ACIEEM, BSc (Hons), Senior Ecologist. Laurence has 4 years' experience completing Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessments and holds a Natural England Class 2 bat licence (licence number available on request).					
Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
11/06/2025	23	74	10	1.73	None
Report Validity					
This report is considered valid for a period of 18 months in accordance with CIEEM guidance in the lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys.					
Limitations					
It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This assessment provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of protected species being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the wider landscape, the ecology and biology of species as currently understood, and the known distribution of species as recovered during the searches of historical biological records. A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.					
Executive Summary					
<i>Further Surveys required to inform the planning application</i>					
None.					
<i>Recommended Mitigation/Compensation Requirements</i>					
Invertebrates	Ecological enhancement proposed.				
Bats	Lighting mitigation proposed.				
Birds	Ecological enhancement proposed.				

Ecological Survey Factor Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations	Detailed using desk study and site survey. Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the Project Ecologist for advice. A site location plan in Appendix A, a site habitat plan in Appendix B, and site photographs in Appendix C. Botanical species are described with reference to the DAFOR scale (D = Dominant; A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare).
Site context	
	The site is located within an urban area of Chandlers Ford, Southampton (national grid reference: SU 43270 20364). The site comprises an office block and surrounding areas of hardstanding. Residential properties are located immediately to the south and east, with associated amenity gardens and scattered mature trees. Small pockets of woodland are situated further to the east, while industrial areas dominate the landscape to the north, west, and far south. Due to the surrounding urban infrastructure and limited on-site habitats, the local and wider environment is considered to hold low potential for supporting wildlife. The site does not contain any habitats listed as a habitat of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). Other habitats within the site have low ecological value. Notable habitats are present within 2km.
Habitats and flora	
<i>Survey Results</i>	Habitats recorded on site include: • u1b5 – Buildings • u1b6 – Other developed land A description of each habitat type is provided below with photos shown in Appendix C and locations of the habitats illustrated on the site plan in Appendix B:

	<u><i>u1b5 – Buildings</i></u> The site comprises a large two storey office block within the northern section of the site (a full description is provided within the 'Bats' section). Multiple temporary storage containers/staffing facilities are also present within the southwest section of the site. These buildings/structures are surrounded entirely by hardstanding. No ecological species of interest were recorded within these areas of the site. <u><i>u1b6 – Other developed land</i></u> Areas of hardstanding consisting of parking areas and turning spaces make up the majority of the site. Amenity gardens and a mature line of trees with areas of scrub are adjacent this area off site to the southeast, however a clear boundary and fencing segregates these habitats from the site. No ecological species of interest were recorded within these areas of the site. <i>The Surrounding Landscape</i> A review of the Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) database was completed to determine the presence of protected and/ or notable habitats within 2km of the site. Protected and/ or notable habitats recorded within 2km and their nearest distance from the site are detailed below. • UK Priority Habitat: Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh – ~270m north. • UK Priority Habitat: Purple Moor Grass and Rush Pasture – ~530m northwest.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	<i>The Site</i> There are no substantial habitats within the site and therefore there is considered to be no ecological habitat value.

	<i>The Surrounding Landscape</i> Due to the distance between the site and nearest protected/notable habitat and the localised impacts of the proposed development, no impacts to protected/notable habitats in the wider landscape are anticipated.
<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Further Surveys</i> The project is unlikely to trigger the requirement for a biodiversity net gain assessment as it falls under the de minimis exemption, however the Local Planning Authority may still request a net gain assessment under their own local planning policy. <i>Enhancements</i> To enhance the site for biodiversity in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), native species of local importance should be selected for landscaping within the development. Mature trees should be included to promote natural linear features within the environment, as well as grassland habitats to create opportunities for small mammals and invertebrates. These enhancements should be situated, wherever possible, as close to already established off site habitats.
Designated Sites	
<i>Survey Results</i>	<i>Statutory designated sites</i> A 2km radius data search for the presence of statutory designations has been undertaken using the MAGIC database. The data search indicates that the site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory designations. However, the below designated site is located within 2km of the site: • Valley Park Woodlands LNR – 350km northwest The site is situated within the Trodds Copse and River Itchen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact zone.

	<i>Non-statutory designated sites</i> The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from Hampshire Biological Information Centre (HBIC). However, due to the small-scale impacts of the development on site and surrounding habitats, a local search is not deemed necessary.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	<i>Statutory and non-statutory designated sites</i> No impacts to designated sites are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such sites (where known) as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None.
Invasive / non-native species	
<i>Survey results</i>	No problematic invasive and non-native species recorded on site.
<i>Foreseen impacts</i>	None.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Remain vigilant for colonising invasive/non-native species.
Invertebrates	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	The habitats present on-site include artificial surfaces. The site contains no further notable habitats which may provide niches for specialised or protected invertebrates.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	The artificial surfaces and scattered plants will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local invertebrate populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally.

Recommendations	Biodiversity enhancements The incorporation of bee bricks (e.g. Ibstock BeeHabitat or similar alternative brand) into the fabric of the new building would provide sheltering opportunities for pollinators and reintroduce habitats for invertebrates to prevent an onsite loss. These should be installed 0.5m above ground level on a south-facing elevation with nearby flowering plants. Alternatively, the site could be enhanced via the provision of additional native wildflowers or wildflower turf, which would provide foraging opportunities for invertebrates.																				
Bats																					
Survey Findings	Desk Study A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. The results are displayed below: <table><tr><th>Bat species</th><th>Year licence obtained</th><th>Licence Activity</th><th>Distance from site</th></tr><tr><td>Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>), common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>), soprano pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>), serotine (<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>)</td><td>2017</td><td>Roost destruction</td><td>~925m north</td></tr><tr><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>2014</td><td>Roost destruction</td><td>~1.1km south</td></tr><tr><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>2009</td><td>Roost destruction</td><td>~1.2km southeast</td></tr><tr><td>Soprano pipistrelle</td><td>2021</td><td>Roost modified</td><td>~1.5km northeast</td></tr></table> There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) designated for bats within 10km of the site.	Bat species	Year licence obtained	Licence Activity	Distance from site	Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>), common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>), soprano pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>), serotine (<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>)	2017	Roost destruction	~925m north	Common pipistrelle	2014	Roost destruction	~1.1km south	Common pipistrelle	2009	Roost destruction	~1.2km southeast	Soprano pipistrelle	2021	Roost modified	~1.5km northeast
Bat species	Year licence obtained	Licence Activity	Distance from site																		
Brown long-eared bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>), common pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>), soprano pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>), serotine (<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>)	2017	Roost destruction	~925m north																		
Common pipistrelle	2014	Roost destruction	~1.1km south																		
Common pipistrelle	2009	Roost destruction	~1.2km southeast																		
Soprano pipistrelle	2021	Roost modified	~1.5km northeast																		

Foraging and commuting habitat

Habitats recorded on site were assessed and considered to provide little opportunities for foraging and commuting bats due to the lack of habitats that would support invertebrates that could be utilised as a feeding source, or tall linear features that could be utilised for commuting.

Building – B1 (office building)

An office building is present in the northern area of the site. A table is provided below with internal and external descriptions (photos provided in **Appendix C**):

<i>External</i>	<i>Internal</i>
• The building is constructed from a brick base with glass and corrugated metal elevations. • The roof is pitched and constructed from metal panelling. • Metal window and door frames are present. • Metal fascia panels are present at the eaves. • A small single storey porch extension is present on the east elevation, comprising a flat roof.	• Internal loft void is not accessible due to limited access. However, the loft void within the building is very limited and consists mainly of lighting installations and ceiling structures.

B1 - Bat Evidence

A thorough search for bat evidence was undertaken on the external features of the building and no evidence was recorded.

B1 - Access Points / Roosting Provisions

No potential access points or roosting provisions were recorded on or within the building. All roof features were inspected and are not considered suitable for roosting bats due to the lack of void or crevice areas around the building.

	B1 - Conclusion The building has been assessed in line with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidelines and considered to hold 'negligible' potential for roosting bats due to the absence of potential access points or roosting provisions. Roosting bats – trees There are no mature trees on site and therefore no trees have been deemed suitable for roosting bats due to a lack of suitable features.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Foraging and commuting bats The addition of artificial lighting as a result of the development may cause adverse impacts on commuting bats. Although this is considered to be limited, this could result in the disturbance of flight paths around the local environment and lead to the abandonment of the commuting path, if present.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Commuting and Foraging bats - Mitigation Although external lighting will be required for health and safety around the site, any lighting installed will be minimal and will adhere to the 'Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night' Guidance Note BN08/23 (BCT & ILP, 2023). These specifications include (but are not limited to): • External lighting will be positioned to ensure that no light spills onto nearby vegetation, including mature trees. • All lighting fixtures will be free of ultraviolet (UV) components. Metal halide and compact fluorescent lamps will not be utilised. • LED lighting will be exclusively employed, offering sharp cut-off, lower intensity, excellent colour rendering, and dimming capabilities. • A warm white light source with a colour temperature of 2700 Kelvin or lower will be used to minimise the blue light component.

Birds	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	The buildings on site have limited potential to support nesting birds due to the low flat roof and small 'shelves' located around the eaves of the building. There is no vegetation on site with the potential to support nesting bird species. The vegetation within the surrounding landscape is considered to be a sufficient distance to the development.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	The demolition of the building may result in the disturbance or loss of nesting birds. Nesting birds are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act. (1981) (as amended) and must be protected, if present.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Mitigation The demolition of the building should be undertaken outside of the nesting bird season (March-August). If this period cannot be avoided, an inspection for nesting birds will be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist. If nesting activity is recorded, a 5m radius buffer will be installed and this area will be left untouched and undisturbed until the chicks have fledged. Biodiversity Enhancement features In line with the NPPF, habitat enhancements for nesting birds could be incorporated into the new development onsite. A minimum of two bird boxes will be installed on mature trees (once they have established). Suitable bird boxes include (but not limited to): • Vivara Pro Barcelona WoodStone Open Nest Box. • Vivara Pro Seville 28mm WoodStone Nest Box
Reptiles	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	Desk Study A search of the Magic.gov.uk database indicates that there have been no granted EPSL pertaining to reptiles within 2km of the site.

	<i>On site Habitats</i> There is no suitable habitat present on site for reptiles due to a lack of habitats such as scrub and rank grassland which would offer refuge for these species. Further, the site is mostly surrounded by urban development (i.e. roads and buildings) which is considered sub-optimal for reptile migration. Although mature trees and scrub is present to the south, this area suffers from poor connectivity and as a result it is considered unlikely that this would therefore be optimal. Reptiles are therefore considered unlikely to migrate from any nearby suitable habitats to the development site. As such it is likely that reptiles are absent from the development site.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts anticipated.
Recommendations	None.
Amphibians	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	<i>Desk Study</i> A search for EPSL records for great crested newts was undertaken on MAGIC and no recorded exist within 2km of the site. Great crested newts exist in metapopulations and are known to utilise ponds and their connecting terrestrial habitat during their life cycle; great crested newts are typically found within terrestrial habitats up to 500m from breeding ponds (Langton et al. 2001). <i>Aquatic habitat suitability (including ponds within 500m)</i> There are no ponds on the site, but a review of aerial imagery (MAGIC and OS Maps) indicates two streams/watercourses within 500m; 120m west and 270m north. The connectivity to both watercourses are very poor due to the presence of dense urban development, which are considered to present significant challenges for GCN and amphibians to commute through, if present.

	<i>Terrestrial Habitat Suitability</i> Due to the artificial-urban nature of the site and the lack of vegetation present, the site is not considered suitable for great crested newts or other amphibians. There is no vegetation or growth that has the potential to provide refuge or foraging opportunities that are considered suitable or would attract species onto the site.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	The site comprises artificial-urban surfaces with no vegetation present that is considered suitable for refuge or foraging activities for great crested newts or amphibians. The site is located within dense urban development and does not act as a commuting corridor between habitats within the environment. The development of the site will not be removing any habitat within the area that would be seen to be detrimental to great crested newts or their activities.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None required.
Badger	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	No badger setts were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. The site is considered unsuitable for badgers given the lack of suitable sett excavation areas/ground. Further, there is no suitable badger foraging habitat on site given the lack of fruiting trees/scrub. The site is also surrounded by dense urban development, which is sub-optimal habitat therefore reducing the likelihood of badgers being present within the surrounding area of the site. Although tree and scrub habitat are present to the south, this habitat suffers from poor connectivity and is considered unlikely to be utilised. The site is also located on the edge of urban development and therefore no habitats are present beyond the site that would be desirable for badgers. Commuting activities on site is therefore seen as negligible.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts are anticipated on badgers as a result of the proposed development.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None.

Otters and Water Voles	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	The site contains no suitable habitat to support otters or water voles due to the lack of aquatic habitats on or adjacent the site.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	None.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None.
Hazel dormouse	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	Desk Study A search of the Magic.gov.uk database indicates that there is one granted EPSL pertaining to dormice within 2km of the site; 480m northeast. Habitats The site is within an urban setting and there are no suitable habitats within the development area. As such it is considered highly likely that hazel dormice are absent from site. Although habitats offsite to the north could be seen as suitable, the poor connectivity to this area and disturbance from the nearby train line is considered to provide areas that are sub-optimal.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	None.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None.
Other species - hedgehog	
<i>Survey Findings</i>	No habitats are present onsite have the potential to support hedgehogs due to the shortly kept nature of the grassland. The surrounding habitats are also considered limited for hedgehogs due to the lack of developed grasslands mixed vegetation.

<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	None.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None required.

Appendix A: Site Location Plan



Appendix B: UKHabs Habitat Plan



Appendix C: Site Photographs



Photo 1: B1 within the central area of the site.



Photo 2: B1 within the central area of the site.



Photo 3: Areas of hardstanding.



Photo 4: Areas of hardstanding.



Photo 5: B1 within the central area of the site and area of hardstanding.



Photo 6: Areas of hardstanding.

Appendix D: Legal and Report VersionLegal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Final	1.0	Laurence Wills ACIEEM, BSc (Hons), Senior Ecologist	25/07/2025