

Ecology response for F/26/100816 MACKOY STADIUM, VT SPORTS GROUND, PORTSMOUTH ROAD, BURSLEDON, SO19 9PW

6 no. covered Padel courts, Padel centre (including Studio, changing areas and refreshments) and associated parking

Gregg Chapman

6/2/26

Objection

The red line boundary must be consistent across all plans. As explained in the EBC Biodiversity Planning Guidance Note (available at [Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain for Planning Applications](#)), a completed EBC Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy Form, a post development habitat map (which indicates where the proposed habitat enhancements would be located), a draft habitat management and monitoring plan and complete proposed landscape plan (which shows the whole site proposed for development) are required.

The Proposed site plan and the Landscape plan do not include all of the land shown in the baseline habitat plan. The red line boundary in the existing site plan does not include the same land as the baseline habitat plan. The red line boundary in the Design and Access statement is different to the baseline habitat plan.

The total site area is given as 1.1 ha on the application form, but the Statutory Metric lists the total site area as 1.55 ha. The site areas must be the same for all documents.

Parking is an issue on this site.

The main proposed site plan area is currently used as temporary parking. This is proposed to continue to be used as temporary parking, but the grassland is also proposed to be enhanced for biodiversity net gain. This is not consistent. Grassland used for car parking will deteriorate due to soil compaction and exposure pollutants from vehicles.

Land to the east of the proposed padel courts is shown as grassland on the baseline habitat plan but shown as parking in the proposed site plan.

Retrospective application F/24/98391 was permitted in October 2024 for a swale, gravel car park and semi-permanent marquee. The area proposed as grassland to the east of the padel courts was already gravelled and used as parking.

Ecology

I have reviewed the Ecological Assessment (EA) by Peach Ecology (January 2026). It states that the site supports habitat with potential to be used by common and widespread species, particularly nesting birds and foraging and commuting bats. *This grassland is subject to regular mowing, trampling and intensive recreational use, resulting in a short, uniform sward with frequent areas of wear.* The photo shows areas of bare earth due to wear from parking and footfall.

The recommendations for mitigation in the EA are appropriate and must be implemented. The mitigation plan in the EA does not match the proposed site plan, particularly along the northern boundary of the site and the locations of lines of trees which have been proposed.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

The amended metric V2 shows that 10.48% net gain in area habitats and 158.89% net gain in hedgerow habitats on site. All proposed enhancements must be shown on a post development habitat map. The total site area is given as 1.1 ha on the application form, but the Statutory Metric lists the total site area as 1.55 ha. The site areas must be the same for all documents.

The existing hedgerow with trees is proposed to be enhanced to a species-rich native hedgerow with trees.

Habitat to be created includes a bioswale, a larger area of mixed scrub, an enhanced area of modified grassland (some poor, some good, some moderate), changes to the trees, and an area of traditional orchard habitat??

A swale and French drain were approved in the same location for application F/24/98391. Have they been built? If the swale is existing from the previously approved application, then it cannot be included as biodiversity net gain for this application.

The grassland on the proposed site plan is labelled temporary grass parking area and bund to be reshaped to allow access to temporary grass parking area. Use of the grassland area for parking means that it is not able to be counted as enhanced grassland. It will be compacted by vehicles driving over it, even temporarily, and the plants will be subjected to increased levels of pollution. It would be subjected to close mowing to allow car parking. Cars driving over this area when the soil is wet would cause ruts and damage to the grass. The root protection areas of the trees and hedges would be impacted by car parking.

I don't see any areas that would be considered suitable to create traditional orchard habitat or any planting proposals which would match the criteria for traditional orchard habitat.

Surface water drainage

A surface water drainage strategy which conforms to DM6, shown on a plan, is required before determination. On sites of 1 hectare or more, or within 100 m of the River Itchen SAC or Solent Maritime SAC, SuDS schemes should include at least three forms of naturalised filtration. The full text of DM6 is available on page 63 at [eastleigh-borough-local-plan.pdf](#).

The site area is given as 1.10 ha on the application form. The total site area is given as 1.1 ha on the application form, but the Statutory Metric lists the total site area as 1.55 ha. The site areas must be the same for all documents.

DAS section 5.1.4 states that surface water drainage will be via soakaways with appropriate attenuation in accordance with policy DN3 an potential surface water flood risk on the site.

Soil infiltration test results must be submitted before determination to provide evidence on whether soakaways would function on this site. Soakaways must be located at least 5 m from any built structure.

If the fields are proposed to be used for parking, compaction due to vehicle use would change the drainage capability of the soil and surface water flooding could occur. Photo 9 in the Ecological Assessment shows drainage that has been impacted by car parking.

A swale is proposed, but it has not been shown how this would function in the surface water drainage strategy for this application.

A swale and French drain were approved in the same location for application F/24/98391. Have they been built?

Lighting

A wildlife sensitive lighting plan must be provided before determination. It must be compliant with lighting guidance note (GN08/23) available at [Guidance Note 8 Bats and Artificial Lighting | Institution of Lighting Professionals \(theilp.org.uk\)](https://theilp.org.uk/Guidance%20Note%208%20Bats%20and%20Artificial%20Lighting).

It must include

- Details of the type, height, position, and orientation of all lighting columns and luminaires;
- Lux level calculations for the playing surface and surrounding areas;
- Light spill, glare, and sky glow assessments, including vertical illuminance at nearby woodland boundaries
- Proposed hours of operation for the lighting;
- Measures to mitigate light pollution, including cowls, shields, or dimming controls where necessary.

As mentioned in the pollution control manager's comments, this should include the condition where all 6 courts are in operation at the same time. The lighting would be in addition to the lighting provided by existing and previously approved facilities. This includes lighting in the car parks, the football pitch, the marquee and exterior lighting on other buildings.

Lisa Malter
Ecologist