

Consultee Comments for Planning Application APP/21/01451

Application Summary

Application Number: APP/21/01451

Address: Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PE

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for the scale and appearance of the development, the landscaping of the site and the layout of buildings pursuant to Planning Permission ref.

APP/17/00863 (B) (Outline Application (All Matters Reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works). Request to Discharge Condition 17 of Planning Permission APP/17/00863 (B) as amended by APP/21/01292 (Design Code) and Condition 26 of Permission APP/17/00863 (B) (viability assessment).

Case Officer: Arleta Miszewska

Consultee Details

Name: Consultee Principal Ecologist

Address: Public Service Plaza, Civic Centre Road, Havant PO9 2AX

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Ecologist

Comments

Dear Arleta,

APP/21/01451 | Reserved Matters application for the scale and appearance of the development, the landscaping of the site and the layout of buildings pursuant to Planning Permission ref.

APP/17/00863 (B) (Outline Application (All Matters Reserved except means of access) for the demolition of 1983 office building and associated brick and glass corridor link and development of up to 70 residential units, associated landscaping, parking and infrastructure works). Request to Discharge Condition 17 of Planning Permission APP/17/00863 (B) as amended by APP/21/01292 (Design Code) and Condition 26 of Permission APP/17/00863 (B) (viability assessment). |

Southleigh Park House, Eastleigh Road, Havant, PO9 2PE

Thank you for consulting me on this application. I have provided comments on this site for a number of years.

This application is accompanied by an Ecological Impact Assessment (ECOSA, October 2023) which includes details of previous ecological surveys and more recent update surveys.

On the issue of the rare Bechsteins Bat, the report (paragraph 4.4.2) states that three Bechsteins Bats have been trapped at the site; a single male and two juveniles. However, the July 2022 trapping surveys recorded a single adult lactating female bat, indicating that the site is within the

range of a maternity roost. The discussion in the report does not mention this female bat nor does it expand on the implications of this finding i.e. that a actively breeding female was present on site. In other words, the discussion on Bechsteins Bat is the same as the previous April 2018 report and has not been updated to reflect recent survey results. Similarly, the discussion of impacts at paragraph 5.5.1 does not mention Bechsteins Bat at all, despite the site having been shown to support at least four individuals including the lactating female. I consider that further information/interpretation is required in order to contextualise the site with respect to Bechsteins Bat in particular and bat species more generally.

I cannot see a lighting strategy within the submitted documents. Given the very high sensitivity of the site for bat species, it is imperative that the applicant is able to demonstrate that bat roosts within buildings and bat foraging/commuting habitat elsewhere is not impacted by artificial lighting. Further information is required.

I note the detailed comments made by your Arboricultural consultee regarding his disappointment with the proposed site layout. There is clearly some synergy here with the ability of the developed site to contain better habitat for bat species through enhanced tree/shrub plantings, and I would like to see how the applicant responds to the consultee comments on trees.

The ecology report contains minimal details on proposed ecological landscaping. I note the intention to include enhanced grassland in the south of the site (overseeding the retained lawn) as well as native plantings in various places. These are found in more detail on the submitted Design Code documents, but proposed establishment and ongoing management measures are not included.

In summary, whilst not explicitly related to the discharge of Conditions 17 and 26, I hope the comments here are helpful in assessing the suitability of ecological information.

NPPF, Circular 06/2005 and Natural England Standing Advice on Protected Species, require that planning decisions are based on full, up-to-date ecological information and it is essential that all necessary survey, assessment and mitigation information is available to the LPA prior to determination, particularly in the case of protected species, which are a material planning consideration. This will enable the LPA to determine the application on the basis of full knowledge about the ecological impacts of the proposal and to ensure that any impacts can and will be mitigated, and are acceptable.

If you have any queries, please dont hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Tristan

Tristan Norton

Principal Ecologist | E: tristan.norton@havant.gov.uk

Planning Services, Havant Borough Council, Public Service Plaza, Havant, PO9 2AX