

## Comments in response to LPA Ecologist and Parish Council comments

### London Road, Pampisford

---

#### Parish Council Ecologist (Dr. Mark Rehfisch) Comments:

##### Bird survey

*Parish Council comments: Ecological appraisal carried out on a single day in August – too late in breeding season to find evidence of breeding by high biodiversity value species that have been reported in vicinity of site by CSa (corn bunting, song thrush [local BAP priority species] - and tree sparrow.) Minimum requirements are 3 evenly spaced site visits to be carried out between mid-April and June:*

CSa did not prescribe a breeding bird survey as, after a review of the habitats present at the site, it was considered that there was limited potential for a significant assemblage of rare/declining bird species to occur at the site.

*Parish council comments: Rapid search of existing datasets – BTO, breeding bird survey, waterways breeding survey should have been done:*

CSa acknowledges that the biological data search could be extended to encompass additional organisations. However we do not typically extend the search for initial appraisals unless the habitats present indicate significant potential for a more interesting range of species. We consider it doubtful that these other sources would hold relevant records for this site.

##### Reptiles

*Parish council comments: A reptile survey needs to be carried out between April and September with return visits.*

CSa recommended a reptile survey be carried out between April and September within the report. It is not unusual for the LPA to condition such a survey, although we do recommend this work be carried out up front.

##### Bats

*Parish council comments: Ecological appraisal should include at least 3 activity surveys to ensure no bat colonies are present:*

Only two derelict garages exist on site, which hold negligible bat potential. On this basis, no further survey of these buildings was considered to be required. Recommendations were made for the retention of trees on site, particularly the veteran willow tree, and a requirement for a further assessment to look for bat roosts was prescribed, if tree removal or tree surgery is required. There are no other habitats on site considered to offer potential for roosting bats. Existing industrial buildings were not included in the survey area.

### Otters

*Parish council comments: A protected species found 60m away from site yet value of London Road site is dismissed cursorily in ecological appraisal.*

CSa noted that the River Cam at its closest point is approximately 60m away. Potential for otters was identified and considered. There are no significant watercourses on site that would offer opportunities for otters. The ditches are actually dry and provide no obvious connection for dispersal purposes. The site and the River Cam is separated by an area of grazed pasture and thus it is unlikely that the site would be used as a lying up location for otters. Thus, no otter related issue was identified.

### Proposed mitigation

*Parish council comments: Ill-defined wish list with no targets.*

Our report provides general mitigation suggestions but is not presented as a detailed mitigation strategy.

### **Local Planning Authority Ecologist (Rob Mungovan) Comments:**

*LPA Ecologist objects strongly to culverting of ditches on site – contra to policy EN12 which seeks to retain features of biodiversity interest.*

The section of ditch that is to be culverted was dry, shaded and filled with leaf litter, dead branches, nettles and dumped materials. There was no aquatic vegetation and no signs of any water. With reference to OS maps this particular ditch doesn't appear to connect up to any existing water bodies at its eastern end. Apart from a few rabbit holes there were no signs of any use of the area by terrestrial wildlife. Thus no specific biodiversity interest was identified.

*LPA Ecologist also raised concerns re. planting proposals at southern boundaries and flooding concerns*

**CSa cannot comment on flooding concerns and has not seen the planting proposals.**

**SURFACE WATER DISPOSAL (SHORT STATEMENT)**

**PHASE 2**

Surface water is to be disposed of as follows:-

1. Car parking areas, road areas and footpaths areas will be surfaced with permeable paving, such as Marshalls Piora Pavers, laid over a permeable sub-base allowing rainfall to pass directly into the chalk subgrade.
2. Rainwater from roofs will be piped into the sub-base to the car park areas.
3. The thickness of sub base will be selected to provide sufficient storage of water to cater for a 1 in 100 year storm.
4. All work will be to the Environment Agency's approval.

**PHASE 3**

Surface water is to be disposed of as follows:-

1. Car parking areas, road areas and footpaths, will be surfaced with permeable paving such as Marshalls Piora Pavers, laid over a permeable sub base placed on a water proof membrane allowing rainfall to pass into the sub base for storage.
2. Rainwater from the roof of unit 7 will be piped into the sub base to the car park areas.
3. The thickness of the sub base will be selected to provide sufficient storage of water to cater for a 1 in 100 year storm.
4. Outflow from the sub base will be by seepage to a collection drain to the south and west of the access road. This will discharge to collection wells adjacent to the ditch, which will have controlled outlets such as orifice plates to ensure discharge does not exceed the permitted rates.
5. Rainwater from the roof to unit 6 will be piped to the diverted ditch with un-restricted discharge to reflect the existing flow to this ditch from existing paved areas on the site.
6. Alternative means of collection, storage and controlled discharge will be considered during design development on the same principle as above.
7. All work will be to the Environment Agency's approval.