

Hill Head Residents' Association

Comments regarding the proposal and the Draft S106 Agreement
for the use two fields off Old Street for mitigation for loss of land at
Newgate Lane, Fareham supporting wintering Brent Geese
Planning Appeal APP/A1720/W/20/3252185

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Hill Head Residents Association (HHRA) were only able to view the draft S106 Agreement on the 21st November 2020 therefore there has been limited time to research and prepare these comments which, hopefully will be of assistance at the Appeal hearing starting on 1st December 2020.
- 1.2 HHRA do not wish to comment on the proposal to erect houses at Newgate Lane South and will restrict comments to the proposal to use parts of two fields west of Old Street as mitigation for loss of land used by wintering Brent Geese at the Newgate Lane South site.
- 1.3 HHRA do not in principle oppose the use of the fields for mitigation purposes but wish to ensure that the Brent Geese and wintering waders together with birds and mammals using the site throughout the year are safeguarded in any mitigation.
- 1.4 The proposed mitigation area borders the eastern edge of the Titchfield Haven National Nature Reserve (the Haven) which is an SSSI, SPA and a RAMSAR site.
- 1.5 Detailed evidence regarding the birdlife and ecology of the Haven and the two fields was provided to the Planning Inquiry at the Appeal Hearing APP/A1720/W/18/3200409 in relation to a proposal by Bargate to build 150 houses on the total area of the two fields. A copy of this evidence is appended and records the use of the fields by Brent Geese dependent upon the crop being grown.
- 1.6 The evidence provided highlights the adverse effect of disturbance by people and dogs on the feeding of Brent Geese, Black Tailed Godwit and other Waders together with nesting of Marsh Harriers

and other ground nesting birds. It is essential that access to the two fields by the public is not permitted: this issue is not explicitly addressed in the documentation we have seen.

2. Mitigation measures and site maintenance.

2.1 Any mitigation must take into account the effect on the Haven and the bird population throughout the year.

2.2 The mitigation is for the benefit of the Brent Geese.

2.3 Is the proposed use of a rye grass and white clover mix the most appropriate option for the Brent Geese? We understand that this is suitable for nitrate mitigation.

2.4 The proposal to retain a wild field margin around the mitigation areas is welcomed. Various raptors hunt for food in the fields.

2.5 In the document *Winter Bird Management*, Timing of Actions, it is noted that the fields will only be cut to 60mm every 4 years. Since the Brent Geese generally appear to prefer short grass the 60mm cut should be performed every September. Evidence of the Brent Geese feeding habits can be observed on the playing fields at HMS Sultan, Gosport and similar playing fields at Drayton, Portsmouth

2.6 Will cattle be able to reduce the height of the rye grass to 60mm, suitable for Brent Geese, in any year when mowing of the grass is not carried out?

2.7 We are advised that rye grass can grow to over 150mm in the growing season, therefore if it is proposed to take a silage crop this could be done after ground nesting birds have fledged in late July/ August.

3. Liaison with Titchfield Haven

3.1 We believe it is essential that Hampshire County Council Countryside Service who own and are responsible for the Haven should be involved in the discussions to finalise the S106 Agreement.

3.2 It would also be important for the Contractor to maintain a close working relationship with the Haven management.

3.3 When consulted on the Planning Application P/17/1451/OA to build the 150 houses, Hampshire County Council commented "We consider that the proposal does not address the issue of disturbance to the reserve or the security of the eastern reserve boundary...."

3.4 HHRA consider it essential that public and dogs are excluded from the mitigation site.

Note: in the Birds UU Engrossment document, the Old Street fields are referred to as being in Warsash. This is incorrect. They are in Hill Head.

Pamela Charlwood and Mike Rose

On behalf of Hill Head Residents' Association

22 November 2020