

Wiltshire Council Planning Consultation Response

ECOLOGY

Officer name:	Jenna Buss
Date:	20/04/2026
Application number:	PL/2025/07278
Proposal:	Extension to Brickworth Quarry (Sandland) to allow the extraction, processing and export of sand followed by backfill with imported inert materials and quarry waste; Importation and blending of sand; Retention and continued use of site compound and buildings, plant site and storage areas; Restoration to commercial forestry and agriculture at original ground levels together with long-term biodiversity enhancements
Site address:	Brickworth Quarry, Whiteparish, Salisbury, SP5 2QE
Case officer:	Adam Madge

Recommendations:

	No Comment
	Support
	No objection
	Condition (no objection subject to conditions)
x	Objection - further information required
	Objection in principle
	HRA completed/required

Further Information Required:

	Issue	Policy/Legislative Compliance	Date information requested & Further information required	Satisfactorily addressed (Document & Date)
1	GCN – European Protected Species	Habitat Regulations, Core Policy 69	GCN Rapid Risk Assessment and supporting mitigation strategy where required	No
2	Dormouse-European Protected Species	Habitat Regulations, Core Policy 69	Dormouse Mitigation Strategy	No
3	LEMP	Core Policy 50- no net loss	Production of a LEMP to support dormouse and GCN habitat at restoration	No
4	BNG	Environment Act	Amended baseline to support the existing site plan.	No

The outstanding document(s) listed above are needed to enable the council's ecology team to consider all the relevant impacts and benefits of the proposed scheme. The council's ecologists will provide a further response once all the above information has been submitted via the case officer.

Please Note: When resubmitting a revised document, ALL changes must be highlighted to enable review.

I have reviewed the application and supporting documents against OS Maps and aerial photography of the site and surrounding area, together with GIS layers of statutory and non-statutory sites and existing records of protected species.

The following submitted documentation was reviewed to inform this response:

- Site location plan 3404-5-2. August 2025. David Jarvis Associates
- Environmental Statement. September 2025. Raymond Brown
- Restoration Scheme 3404-5-2. September 2025. David Jarvis Associates
- Environmental Statement Chapter 7: Ecology. September 2025. Raymond Brown
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement. Wessex Woodland Management
- Statutory Biodiversity Metric. August 2025. Georgie Starkie
- Existing Site Plan 3404-5-2. August 2025. David Jarvis Associates
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Ecological Impact Assessment. February 2026. Stark Ecology
- Environmental Statement Addendum. March 2026. Raymond Brown
- Sections A-A & B-B 3404-5-2. September 2025. David Jarvis Associates

Protected and Notable Species/Habitats

It is stated that the proposals will result in the loss of an area of cropland and neutral grassland with potential impacts on bracken dominated field margins. Boundary features are assessed to include woodland edges, scrub, and a mature oak tree which are not proposed to be impacted by the scheme. It is anticipated that following quarrying activities, those habitats to be impacted will be reinstated [as per Restoration Scheme 3404-5-2. September 2025. David Jarvis Associates.](#)

GCN

A pond lies approximately 60m south east which was recorded to support a small population of GCN. The grassland and field margins within this development proposal provide some terrestrial habitat suitable to support GCN and although the pond won't be directly impacted by the scheme, impacts to GCN cannot be ruled out.

[A Rapid Risk Assessment has now been carried out which states that the proposals are highly likely to lead to an offence. The Ecology report states an enquiry has been submitted to NE to register the site under DLL, however no additional information was submitted in support of this application. If the scheme is accepted under the District Level Licensing Scheme for Great Crested Newts, the *Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate \(IACPC\)*, which must be signed by the applicant and countersigned by Natural England must be submitted to the LPA prior to determination.](#)

[Please note: 'Annex 3: Site Location' must also be submitted with the IACPC and correspond with the red line site boundary submitted with the planning application.](#)

Dormice

Dormice are afforded stringent protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and as such are a material consideration within the planning process. Dormice are known to be present within the wider quarry site. Suitable habitat in the form of woodland, hedgerow, bracken and scrub habitat lies within the proposed red line boundary, there is therefore potential for dormice and their habitats to be impacted by the proposal.

[Where works that may contravene the legislation afforded to dormice will occur, a European Protected Species \(EPS\) dormice Mitigation Licence may need to be obtained for the lawful](#)

construction of this development to ensure that favourable conservation status of dormice can be maintained should the application be approved.

The submitted information indicates that woodland and scrub habitats are proposed to be retained and protected during extraction operations through the use of Heras fencing, as outlined in the Arboricultural Report. However, no consideration appears to have been given to the bracken habitat, and the extent to which this area may be affected by the proposals is unclear. While bracken does not represent optimal dormouse habitat, the species is known to utilise this habitat type. Furthermore, the bracken area appears to be functionally linked to the surrounding woodland and scrub habitats and, on this basis, the presence of dormice within the operational area cannot be ruled out.

Sufficient and appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that dormice are not adversely affected as a result of the proposed development must be submitted as part of the proposal, and shown on development drawings, where dormice are present, or likely to be present. This should comprise of a dormouse mitigation strategy which outlines the areas of habitat suitable to support dormice, the measures to be taken to protect and enhance these habitats during both construction and operation.

From the arboricultural drawing, Heras fencing is not proposed along the southern section of planted mixed woodland in the northern parcel. It is understood that there may be an existing fence however this is unclear. This should be clarified within the dormouse mitigation strategy to ensure impacts on dormice are minimised.

The Existing Site Plan also indicates that existing vegetation occurs along the western boundary of the southern parcel which is not included within the Appendix 1: Habitat Map and no impact assessment of this loss is included. These inconsistencies in habitat mapping are discussed further below but should habitat in this area be lost, this should also be included within the dormouse mitigation strategy.

The current proposal conflicts with Core Policy 50 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 and Paragraphs 192 (b) and 193 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024, because mitigation is not included in the proposal.

In carrying out its statutory function, the LPA must be reasonably sure that the proposal will not result in significant adverse effects on protected habitats or species. The information outlined above must therefore be submitted and reviewed by the LPAs ecology team prior to determination of the application.

Ground nesting birds

A total of 3ha of habitat will be temporarily affected by the proposals which represents a small proportion of the land within the ownership. The active area has been subject to prolonged working and disturbance and therefore this extension is unlikely to significantly increase disturbance levels in the nearby area. It is noted that large areas have already been restored or are in the process of being restored which could form suitable dispersal habitat for any ground nesting birds impacted by these smaller scale proposals.

Habitats

No tree reductions or removals and no incursions into root protection areas are proposed. Operations are anticipated to be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement. Adherence to these recommendations must be provided in the form of a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) with detailed mapping demonstrating the proposed exclusion areas and fencing to ensure protection of the retained vegetation. It is noted that the

arboricultural plan only relates to the northern parcel, where protection is required in the southern parcel, this should also be mapped and submitted in support of the CEMP.

We welcome the restoration scheme submitted in support of the application and note the proposed scrub belt along the haul road which would provide functionally connected habitat for dormice on site post operation. We note that these habitats are included within the metric for net gain and will be secured through an HMMP.

Habitat created to mitigate for the loss of habitat that currently supports protected species must be secured in perpetuity, in line with Core Policy 50 and therefore those areas to be retained and managed for protected species must be considered within a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) in addition to those habitats created to achieve BNG. This LEMP should support the dormouse mitigation strategy and be submitted prior to determination for agreement with the LPA.

Mottisfont Bat SAC

The site lies 800m to the west of the 7.5km buffer zone for the Mottisfont Bat Consultation zone Special Area of Conservation. Due to the distance from the outer edge of the bat consultation zone and nature of the works which are proposing to retain boundary features, it is considered there will be no likely significant impact upon the SAC.

A test of likely significance has been carried out by the relevant Competent Authority (Wiltshire Council) as required by Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). This concluded that given the scale and nature of the development combined with the separation between the SAC and the application site, there is no mechanism for adverse effect. **The HRA has concluded that the application is not likely to have significant impacts on the SAC and subsequently the application is screened out of Appropriate Assessment.**

New Forest protected sites: 13.8km Zone of Influence

The site lies within the New Forest Protected Sites. A test of likely significance has been carried out by the relevant Competent Authority (Wiltshire Council) as required by Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). This concluded that given the scale and nature of the development there is no mechanism for adverse effect **The HRA has concluded that the application is not likely to have significant impacts on the SAC and subsequently the application is screened out of Appropriate Assessment**

River Test Catchment: Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site, Portsmouth Harbour SPA and Ramsar site, Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site.

The site lies within the River Test Catchment and the underlying chalk at the site is a major regional aquifer supporting public water supplies. Surveys have revealed that groundwater flow is in a north-easterly direction towards the River Test, which passes 10km to the east of the site. It has been concluded that there will be no risk of intercepting the water table during the operational life of the quarry and therefore there are likely to be no significant impacts upon the protected site. It is noted that local groundwater levels will continue to be monitored via the installed boreholes on site.

A test of likely significance has been carried out by the relevant Competent Authority (Wiltshire Council) as required by Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). This concluded that given the scale and nature of the development there is no mechanism for adverse effect **The HRA has concluded that the application is not likely to have significant impacts on the SAC and subsequently the application is screened out of Appropriate Assessment .**

BNG

Under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) this application is required to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The Biodiversity Gain Plan condition will automatically apply if approval is forthcoming.

A completed statutory metric calculation (Statutory Biodiversity Metric. August 2025. Georgie Starkie) confirming the baseline and predicted post- development biodiversity units of the site has been submitted. However, it would appear that the red line boundary and existing site plan do not align with the habitats included within the metric. The red line boundary and habitat types used for the BNG assessment must align with the development boundary and associated existing site plans. These issues must be addressed prior to determination.

For clarification, the Existing Site Plan and Appendix 1: Habitat Map within the Ecological Report do not align. In particular, there are apparent inconsistencies relating to the vegetation within the southern parcel along the western boundary of the site. The Ecological Report identifies this area as a haul road and quarry area, whereas the Existing Site Plan indicates the presence of existing vegetation, a minerals processing area, and a soil storage area.

Furthermore, within the biodiversity metric, this area appears to have been mapped as *artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface*. However, available aerial imagery suggests that, although the land is disturbed, vegetation cover may exceed 10%. On this basis, it is unclear whether the area meets the criteria for classification under this habitat type.

Clarification is therefore required to resolve these discrepancies and to ensure consistency between the submitted plans.

In summary, additional information is required to clarify the habitats present on site, the extent of habitat loss and the impacts this may have on protected species. We would be happy to provide further comment once this information has been provided.

Final sign off – all matters addressed:

Ecologist Jenna Buss	Date
-------------------------	------