

REF: 3804 (EBH/KS/SR)
PROJECT: Sarum Academy, PL/2026/00589
CLIENT: Morgan Sindall
DATE: 10/06/2026

SARUM ACADEMY CONSULTEE COMMENTS FOR PLANNING APPLICATION PL/2026/00589 ECOLOGY NOTE

This Ecology Note has been produced by The Landmark Practice (TLP) to respond with additional detail to consultee comments made by Jenna Buss of Wiltshire Council, dated 18/05/2026, included in full below at **Annex 1**. Where a response is required, extracted comments are reproduced below on the left of the table with response by TLP on the right.

Consultee Comment	TLP Response
<u>Reptiles</u> <i>...In view of the above, a comprehensive Reptile Mitigation Strategy is required to accompany the application. The proposed development will result in a reduction in available habitat and overall carrying capacity, and it cannot be assumed that displacement into the wider landscape is feasible given the constraints posed by the adjacent site, which already supports significant reptile populations. Accordingly, further ecological information is required at this stage to adequately assess impacts and to ensure that reptiles are appropriately safeguarded in accordance with relevant legislation and planning policy.</i>	A Reptile Mitigation Strategy (TLP, 2026) has been prepared detailing required measures to safeguard any on-site population of reptiles both during the construction phase and long term. Reptile surveys will be conducted prior to commencement of works on site. Reptile surveys will be used to inform update Reptile Mitigation Strategy in advance of works commencing. Notwithstanding the fact that reptile fencing fragmenting the populations on the Site and the nearby application sites,
<u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u> <i>For the whole site metric and 10FE the baseline is not currently acceptable. The following issues must be addressed in the baseline prior to determination:</i> <i>There are a number of errors that will require amendment prior to determination in 10FE which will also impact the Overall Net Gain calculation as identified below:</i> <i>• The submitted 10FE metric is currently incomplete, with the baseline showing a metric error where no area has been stipulated for the urban trees in cell H20;</i>	This is an erroneous row from historic alterations splitting up phases, and has been deleted in the re-issued Metric (3804_10FE_Metric_v2). There are no poor condition trees within 10FE area.
<i>• The broad assessment of modified grassland for the 10FE grassland area requires</i>	While not being regularly mown, the grassland community across the northern 10FE parcel

<i>justification. The area does not appear to be managed and could meet the requirements of other neutral grassland. We would advise that this is reviewed and quadrat data supplied together with a species list for the site with full justification for the current UK Hab definition.</i>	was unvarying and uninteresting. As noted in the BNG report the survey identified that there was a lack of vascular plant diversity across the parcel, with very low numbers of forbs, being dominated by palatable grasses. The Ecological Appraisal contains a walkover species list for this area, stating it is dominated by cock's-foot and Yorkshire fog, along with occasional sweet vernal grass, red fescue and common bent. It also notes presence of nutrient favouring species stinging nettle and creeping thistle, along with hogweed, dandelion and lesser stitchwort. It should be noted that these were species picked up during a walkover of the entire parcel. Due to the species composition and lack of vascular plant coverage and diversity, the grassland therefore fails other neutral grassland qualifying criteria no. 1 (>20% cover of broadleaved herbs and sedges) and no. 2 (>8 species per m²). It was not considered an effective use of survey time to take quadrats here as the grassland was very clearly of low distinctiveness due to the lack of consistent forb presence (and grass diversity) across the parcel, as described within the reports.
• <i>There are net losses of Medium distinctiveness area habitats in 1 broad habitat group, and too few gains at higher distinctiveness categories to offset these losses. The broad habitat group concerned is:</i> <i>o Woodland and forest, which loses 0.00099 BU, from "Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved" (0.15 BU pre-intervention, and 0.15 BU post-intervention, so a loss of 0.00099 BU)</i>	We appreciate highlighting this error. The loss of woodland within the Metric is a mapping error within GIS brought through to the Metric via the Natural England GIS export tool. Woodland is retained on site and the Overall (3804_Entire Site_Metric_v2) and 10FE Metric (3804_10FE_Metric_v2) have been updated to account for this, along with the BNG Report (v2).

ANNEX 1: Consultee Response