

Land Northeast of Haverhill, Wilsey Road

Comments 4.05.21

DCON(I)/15/2151

Application to Discharge Conditions 4 (Updated survey information), 6 (waste and recycling), 7 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan), 8 (Landscape), 15 (Open space strategy), 28 (Garage /parking provision), 30 (Travel Plan - Residential), 40 (Arboricultural method statement), 42 (Ecological implementation strategy), and 45 (Biodiversity monitoring) parcel A1, A2 and A8 of application DC/15/2151/OUT

7 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan)

See below comments as the same document has been submitted in respect of both DCONs

45 (Biodiversity monitoring)

The Biodiversity monitoring strategy (March vf7) submitted relates to the infrastructure RM rather than specifically to the housing parcels. Section 15.3 of the report states that the *Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy covers the first five years following completion of the landscaping and ecological enhancement works associated with the Infrastructure RMA*. This section should be amended firstly to make it clear that is also to be implemented in relation to the housing parcels and secondly to cover the phasing of the project (see below). The section should make it clear that the monitoring begins on each phase as it is completed and covers the 5 year period after completion. This is because there could be a number of years between the completion of each phase.

DCON(F)/15/2151

Application to Discharge Conditions 2 - Phasing Strategy, 4 - Ecology, 7 - Landscape Ecological Management, 8 - Soft Landscaping, 9 - Service, 15 - Open Space and Play Strategy, 36 - Fire Hydrants, 38 - SUDS, 39 - Written Scheme of Investigation, 40 - Arb Method Statement 41 - Tree Survey, 42 - Ecological Implementation Strategy, 44 - Lighting Strategy for Bats, 45 - Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy

7 - Landscape Ecological Management

The LEMP remains lacking in detail. This strategic development is expected to deliver a large area of open space and this LEMP document needs to secure the management of this open space into the future taking into account the requirements of landscapes in the public realm and the need for ecological enhancement of the site. The current document does not fulfil the requirements of the condition.

The context and consultation included in section 2 is largely superfluous in this document. The context for this document is the landscape design that has been approved and the commitments in terms of mitigatory/compensatory habitats and features that are required to be managed into the future.

The section on *description and evaluation of features to be managed* does not cover all the habitats/features identified in the condition i.e. *all new and existing woodland and coppiced areas, tree and shrub belts, field margin compensatory habitat, new and existing hedgerows and gapping up of existing areas of grassland, meadow and hedgerow margins with intended*

management regimes, those parts of the site that contain notable plant species recorded on the site, watercourse margins, attenuation ponds and associated features.

It is recommended that a plan is included that shows the locations of all the features/habitats that are to be managed (something like a Phase 1 for the newly created site)

For those sections that are included:

Field margins – probably not necessary to include all the species present. The location of the compensatory habitat that is to be managed is not identified

Ditches – the ditches to be managed are not specified

The *ecological constraints* section needs to recognise the importance of the integrity of the existing hedgerow and woodland systems which connect and provide good linkage through the site for wildlife. In addition, that fragmentation of linear navigational and foraging corridors used by bats should be avoided through appropriate management of the existing and new green infrastructure. It should concentrate on the future site and what is important in achieving the wildlife gains on the site such as ongoing protection of veteran trees, retention of hedgerow margins etc

Aims and objectives of management – these are too general and need to relate more closely to the requirements of the ES, the site constraints and what we are looking to achieve on this site – remember too that this is a landscape and ecology management plan and there will be different aims and objectives for the play areas and more formal landscaped areas.

The vision should be something like... *create a framework of green infrastructure running through the site that will be multi-functional and will, through appropriate management of the variety of habitats and features, provide a semi natural experience for the new residents whilst protecting and enhancing the sites biodiversity.*

Achieving the objectives. This is a management plan and should include management options both short term (establishment) but also longer term. It is not a specification for implementation. The text in section 6.3 is not prescriptions for management. The management prescriptions in section 6.4 need to be precise and relate to areas on the plans so that it is clear what type of management will be undertaken where.

Section 7 needs to be much more detailed. For example, how big will the glades in Great Field plantation be, where abouts in the woodland, and over how many years will they be created? Where will the new planting be, and how many trees 3 or 300? Where in the wood are the existing hazel stools, and in which year will the coppicing cycle start, where will the year 2 coppicing be? There needs to be more information about how access will be controlled, where the access points will be and how the communities on the different sides of the woodland will be connected.

The condition requires that *the management plan for the existing Great Field Plantation woodland must include monitoring of public use of the woodland such that the design of pathways, fencing, hedging and other management operations are*

iterative, with the aim that the woodland design reflects the needs of the new community. Control of litter and dog waste (within normal refuse collection) can be part of this iterative process. The management plan should identify areas for coppicing to encourage understorey development. This does not appear to have been considered in this document.

Great Field Plantation warrants a management plan of its own and it might be that a separate LEMP is provided for that part of the site. If route is to be followed, it must be made clear at the front of this document that GFP is not included in this LEMP and it should be removed from the plans. A plan at the front of the document should show clearly the parts of the site that are included.

There is insufficient information about the management of Southern Plantation and the Stour Brook Tributary.

The document does not include the maintenance of the other measures for biodiversity that will be required in the future for example hibernacula, hedgehog log piles, bird and bat boxes, bee mounds

The information strategy is not detailed enough. Where will the boards be and what will they be about?

45 - Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy

The Biodiversity monitoring strategy (March vf7) submitted relates to the infrastructure RM. Section 15.3 of the report states that the *Biodiversity Monitoring Strategy covers the first five years following completion of the landscaping and ecological enhancement works associated with the Infrastructure RMA*. This section should be amended to cover the phasing of the project (see below) so that it is clear that the monitoring begins on each phase as it is completed and covers the 5-year period after completion. This is because there could be a number of years between the completion of each phase.

