

Sue Cavalier

From: Sue Cavalier
Sent: 03 July 2013 14:14
To: Sue Cavalier
Subject: FW: Consultation - Bicester Eco Town Exemplar Site, Caversfield, Oxfordshire - Ecology and Landscape Management Plan

From: Scholey, Graham [mailto:graham.scholey@environment-agency.gov.uk]
Sent: 28 June 2013 14:00
To: Sue Cavalier; Jenny Barker
Cc: LesleyTims
Subject: RE: Consultation - Bicester Eco Town Exemplar Site, Caversfield, Oxfordshire - Ecology and Landscape Management Plan

Sue/Jenny,

I realise that I am way past the deadline for commenting on the revised ELMP for the Exemplar site. I do apologise for that. I hope you got feedback from some of the other consultees.

If it is still possible to consider a few comments then I have the following observations to make:

-Generally I am happy with the ELMP as it pertains to the Exemplar site. The changes made are improvements on the previous plan.

-In Table 1, item 4 (River Bure), I would re-iterate comments made elsewhere that we are not expecting watercourses to carry augmented flow when we wouldn't expect them to do so under the hydrological regime they experience, but of course the retention of water on site through the creation of wetland features and reduced run-off rates should benefit wetted features and also perhaps extend stream flow periods.

-In Table 1, item 7 is given as 'temporary amenity grassland' whereas the corresponding item in Table 2 is shown as 'temporary herb-rich amenity grassland' (as it was described throughout in the previous version). I suggest there is no reason why temporary grassland could not be managed to be of value to wildlife so table 1 should be amended.

-In item 9 of Table 1 there is reference to the desire to keep one third of pond water surface as open water, and this occurs elsewhere – this could be deemed as too prescriptive, and there should be room for variation depending on pond function. Heavily vegetated ponds are of great value.

-In Table 2, the section on native woodland (item 13) should be labelled as 'continued' on page 21.

-In Table 3.2 (Monitoring) – I suggest the invertebrate monitoring success criteria for the water features should be for the ponds to hold invertebrate communities typical of high quality ponds, and for the watercourses to hold invertebrate communities typical for predominantly seasonal streams on this geology with no evidence of water quality pressures.

Hope these late comments can be considered.

Regards,
Graham.

Graham Scholey MCIEEM
Conservation Technical Specialist
West Thames, South East Region

Tel: 01491 828346

E:mail: graham.scholey@environment-agency.gov.uk