

## CHERWELL DISTRICT COUNCIL

### MEMORANDUM

To: Andrew Lewis – Senior Planning Officer  
(Development Management)

From: Paul Evans – Ecology Officer  
(Enforcement – Development Management)

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> September 2018

#### **Ref: 18/00347/DISC – Discharge of condition 19 (LEMP) of 16/00263/F, Building 488 Heyford Park Camp Road – Ecology Comments**

I have reviewed submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) Heyford Park Bicester Parcel 6 by Liz Lake Associates dated January 2017 and have the following comments to make.

Paragraph 4.3 makes reference to “Best Working Practice” as specified by The Bat Conservation Trust (Hundt 2012), this is the previous addition of this document which was updated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition in 2016. The reference to the current guidance (see below) should be given to ensure these are followed.

“Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.) The Bat Conservation Trust, London”

Paragraph 5.2.2 makes reference to the modification of an EPS licence to destroy any new roosts found in trees to be removed. There should be additional wording included that the removal of the trees should only be carried out following the appropriate bats surveys, updated mitigation measures and following a successful application to Natural England to modify the existing licence.

Paragraph 5.3.2 regarding the species mix of the native hedgerows makes reference to the planting schedules in Appendix 1, the species listed here for the hedgerows either not native or are not local provenance to this area. It is not clear whether this is just because there are no native hedgerows identified to be planted or retained in this parcel if there are none in this parcel then this should be clear as it is currently misleading. Paragraphs 5.3.3 – 5.3.16 go on to detail management of the native hedgerows, but again it is misleading if there are no native hedgerows in this parcel to be managed. However the management approaches detailed do seem appropriate.

Paragraph 5.5.5 in relation to the use of grass clipping to create grass snake hibernaculum, these should be located in areas of low species diversity where they will not adversely affect the existing habitat in which they are created e.g. via nutrient enrichment, ground cover, additional vehicle movements.

Section 5.6 that are a lot of good objectives in here to benefit biodiversity, however it does not appear to be specific to this parcel as none of the objective related to the plan in Appendix 1.

Sections 6.1, 6.2 & 6.3 all detail very good objectives and prescriptions in relation to bird, bats and lighting but there is a lot of reference in the text to “to be agreed with the consulting ecologist” for example in relation to the location of bird and bat boxes and log piles. These should really be already agreed and detailed on the attached plan in appendix 1.

The LEMP would benefit from a schedule of maintenance/works and monitoring so that contractors, ecologists, operatives and others involved in the management of the areas can see what management needs carrying out in which year, timings and where, with a brief summary of the management prescription and who is responsible for it.