

**Appendix 2 (late responses): Summary of Consultations Received on the Draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy**

Consultee	Nature	Representation	Assessment	Recommendation
<p>CCC, Environment and Policy Service (Phil Clark)</p>	<p>Support and suggested amendments</p>	<p>1) Policy Is it the intention of SCDC is to adopt the Biodiversity Strategy as SPD following the adoption of the LDF in spring 2007? Currently the strategy only refers to two policies, LDF: POLICY NE/6 Biodiversity and Policy NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance in addition to those of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>2) Therefore it is suggested that the Biodiversity Strategy would have to be reviewed in the light of the adoption of the policies of the LDF prior to a further period of public consultation. The following is a suggested list of those Development Control policies.....</p> <p>3) There is also a need for clarification whether it is the intention that the Biodiversity Strategy will be used in the determination of planning applications prior to the adoption of the LDF.</p> <p>4) Contribution to the Regional Spatial Strategy (P8) Reference is made to RPG 6 but not to the East of England Plan. In particular Policy ENV3: biodiversity and earth heritage. This document refers to the consideration, which should be given to biodiversity in plans, policies and proposals.</p> <p>5) Biodiversity Action Plan: Built environment (P25) “Develop detailed and appropriate planning guidance to secure the innovative provision of biodiversity enhancement measures within all developments”. It is unclear as to what this is referring to, is this a reference to the Biodiversity</p>	<p>1) Noted, clarification on this point is provided in the Strategy on p.3.</p> <p>2) The suggested range of policies against which future SPD will have to be assessed is welcomed. However, the inclusion of the full range of policies is not required within the Strategy whilst it is simply council policy in support of the Local Plan 2004.</p> <p>3) Noted, clarification on this point is provided in the Strategy on p.3.</p> <p>4) Noted, included appropriate reference to the Plan.</p> <p>5) Noted, there is a slight degree of confusion within the statement. Insert further text to clarify the point.</p> <p><b>6) Noted, in the light of the recently received DEFRA</b></p>	<p>1) No change 2) No change 3) No change 4) Include suitable reference on p.8 such as, “...and the emerging East of England Plan have emphasised .....” 5) Change BAP urb/1, action, on p.25 to read, “Develop detailed and appropriate planning guidance <i>within the Biodiversity Strategy</i> to secure....” <b>6) In the light of the DEFRA Local Sites guidance it would be wise to review to LBA proposal, ensuring consistency with guidance now will avoid confusion when the Strategy is finally proposed as SPD.</b> <b>There is a need to reconsider the</b></p>

	<p>Strategy, which is to become SPD or something else.</p> <p><b>6) BS3 – Designation of Local Biodiversity Areas (LBAs) and supporting text (P38)</b>  It is important that this principle is consistent with Structure Plan policies however it is felt that this is not achieved because this section of the document is confused and needs to be clarified. There is concern that the introduction of new and additional terminology is unnecessary and will further add to confusion of planners, developers and the public. This is because the introduction of a new tiered system for sites includes both statutory and non-statutory designation. The principle also has the potential to cover a significant proportion of District land that could undermine the system of site protection and be impractical to operate. If this approach is followed it must be clear who is identifying and reviewing the status of areas listed as local biodiversity areas.  There is a need to refer to the recent DEFRA guidance on identification, selection and management of local (non statutory) sites.</p> <p>7) BS11 – Provision of Green Roofs (P68)  Draft PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk refers to “promoting the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) to achieve wider benefits such as sustainable development, water quality, biodiversity and local amenity”. Therefore it is suggested that this Biodiversity principle should be expanded to include other SUDs measures in addition to Green Roofs, which could incorporate biodiversity features e.g. swales.</p>	<p><b>guidance on Local Sites there is a requirement to ensure a consistent approach across England. Guidance is given as to how LPAs are expected to achieve this. The SCDC approach is currently not consistent with the new DEFRA Local Sites guidance, particularly the proposal of LBAs. Furthermore, there is a need to develop and publish the criteria by which Local Sites are to be designated, and a Local Sites Partnership should be established to assist with this process. Such a body needs yet to be established for Cambs. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Structure Plan</b></p>	<p><b>proposed approach to LBAs in order to make it consistent with the Local Sites guidance. This will result in the removal of the LBA maps 1-15 and to incorporate them into one proposals map, and the review/re-wording or BS3 and BS4.</b>  7) No change  8) No change  9) No change  10) No change  11) No change  12) Include reference to BRC on p.31.  13) No change  14) No change  15) Correct the decribed growth area on p.7 to read, “<i>Growth area is London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough, and covers the whole of the District.</i>”  16) Change title to</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>8) Enhancing biodiversity through development schemes (P71-72) Support the development principles to be taken into consideration when developing a site.</p> <p>9) Table 10 - Guidance for typical “smaller” development proposals and potential impacts (P78), Table 11 – Statutorily protected species and the habitats where they may occur (P79), South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Checklist (P82) The above tables and checklist are supported as they provide information to applicants and will improve the development control process through the provision of sufficient information.</p> <p>10) Rights of Way It should be noted that in South Cambridgeshire there are significant coincidences of wildlife interest associated with public rights of way, where it could be argued the latter has provided the protection that sustained the former e.g. Roman Road and Ashwell Street. I would suggest that provision of open space and routes should be considered with current provision and current and likely future demand in mind. To this end I would recommend referral to the Green Infrastructure Strategy. I would add that members of the public seeking a countryside experience could go home more satisfied if directed to an area of amenity green space, than if they have been encouraged to use a site valuable for a species susceptible to trampling which they were unable to recognise. The Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan is not mentioned despite being occasional reference to countryside access for which it is the chief statutory guiding document in</p>	<p><b>policy P7/1 does not make provisions for wildlife sites such as Pocket Parks or Village Green Space they are felt to be important to the district for the conservation of biodiversity within parishes. In the light of the Local Sites guidance the council should perhaps attach a greater importance to the need and urgency of designating such lower tier sites as LNRs. The reasons for notifying such sites also needs to be included within the Strategy.</b></p> <p>7) Noted, the inclusion of principle BS11 is to raise awareness of green roofs, not specifically SUDs. SUDs are supported by their own PPS</p>	<p>include “Peterborough” 17) Review the BAP targets that were for 2005 given the length of time that has now passed since the original drafting. Invited CCC to comment where they are proposed as a lead partner. 18) On p.18, BAP rw/3 include SCDC and EA as lead partners. 19) Add in text, “<i>Rivers and streams can contribute to the creation/enhancement of green corridors defined in the Green Infrastructure Strategy</i>” 20) No change 21) Remove CCC from actions and targets relating to hedgerows, p.23. 22) No change 23) As for “12” above 24) No change 25) No change</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>the county. The most pertinent Improvement Plan policies are Statement of Action Issue 6 action (6/5) calling for better conservation liaison and Issue 8 action 8/1 seeking an anti-flytip programme on paths.</p> <p>11) General One general concern is that the document appears to be attempting to do many different things. As a result it comes across as confused and does not leave a lasting impression on what the Council is ultimately trying to achieve. It is therefore suggested that Section 2 contains a short and clear list of objectives so the reader can see at a glance what this strategy wants to achieve for the District. The second suggestion is that the action plan is separated from the main strategy and presented as a key delivery mechanism. Whilst it shouldn't be relegated to an appendix there is a need to enable it to be updated fairly easily and perhaps be seen as part 2 of the document. It would appear that there are three things this document wants to achieve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the strategic strategy is for the District</li> <li>• What the justification is or what the drivers are for the strategy</li> <li>• Delivery mechanism and guidance.</li> </ul> <p>By separating out the different sections of the document it should be a clearer document to engage with.</p> <p>12) Biological Record Centre The document does not contain a specific section that relates to the collation and use of ecological information nor does it mention the Biological Record Centre (BRC). A reference to this resource and the benefits it can bring to planning</p>	<p>which draws suitable attention to their benefits.</p> <p>8) Noted 9) Noted 10) Noted, it is not felt necessary to specifically reference issues and actions of the RoWIP within the Strategy.</p> <p>11) Noted, statement is disagreed with. The Biodiversity Statements outline what the Council expects to achieve, many respondents have been able to understand and appreciate the purpose of the Strategy. The BAP is presented in its current location so that the actions and targets of the Council are clearly accessible and come before the Planning Guidance where harm resulting from development</p>	<p>26) Review the presentation of LBA maps in the light of the new Local Sites guidance. <b>27) Review BS4 in the light of the new Local Sites guidance.</b> <b>28) Include a suitable cross reference to the SC Biodiversity Site Checklist on p.57</b> 29) On p.58 BS6 second sentence, include, “...Enhancement Areas and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region” and replace “wider Growth Area” with the “Cambridge sub-region”. And, obtain suitable wording relating to the Green Infrastructure Strategy’s brief from CCC. 30) No change</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>decisions needs to be strengthened especially in the text on page 31. A section detailing how the strategy will be monitored is particularly important and in relation to the action plan would also be helpful.</p> <p>13) Biodiversity and People The document needs to be more explicit about the creation of new habitats for people and wildlife and must contain a brief paragraph highlighting the need for ongoing management and monitoring of existing and new habitats to ensure success against the principles and objectives of the strategy.</p> <p>14) Green Infrastructure Strategy There should be a specific and explicit reference to the Green Infrastructure Strategy in the document. Some of the BAP issues in the SCDC BAP Plan will contribute to the Green Infrastructure Strategy. The intention of the Green Infrastructure Forum, of which South Cambridgeshire District Council is a member, is to adopt this strategy into the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>15) Specific Comments Section 2.2, page 7 - Growth area is London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough, and covers the whole of the District.</p> <p>16) Section 3.1, page 11 - The title of 3.1 needs to be amended to read Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Biodiversity Action Plan</p> <p>17) Section Biodiversity Action Plan 2005-2008, page 16 - The time scale for the action plan should be revised so that it</p>	<p>proposals is likely to arise. Following various review of the content arrangement the current format is felt to be suitable.</p> <p>12) Noted, the BRC is included on p.89. However, it should be referenced to within p.31. Monitoring of the Strategy will take place at the end of 2008.</p> <p>13) Noted, it is felt that suitable references to accessible wildlife spaces is already provided within the Strategy e.g. p.33,38 &amp; 56</p> <p>14) Noted, see p. 7, 59 &amp; 60</p> <p>15) Noted, amend accordingly.</p> <p>16)Noted, amend accordingly.</p> <p>17) Noted, the action plan period started in 2005 due to the long lead in time to produce the draft</p>	<p>31) Include detail of CCC Biodiversity Officer and clarify the level of protection afforded to PRVs</p> <p>32) No change</p> <p>33) No change</p> <p>34) No change</p> <p>35) Included additional reference to "Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 - Section 74: list of habitats and species of principal importance for the conservation of biological diversity in England" on p. 77.</p> <p>36) Review the inclusion of LBA in the light of new Local Sites guidance.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>runs from 2006/07 – 2008/09. Presentation of this section of the document would be clearer if only 1 lead partner was identified with a separate column for contributing organisations. A key for abbreviations at the bottom of the page by the tables would be helpful. A number of projects highlighted in these tables have been allocated to CCC. These will need updating prior to this draft being published and we would like the opportunity to agree these.</p> <p>18) Page 17 - Preservation of priority species – water vole. This might be an error in presentation, but no lead partner has been identified.</p> <p>19) Page 17 Development of rivers and streams conservation - Add, "Rivers and streams can contribute to the creation/enhancement of green corridors defined in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>20) Page 22 – Grassland. Contribute to Green Infrastructure Strategy</p> <p>21) Page 23 - Preservation of priority habitats – hedgerows. Given the withdrawal of funding for our hedgerow scheme some time ago we suggest that our initials should be removed from this action.</p> <p>22) It is suggested that each Biodiversity principle has a bulleted summary of the key guidance to enable the readers to quickly refer to it without having to wade through the entire text.</p>	<p>Strategy. An amendment will now be made to the general timings. CCC should be invited to comment upon the lead partner proposals.</p> <p>18) Noted, propose lead partner to be SCDC and EA</p> <p>19) Noted, add in additional text to Relevance to South Cambs column</p> <p>20) Noted, no change due to space restrictions.</p> <p>21) Noted</p> <p>22) Noted</p> <p>23) Noted, reference to the Cambs and Peterborough Checklist has been superseded by the SC Biodiversity Site Checklist. Reference to BRC already acknowledged in "12" above.</p> <p>24) Noted</p> <p>25) Noted, the reference</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>23) BS1, page 31 - The supporting text should strengthen the need for surveys and be more explicit drawing on the stages within the Cambs &amp; Peterborough Biodiversity Checklist to survey, protect, mitigate etc. A recommendation that all application sites should be surveyed to assess the value to biodiversity would strengthen the text. A reference to the BRC should also be included to direct the reader to where additional information may be obtained.</p> <p>24) Page 33 - Enhancement of existing biodiversity assets. The text needs to be made clearer and make a reference to the wider countryside, emphasising the point that enhancement need not be within a development area or just next door to existing sites of nature conservation value although this will be viewed favourably.</p> <p>25) Page 34 - Natural areas. Whilst the use of natural areas to help guide planting specifications/landscape design is welcomed the document ought to reference Cambridgeshire's Landscape Guidelines as well.</p> <p><b>26) LBA maps, page 41-55. The document places significant emphasis on these areas potentially to the detriment of sites with statutory designation. The inclusion of individual maps for each area is not warranted and they should be included on proposals map instead to help reduce the length of the document.</b></p> <p><b>27) BS 4 Protection and management of LBAs - The inclusion of a policy on the management of LBAs raises the question as to why other types of sites have not been</b></p>	<p>to Landscape Guidelines will be the subject of a separate SPD in due course.</p> <p><b>26) The inclusion of the LBA maps in this manner was considered to be the most effective means of drawing attention to relatively small sites. In the light of the new Local Sites guidance they shall be reviewed.</b></p> <p><b>27) In the light of the new Local Sites guidance BS 4 shall be reviewed.</b></p> <p>28) Noted, it is agreed that there is a need for BS5 to cross reference to the SC Biodiversity Site Checklist.</p> <p>29) Noted, accept proposed additional wording and correction.</p> <p>30) Noted, the proposed CEA largely include</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p><b>given the same treatment?</b></p> <p>28) BS 5 Mitigation and compensation - It is important that this section makes a reference to the Biodiversity Checklist</p> <p>29) BS 6, page 58 - BS6 should include reference to the Green Infrastructure Strategy at the end of the second sentence, "...Enhancement Areas and the Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region". Under 'Establishing enhancement targets': The Green Infrastructure Strategy covers the Cambridge Sub-Region, not the 'wider Growth Area'. Reference should be made to the strategy's brief rather than the text included in the SCDC document (this can be provided separately).</p> <p>30) BS 7 Countryside Enhancement areas, page 59 - Clarification is needed to avoid confusion as to whether new Countryside Enhancement Areas are to be identified or use those in the Structure Plan Policy P7/3. It has been assumed it is the latter.</p> <p>31) BS 8 Roadside Verges page 60 - It is suggested that this section should be expanded, perhaps to note how many Protected Roadside Verges (PRVs) there are in the District. As a general point it should be noted that road verges need special consideration if planning any works that may affect them. Inclusion of the CCC Biodiversity Officer contact details to discuss PRVs could be included for further information.</p> <p>32) Proposals Map 3, page 62 - Wildlife corridors should broadly correspond to Green Corridors in Green Infrastructure Strategy, where possible/practical.</p>	<p>those of the Structure Plan and propose additional ones given the length of time passed since the Plan was written and the number of projects evolving in the district.</p> <p>31) Noted, include details of the CCC Biodiversity Officer response for the protection and management of PRVs. Clarify the level of protection afforded to PRVs.</p> <p>32) Noted</p> <p>33) Noted, No comment as such received from the WT. WiT to provide the definitive answer.</p> <p>34) Noted, the current position of the guidelines is felt to be adequate. The Principles are what future applications shall be assessed against (and they</p>	
--	--	---	--



		<p>33) Enhancement of woodland sites, page 64 - Forest of South Cambridgeshire is a Wildlife Trust <i>and</i> Woodland Trust initiative – also alter earlier reference to this scheme.</p> <p>34) 4.2 Enhancing biodiversity through development schemes, page 71 - These are very important sections that should be moved to the beginning of this chapter. These contain key principles that should be followed through into the Control Principles and it is felt that their current location could mean they are overlooked.</p> <p>35) 4.4 Statutorily Protected Species, page 77 – Also needs to list those species and habitats listed under CROW Act 2000. Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 - Section 74: list of habitats and species of principal importance for the conservation of biological diversity in England.</p> <p>36) 4.5 South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity site checklist, page 81 - A reference in the text should really be made to the Cambs &amp; Peterborough Biodiversity checklists. The guidance provided in these should help applicants fill in the form more effectively. On the form, under site designation it also needs to include Local Nature reserves as a statutory site.</p>	<p>incorporate many of the guideline aspects).</p> <p>35) Noted, however the inclusion of all species listed in the CROW Act would make this section too long. The ODPM web link is provided. Agreed that full reference should be made to the section 74 species within the text.</p> <p>36) Noted, reference to the Cambs and Peterborough Checklist has been superseded by the SC Biodiversity Site Checklist. The guidelines on p.71 will help applicants to complete the checklist. The inclusion of LBA on the checklist would have accounted for the presence of an LNR.</p>	
CCC, County	Support	1) General Comment:	1) Noted, the emerging	1) No change

<p>Development, Minerals and Waste Group (David Atkinson)</p>		<p>I note the status of the document. With regard to adoption of this document as SPD the Government Office has advised this Council that in order to link SPD to a new LDF Plan the SPD must be prepared / reviewed after the new Plan is adopted, through the statutory processes for preparing SPD, before it can be tied to the new Plan. Clearly provision for this must be made in the Council's Local Development Scheme.</p> <p>2) Detailed Comments: It should be noted that some of the sites that have been put forward within the context of this Council's Minerals and Waste Development Plan (Issues and Options Paper 1 and Paper 2) are in special areas referred to in the Biodiversity Strategy. For completeness the list is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SS5 Site 1 Honey Hill Area of Search is in Countryside Enhancement Area 4, Wicken Fen Vision Area to Great Wilbraham (Wetland habitats, inc fen and wet grassland. Dry grassland, inc. chalk and neutral grassland)</li> <li>• SS1 Site 4 Needingworth is in Countryside Enhancement Area 1, Fen Drayton to Willingham, River Ouse corridor (Wetland habitats, inc, fen and wet grassland)</li> <li>• SS2 Site 4 Needingworth is in Countryside Enhancement Area 1, Fen Drayton to Willingham, River Ouse corridor (Wetland habitats, inc, fen and wet grassland)</li> <li>• SS2 Site 2 Hauxton is in Countryside Enhancement Area 11, River Rhee corridor (Wetland habitats, inc. fen and wet grassland)</li> </ul>	<p>LDF contains the necessary provisions. 2) Noted, consideration should be given to the scope of potential after-use restoration plans. <b>3) Noted, review sites</b> 4) Noted 5) Noted</p>	<p>2) No change <b>3) Review all proposed CEAs in the light of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan.</b> 4) No change 5) No change</p>
---	--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SS4 Site 21 Bridgefoot Quarry Flint Cross is in Countryside Enhancement Area 9, Great Chishill to the A505 (Chalk Grassland)</li> <li>• SS1 Site 21 Station Quarry Steeple Morden is in Countryside Enhancement Area 12 (woodland inc. grassland specific to varying geology)</li> <li>• SS2 Site 1 Cottenham has a Wildlife Corridor running through the Site.</li> <li>• SS1 Site 8 Barrington has Wildlife Corridor running through the Site.</li> <li>• Proposals Map 1 Barbastelle bat – area of importance for Eversden and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Both SS1 Site 8 Barrington and SS4 Site 38 Barrington fall within the area the bats fly and feed.</li> </ul> <p><b>3) These are suggestions for new minerals and waste development that have been put forward by the minerals and waste operators, and other stakeholders, including the County Council as a waste management service provider. We are sharing these suggestions with stakeholders, including the public, in order to obtain their views prior to undertaking a site selection process. It is following this exercise that the Council will identify its Preferred Options in late 2006.</b></p> <p>4) In considering the impact of any future minerals or waste development it should be made clear in the Biodiversity Strategy that such development does not necessarily have an adverse impact. Indeed areas that are now valuable for biodiversity have in the past been formed by minerals and</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>waste activities. For example, sand and gravel extraction in the Fen Drayton area has resulted in a valuable biodiversity resource; and in the Needingworth area restoration proposals will expand the biodiversity of the area through making a significant contribution to national BAP targets for the creation of wetland habitat. Other examples also include the potential to use reed beds in the treatment of waste water, which could contribute both to the biodiversity and habitat enhancement schemes.</p> <p>5) In addition broader aspirations in relation to increasing public access to the countryside and rights of way can also be secured through minerals and waste development.</p>		
Haslingfield PC (Janet Hendy)	Support and seek inclusion of further sites	1) I have circulated the consultation draft amongst the Haslingfield Parish Councillors and the comments coming back are that there is no mention of Haslingfield Quarry Pit or Wellhouse Meadow which is an area of common land in the village owned by the PC.	1) Haslingfield Quarry Pit is a CWS, thus the protection afforded under SBGI policy in the LDF would be applicable. The Ecology Officer is not familiar with the biodiversity value of Wellhouse Meadow. It should be investigated in further detail and considered as a Local Site in due course (inline with the new Local Sites guidance rather than as a LBA).	1) No change
Bridget Hodge Chair Planning	Support	1) Thank you for consulting Gt Shelford P.C. on the Biodiversity Strategy. We found it to be a clear,	1) Noted 2) Noted, this is an issue	1) No change 2) No change

Gt Shelford P.C.		<p>comprehensive and welcome survey of all aspects of biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>2) The detailed and specific strategies for action are clearly outlined and the reference material is useful. Our main concern is how these excellent proposals can be overseen and managed - past experience has shown that they can be implemented but that there are not enough resources to ensure the ongoing success of projects e.g. the newt ponds illustrated on page 74 which twice drained dry because of their construction.</p> <p>3) We therefore welcome the partnership initiative and would hope that it could be extended from an enhancement role to one of monitoring to ensure that initiatives to retain local biodiversity are effectively implemented and consistently maintained.</p> <p>4) (In some of the tables, items reading across do not always relate to each other - a small point in a useful and interesting document which we hope will generate projects in the local area.)</p>	<p>for the monitoring of planning conditions and S106 agreements.</p> <p>3) Noted, it will note be possible to enter into a greater role with respect to monitor partnership projects site due to the large time commitment involved.</p> <p>4) Noted, the print layout has been arranged in this manner to minimise the numbers of pages that the various tables take up. No other respondents have expressed the concern.</p>	<p>3) No change 4) No change</p>
Willingham PC	Agreement	<p>1) With Biodiversity now high up on the political agenda and the Biodiversity remit having been granted Royal Assent via Parliament, the opportunities this present the District to address the Biodiversity Issues are enormous.</p> <p>2) Whilst broadly agreeing with the vision document, it appears to lack as much foresight as it might in maintaining the status quo for most of the District. Opportunities for enhancement appear to have been lost.</p>	<p>1) Noted 2) Noted, comment appears slightly unfair due to the large emphasis placed upon enhancement especially BS7 and section 4.2. 3) BS7, area 1, outlines the area of land that could be suitable for the</p>	<p>1) No change 2) No change 3) No change 4) No change 5) No change 6) No change</p>

		<p>3) Willingham is fortunate in that the proposal to create ‘...wetland habitats including fen and wet grassland...’ - Proposals Map 3 - is part of the 50 year vision and to be welcomed and applauded but what and where are the more immediate proposals? With the quantity of new developments now beginning to accelerate and scheduled to rise still more in the immediate future, it would that appear more habitats are being destroyed than being preserved or even improved. It is accepted that hedgerows are important green corridors in their own right, but the amount being ripped out in the name of progress in this vicinity is extremely worrying. There do not appear to be plans to have them replaced on a ‘like for like’ basis and any new plantings (if any are proposed) will take many years to reach the same level of maturity. Hopefully this type of habitat will be secured from further destruction with this Biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>4) Whilst it is encouraging to see ‘greenspace’ included in new developments, this appears to be on a very formal basis. It could be more profitable if a system of ‘community consultation’ could be written into the developments with the community being responsible for an area of say 2/3 ha. This would then become their space. Encouragement and support for planting neighbourhood copses of trees or small woods would also be a gain for biodiversity. but more importantly both would provide respite from usage and an opportunity for the more formal green space to develop and increase the range of biodiversity. Thus the areas would compliment each other and also increase the development of Green Infrastructure. The same principle should also apply to</p>	<p>enhancement of countryside in the Willingham area in the medium term. The protection of hedgerows is considered in the BAP fm/2 to 5. Protection of hedgerows is also covered by the Hedgerow Regulations and unmitigated impacts should not be occurring.</p> <p>4) The opportunity for land to be managed by the community currently exists, such as through the parcels of land given to PCs as a result of planning gain. The negotiation of larger parcels of land could possibly be achieved where there was a desire to take on the specialist management of the land (which is often felt to be beyond the scope of most PCs)</p> <p>5) Proposals map 1 has been refined with the input of the Cambs Bat Group (C Vine) to</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>retention of footpaths and bridleways. Although not specifically noted in the Strategy document, these areas are important corridors not only for people but wildlife and therefore Biodiversity.</p> <p>5) Referring to the area of the SAC and in particular the Barbastelle bat. Current research being carried out on the bat would suggest that the bat will travel up to 20km in its search for Lepidoptera. An area stretching from Wimpe to Cambridge (it has been recorded doing this journey twice a day). What plans are in place to protect the hedgerows and other 'lines' that the bat uses in its search are not clear..</p> <p>6) Whilst the Biodiversity Strategy has the potential to enhance the environment, the reality of it to take precedence over conflicting developments is in question. It will require a strong and united front from Parish District and County Councils to see it prevail.</p>	<p>produce a map that is considered to be a more accurate representation of the main foraging area, rather than to use to use a prescriptive 20km area around the main roost. The Habitats Regulations will be unused where appropriate to protected roosts and important landscape features.</p> <p>6) Noted</p>	
--	--	--	---	--