

# Biodiversity Action Plan 2018-2023 - Public consultation results

An online, public, anonymous consultation was run from the 5<sup>th</sup> of March until the 16<sup>th</sup> of April 2018. The survey form and consultation results are presented in this document.

## Survey form

### Bracknell Forest Biodiversity Action Plan 2018-2023

#### Why we are consulting

The council would like your opinion on management of wildlife and natural habitats in Bracknell Forest Borough.

We and our partner organisations are committed to protecting and enhancing biodiversity and nature within the borough.

As a result, we have developed the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) 2018-2023. This plan builds upon the former BAP 2012-2017, taking over the plan's aim, expanding the objectives and proposing new actions.

We want to understand your opinion on:

- our approach towards nature conservations
- your worries about nature management
- your preferences for conservation actions

This will enable us to identify objectives and develop targets that deal with your concerns.

#### How you can get involved

Please refer to the supporting BAP 2018-2023 document below, which contains the targets, objectives and action plans. You can give us your views by clicking on the start button below and completing our consultation.

You can also oversee the implementation of the BAP plan and protect wildlife within the borough by joining Bracknell Nature Partnership.

#### What happens next

We will consider your comments and ideas to determine if they will help to improve the plan to protect and enhance biodiversity in the borough.

#### Type of consultee:

1. Are you responding to the questions as a:

- a) Landowner
- b) Resident
- c) Local business
- d) Other

*If other, please specify:*

2. Do you usually participate in volunteering activities for nature conservation or enhancement?

- a) Yes
- b) No

*If the answer is No:*

3. Why not?

- a) Not aware
- b) Cannot access them
- c) Not interested
- d) Lack of time
- e) Other

*If other, please specify:*

4. What could be done to encourage you or others to participate in conservation volunteering activities?

#### General:

5. Do you think the Biodiversity Action plan effectively deals with the main pressures on wildlife within Bracknell Forest Borough; such as development, neglecting land management, habitat degradation?

- a) Yes
  - b) No
  - c) I don't know
6. If the answer is No, please explain why you think the plan doesn't effectively deal with the main pressures on wildlife within Bracknell Forest?
7. Did you find the document easy to read?
- a) Yes
  - b) No
- If the answer is No:*
8. Please tell us what you found difficult?

### Objectives

Each theme and habitat within the plan contains a list of Objectives designed to protect and enhance biodiversity within the borough.

In this section, please tell us if you think these Objectives are adequate, or how could they be improved.

9. General themes
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the General theme objectives?*
10. Grassland
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Grassland objectives?*
11. Woodland
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Woodland objectives?*
12. Wetland
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Wetland objectives?*
13. Heathland
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Heathland objectives?*
14. Farmland
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Farmland objectives?*
15. Urban
- a) Objectives are adequate
  - b) Objectives are not adequate
  - c) I don't know
- If the answer is 'The objectives are not adequate', how can we improve the Urban objectives?*

### Targets

The Targets within the plan are the actions needed to achieve the Objectives.

In this section, please tell us if the Targets are sufficient, or how could they be improved.

16. General themes

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

17. Grassland

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

18. Woodland

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

19. Wetland

- d) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- e) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- f) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

20. Heathland

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

21. Farmland

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

22. Urban

- a) targets sufficient to achieve objectives
- b) targets not sufficient to achieve objectives
- c) I don't know

*If the answer is 'Targets are not sufficient', how can we improve the targets, so we can achieve our objectives?*

23. Other comments

If you wish to add any remark, please write your comment below

Thank you for completing the BAP 2018-2023 survey form.

We will consider your comments and ideas to determine if they will help to improve the plan to protect and enhance biodiversity in the borough.

## Summary of consultation results

A total of 6 respondents completed the survey, of which 4 were residents, 1 landowner and 1 public body. 67% of the respondents considered that the BAP did not effectively deal with the main pressures on wildlife within Bracknell Forest Borough, being urbanisation and development the main concerns.

This Appendix presents the anonymous **Feedback** received during the consultation, the subsequent **Responses** from the Biodiversity Officer and the **Actions** taken whenever the feedback could be implemented. Since the most notorious concern was about how the BAP interfaces with housing development, a number of specific amendments have been implemented in this regard and are collated in Action 1.

### Action 1

1. The document includes a statement about the role of the BAP in the new development that will be implemented with the adoption of the new Bracknell Forest Local Plan (BFLP). See 'The role of the BAP in sustainable development' – page 8.
  2. As consequence of the BAP role in sustainable development, one objective and target have been added in General Themes section (page 11) to contribute to the BFLP in the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the Borough.
    - 2.1 New Objective B. 'Explore habitat connectivity through ecological networks of corridors' – knowing the ecological connectivity in the Borough will help to better inform development decisions.
    - 2.2 New Target B.i. 'Produce a detailed green corridor map for Bracknell Forest Borough'.
  3. Other targets that address impacts of development are:
    - 1.1 Target D.i. Address one of the deficits in the provision of 20ha of public accessible greenspace within 2km of residences, listed in Bracknell Green Infrastructure Review 2017
    - 1.2 Target D.ii. Develop a system for biodiversity accounting to achieve net gain in planning applications
  4. Regarding species monitoring on the development sites, it is the legal duty of the developers to do so, therefore no new targets have been added. Nevertheless, the plan already includes monitoring across critical habitats (e.g. LWS and SSSI) – see Objective A for all the BAP habitats – as well as surveying of sites without designations such as urban spaces, orchards, reedbeds, and hedgerows. Furthermore, an extensive database of notable species is already being kept and maintained by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre. Thanks to this, many critical habitats have obtained protection statuses and are managed accordingly.
-

#Respondent number

GENERAL QUESTIONS		
#	Feedback	Response/Action taken
<b>QUESTION 1. Are you responding to the questions as a</b>		
1	resident	N/A
2	resident	N/A
3	landowner	N/A
4	resident	N/A
5	resident	N/A
6	Town Council ( <i>received via email</i> )	N/A
<b>QUESTION 2. – Volunteering. Do you usually participate in volunteering activities for nature conservation or enhancement?</b>		
1	No	N/A
2	No	N/A
3	Yes	N/A
4	Yes	N/A
5	Yes	N/A
6	Yes	N/A
<b>QUESTION 3 – Volunteering. Why not?</b>		
1	lack of time	N/A
2	not aware	N/A
3		
4		
5		
6		
<b>QUESTION 4. – Volunteering. What can be done to encourage you or others, to participate in conservation volunteering activities?</b>		
1	More information - I tried to see if there was some organised litter picking to clean up Swinley Forest a few years ago that I could take part in regularly, no info available on this whatsoever and the main tracks are so littered - same with my local area Something aimed at full time workers (I'm 33, work full time and drive) - for example I'd love to regularly join in on beach clean-ups but I'm not close enough to one - plenty of places nearer me that need this! – <b>Response 1</b>	<b>Response 1.</b> BFC Parks and Countryside is currently working on a system to make easily available information and events related to Nature Conservation in Bracknell Forest.
2	....	
3	Involve our children – Publish activities - Be more visible	See <b>Response 1.</b>

4	Raise awareness of the natural world and it's values to the general public BFC to learn best mechanisms for public engagement Focus on achievable targets that can be measured to demonstrate progress with conservation measures in the plan	See <b>Response 1.</b>
5	Outreach/publicity: one-stop shops/diary for what is happening and where; feedback on results of activity, regular news; events at different times re different time constraints of different residents	See <b>Response 1.</b>
6		
<b>QUESTION 5 – Main pressures. Do you think the Biodiversity Action plan effectively deals with the main pressures on wildlife within Bracknell Forest Borough; such as development, neglecting land management, habitat degradation?</b>		
1	Yes	
2	No	
3	No	
4	No	
5	No	
6	Yes	
<b>QUESTION 6. – Main pressures. If not, please explain why you think the plan doesn't effectively deal with the main pressures on wildlife within Bracknell Forest?</b>		
1		
2	Not enough being done to halt development and urbanisation – <b>Response 2</b>	<b>Response 2.</b> Stopping development and urbanisation is not a feasible measure due to external factors (such as population growth and the consequent housing strategies at the national level). Bracknell Forest Council has the duty to allow development while maintaining and enhancing biodiversity to the highest degree possible. This is why having a clear strategy (such as the BAP) allows the council to take optimal decisions allowing maximizing the biodiversity values in the borough. In addition, see <b>Action 1.</b>
3	Continual destruction of trees and landscapes reduces the wildlife habitation Additional roads, housing and general pollution has irrecoverable impact to wildlife BFB wants to develop - they don't	In addition, see <b>Action 1.</b>

	<p>care about saving wildlife I was told recently by one of the BFC consultants if you are a horse rider and expect to use the roads, go to the country. Perhaps the wildlife should move to the country? We are in a semi-rural area. Bracknell 'Forest' should have forests and woods. The birds, owls, deer, badgers let alone the smaller mammals and birds/insects need homes. – see <b>Response 2</b></p>	
4	<p>For measurable conservation initiatives, baselines on status are needed for the situation to date across critical habitats. It is agreed that this information is difficult to get for some areas but some broad scale measures could still be made. The new Plan has monitoring included but this in over the period until 2023 which will be too late as much development for housing is already underway/plans being decided now so many sites that are very likely to be key for conservation will be lost – <b>Response 4</b></p>	<p><b>Response 4:</b> this plan not only includes targeted monitoring across critical habitats (e.g. LWS and SSSI) – see Objective A for all the BAP habitats – but it also considers sites without designations such as urban spaces, orchards, reedbeds, and hedgerows. Furthermore, an extensive database of notable species is already being kept and maintained by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre. Thanks to this, many critical habitats have obtained protection statuses and are managed accordingly.</p>
5	<p>Overall a very good plan and the team is congratulated on keeping up an excellent standard. Perceived deficiencies are largely owing to the scale of development BFC is facing, and the location of that development.</p> <p>Page 9. Plan objectives. Given the location of SALP (Site Allocations Local Plan) and BFLP (Bracknell Forest Local Plan) allocated large sites in greenfield and other sensitive (next to European site) areas, targeted monitoring should assess the allocations (before they are 'lost'), so on the same 'level' as the designated sites – from which work towards the other objectives could follow. – see <b>Action 1</b></p> <p>Page 10. As a basis for deciding priorities, the BAP Habitats map seems scant/somewhat inaccurate (e.g. cf. the habitats maps in the GI evidence base document for the draft BFLP), for example, woodland and grassland in Hayley Green and north Winkfield seem mostly not indicated, and The Cut is only partially marked. There appears to be an area north-east of Hayley Green marked 'coastal and floodplain grazing marsh'. Assuming these reflect a map-wide issue, the map would benefit from review. – <b>Response 5</b></p>	<p><b>Response 5:</b> this map is used to just provide a general overview of the habitats present in Bracknell. The scale is too small to obtain an accurate representation of smaller habitats. The habitat 'coastal and floodplain grazing marsh' appears to be correct. For a full description of this UK BAP priority habitat see <a href="http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5706">http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5706</a></p> <p><b>Action 2:</b> Page 14, target D.i) now reads 'Address the deficit in the provision of 20ha of public accessible greenspace within 2km of residences, listed in Bracknell Green Infrastructure Review 2017'</p>

Page 12. Objectives/targets.

Should there be specific objective/targets for SALP and BFLP allocated sites, cf. the ones for designated sites (A(i), (ii))? – see **Action 1**

C – agree, very good.

D(i) How do you prioritize? E.g. Should designated sites and allocations be prioritized? (A general point for all habitat sections, presumably to be tackled down the line?) –**Action 2**

D(ii) is surely nigh-impossible to achieve given the alienation of so much greenfield land via SALP & BFLP allocations. – **Response 6**

E Can you explain the link between this and the BFLP? – **Response 7**

G Could you include in the platform a facility for residents to record a wider list of species? cf. TVERC system – and to feed into this (potentially more effective than direct resident reporting to TVERC) – **Response 8**

Page 15. (The 'Threats' list does not seem to be ordered.) The BAP seems to duck the issue of the scale of development (>12,000 homes in the BFLP to 2034) and the threat this poses of itself and via habitat degradation notably (i) to farmland biodiversity owing to large SALP and BFLP allocations on greenfield sites in north Bracknell and (ii) to heathland biodiversity in face of large SALP and BFLP allocations in the south of the borough (ii. is protected to some extent by SPA status and SANG creation, but pollution is an ongoing and likely increasing issue). While the BAP cannot stop development it could be more open about the scale of the problem of over-development in the remaining countryside areas. – See **Action 1**

**Response 6:** consequence of the possible inclusion of biodiversity net gain in the National Planning Policy Framework, and the principles of natural capital and ecosystem services being adopted by the UK Government (and central to Defra's new 25-year environment plan), efforts are underway to incorporate these ideas into the planning and development process by Bracknell Forest Council. Therefore this Target is key to avoiding or minimising the impacts of development since there is not a standard system for biodiversity accounting to achieve net gain yet.

A particular example of how this can be achieved can found in Tresham Garden Village case study.

<https://ecosystemsknowledge.net/natcap-project/tresham-garden-village-natural-capital-impact-assessment>

**Response 7:** this target supports and complements, rather than adds on, the BFLP. The local plan already includes policies regarding green infrastructure and biodiversity (Policy LP38 - Green Infrastructure and Policy LP36 – Biodiversity).

**Response 8:** TVERC is the organisation that manages the council species database. This would simply generate more work as this information would need to be sent to TVERC by the council. But the platform could include



		a link to TVERC recording tool.
6		
<b>QUESTION 7. – Easy to read. Is the plan easy to read?</b>		
1	No	
2		
3	No	
4	Yes	
5	No	
6	Yes	
<b>QUESTION 8. – Easy to ready. If not, please tell us what you found difficult?</b>		
1	For starters it's 57 pages long, it's not written in particularly plain English, it's not aimed at a general audience – <b>Response 9</b>	<b>Response 9:</b> although we hope the plan is comprehensible to the general public, a certain degree of technicality is needed since it needs to set out action for biodiversity.
2		
3	Its not plain english. A lot of jargon is used.	See <b>Response 9</b>
4		
5	<p>There is no option to comment on a 'Yes' answer, which this deserves. I commend the BAP for being well-organised and exceptionally easy to read.</p> <p>Reservation: unless a reader is familiar with layers of local/national/international regulation, they could be confused or miss a site's relative significance, e.g. the SC is introduced on p.21 with no indication (endnote aside) of its status, and also a reader might infer that it was designated for its veteran trees, while it was designated for oak and beech woodland habitats as a whole. Equally, the grouping of the three 'SPA' species in absence of explanation of the significance of the European site (p.28) could indicate they are of less individual significance than other species. I note there are endnotes guiding readers to the Appendices, but a short section/list/table in the introductory section, linked to Appendices would be helpful. (Or if not, can we have footnotes not endnotes, and more explanatory ones?) – <b>Actions 3 and 4</b></p>	<p><b>Action 3:</b> A short table has been including in 'Legislation and Policy' Section (page 5), with the definitions of the designated sites mentioned throughout the BAP.</p> <p><b>Action 4:</b> The text on p.21 introducing Windsor Forest SACs has been modified and now reads: 'A great deal of ancient trees are found within Windsor Forest, which is recognised as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC<b>Error!</b> <b>Bookmark not defined.</b>) due to the value of the oak and beech woodland habitat as a whole, as they provide habitat for rare species such as the violet click beetle.'</p>

6			
QUESTIONS 9 to 15 - OBJECTIVES			
#	Are objectives adequate?	Why not?	Response/Action taken
<b>General themes</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across – <b>Response 10</b>	<b>Response 10:</b> this document has been revised by experts on the topic (members of the Bracknell Forest Nature Partnership among others) to confirm its ecological significance and ensure its feasibility.
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are not adequate	Use less jargon - plain English – <b>See Response 10</b> The point gets lost Be clear in the goals of the objectives Its comes across as incomplete – <b>Response 11</b>	<b>Response 11:</b> the 'Objectives' are broadly stated to allow flexibility for action, while specific actions are described in the 'Targets'. Therefore, see 'Targets' for completeness. Legislative jargon, such as designated sites acronyms, is described in a footnote after each chapter (also, see <b>Action 3</b> ). This feedback cannot be implemented without specific examples.
4	objectives are not adequate	How will enhancements to biodiversity conservation be made if only existing LWS are assessed? Other parts of the plan seem to imply that new areas for conservation will be included in the plan.	See <b>Action 1</b> . See <b>Response 4</b>
5	objectives are not adequate	General themes. See QUESTION 5/6 comments: i.e. a specific objective and targets for SALP and BFLP allocated sites are needed.	See <b>Action 1</b> .
6	objectives are not adequate	Bracknell Town Council had concerns that 8000 volunteer hours per year would not be achievable. – <b>Response 12</b>	<b>Response 12:</b> the number of volunteer hours has been increasing from 3629h in 2012 to a peak of 8569h in 2016 (hours provided by volunteers and probation groups working with BFC rangers; Bracknell Conservation Volunteers, Berkshire Conservation Volunteers and Windsor & Maidenhead Conservation Volunteers provided a significant proportion of

			this time). Hence, a target of 8,000 volunteer hours is an ambitious target, but achievable.
<b>Grasslands</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10</b> .
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are not adequate	Rushed – <b>Response 13</b>	<b>Response 13:</b> the BAP 2018-2023 builds on the last BAP 2012-2017, proved to be successful, and a great number of hours have been invested by various qualified persons, including two Biodiversity Officers, the members of Bracknell Forest Nature Partnership and TVERC, among others. A more detailed feedback on how this plan is 'rushed' would be needed to make any improvement.
4	objectives are not adequate	The monitoring for informing decisions is planned for AFTER most expansion for development has been made/decided. Thus the monitoring objective needs to more realistic and put in the context of all other activities currently talking place in in the borough	See <b>Action 1</b> .
5	objectives are not adequate	Re SALP and BFLP allocations in north Bracknell: much grassland habitat risks being lost before it is assessed. Could allocated sites have specific objectives/targets?	See <b>Action 1</b> .
6	objectives are not adequate	The document talks about bumblebees and the decline in numbers due to habitant loss and increased pesticide use but does not address the use of pesticides or suggest a programme to reduce the usage. The document needs to have a positive push to stop the use of pesticides, especially as more organic alternatives are becoming available. – <b>Response 14</b>	<b>Response 14:</b> although not specifically stated, this issue is covered by the Farmland target 'C(i) At least 60% of agricultural holdings entered into agro-environment scheme or habitat management plans' (which has been modified after the consultation and now reads 'C(i) At least 60% of agricultural holdings entered into Countryside Stewardship scheme or habitat management plans'.). The Countryside Stewardship provides financial incentives for land managers to look after their

			environment. Within this agro-environment scheme, organic conversion and management are encouraged. For more information on this scheme see <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/countryside-stewardship-get-paid-for-environmental-land-management">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/countryside-stewardship-get-paid-for-environmental-land-management</a>
<b>Woodland</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are not adequate	Insufficient	See <b>Response 13.</b>
4	objectives are not adequate	The plan states that most of the hedges are in the northern parishes: - the green belt is not included in the plan but BFC have a policy of not putting housing in this zone; so this needs to be included in the LBAP - important stretches of hedges and trees, also in the northern parishes are to the south of the green belt and are currently under threat from housing plans - how BAP will interface with housing development needs to be made clear	BFLP already addresses that any new housing will be built in the green belt. See <b>Action 1.</b>
5	objectives are not adequate	BFC values its woodland (and it is great to see orchards promoted). It is also great to see the objectives/targets for veteran trees, but unless younger trees are protected, there will be no replacements – no succession. Can consideration of younger trees, and areas of woodland as important biodiversity refuges, be incorporated? – <b>Action 5</b>  Regarding threats to woodland, no mention is made of pollution, but it is a specific threat to the SAC and the SPA. – <b>Action 6</b>  Regarding threat to hedges including hedgerow trees from development – could allocated sites have specific objectives/targets, so hedgerow is not lost before it is surveyed? – See <b>Action 1</b>	<b>Action 5:</b> the following paragraph has been added in page 18 'Woodlands support more wildlife than any other habitat, and together with hedgerows, orchards and copses provide habitat corridors that connect wildlife across the landscape. Furthermore, the potential of woodlands to soak and store CO2 is being increasingly recognised to be an important measure for fighting against climate change.' Management of LWS and SSSI already considers forest succession; hence making a target for the protection of younger trees would be redundant.

		<p>Objectives: although fragmentation/isolation is identified as the major threat, there is no explicit objective/target to counteract this. Can these been added (to include minimizing potential increased loss via SALP and BFLP allocations)? – See <b>Action 1</b> (the hedgerows are an element to take into account when producing the green corridor map)</p> <p>Objective A/target (ii): It could be interpreted to mean that once a site has been found, that year’s surveys will be halted. – <b>Response 15</b></p> <p>Objective D/target (i): p.21 says, “It has not been possible to estimate hedgerow extent in Berkshire or Bracknell Forest due to the difficulties in identifying hedgerows from aerial photography”. Could you clarify? – <b>Response 16</b></p> <p>European sites: (i) no ref is made to significance (cf. p.28 of the BAP) coniferous woodland/plantation for some SPA species; (ii) The SAC illustrates that biodiversity does not stop at administrative boundaries. Does the BFC BAP ‘stand-alone’ or does BFC engage adequately with other entities (RBWM, Crown Estate) in SAC management – as it does for SPA management (which is not mentioned either?)? Appendix A6 indicates other entities' activities but it would help if the text indicated how/whether they are joined up. – <b>Response 17</b></p>	<p><b>Action 6:</b> ‘Pollution’ has been included as a threat to woodland habitats</p> <p><b>Response 15:</b> the surveys won’t necessarily stop even though the target for that year has been met.</p> <p><b>Response 16:</b> until today, the technology for identifying hedgerows via aerial photography was not reliable. TVERC has made progress on this technique, so it has been added as a feasible target for the BAP timeframe.</p> <p><b>Response 17:</b> (i) there are limitations in the amount of information to be included as background, since the document is already quite long, (ii) General themes, Objective B states that BFC will ‘Contribute towards Berkshire biodiversity goals and work across administrative boundaries’. BFC already works with RBWM and Crown Estate as well as other bodies to manage our environmental resources. Therefore it cannot be included as an objective or target because it has already been met.</p>
6	objectives are not adequate	No mention is made of the Cedar of Lebanon trees or of the community orchards at Ringmead and Anneforde Allotments. – <b>Response 18</b>	<b>Response 18.</b> This document defines general targets, rather than address specific cases.
<b>Wetland</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are not adequate	Improving the roads that flood every year would be helpful – <b>Response 19</b>	<b>Response 19:</b> this feedback doesn’t relate to the BAP.

4	objectives are not adequate	<p>Although the River Cut is mentioned, a few specifics on how the conservation of this river and it's associated habitat can be improved would improve the plan. It's understood the LBAP is 'high level' but for example, to say 'restore or enhance 2km of river or stream' does not say much and seems unachievable - how can one stretch of river be improved when the fate of the river depends on what happens upstream? – <b>Response 20</b></p>	<p><b>Response 20:</b> targets H(i) and H(ii) define how this is going to be achieved (by partnership and guidance with managers and landowners). More specific actions will be developed along the BAP period and added in the BAP toolkit. Although it is beyond BFC capabilities to improve upstream habitat, we believe that the quality of the water and the habitat within BF boundaries can be improved with restoration actions.</p>
5	objectives are not adequate	<p>GCN: Could there be an Objective/target to link such sites - e.g. with the Warfield Newt Reserve – as part of the green/blue infrastructure network? – <b>Response 21</b>  Re Kingfisher and WFD. Very good to see a commitment to the WFD. (Note above comment that part of The Cut is not marked on the Map, p.10.)  In general, waterways are particularly amenable to area wide efforts and it would be nice to see this planned (at a later stage?) – <b>Response 22</b></p>	<p><b>Response 29:</b> the National ‘District licensing for great crested newts’ scheme has been identified in the Housing White Paper ‘Fixing our broken housing market February 2017’ as one of the tools for speeding up sustainable housing delivery. This new approach seeks to encourage a net gain in GCN habitat, providing habitat in areas where surveys suggest it will most effectively connect up and expand populations. The plan will be set up by Natural England over the next 3 years, 2017/18 to 2019/20. Therefore this scheme, aimed at providing net habitat gain for GCNs, already covers this issue.  <b>Response 22:</b> this could be considered after obtaining results of habitat connectivity.</p>
6	objectives are not adequate	<p>To create 5 new ponds is a large task and takes many years to establish. Bracknell Town Council does not have the facilities to make new ponds but has done extensive work on enhancing Braybrooke Pond, The Cut, North Lake and the bog area at North Lake. – <b>Response 23</b></p>	<p><b>Response 23:</b> this target was met in the previous BAP period (2012-2017): one pond was created at Sandhurst Memorial Park, two at Ambarrow court and one at West Garden Copse; an additional pond has formed naturally at Garth Meadows. For this period,</p>

			one small pond has already been dug out at Big Wood.
<b>Heathland</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10</b> .
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are adequate		
4	objectives are adequate		
5	objectives are not adequate	Objectives A & B and targets could be compromised by pollution (traffic/air-borne). While the BAP cannot control that, could it include objectives/targets to monitor this pollution? – <b>Response 24</b>	<b>Response 24:</b> Objective A is not strictly compromised by pollution, as the monitoring can still be carried on. Objective B could be compromised by pollution. However, this suggestion hasn't been added because (1) if the problem arises, it will be identified thanks to objective A and (2) TVERC carries out the identification, designation and monitoring of the LWS, therefore in the case of LWS tasks would overlap.
6	objectives are adequate		
<b>Farmland</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10</b> .
2	objectives are adequate		
3	objectives are not adequate	Our farming land should be protected. Children don't see and understand farming initiatives – <b>Response 25</b>	<b>Response 25:</b> agree. Initiatives to promote environmentally friendly farming (target C(ii) and C(iii)) and to raise awareness on the importance of this habitat (target D(i)) are included
4	objectives are not adequate	It's understood the number of indicator species has been reduced to allow more of a habitat approach. However, in the case of farmland (and the grassland section), all the species are residents. The farmlands in borough are very important for priority migratory bird species that over winter here (fieldfare, redwing) and reflect	<b>Response 26:</b> by improving habitat quality all species benefit. The 'habitat approach' is designed to preserve ecosystems for the benefit of all species, resident or migrant, protected or not.

		dimensions of what needs to be conserved across farmland/grassland habitats – <b>Response 26</b>	Although the BAP species have been selected because they cover key aspects of their habitat, and better define their targets within the plan, this doesn't imply that other species won't benefit of the objectives. Also, the main purpose of the BAP species is acting as flagships to focus interest and help to deliver the targets.
5	objectives are not adequate	<p>What does BFC envisage as 'Farmland'? Does it already disregard allocated sites? Threats to north Bracknell farmland biodiversity should include development as arguably the greatest threat to 2034, via the SALP and BFLP allocations. (Or is 'development' as a threat hidden in the phrase, 'Market forces leading to changes in land use'? If so please make it more explicit.) – <b>Action 7</b></p> <p>Opportunities: could include SANG as representing an opportunity to conserve/enhance farmland-like habitat. Although this is presumably largely the remit of the SPA SPD and not the BAP, could farmland biodiversity BAP objectives/targets be promoted in SANG creation, e.g. ensuring adequate/protected foraging/nesting sites? – <b>Response 27</b></p> <p>Objectives A &amp; B are likely to be overtaken by the proposed alienation of farmland to 2034 via SALP and BFLP allocations, with Targets A(ii), (iii) at risk of coming too late, and B being potentially very hard to achieve in face of ever-decreasing areas of farmland and the encroachment of urbanisation. – <b>Response 28</b></p>	<p><b>Action 7:</b> the threats that involve 'Market forces leading to changes in land use' are more explicit now that three examples have been added: development, urbanisation and land neglect (page 33).</p> <p><b>Response 27:</b> SANGs are not included as opportunities as this would apply to every BAP habitat. The works carried out in SANGS do however contribute to BAP targets, since the SANG management plans are designed taking the BAP into consideration.</p> <p><b>Response 28:</b> objectives and targets are still relevant for the land not lost to development.</p>
6	objectives are adequate		
<b>Urban</b>			
1	objectives are not adequate	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10</b> .
2	objectives are not adequate	More needs to be done to stop urbanisation and protect what we have before it's too late	Stopping development is not the only solution to preserve/enhance biodiversity; neither is it a feasible one. See <b>Response 2 and 6</b> , and <b>Action 1</b> .



3	objectives are not adequate		
4	objectives are not adequate	What's important for all species is the connectivity of habitats to allow viable population to exist. Thus more emphasis should be placed on this for Urban areas and factored into housing development plans	See <b>Action 1</b> (Objective B).
5	objectives are not adequate	Threats and Objective A, Target (ii): Development. Cowslips are a BFC success story: the Northern Distributor Road verges are a sea of cowslips in places. However, this has been destroyed beside Woodhurst Park where swathes of mixed verge have been replaced with turf grass. Can the BAP influence this practice in future? – <b>Action 7</b> ‘Badger’ paragraph on p.36 and Objective/targets B(vi) and C(ii). The decline in badgers in BFC is of great concern. Can the BAP influence any future pressure to cull badgers inside Bracknell Forest boundaries? – <b>Response 30</b>	<b>Action 7:</b> no amendment has been done to the BAP, but this location has been included in the toolkit to be considered as one of the sites to be managed. <b>Response 30:</b> unfortunately, badger cull is a governmental measure that should be dealt with via other procedures.
6	objectives are not adequate	What is the baseline for starting the 30% of grass verges and wildflower areas? Is this just 30% or 30% each year. Need a clear base line on these projects to be able to monitor progress. – <b>Response 31</b>	<b>Response 31:</b> last year the target ‘Manage at least 25% of grass verges as roadside nature reserves within Bracknell town’ was almost met in the previous BAP period. This year we have increased the target to further improve Bracknell’s urban areas. The timeframe of the target refers to the BAP period (i.e. 30% of grass verges by 2023).
<b>QUESTIONS 16 to 22 - TARGETS</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Are the targets sufficient to achieve objectives?</b>	<b>Why not?</b>	<b>Response/Action taken</b>
<b>General themes</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10</b> .
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		

3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	Water quality is essential for communities of both humans and wildlife. BFB will be greater London – <b>Response 32</b>	<b>Response 32:</b> water quality is a wider issue that cannot be fully addressed in this BAP. However, General Themes target E.i) addresses the adoption of a green infrastructure policy, which includes sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), parks, playing fields, and other open spaces, woodlands, hedgerows and water features. These elements contribute to a good water quality.
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	Community participation in surveying will be a key resource for monitoring. Nationally, citizen science is popular and works well. Many living in the borough are members of national monitoring schemes and record biodiversity in the borough. In the LBAP, only local organisations are listed - thus this should be extended to include national ones as well such as BTO, Mammal Soc etc – <b>Response 33</b>	<b>Response 33:</b> the partners listed in each target are those organisations that have agreed on executing with that target.
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>Grassland</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	The plans for the assessment of what still exists is being done too late. Other developments in the borough are taking place now and the impacts very likely irreversible. This is particularly important as the LBAP lists enhancing/restoring potential BAP grassland - potential	See <b>Response 4</b> and <b>Action 1</b>

		sites may be lost before assessments have been made	
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>Woodland</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See comments under 'objectives'	
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>Wetland</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See comments under 'objectives'	
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to	See Objectives comments	

	achieve objectives		
<b>Heathland</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>Farmland</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific knowledge?	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See comments under 'objectives'	
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>Urban</b>			
1	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	hard to tell, I'm not an expert on biodiversity... and this is how this document comes across - how could I gauge this without specific	Repeated feedback, see <b>Response 10.</b>

		knowledge?	
2	targets sufficient to achieve objectives		
3	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives		
4	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See comments under 'objcetives'	
5	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
6	targets not sufficient to achieve objectives	See Objectives comments	
<b>QUESTION 23 - OTHER COMMENTS</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>		<b>Response/Action taken</b>
1	The link to this survey was posted on social media (Facebook) - I doubt most people will take the time to read this 57 page document or understand it particularly well, most of us aren't qualified enough to form an opinion on what's proposed that would be of much use! I do hope that this helps biodiversity, not enough care is taken by people in general and not enough knowledge is provided for us to KNOW to take better care. – <b>Response 34</b>		<b>Response 34:</b> fortunately, a few people responded to this consultation and as consequence the BAP has been improved. Ultimately, helping people to know how to take better care of nature is part of the objectives of this BAP.
2			
3	the overall objectives are lost. It would be helpful if the objectives and goals are clearly set out in parallel with the housing and infrastructure development – <b>Response 35</b>		<b>Response 35:</b> more emphasis on how the BAP addresses the impact of new housing has been added after this consultation (see <b>Action 1</b> ).
4	Overall, it's a well presented plan. Two high level concerns: 1. It's not clear how the objectives will 'fit' with the other major developments underway in the borough and thus how target can be met. 2. Most of the assessment/monitoring will take place after some key habitats are lost to housing etc. This is too late. there is already evidence that many species - plants, birds, reptiles, insects are on the decline in the area (data to support some of this is available). And most of the monitoring is focussed on sites already identified for biodiversity. But there is much habitat that has not been assessed (e.g. hedgerows, trees that are mature and future 'veteran' trees) and some of this will be important to maintain for the LBAP to meet its targets, not to mention being realistic in terms of achieving concrete contributions to conservation – <b>Response 36</b>		<b>Response 36:</b> more emphasis to how the BAP addresses the impact of new housing has been added as result of this consultation (see <b>Action 1</b> ).

5	<p>Appendix A6. See comment above re explanation of law/regs. If not dealt with in an introductory section, might it help to give a brief overview of how the regulations/legislation fit together, and with reference to Bracknell? (e.g. a significant impact of the Habitats Regs on BFC is via the SPA species). categories? – see <b>Action 3</b></p> <p>Also, are all cited versions of the legislation the most recent? – <b>Response 37</b></p> <p>Could Wildlife in Ascot be included as a group “ covers also North Ascot, BFC. – <b>Action 8</b></p>	<p><b>Response 37:</b> the legislation has been added after this consultation</p> <p><b>Action 8:</b> the mission and goals of Wildlife in Ascot have been added to ‘A6 Relevant Legislation, Policies and Plans - Local Strategies’</p>
6	<p>Working together to achieve nature conservation is vital for the enjoyment of the natural environment locally and good for mental and physical health. The overall strategy with its aims and objectives are supported with a pro-active plan and positive management. Clear baselines need to be established for all the targets to all progress to be monitored. Bracknell Town Council already install bat boxes, swift boxes, hedgehog hotels and install wood piles at various sites and are committed to enhancing the areas it manages. Bracknell Town Council looks forward to working with the Bracknell Forest Biodiversity team to help safeguard and enhance our community. – <b>Response 37</b></p>	<p><b>Response 37:</b> targets have been designed so the progress can be monitored (e.g. by providing numbers and percentages, or by being a one-off project). Thanks to BTC for contributing so actively to the BAP targets.</p>