

**Whitcher Wildlife Ltd.
Ecological Consultants.**



BURNTWOOD COURT.

OS REF: SE 42513 10810

**GRASSLAND CREATION AND CONDITION
ASSESSMENT.**

Ref No: 201125/GCCA.

Date: 9th August 2023.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page Number
1. INTRODUCTION.	3
2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN.	4
3. GRASSLAND CONDITION ASSESSMENT.	6

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Planning Consent, reference **2020/1417** has been granted for the construction of a group of pods and a lake at the eastern side of the Burntwood Hotel site.

1.2. Planning Condition 3 states the following:

“Notwithstanding the approved plans, on commencement of development, a revised version of the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan, cross referencing its habitat management with the Biodiversity Net Gain Condition Assessment for Grassland in the Defra Metric 2.0 Technical Supplement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development and long-term management (to 30 years) shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.”

1.3. This document has been prepared to satisfy that planning condition. Not by the revision of the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP), produced by Bond Bryan, dated 11th May 2021, but by documenting how the LMMP ensures that the grassland reaches the condition assessment of fairly good in line with the Metric 2.0 technical supplement.

2.1. The above shows the layout of the site, including the location of the lodges, pond, shrub planting and wildflower meadow creation, which is the area in which this document relates to.

2.2. The full landscaping plan is available as a separate document and is easier to read than the above.

3. GRASSLAND CONDITION ASSESSMENT.

3.1. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which supported the planning application, was accompanied by a Metric 2.0 calculation, specifying that condition of the enhanced grassland would reach fairly good.

3.2. Bond Bryan have produced an LMMP documenting the maintenance and management of this habitat. Shown below are reasons why, providing the LMMP is strictly followed, each of the criterion will be achieved.

3.2.1. Criterion 1: The area is clearly and easily recognisable as a good example of this type of habitat and there is little difference between what is described in the relevant habitat classifications and what is visible on site.

3.2.1.1. The grassland should be recognisable as a good example of a wildflower meadow due to the precise management schedule documented in the LMMP along with the species mix being typical of a high-quality grassland, including nine indicator species of lowland meadows. The management regime specified on page 9 of the LMMP documents how the habitat will be established.

Wild Flower Meadow Grass Seed Mix 01- for main Site						
-To be used for areas defined as 'Wildflower Meadow Grassland'						
-Source : (based on) Emorsgate Seeds EM4 Meadow Mixture for Clay Soils						
-Sowing rate - 4g/m ²						
Species					% per Mix	m ²
<i>Achillea millefolium</i> /Yarrow/					0.5%	27
<i>Centaurea nigra</i> /Common knapweed/					3.5%	191
<i>Filipendula ulmaria</i> /Meadowsweet/					1.0%	55
<i>Galium verum</i> /Lady's Bedstraw/					2.5%	137
<i>Lathyrus pratensis</i> /Meadow Vetchling/					0.4%	22
<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i> /Oxeye Daisy/					0.5%	27
<i>Lotus corniculatus</i> /Birdfoot Trefoil/					0.5%	27
<i>Lychnis flos-cuculi</i> /Ragged Robin/					0.2%	11
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i> /Ribwort Plantain/					1.0%	55
<i>Primula veris</i> /Cowslip/					1.0%	55
<i>Prunella vulgaris</i> /Selfheal/					1.0%	55
<i>Ranunculus acris</i> /Meadow Buttercup/					2.0%	109
<i>Rhinanthus minor</i> /Yellow Rattle/					2.0%	109
<i>Rumex acetosa</i> /Common Sorrel/					1.4%	77
<i>Silaum silaus</i> /Pepper Saxifrage/					0.4%	22
<i>Stachys officinalis</i> /Betony/					2.0%	109
<i>Trifolium pratense</i> /Wild Red Clover/					0.1%	5
					20%	
Grasses						
<i>Agrostis capillaris</i> /Common Bent/					10.0%	547
<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> /Meadow Foxtail/					2.0%	109
<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i> /Sweet Vernal-grass/					2.0%	109
<i>Briza media</i> /Quaking Grass/					1.0%	55
<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> /Crested Dogstail/					36.0%	1969
<i>Festuca rubra</i> /Slender-creeping Red Fescue/					24.0%	1313
<i>Phleum bertolonii</i> /Smaller Cat's-tail/					4.0%	219
<i>Hordeum secalinum</i> /Meadow Barley/					1.0%	55
					80%	
Totals					100%	5470

3.2.2. Criterion 2: The appearance and composition of the vegetation on site should very closely match the characteristics for the specific Priority Habitat [i.e as described

by either the Phase 1 Habitat Classification or the UK Habitat Classification], with species typical of the habitat representing a significant majority of the vegetation.

3.2.2.1. The above reasoning also applies to this criterion.

3.2.3. Criterion 3: Wildflowers, sedges and indicator species for the specific Priority grassland habitat are very clearly and easily visible throughout the sward and occur at high densities in high frequency. See relevant Habitat Classification for details of indicator species for specific habitat.

3.2.3.1. The species table shown above, extracted from the LMMP specifies the exact species mix which is to be used and confirms that 20% of the sward will be made up of a wildflower meadows, meaning they will be easily visible throughout. It is unclear what constitutes 'high densities in high frequency' but assuming this means that localised patches will have a great abundance than the 20%, then this should be achievable through the natural colonisation of the grassland. Species such as bird's foot trefoil will often form clumps, likely in high frequency.

3.2.4. Criterion 4: Undesirable species and physical damage is below 5% cover.

3.2.4.1. As above, the species mix is shown and contains no undesirable species. The management regime on page 9 of the LMMP details how any such undesirable species will be spot treated to ensure they do not establish.

3.2.5. Criterion 5: Cover of bare ground greater than 10% (including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens).

3.2.5.1. This should be achievable, but is typically the hardest to guarantee as the grassland will be accessible to lodge users and dogs etc, which can result in section becoming worn down. However, this is very unlikely to reach greater than 10%. On going monitoring checks are planned for the next thirty years, and should it reach a stage where it appears to be reaching 10% bare ground, then signage or fencing will be erected to prevent access until the grassland has recovered to its original condition.

3.2.6. Criterion 6: Cover of bracken less than 20% and cover of scrub and bramble less than 5%.

3.2.6.1. Easily achieved, no bracken is currently present and none will be. Should for any reason it appear, which is extremely unlikely, it will be instantly removed.

3.3. As can be seen from the above, all criterion can be achieved comfortably by following the plan set out in the LMMP which should result in a score of good. However, on the Metric 2.0 supplement, which includes the condition assessment, the wording for good condition grassland states that “*Wildflower and sedges above 30% excluding white clover Trifolium repens, creeping buttercup Ranunculus repens and injurious weeds*”. The grassland will fall short of that, with a 20% cover, so the score has been downgraded to fairly good.

Prepared by:	
Mitchel Greenhalgh. BSc, ACIEEM.	Date: 9 th August 2023.
