

Our ref: W4361\_let\_White Cross Farm\_02-02-22

Your ref: Land at White Cross Farm, Wallingford

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**REFUSED**

DATE: 03/09/2024

APPLICATION No: P21/S3961/CM, (MW.0115/21)



**Ecological Consultancy for Planning  
Research & Development**

Simon Heaton  
Planning Consultant  
Heaton Consulting  
07958 043814  
simon@heatonsconsulting.com  
*by email only*

2<sup>nd</sup> February 2022

Dear Simon,

**Re: Further Information Request – Proposed Sand and Gravel Extraction at Land at White Cross Farm, Wallingford**

I am writing to you with regard to the further information request from Oxfordshire County Council in their letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2021 under Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, reference MW.0115/21.

Within that letter, further information was requested on the following four topics:

- Confirmation whether the tree identified as a potential Black Poplar is to be retained.
- Confirmation of presence or likely absence of invasive species within the site.
- Clarification regarding discrepancies between the area values and habitat types detailed in the Biodiversity Metric and those within the Restoration Strategy.
- A proposed habitat plan with the habitat types labelled as per the biodiversity metric

I am hoping that the following information will provide the necessary information.

**Black Poplar Tree**

I can confirm that the tree identified as a black poplar is to be retained, and is correctly identified as a black poplar.

**Invasive Species**

No non-native, invasive plant species have been found within the site.

Photograph 14 of the ecology report, which is of a wet ditch, is not particularly clear but does not show New Zealand pygmyweed *Crassula helmsii*, but is showing a mixture of native species including water mint *Mentha aquatica*, fool's water-cress *Apium nodiflorum*, and brooklime *Veronica beccabunga*.

**Discrepancies in the Biodiversity Metric**

There are some 'discrepancies' between the area values and habitat types detailed in the Biodiversity Metric and those within the Restoration Strategy, but these should be explained through the attached proposed habitats map.

The differences are mainly down to how different habitats are categorised, and inputted, into the Metric which has its own categorisation system that the Restoration Plan does not strictly follow.

The following points should be noted.

- We calculate less proposed agricultural area than the Restoration Plan. This is because we have measured the agricultural area (cereal crops) as running to the edge of cultivated land, and have calculated the field margins as separate habitat. We assume the restoration plan puts these habitats together.
- We give more area as reedbed, this is because we have combined the mesotrophic lake and reedbed into one habitat (as they are likely to function as one habitat, and unlikely to be distinct habitats in our opinion).
- The total site area should be the same.
- The Restoration Plan maps individual trees in the restoration plan. We have included these in linear habitats for the Metric calculation.
- The Restoration Plan shows deciduous woodland creation. We have included this as creation of hedgerow with trees, which we have included as a linear habitat.

I have attached the Metric calculation, in its Excel format.

**Proposed Habitat Plan**

I have attached this as a PDF, but have included a copy below.

I hope that this provides the necessary detail, as requested.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Bodsworth', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Edward Bodsworth MA (Cantab) PhD MCIEEM  
DIRECTOR

