

SALFORD CITY COUNCIL

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

**NATURE CONSERVATION AND
BIODIVERSITY**

JULY 2006

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

**Prepared under regulation 18 (4) (b) of the Town and Country Planning
(Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004**

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 relates to public participation and states that the Local Planning Authority should prepare a consultation statement before advertising a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for public consultation. This is a reflection of the Government's desire to 'strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities'.
- 1.2 In due course, the Council will be adopting a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) that will set out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. Once the SCI is adopted, which is due to be in May 2008, planning documents will be required to conform to its provisions.
- 1.3 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in advance of the SCI, but aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the Plan making process. It describes the involvement of stakeholders, voluntary organisations and statutory consultees in the preparation of the Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD.
- 1.4 The consultation process adopted meets the minimum requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. In terms of the local community, preparation of the SPD involved representatives from both the city's ranger service, and the local voluntary wildlife trust.
- 1.5 The Consultation Draft of this Statement was made available during the formal period of public consultation, alongside the Consultation Draft of the SPD and the Sustainability Appraisal report.

2 Process of Community Involvement to Consultation Draft Stage

- 2.1 The consultation up to the draft stage has involved:
 - Preparation of a draft outline of the SPD (see Appendix A of this report) and a list of Key Issues for it to address (see Appendix B of this report), which were circulated in letters and a memo dated 27th September 2005, to those key stakeholders (excluding English Heritage and the Government Office for the North West) listed in Appendix D. Both the national (because of the implications for lowland raised bog - the responsibility for which resides at national level) and regional offices of English Nature, were invited to comment
 - Comments on the key issues and structure of the proposed SPD were invited by 14th October 2005

- Prior to the 21st October 2005 meeting (referred to below) comments were received from English Nature (both from national and regional offices), the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and Red Rose Forest
- A meeting of the key stakeholders was then held on 21st October 2005
- The purpose of the stakeholder meeting was threefold as follows:
 - To briefly explain the new planning system and its implications for the proposed SPD
 - To briefly explain the methodology and programme for the environmental assessment / sustainability appraisal
 - To discuss the key issues relating to the proposed SPD
- The Countryside Agency, English Nature and Red Rose Forest (RRF) did not attend the meeting. However, EN and RRF had previously sent comments
- Following the meeting, a meeting note was sent out to the attendees and a request was made inviting any additional comments on the key issues for the proposed SPD
- The Environment Agency (EA) subsequently provided a reference on information referred to in the meeting (see Appendix C for final note of meeting)
- On the 24th November 2005, the newly appointed Greater Manchester Biodiversity Officer was invited to comment on some information for inclusion in the proposed SPD, and he subsequently responded on 28th November 2005
- Following approval by the Lead Member for Planning on 14th November 2005, a Scoping Report on the proposed SPD was prepared and sent to those parties listed in Appendix D (in order to comply with the requirements of the SEA and SA Regulations)
- Comments on the Scoping Report were received from the Government Office for the North West, Red Rose Forest, the Environment Agency and the Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside

3 Outcome of Consultation on Proposed Structure and Key Issues for SPD

3.1 The key points arising from the key stakeholder meeting and consultation on the Draft Outline and Key Issues for the SPD to address were as follows:

- The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds wanted the following:
 - That the SPD should only deal with issues relating to lowland raised bog habitat
 - That lowland raised bog should have the status of a UK Priority Habitat

- That sites supporting priority habitats and species should be included
- The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside wanted the following:
 - The 6 key guiding principles in Section 1 of the latest national planning guidance “Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation” restated in the SPD
 - Protected nature conservation sites to be included in the SPD
 - Sites supporting priority species to be included in the SPD
 - That additional priority species may be identified in future to be included in the SPD
- EN (regional office) requested that the SPD should clearly define the different levels of protection afforded to the key biodiversity features found in Salford
- As yet there is little guidance at a regional level, both on the proposed location and on the extent of national priority habitats, which the latest government guidance is requiring the re-creation of, as part of the development planning process
- As yet (apart from lowland raised bog) there is little published guidance on the techniques needed to re-create different types of priority habitat, however, see below
- The key stakeholders at 21st October 2005 meeting and RRF suggested references (including the Association of Local Government Ecologists (ALGE), other local authorities and websites) for more general guidance in relation to development planning and general impacts on biodiversity features (including general guidance on steps necessary for re-creation)
- The Senior Peatlands Officer for EN provided guidance on the techniques necessary for lowland raised bog restoration
- RRF suggested greater input on how the design of new development can generally contribute to enhancing biodiversity

4 Outcome of Consultation on Scoping Report

4.1 The key points arising from consultation on the Scoping Report were as follows:

- There was some confusion on the role of the Scoping Report and the proposed Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process by some key stakeholders
- The GONW had no comments
- The EA supported and shared the objectives outlined in the report, and referred to the potential role of biodiversity in implementing the

new River Irwell Catchment Flood Management Plan, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and the urban regeneration initiatives in Salford

- The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside wanted the following:
 - Biodiversity to be regarded as making a “considerable difference” to ensuring a healthy society, as opposed to only contributing in a “minor way”
 - Hedgerows and woodlands to be seen as landscape features
 - Monitoring to be required as part of any proposed mitigation measures
 - Mitigation to be implemented through Section 106 Agreements
 - Compensation (especially monetary) not to be seen as an alternative to mitigation
 - Planning permission to be withheld if mitigation is not possible
 - Government policy on peat extraction to be seen as reducing dependence on peat and increasing use of recycled materials as alternatives, rather than enabling the horticultural industry to continue to be supplied by peat

5 Council Response to Comments on Proposed Structure and Key Issues for SPD

5.1 Role of SPD

The Council could not accept that the proposed SPD should only relate to “lowland raised bog” habitat. Its role was intended to be much wider, and to cover all key biodiversity assets in Salford, of which bog is only one. The UDP (Adopted June 2006) contains a commitment to produce additional guidance on both Policy EN8 and EN11. The reasoned justification of Policy EN8 contains a commitment to produce guidance on “priority habitats”, which include any type of national or local priority habitat occurring in Salford, and not just readily restorable lowland raised bog. However, the SPD would include further guidance in relation to lowland raised bog in line with the commitment given in Policy EN11 Mosslands of the UDP (Adopted June 2006).

5.2 PPS9 Guiding Principles

The Council has included the 6 guiding principles from PPS9 in Section 4, Para 4.1.3 of the SPD.

Need for Clarity on Different Levels of Protection Afforded to the Different Biodiversity Features

- 5.3 The SPD is structured to indicate what legislation protects some internationally and nationally important sites, and certain wild animal and plant species. It also indicates those national and local priority

habitats and species referred to in national, regional and local policy guidance, but which are not necessarily afforded statutory protection.

Need to Include Protected Sites as Biodiversity Assets

- 5.4 The Council agreed that the SPD needed to include reference to protected sites. Those in Salford, which are protected locally by Policy EN8 of the UDP (Adopted June 2006), are the Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs), the Local Nature Reserves, and areas of both national and local priority habitats. These sites are clearly referred to in the SPD.

Need to Include Sites Supporting Priority Habitats and Species

- 5.5 The Council agreed that there was a need to refer to national priority habitats and species in the SPD as important biodiversity assets. Policy EN8 of the UDP (Adopted June 2006) seeks protection of areas of both national and local priority habitats, and the draft SPD included a plan showing the location of the national priority habitats.

- 5.6 In terms of sites supporting national priority species, the issue is more difficult because as with protected species, the presence of such species on a site, are only likely to be definitely known as a result of surveys. It would be impossible to undertake an in depth survey of every site in the city, in order to determine the presence of these species. However, Para 3.4.9 to 3.4.11 of the Consultation Draft SPD listed those priority species known to have occurred in Salford at some time in the past.

Lowland Raised Bog Should be Included as a UK Priority Habitat

- 5.7 Given that the European Union Habitats Directive Annex 1 affords priority habitat status to 2 categories of bog (i.e. active and readily restorable bog - which were explained in Appendix A of the Consultation Draft SPD) the Council acknowledged this in the Consultation Draft SPD, and had a separate policy seeking opportunities to restore it on Chat Moss.

Lack of Strategic Guidance on Potential Location of Re-created National Priority Habitats

- 5.8 The council sought advice from all key stakeholders and eventually used the Association of Local Government Ecologists publication "Developing Naturally" by Michael Oxford for general guidance on re-creating habitats, and EN advice on re-creating lowland raised bog (see Bullet Point Below). An indication of the techniques necessary for re-creating habitats, are referred to in the reasoned justification to Policy NCB3 Provision of Habitats and Landscaping.

Advice on Restoration of Lowland Raised Bog

- 5.9 Because of particular difficulties of restoring/re-creating lowland raised bog (which is a particularly sensitive habitat) the advice of the Senior Peatlands Officer, at English Nature was sought, and the main points

of his advice are included within Policy NCB4 Lowland Raised Bog Restoration of the Consultation Draft SPD.

6 Council Response to Comments on Scoping Report

Lack of Clarity on Role of Scoping Report

- 6.1 The Council sought to explain the role of the SA process, which was largely new to most of the key stakeholders, at the meeting on 21st October 2005. It was thought that the process would become clearer when the Consultation Draft SPD was out to public consultation.

Need to Acknowledge Role of Biodiversity when Implementing Other Initiatives

- 6.2 The Council acknowledged that, opportunities to improve biodiversity needed to be sought through a range of different mechanisms, and included a separate section referring to this issue in the Section 7 Implementation of Consultation Draft SPD.

The Role of Biodiversity

- 6.3 The Council pointed out that the wording in Table 3, which referred to the biodiversity interest of parks and open spaces, was referring to whether biodiversity rich surroundings, were actually going to encourage greater use of these facilities, and thereby improve the health of the city's population. It was thought that improvements in biodiversity will enrich the city's environment, but given that the Consultation Draft SPD would only relate to improvements through the development planning process, the extent to which "it" would "actually" result in a healthy population were considered to be minor.

- 6.4 It was considered that biodiversity could contribute to a range of other sustainability objectives for the city, and this was clearly demonstrated in the biodiversity Sustainability Appraisal report.

Landscape Features

- 6.5 The Council was happy to consider hedgerows and woodlands as landscape features. The "canals, ponds and lodges" as referred to in Table 3, were only being used as examples of landscape features, rather than being intended as an exhaustive list of such features. It is thought that Policies NCB1 Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity and NCB2 Ecological Appraisal of the Consultation Draft SPD clearly require the presence of any existing natural and landscape features on a proposed development site to be acknowledged and addressed in the design of a development and in any mitigation and/or compensation measures proposed.

Need to Require Monitoring as Part of Mitigation Measures

- 6.6 The Council was happy to accept that appropriate monitoring should be seen as important in any mitigation and/or compensation measures put forward. The fourth paragraph of the reasoned justification to Policy NCB2 of the Consultation Draft of the SPD included reference to

“future monitoring to establish appropriate remedial measures that may be necessary” as being an appropriate matter for inclusion in a management plan.

6.7 Mitigation Measures Should Be Enforced Through Section 106 Agreements

The Council agreed that it might be necessary to enforce mitigation measures through legal agreements and made provision for this within the wording of Policy NCB2 Ecological Appraisal of the Consultation Draft SPD.

Compensation is no Alternative to Mitigation

6.8 The Council accepted that “mitigation” was different from “compensation”. Mitigation measures are those needed to avoid “harm” to any key biodiversity feature, whereas “compensation” measures are those taken when appropriate mitigation measures are not possible, and the development proposals if implemented, would result in harm to a key biodiversity feature.

6.9 The reasoned justification to Policy NCB1 of the Consultation Draft SPD outlined a number of potential mitigation measures that might be possible, and it also outlined potential compensation measures. Compensation simply in the form of monetary provision alone would be unacceptable.

Planning Permission should be Refused if Mitigation not Possible

6.10 The Council could support this viewpoint. The latest national “Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (PPS9)” states within Section 1 (vi) that “where a planning decision would result in significant harm to biodiversity and geological interests that cannot be prevented or adequately mitigated against, appropriate compensation measures should be sought”. It is very clear therefore that there are likely to be occasions when full mitigation may not be possible, but “appropriate compensation measures” may nonetheless be acceptable.

6.11 PPS9 is very clear that it is only if adequate compensation is not provided that planning permission should be refused. Even the legislation covering European protected species, allows derogation from the provisions of the regulations in certain very limited circumstances because it recognises that the benefits of a development (e.g. in terms of human health and safety) may outweigh the harm to the biodiversity feature in question. This issue was fully considered at the Public Inquiry into the UDP (Adopted June 2006), and the inspector supported the Council’s approach.

Government Policy on Peat Extraction

6.12 The Council accepted that government policy, in addition to “enabling the horticultural industry to continue to be supplied with peat”, was also to reduce the dependence on peat. However, these 2 approaches are

not mutually exclusive. The reference to “reducing” dependence, still allows for some future appropriate peat extraction rather than stating that there should be no future extraction at all.

- 6.13 Although the UDP (Adopted June 2006) and the Consultation Draft SPD allowed for future peat extraction, their policies were very clear that the aim when restoring the extraction site will be to re-create lowland raised bog habitat. Policy NCB4 gives guidance on the techniques necessary for restoring bog, and on how the potential for bog restoration outside the Mossland Heartland will be identified.

7. Formal Public Consultation on Consultation Draft SPD

- 7.1 Consultation on the Consultation Draft SPD was carried out during a period of formal public consultation from Friday, 17th February to Thursday, 30th March 2006. This involved:

- Placing the Consultation Statement, the Sustainability Appraisal and the draft SPD on the council’s website
(Where copies can be downloaded)
- Making the 3 documents available for public inspection at Salford Civic Centre, Emerson House and Salford libraries (see Appendix H for their location and detailed opening times)
- Sending a letter (together with the 3 documents) inviting comments from the 4 statutory consultees for the Scoping Report and the key stakeholders involved in preparation of the draft SPD (see Appendix D)
- Sending a letter (together with the 3 documents) inviting comments from those consultees who supported/objected to the nature conservation policies in the Replacement UDP
- Sending a letter with notification of the consultation process (and availability of 3 documents on website), and inviting comments, to a number of ecology consultancies
- Sending a letter (together with the 3 documents) inviting comments from Chairs of Community Committees and Neighbourhood Co-ordinators
- Sending a letter inviting comments to all councillors

(See Appendix E of this report for a full list of consultees and method of consultation)

- 7.2 Anybody who was interested in the process for considering and determining planning applications with potential biodiversity implications was invited to comment on the draft SPD. The different means of response are given in Section 9 below.

8 Inspecting the Documents

8.1 The 3 documents were made available for inspection at the following locations:

- On the council's website:
<http://www.salford.gov.uk/spdconsultation>
- Salford Civic Centre, Chorley Road, Swinton, Salford, M27 5BW.
Opening times:
Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 4.30pm
- Emerson House, Albert Street, Eccles, M30 0TE.
Opening Times:
Monday to Friday 8.30am to 4:30pm
- Salford Libraries (see Appendix G for location and opening hours)

8.2 For anyone wanting an individual copy of the document, they were made available at a cost of £10 (which included postage and packing) each by post. They could be requested by sending a cheque or postal order for £10, crossed and marked 'Account Payee' and made payable to City of Salford, to the postal address given in Para 9.1 below.

9 Making Representations on the draft SPD

9.1 Any comments were requested in writing (together with name, address and organisation (if appropriate)), and could be submitted either by electronic communication (see below), or by letter or hand to the postal address below:

- Completed forms could be submitted online on the council's website: <http://www.salford.gov.uk/spdconsultation>
- Postal address:
Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Draft SPD
Spatial Planning Section
Salford City Council
Salford Civic Centre
Chorley Road
SWINTON
Salford
M27 5BW

9.2 It was also pointed out that any representations could be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address, of the adoption of the SPD. It was also pointed out that the consultation responses and the

identity of those making them would be matters of public record and open to public scrutiny.

9.3 The deadline for submission of the representations was:

4.30 pm on Thursday, 30th March 2006

9.5 All responses received by the above deadline were fully considered, and where appropriate, changes were made to the Consultation Draft SPD.

10. Outcome of Consultation on Draft SPD

10.1 A total of 135 individuals and organisations were consulted either by email, or letter (see Appendix E for a full list). A total of 11 organisations responded, with 105 representations on the Consultation Draft of the SPD, and 9 on the Sustainability Appraisal. Of the responses on the SPD, only 3 are definite objections.

10.2 Of the 11 bodies responding, 3 were from government organisations (Government Office for the North West, Environment Agency and Highways Agency), 2 were from local government organisations (Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and Red Rose Forest), 3 were from local voluntary sector organisations (The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West, British Trust for Ornithology and Ramblers Association), 1 (an objection) was from a local community organisation and 2 were from local ecology consultants. One of the ecology consultants (Greenspace) generated over 30 of the representations concerning the clarity of the points being made in the SPD, while the other ecology consultant (Mr Kelcey) made 2 objections. No representations were received from English Nature, the Countryside Agency or the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, although they were sent the relevant documents.

11 Summary of Representations

11.1 It is a requirement of the regulations that a summary of the main issues raised in representations made during the formal public consultation period and how these have been addressed in the SPD is prepared and publicised by the Council.

11.2 A full schedule of all representations on the Consultation Draft of the SPD is attached as Appendix F, and for those on the Sustainability Appraisal as Appendix G. This schedule includes the policy / paragraph to which a representation is made, the name and reference number of the respondent, a summary of the representation, the council's response to the representation and any proposed change to the document as a result.

APPENDIX A

Draft Outline of Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD

1) Introduction (UDP Review and its SPDs)

2) Purpose of SPD

- Identification of potential habitats supporting protected species
- Identification of distribution of priority habitats
- Identification of potential habitats supporting priority species
- Understanding of condition of priority habitats
- Establishment of targets for protection of priority habitats
- Establishment of measures to enhance/improve priority habitats
- Establishment of measures to re-create (if appropriate) priority habitats (including lowland raised bog)
- Potential function of key areas of search for wildlife corridors

3) National Legislation and Planning Policy Guidance

Brief explanation of legislation and guidance on protecting the following:

- Protected species
- Priority Habitats
- Priority Species

4) UK Biodiversity Plan

Brief explanation of definitions of priority habitats and species, and identification of targets set in the Habitat/Species Action Plans for each of those Priority Habitats and Species occurring in Salford (Priority Habitats as identified in GMBAP and Phase 1 Habitat Surveys i.e. lowland dry acid grassland, lowland heathland, reedbeds, lowland mixed deciduous woodland, wet woodland)(Priority Species i.e. water vole, brown hare, pipistrelle bat)

5) Regional Spatial Strategy

Brief explanation of policies for biodiversity, and any specific targets set for priority habitats and species

6) Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan

- Identification of targets set in the Habitat/Species Action Plans for each of those UK Priority Habitats and Species occurring in Salford and for lowland raised bog
- Identification of targets set in the Habitat/Species Action Plans for each of those GM Priority Habitats and Species occurring in Salford and for lowland raised bog

7) Protected Species in Salford

- Identification of habitats potentially supporting protected species in Salford

8) UK Priority Habitats in Salford

Brief explanation (and accompanying maps) for each habitat of:

- Distribution (location and extent)
- Condition
- Target for protection (possibly Hectares/Location)
- Enhancement measures (agreed with ecologists)
- Re-establishment potential (location - agreed with ecologists)

9) Lowland raised bog (UK Priority Habitat) and mossland

- Former Distribution in North West and on Chat Moss
- Condition of mossland in Salford
- Target for protection
- Re-establishment measures

10) UK Priority Species in Salford

- Identification of habitats potentially supporting priority species in Salford

11) GM Priority Habitats and Species in Salford

Brief explanation for each habitat of distribution (location and extent) / target for protection / condition / enhancement measures / re-establishment potential

Brief explanation of habitats potentially supporting GM priority species

12) Wildlife Corridor function

Brief explanation for each key area of search, what function it is potentially fulfilling

13) Key Guidance:

Potential Developers

- Need to acknowledge possible presence of protected species (see 7 above) and undertake surveys as appropriate
- Need to acknowledge location / extent / condition of UK priority habitats in Salford (see 8 above) and propose measures to protect from, and mitigate the effects of, any development
- Need to acknowledge suitable enhancement measures (see 8 above) and propose appropriate improvement measures relevant to the type of habitat

- Where appropriate need to propose measures for re-creation of priority habitats (see 8 above) as part of the development (subject of planning obligation)
- Where not appropriate to re-create any priority habitat lost as part of a development, need to propose compensatory measures (subject of planning obligation)
- Need to acknowledge potential function of any key area of search for a wildlife corridor (see 11 above)

Salford Development Control Officers

- Need to be seeking appropriate protection measures for any protected species potentially affected by any development proposal
- Need to be seeking appropriate mitigation measures for any protected species directly affected by any development proposal
- Need to be seeking appropriate protection measures for any priority habitat directly, or indirectly affected by any development proposal (subject of planning conditions)
- Need to be seeking appropriate mitigation measures for any priority habitat directly affected by any development proposal
- Need to be seeking appropriate compensation measures for any priority habitat lost as a result of any development proposal

APPENDIX B

Issues concerning Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD

Draft Outline Section 7: Protected Species in Salford

(Examples of Potential and known)

- Fieldfare
- Adder
- Common Toad
- Kingfisher
- Common Frog
- Water Vole
- Barn Owl
- Great Crested Newt

Survey Requirements

- New Circular accompanying PPS9 indicates that surveys concerning protected species should only be carried out after planning permission has been granted in **exceptional** circumstances. What might constitute exceptional circumstances?
- In circumstances where there may be a relatively long time (e.g. 2 – 3 years) between the grant of an outline application, and the submission of a detailed application, and where it is being argued by the developer that over the intervening time the population and behaviour of any protected species on the area in question may change, would it be appropriate to grant the outline (if appropriate) with a condition requiring detailed population surveys prior to the submission of the detailed application?

Draft Outline Section 8: UK Priority Habitats in Salford

- Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
- Wet woodland
- Lowland heathland
- Lowland dry acid grassland

Protection of Habitats

- Need to agree a definition for different habitat types (*as referred to in the GMBAP*)
- Need to establish the potential techniques for protecting different habitats from the effects of different types of development (e.g. fencing, buffer zones, incorporation within proposed development) that could be required by planning conditions

Enhancement of Habitats

- What is the favourable condition for each of the habitats? (*as referred to in the GMBAP*)
- What is meant by “enhancement” (as referred to in PPS9)? Is it appropriate to take the line, that in the case of priority habitats in Salford, the enhancement that will be sought will be the positive management of the habitat for the benefit of wildlife?
- If management is being sought, what should be the key management objectives for each habitat?
- What key management measures are appropriate for each type of habitat?

Re-establishment

- What are the key factors to be taken into account when considering sites for the potential extension of the existing areas of priority habitats (*e.g. presence of other priority habitats, substrate, size of receptor site, relevant types of species, species of local provenance*)?
- Is there any guidance on the optimum size of each site supporting a particular habitat (i.e. what is viable)?
- What are the techniques for re-establishing the different habitats?
- What are the rare or declining species associated with each habitat?

Other compensation

- If it is not possible to re-establish a priority habitat, for example due to lack of relevant site ownership / lack of appropriate substrate, what other types of habitat, would it be appropriate to establish? (*e.g. Other priority habitats, other non-priority habitats of local distinctiveness, other habitats that would support species of local distinctiveness*)?
- If other habitats / species of local distinctiveness are thought to be appropriate, what are they?
- When seeking replacement habitats, should the area of replacement be on an equivalent area basis, or greater because of likelihood of some plant failure in initial stages of re-establishment?

Draft Outline Section 9: Lowland raised bog and mossland

- There is no lowland raised bog in Salford, but there are examples of degraded bog and extensive areas of mossland converted to agricultural use

Re-establishment

- What are the factors to be taken into account when considering the lowland raised bog restoration potential of the areas of degraded bog, and the areas of mossland used for agriculture (*e.g. depth and quality of peat deposits, quality of water supply*)?
- What are the techniques for re-establishing lowland raised bog?
- What are the rare or declining species associated with lowland raised bog?

Draft Outline Section 10: UK Priority Species in Salford

Potential Habitats for UK Priority Species

- Need to know the type of habitat that supports those Priority Species occurring in Salford (*Given guidance in PPS9 Para 16*)

GM Priority Habitats and Species in Salford

- Ponds and Lodges
- Canals
- Urban Managed Greenspace
- Bats
- Water Vole (EPS and covered by Section 7)
- Brown Hare

- Great Crested Newt (EPS and covered by Section 7)
- Song Thrush
- Floating Water Plantain (W&C and covered by Section 7)

Enhancement of Habitats (Ponds and Canals)

- What is favourable condition for ponds and canals?
- What are the key management objectives for ponds and canals?
- What key management measures are appropriate for ponds and canals?
- What are the undesirable species associated with ponds and canals?
- What management measures should be used to control undesirable species associated with ponds and canals?

Enhancement of Managed Greenspace

- What are the key management objectives for green space?
- What are appropriate management practices to enhance or increase greenspace's contribution to biodiversity?
- How can the enhancement of managed greenspace contribute to the implementation of other species action plans (what species, practicable measures)?

Re-establishment (Ponds and Canals)

- What are key factors to be taken into account when considering sites for the potential provision of new ponds (i.e. substrate, size, relevant species – flora and fauna)?
- What are the rare or declining species associated with ponds and canals?

Draft Outline Section 12: Wildlife Corridor Function

- Need to establish how each area identified as a key area of search in the UDP Review is likely to support wildlife
- Need to determine what would represent appropriate measures to ensure the continued movement of wildlife through wildlife corridors
- The reasoned justification of Policy EN7C indicates that for any habitats to be created as part of new development should relate to the priorities of the UK and GM Biodiversity Action Plans, therefore Sections 8 and 11 will be relevant

APPENDIX C

Salford Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (NC&BSPD)

Note of Key Stakeholder Meeting on Friday, 21st October 2005 at Salford Civic Centre

Present

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Annie Surtees | Environmental Services Directorate |
| Derek Richardson | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit |
| Gary Morris | Environment Agency |
| Tim Melling | Royal Society for the Protection of Birds |
| Martyn Walker | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| Dave Finch | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |

Apologies

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Nigel Blandford | Red Rose Forest |
| Mandy North | English Nature |

1.0 Apologies

- 1.1 MR had received apologies from Mandy North (English Nature) and Nigel Blandford (Red Rose Forest). She had had no response from Martin Moss (Countryside Agency).

2.0 Purpose of Meeting

- 2.1 MR explained that the purpose of the meeting was threefold as follows:
- To briefly explain the new planning system and implications for Salford
 - To briefly explain the methodology and programme for the environmental assessment / sustainability appraisal
 - To discuss the key issues relating to the proposed NC&NSPD

3.0 Local Development Scheme for Salford

- 3.1 The national planning system has recently been changed and in Salford this means that there is now a Local Development Scheme (Published in April 2005) setting out the suite of land use policy documents relating to the city. These include the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS13), the Salford Revised Unitary Development Plan (which went to public inquiry towards end of 2005 and beginning of 2006, and for which the Council now has the Inspector's Report), plus a number of more detailed Supplementary Planning Documents, which include the proposed NC&BSPD.

4.0 Sustainability Appraisal Process

- 4.1 MR explained that undertaking a SA of projects and policies was now a statutory requirement. She tabled a note seeking to explain the Draft Methodology and Programme for the Environmental Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal of the NC&BSPD. She explained that rather than setting out the nature conservation information in support of the UDP policies in Salford (which would be covered in the SPD), the SA sought to examine what the policy guidance generally says in relation to biodiversity, what the biodiversity issues are in Salford, what biodiversity objectives should be agreed for the future, and what would be the likely impact of the proposed SPD on a number of other sustainability objectives (e.g. relating to social and economic issues) in Salford.
- 4.2 MR explained that the Scoping Report (which explains the intended scope of the SPD – see Section 1 of the note) is virtually complete, and will be sent out for consultation in the near future after approval from Lead Member has been given. Everybody at the meeting together with a number of other parties / organisations would receive an electronic copy. The 6 weeks consultation period for it will be from 8th November 2005 to 15th December 2005.
- 4.3 There may be a need to amend the objectives / proposals of the SPD following consultation on them, and / or in the light of the findings of the SA. (See Section 2 of the note). As indicated in the note tabled, the meeting is part of the overall SA process. MR explained that a Sustainability Appraisal report would be prepared explaining the results of the assessment as to how the SPD is likely to perform (See Section 3 of the note). MR indicated that there would be a statutory consultation period jointly for the SA and the NC&BSPD from February to March 2006, with Adoption of the SPD in August 2006.
- 4.4 MR indicated that hopefully the concept of the SA would become clearer when people have had a chance to read and digest the Scoping Report. She welcomed comments on both the note (concerning the sustainability process) she had tabled, and on the Scoping Report.

5.0 Draft Outline of the Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD

- 5.1 TM stated that he thought that the SPD should deal only with “lowland raised bog” rather than seeking to deal with a range of habitats / species. MR explained that was not possible because the SPD was being prepared in order to support a number of nature conservation policies in the Revised UDP, which related to a number of different biodiversity assets in Salford.
- 5.2 MR then proposed that the group should go through the 2 notes she had previously circulated (i.e. the Draft Outline of the SPD and the Issues concerning its production) starting with the Outline. MR indicated she

had already had comments on them from Mandy North (English Nature), and Nigel Blandford (Red Rose Forest).

- 5.3 Draft Outline – MW/DF indicated that as a starting point, it would be helpful for the SPD to restate the Key Principles set out on Page 3 Para 1 of Planning Policy Statement 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. MR agreed that she would include these principles at the start of the SPD. MW/DF also wanted the Outline to include “protected sites” such as SBIs and LNRs. MR indicated that MN had made the same comment, and that she would include them as important biodiversity assets.

ACTION MR

- 5.4 TM indicated that sites that supported Priority Habitats and Species should be included. MR had already referred to these in Sections 2, 10, and 11 of the Draft Outline. The point was made that in future other habitats and species may be classified as being of “Priority” importance and the SPD should seek to build in some flexibility to take account of that. MR agreed she would try.

ACTION MR

6.0 Issues arising from Proposed SPD

Protected Species

- 6.1 There was some discussion about the species listed at the start of the Issues note. DF pointed out that some species (such as common frog and common toad) should not be referred to as being “protected” because the only form of protection that they had, was in terms of their “sale”. He indicated that the government Circular in support of PPS9 was very useful in setting out the types of different protection given to a range of species and habitats. TM explained that, “fieldfare”, need not be included as a protected species, because it did not breed in Salford. It was then mentioned that “bats” were also a protected species not referred to in the list. MR pointed out that the species given were not intended as an exhaustive list of protected species in Salford, they were only “examples”.

Protected Species Surveys

- 6.2 In terms of the Survey Requirements for protected species, as expressed in Para 99 of the new Circular, and the reference to the fact that the need to carry out surveys should “only be left to coverage under planning conditions in **exceptional circumstances**”, and MR’s query as to what might constitute such circumstances, the group thought there were likely to be very few cases where the need to undertake detailed surveys could be left, to be undertaken at the submission of a detailed planning application stage of a development. This was because the presence of protected species, were a material consideration in determining the application at outline stage. MN had indicated that if outline permission were granted then EN would accept a planning condition requiring **additional surveys** as part of outline permission.

Lowland Raised Bog

- 6.3 TM indicated that Lowland Raised Bog should be included as a UK Priority Habitat. MR explained that following the Inspector's Report "degraded lowland raised bog (in the form of bare peat deposits within the Mossland Heartland as shown on the Revised UDP Proposals Map)" were to be given the status of a Site of Biological Importance, rather than an "internationally important habitat". MR indicated however, that MN had also said that degraded bog which was readily restorable to lowland raised bog within 30 years, should be considered as a UK Priority Habitat. MR indicated that she would seek to take account of these comments in the SPD. She intended there to be a separate section relating to bog in the SPD (See Section 9 of circulated note).

Other UK Priority Habitats in Salford

- 6.4 TM also said that in addition to the UK Priority Habitats listed in the GM BAP as being in Salford (and which MR had listed in her note) there were also a number of other priority habitats such as "cereal field margins", which should also be included. MR would need to identify them.

ACTION MR

Definitions / Protection / Condition of UK Priority Habitats

- 6.5 MR asked what definitions should be used for the different types of habitat. The group said there should be definitions in the various national, regional and local BAPs. MR indicated that the need for the definition was referred to in the GMBAP itself and she asked if other groups in Greater Manchester had agreed to specific definitions. DR indicated that there was currently no GMBAP officer in post, although one was to be appointed in the near future.
- 6.6 MR asked whether there was any guidance, which set out how the different types of habitat should be protected. DR thought there was guidance in the information (prepared by a previous GMBAP officer) he had previously sent to MR. MR indicated that it did not.
- 6.7 MR asked whether there was any definition of what constituted the "favourable condition" of the different types of habitat as referred to in the GMBAP. TM indicated that MR would need to refer to English Nature's definition in relation to Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and use a "watered down" version of this. DR indicated that the next GMBAP officer would be looking at this issue. In terms of enhancement of priority habitats, it was agreed that the aim should be to get back to a "favourable condition".

ACTION MR

- 6.8 DR indicated that the government was currently considering changing the guidelines used in relation to the identification of local sites of biodiversity value. This review had been expected for some time, but had still not been undertaken. Therefore DR was progressing with his own

review but the new GM guidelines would not be ready until the end of this year / beginning of next year, which was awkward in terms of the preparation of Salford's NC&BSPD.

6.9 **Re-establishment of Habitats**

As in her note, MR asked what factors should be taken into account when considering the re-establishment of habitats. The group thought that there was a need to recognise that wherever possible, the emphasis should be on enhancement / restoration of original areas of habitat rather than creation of new areas of habitat. The group thought that the two key issues to take into account in considering the possible establishment of habitats, related to substrate and location. MW/DF indicated that the historical presence of habitats / species should also be taken into account. DR also thought that the local community should be involved in the choice of appropriate habitats for re-establishment.

- 6.10 MR asked what guidance there was in terms of for example the optimum size needed to create new areas of habitat. The general feeling of the group was that the site should be as large as possible. (*Following the meeting Gary Morris indicated that the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) had published "Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems – Design Manual for England and Wales"*).

Lowland Raised Bog

- 6.11 MR said that Roger Meade (Senior Peatlands Officer, English Nature) had indicated that because there was little to no guidance available on whether agricultural land could be successfully restored to lowland raised bog, the issue of the need to identify suitable areas with bog restoration potential on Chat Moss (as required by Policy EN8 Mosslands of the Salford Revised UDP) would be mainly dependant on the condition of the peat deposits (with no past agricultural use being the best) and location of them mainly in relation to the Mosslands Heartland, which focuses on 2 peat extraction sites.
- 6.12 DF asked whether there was any possibility of Little Woolden Moss being restored to lowland raised bog. MR explained that the landowner/peat operator have planning approval for restoration of the site to an agricultural after-use. Therefore if the site were to be restored to nature conservation, there might be some loss in asset value. MR explained that Roger Meade had recently visited Salford in relation to identifying sites with the potential to act as carbon sinks. He thought that given the planning approval for Little Woolden Moss, he would probably not consider that site.
- 6.13 TM listed the rare or declining species associated with lowland raised bog as follows:
- Nightjar
 - Bog bush cricket
 - Large heath butterfly

- Manchester Treble Bar
- Black poplar

Potential Habitats supporting UK Priority Species

- 6.14 TM indicated that a list of rare / declining bird species were given in a recent publication. The group listed the priority species associated with priority habitats as follows:

Wet Woodland

- Willow Tit
- Lesser spotted woodpecker
- Argent and sable moth
- Black poplar

Lowland Heathland

- Nightjar

Acid grassland

- Barn owl

Lowland mixed deciduous woodland

- ???

7.0 Conclusions

- 7.1 MR asked the group for any other comments they may have, on any of her previously circulated / tabled notes. *(Other than the reference referred to in Para 6.10, no further comments on this note were received)*

Appendix D

LIST OF CONSULTEES AND KEY STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN CONSULTATIONS TO DATE

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FOR SCOPING REPORT

Environment Agency
Countryside Agency
English Nature
English Heritage

KEY STAKEHOLDERS INVITED TO 21stOCTOBER 2005 MEETING (see Appendix C for those who attended)

Government Office for the North West (GONW)
North West Regional Authority (NWRA)
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Red Rose Forest
The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Environmental Services Directorate (Salford City Council)

Appendix E : List of Consultees and Method of Consultation

| Consultee | Consultation Draft of SPD | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------|
| | Copy of SPD | Letter/Email |
| Statutory (Total 5) | | |
| English Nature (Regional) | √ | |
| English Nature (National – Peat lands Officer) | √ | |
| Countryside Agency | √ | |
| Environment Agency | √ | |
| English Heritage | √ | |
| | | |
| Other Government Bodies (4) | | |
| Government Office for the North West | √ | |
| Home Office | √ | |
| Highways Agency | √ | |
| North West Regional Assembly | √ | |
| | | |
| Key Stakeholders (4) | | |
| Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | √ | |
| Red Rose Forest | √ | |
| Royal Society for the Protection of Birds | √ | |
| The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Merseyside and North Manchester | √ | |
| | | |
| Others within Salford CC (4) | | |
| Environment Directorate | √ | |
| Building and Development Control/Urban Vision | √ | |
| Landscape Design/Urban Vision | √ | |
| Property Services/Urban Vision | √ | |
| | | |
| Other Local Authority (7) | | |
| Greater Manchester Geological Unit | √ | |
| | | |
| Bolton MBC | √ | |
| Bury MBC | √ | |
| Manchester CC | √ | |
| Trafford MBC | √ | |
| Wigan MBC | √ | |
| | | |
| Warrington MBC | √ | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Community Committees (Chair/Deputy)(6) | | |
| Broughton and Blackfriars | | |
| Valerie Ivison, Claremont and Weaste | √ | |
| Cllr Murphy, East Salford | √ | |
| John Matthews, Eccles | √ | |
| Irlam and Cadishead | | |
| Roy Marsh, Ordsall and Langworthy | √ | |
| Norman Shacklady, Swinton | √ | |
| Sylvia Phillips, Walkden and Little Hulton | √ | |
| | | |
| Neighbourhood Co-ordinators (8) | | |
| Mick Wallbank, Claremont and Weaste | √ | |
| Chris Skinkis, East Salford | √ | |
| Julie Blagden, Eccles | √ | |
| Ursula Sossalla-Iredale, Irlam and Cadishead | √ | |
| Ross Spanner, Ordsall | √ | |
| Heidi Finlay, Swinton | √ | |
| Angie Taylor, Walkden and Little Hulton | √ | |
| Tony Walsh, Worsley and Boothstown | √ | |
| | | |
| Councillors (58) | | |
| Cllr Ainsworth | | √ |
| Cllr Antrobus | | √ |
| Cllr Broughton | | √ |
| Cllr E. Burgoyne | | √ |
| Cllr V. Burgoyne | | √ |
| Cllr Clague | | √ |
| Cllr Compton | | √ |
| Cllr Connor | | √ |
| Cllr Cooke | | √ |
| Cllr Cullen | | √ |
| Cllr Dawson | | √ |
| Cllr Devine | | √ |
| Cllr Dobbs | | √ |
| Cllr K. Garrido | √ | √ |
| Cllr R. Garrido | | √ |
| Cllr Gray | | √ |
| Cllr Harold | | √ |
| Cllr Heywood | | √ |
| Cllr Hinds | | √ |
| Cllr Howard | | √ |
| Cllr Hudson | | √ |
| Cllr Hulmes | | √ |
| Cllr Humphreys | | √ |
| Cllr Hunt | | √ |
| Cllr Jolley | | √ |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cllr Jones | | √ |
| Cllr Kean | | √ |
| Cllr King | | √ |
| Cllr Lancaster | | √ |
| Cllr B. Lea | | √ |
| Cllr M. Lea | | √ |
| Cllr Lewis | | √ |
| Cllr Lightup | | √ |
| Cllr Lindley | | √ |
| Cllr Loveday | | √ |
| Cllr Macdonald | | √ |
| Cllr Mann | | √ |
| Cllr McIntyre | | √ |
| Cllr Merry | | √ |
| Cllr Miller | | √ |
| Cllr Morris | | √ |
| Cllr Mullen | | √ |
| Cllr B. Murphy | | √ |
| Cllr Jane Murphy | | √ |
| Cllr Joseph Murphy | | √ |
| Cllr Owen | | √ |
| Cllr Pennington | | √ |
| Cllr Perkins | | √ |
| Cllr Pooley | | √ |
| Cllr Potter | | √ |
| Cllr. Powell | | √ |
| Cllr Salmon | | √ |
| Cllr Sheehy | | √ |
| Cllr Smyth | | √ |
| Cllr Warmisham | | √ |
| Cllr Warner | | √ |
| Cllr Wilson | | √ |
| Cllr Witkowski | | √ |
| | | |
| UDP Respondents and Others (19) | | |
| A and B Motors | √ | |
| Barton Wilmore Partnership | √ | |
| Bidwells | √ | |
| Boothstown Residents Association | √ | |
| British Trust for Ornithology | √ | |
| British Waterways | √ | |
| CABE Space | √ | |
| Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lancs) | √ | |
| Countryside Properties | √ | |
| Forestry Commission | √ | |
| Mr Kelcey | √ | |
| Mr Lilburn | √ | |
| Moorside South Residents Association | √ | |

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| North West Tourism Board | √ | |
| Paul and Company | √ | |
| Peel Holdings | √ | |
| Ramblers Association of Manchester | √ | |
| The Scotts Company (UK) Ltd | √ | |
| Strategic Rail Authority | √ | |
| Swinton Open Spaces Community Association | √ | |
| Viridor Waste Management Ltd | √ | |
| Westbury Homes | √ | |
| Worsley and Boothstown Community Cttee | √ | |
| Worsley Civic Trust and Amenity Society | √ | |
| | | |
| Ecology Consultants (15) | | |
| ADAS | | √ |
| Andrew McCarthy Associates | | √ |
| Baker Shepherd Gillespie | | √ |
| Cheshire Ecological Services | | √ |
| Ecological Consultancy for Sheffield University (ECUS) | | √ |
| ENTEC UK Ltd | | √ |
| The Environment Partnership | | √ |
| Greenspace | | √ |
| Mr Holloway | | √ |
| Penny Anderson Associates | | √ |
| Dr E Radford | | √ |
| PSG Vegetation Surveys | | √ |
| Scott Wilson Resource Consultants | | √ |
| P. Waring | | √ |
| Whistling Beetle Ecological Consultants | | √ |
| Total | 135 | 63 |
| | | 72 |

Appendix F Schedule of Representations, Council Responses and Proposed Changes if Necessary

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--|---------------|--|--------------------|------------------|
| | | General | Red Rose Forest Team | 1/1 | Supports what is an excellent and concise document. Particularly likes clarity over need for "compensation". | Support noted | No change |
| | | General | British Trust for Ornithology (County Bird Recorder) | 2/1 | Is very pleased to see SCC taking its nature conservation responsibilities seriously. The perception of the city as a predominantly urban area needs to be challenged. | Support noted | No change |
| | | General | Government Office for the North West | 4/1 | Generally document is well written with clear and easy to follow layout | Response noted | No change |
| | | General | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/1 | Supports the document and the policies on which it is based | Support noted | No change |
| | | General | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/1 | Very much welcomes the development of this SPD. Implementation of its policies will make a major contribution to biodiversity in the city | Support noted | No change |
| | | | | 7/2 | The specific reference to the need to conserve priority species and habitats, and to reduce habitat fragmentation and enhance wildlife corridors is particularly welcomed. | Support noted | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | General | Environment Agency | 9/16 | States that if the SPD's objectives are to support the expansion and management of designated sites and priority habitats there should be strategic thought and action on biodiversity. Points out that both large scale and long-term action is needed to replace past habitat and species losses. Suggests that there may be an opportunity through the SPD process to clearly identify possible priority habitat expansion areas, allocate suitable land and achieve some of the UK and GM Biodiversity Action Plan targets. | It is accepted that strategic, large scale and long term actions are likely to be needed to replace past habitat and species losses. However, the council would point out that the SPD process does not allow the council to make land use allocations, such as identifying sites for the possible expansion of priority habitats. That would require preparation of a Development Plan Document (DPD), which would allow for a public inquiry into land use allocations. Consideration is being given to commencing work on a Biodiversity DPD in the next few years. | No change |
| | | General | Highways Agency | 10/1 | Welcomes having had the opportunity to comment, but has no comments | Response noted | No change |
| 3 | 1.3 | Introduction | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/1 | Thinks that the SPD should be truly aspirational. To that end, suggests replacing the first sentence with the following wording: "The overarching goal of the SPD is to maintain and improve | The council concedes that it would be good to achieve an overall increase in nature conservation assets but potential developers should only be required to provide an "increase" in assets in appropriate situations and not | The words "to maintain and improve the city's biodiversity, ensuring there is no net loss of nature conservation assets" will be deleted, and replaced with the following: |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | the city's biodiversity, ensuring that there is no net loss, but an increase in nature conservation assets" | automatically as part of every application. It is therefore proposed to change the wording of the first sentence of the paragraph to reflect this point. | "to ensure that there is no net loss of nature conservation assets, and where appropriate there is an improvement in them" |
| 4 | 2.2 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/1 | Suggests amendments to the wording that would be intended to improve clarity of presentation or to remove ambiguities in some way rather than to alter the statements in a substantive way | Comments noted. Some suggested amendments are agreed and changes will be made as indicated. Some other changes are not agreed and the existing text will stand. | See below for where proposed amendments have been agreed, and where they have not. |
| 4 | 2.2 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/2 | Suggests in Para 2.2 that the use of the phrase "in some way" in the first sentence is redundant, and that the phrase "those which" would be better than the word "that" in the second sentence. It is also suggested that the wording of the second sentence can be amended by use of phrase "the population numbers of species which depend". | Disagree that the first 2 proposed changes would improve clarity of this paragraph. Agree that the last proposed change is appropriate. | No change In the last sentence of Para 2.2 delete "the numbers of certain species that rely on it for food ..." and replace with "the population numbers of species which depend on it for food and shelter..." |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| 4 | 2.3 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/3 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean that the following wording i.e. "High levels of species diversity contribute to the stability of habitats and can help to make them more resilient. A habitat from which species have been lost may be rendered more vulnerable to change", should be used to replace the first 2 sentences of this paragraph. | Disagree the suggested changes. The proposed rewording would exclude reference to diversity within species, as referred to in the definition of biodiversity as given in Para 1.11 of Biodiversity: The UK Action Plan. | No change |
| 4 | 2.3 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/4 | States that the last sentence in the paragraph is incorrect and would be best left out | <p>Disagree that the content of the last sentence, which indicates that less internally diverse species are more vulnerable to changes in their environment is incorrect.</p> <p>However, agree that last sentence should be amended to more clearly reflect that there can be diversity within species, in the form of "genetic variation" within individual species as explained in Para 1.12 of Biodiversity: The UK Action Plan.</p> | <p>No change</p> <p>In the last sentence of Para 2.3, replace the word "internal" with "genetic diversity" and include the word "genetically" before the word "varied".</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|--|------------------|
| 4 | 2.4 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/5 | Asks us to note that all species are genetically diverse. Then provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing this paragraph with "An increasing rate of climate change may not allow sufficient time for species to adapt to changes in their environment, thus reducing their chances of survival". | Disagree. The proposed change excludes the point that genetic variability can possibly enhance a species' chance of survival even in the face of climate change | No change |
| 4 | 2.6 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/6 | Suggests inserting the words "the natural resources which sustain life now will be preserved and therefore will be available for future generations". This is taken as referring to the deletion of the last part of the second sentence and replacement with the wording provided. | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. | No change |
| | | | | 5/7 | Suggests that the second sentence (think the reference should actually be to the third sentence) is not needed and could be omitted. | Disagree. The third sentence emphasises that "biodiversity" is a natural resource, and that it should be protected so that the lives of future generations are not compromised | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| 4/5 | 2.7 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/8 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the wording of the second sentence with "The relationships between different species and between species and their environment are often complex and not well understood". | Agree. The current wording omits reference to the relationship between different species and as this is an important element of biodiversity, it is thought that it should be included. | The second sentence will be replaced with the following wording "The relationships between different species and between species and their environment are often complex and not well understood". |
| 4/5 | 2.7 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/9 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean that the wording of the third sentence should be amended to read "decisions which may lead to changes to habitats need to be made on the basis of strong scientific evidence wherever possible", and that the last part of the sentence is therefore "redundant" | Disagree because the proposed amendment only refers to decisions affecting habitats, and the last part of the current sentence is important in emphasising the need to take scientific uncertainty into account | No change |
| 4 - 5 | 2 | Importance of Biodiversity | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/3 | Suggests that a paragraph could be included saying something about the importance of biodiversity for the quality of life of Salford's people. Access to natural and semi natural habitats is known to enhance quality of life and contribute to health and | Agreed. It is accepted that biodiversity can be beneficial to Salford's residents, and that it would be good for the SPD to make this point. | A new paragraph (2.8) will be inserted on Page 5, with the following wording: "The council recognises the importance of biodiversity in contributing to the economic and |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | wellbeing. By working to conserve biodiversity Salford is fulfilling international and national obligations and also improving the quality of life for the people of the city. | | social health of an area. It therefore believes that by working to conserve biodiversity, it is not simply fulfilling international and national obligations but is also improving the quality of life for Salford's residents, now and in the future" |
| 6 | 3.1.2 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Geology | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/10 | Points out that "glacial" implies "Ice Age" and suggests replacing the first 2 sentences with "Glacial deposits provided the materials from which most of the soils were formed and on which the natural habitats of the area developed" | Agreed. The reference to the term glacial, as well as Ice Age are not necessary, and that the second sentence should be reworded in line with this representation | The word "glacial" will be deleted from the first sentence, and the second sentence will be replaced with "These glacial deposits provided the materials from which most of the soils were formed and on which the natural habitats of the area developed" |
| | | | | 5/11 | Queries whether the words "raised above the level of the surrounding land" are needed | Disagree that wording should be removed. It is thought that it helps to explain one of the physical characteristics of lowland raised bog to a non ecologist | No change |
| 6 | 3.1.3 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Landscape | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/12 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean rewording the whole paragraph | Disagree that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | as follows "Outlying settlements (such as Worsley, Irlam, Cadishead and Pendlebury) were established on the higher ground and the lower parts of the area, and especially the peat moss were avoided. Development subsequently expanded on the flood plain of the River Irwell, and, following drainage operations, onto parts of the mosslands" | | |
| 6 | 3.1.3 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Landscape | Government Office for the North West | 4/2 | <p>Suggests including a description of landscape type in Salford, and that the council may wish to consult the 2 Joint Character Area profiles which cover the city i.e. Manchester Conurbation (55) and Mersey Valley (60). Provides website addresses for these.</p> <p>Suggests the following wording for a partial description of Salford's landscape:</p> <p>"to the west an open landscape of regular shaped fields in agricultural production, with boundary features that includes hedges, ditches, fences and</p> | <p>Agreed. Para 3.1.3 will be amended to include a fuller description of Salford's landscape but see below with respect to the description provided by GONW.</p> <p>Disagree that the wording given is an entirely accurate description of Salford's landscape in that it refers to hedges and fences on Chat Moss. There are relatively few hedges and fences on Chat Moss, therefore an alternative description is</p> | <p>The following wording will be included at the end of Para 3.1.3:</p> <p>"This development has led to an open landscape on Chat Moss of regular shaped fields in agricultural production, bounded by deep ditches and interspersed with blocks of mature woodland. In the more heavily degraded urban landscape, built development straddles key transport routes, but there is a narrow corridor of open grassland and</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | interspersed with blocks of mature woodland. Landscape features have been heavily degraded at the periphery of on the urban areas etc" | given. | pockets of semi natural habitats extending along the Irwell valley". |
| 6 | 3.1.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Land Use | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/13 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean rewording the first sentence as follows "The City-wide Phase 1 Habitat Survey, carried out in 2000, showed that 42.5% of the area of the borough (some 4130 ha out of 9721) was either open land or water". | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. | No change |
| 6 | 3.1.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Land Use | Government Office for the North West | 4/3 | Suggests that given the development of the region's Green Infrastructure (and RSS), it might be beneficial to provide a further break down of the open land categories given in this paragraph e.g. agricultural land, green space, and different types of water. Also gives a breakdown of data as follows: Domestic Buildings 526 Gardens 1415 Non Domestic 365 Road 1018 Rail 71 Path 59 | Agreed that it would be useful for more clearly understanding the character of the city, to provide a further breakdown of the figures. Given that the existing figures in the SPD have been obtained from the 2000 Phase 1 Habitat Survey, it is thought for the sake of consistency, that the further proposed breakdown should also be taken from that source rather than from another totally unrelated source. | A new sentence will be inserted after the first one in Para 3.1.4 as follows: "Of the open land in the city, 1,118 ha are covered by arable crops (largely on Chat Moss) and 681 ha by amenity grassland (largely within recreation grounds, parks and playing fields in the urban areas). Of the open water, 36 ha were composed of standing water such as reservoirs, lakes and ponds and 92 ha by |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|--------|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>Greenspace 5423 Water 178 TOTAL 9639 ha</p> <p><i>(It was later established that this alternative data source was "Generalised Land Use Database Statistics for England" provided by the ODPM).</i></p> | | <p>running water, such as rivers and canals".</p> <p>The existing second sentence will be retained and put in italics to more clearly reflect that it is an explanatory note.</p> |
| 6 - 15 | 3 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/4 | <p>Points out that no reference is made to the contribution "brownfield" land can make to the biodiversity of the city. Suggests that it may be worth stating that important habitats and species may be found on brownfield or previously developed land. Points out that many SBIs are on previously developed land.</p> | <p>Agreed. Given the urbanised nature of much of Salford, it is thought that it would be useful to point out that biodiversity assets can be found on previously developed land as well as on more natural sites.</p> | <p>A new paragraph 3.1.5 on Biodiversity Features, and with the following wording will be inserted on Page 6:</p> <p>"Biodiversity features are usually identified as habitats and species. Given the built form of much of the city, many biodiversity features in Salford occur on brownfield or previously developed land within the urban area, as well as in countryside areas such as Chat Moss"</p> |
| 7 | 3.2.1 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Auditing Biodiversity | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/5 | <p>Points out that the Register of SBIs is updated annually, although not all SBIs are reviewed annually. This is slightly different to the text, which states that the register is</p> | <p>Agreed that the text should be amended to take account of this point.</p> | <p>The words "though not annually" will be deleted from the end of Para 3.2.1.</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | updated on a regular basis but not annually. | | |
| 7 | 3.3.1 | Special Areas of Conservation | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/14 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean rewording the first sentence so that it would read "The EU Habitat Directive requires member states to designate a network of sites that will collectively ensure the maintenance or restoration of the natural habitats and species of EU interest in a favourable conservation state." | Disagree that the proposed changes sufficiently add to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence to warrant a change. | No change |
| | | | | 5/15 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean rewording the second and third sentences of Para 3.3.1 as follows: "The network of habitats is known as Natura 2000. The sites, which make up this network contain habitats and / or species which are considered to be of importance within the EU. The individual sites are each designated either as SPAs or SACs". | Agreed that the suggested change which deletes the references to wildlife, and that the wildlife and/or the habitats are designated as being of EU wide importance, does more accurately reflect the provisions of the EU Habitats Directive. | The second and third sentences to Para 3.3.1 will be replaced by the following wording: "The network of habitats is known as Natura 2000. The sites, which make up this network contain habitats and / or species which are considered to be of importance within the EU. The individual sites are each designated either as SPAs or SACs. <i>(See Appendix A for an</i> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| 7 | 3.3.1 | Special Areas of Conservation | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/16 | Suggests that the terms for SPAs and SACs should be explained | Agreed that it would be appropriate to explain the terms SPA and SAC. An explanation of them will be included in a new Appendix A. | <p><i>explanation of SPAs and SACs)</i>".</p> <p>A new Appendix A will be inserted and the existing Appendices will be relabelled as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix A becomes B • Appendix B becomes C • Appendix C becomes D • Appendix C becomes D • Appendix D becomes E |
| 7 | 3.3.2 | Special Areas of Conservation | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/17 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean slightly rewording the phrase from "have all been designated as the Manchester Mosses, Special Area of Conservation" to "have collectively been designated as the Manchester Mosses, Special Area of Conservation". | Agreed. It is thought that the proposed change clarifies that it is the combination of sites that have identified as a SAC, rather than each site being a separate SAC. | The word "all" will be deleted and replaced with "collectively". |
| | 3.3.2 | Special | Greenspace | 5/16 | | Because of the proposed | In the explanatory note in |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | Areas of Conservation | (consultancy) | | | change to the labelling of the Appendices in line with the response to Representation 5/16 on Para 3.3.1 above, the reference to Appendix A at the end of Para 3.3.2 needs to be amended. | italics at the end of Para 3.3.2 the letter A will be deleted and replaced with "B". |
| 7 | 3.3.3 | Sites of Special Scientific Interest | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/18 | Refers to a new sentence, which reads, "They may support rare or endangered species" but does not indicate where it should go. It is taken to mean replacing the second sentence of Para 3.3.3 rather than 3.3.2 as the representation refers to. | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change to the wording adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. In addition, it would delete reference to the geological and physiological characteristics, for which such sites are also designated. | No change |
| | | | | 5/19 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean rewording the third sentence as follows "The SSSI designations are intended to safeguard the sites now, and for the future". | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change to the wording adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. | No change |
| | 3.3.3 | Sites of Special Scientific Interest | Government Office for the North West | 4/5 | Please see the details set out in relation to Section 3.4 below. | The council thinks that reference to that element of the Public Service Agreement Target 3 should be added to | The following words will be included: "The Department for the |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | Para 3.3.3 rather than somewhere in Section 3.4. | Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) has a Public Service Agreement Target of bringing 95% of all nationally important sites into a favourable condition by 2010". |
| 8 | 3.3.4 | Sites of Special Scientific Interest | Moorside South Residents Association | 6/1 | Objects. Suggests that there should be protection of the trees surrounding Botany Bay Wood. It is pointed out that removal / damage to trees on the edge of the wood could occur as the paragraph is currently written. This could disturb the roosting and / or nesting of the herons. The respondent continues by saying that although the wood itself is considered as unimportant it should be protected in its entirety in order to protect the herony. | Disagree. The exact boundary of any SSSI would be determined by English Nature or its successor organisation "Natural England", rather than by the council or the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. However, it should be pointed out that the whole woodland has been identified as a Site of Biological Importance and therefore will receive local protection under Policy EN7C of the draft UDP and under policies NCB1 and 2 of the draft Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD | No change |
| 8 | 3.3.5 | UK Priority Habitats | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/20 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the first sentence with 2 others as follows, "42 habitat types are regarded as being of | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change to the wording adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence. | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | | national priority importance for conservation. Each one is the subject of a national action plan". | | |
| 8 | 3.3.7 | UK Priority Habitats | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/21 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the phrase "which relate to standard National Vegetation Classifications" with the words, "which are based on the National Vegetation Classification" | Agreed that the proposed replacement of the existing wording would clarify that the definitions are "based" on National Vegetation Classifications rather than simply "relating" to them as currently stated. | The words "which relate to standard National Vegetation Classifications" will be deleted and replaced with "which are based on the National Vegetation Classifications" |
| | | | | 5/22 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the note in italics at the end of the paragraph with the words "It should be appreciated that, in Salford, acid grassland and heath are often found together as part of a habitat mosaic" | Disagree. It is thought that the proposed wording change would be inaccurate. The proposed wording would imply that there are separate areas of dry acid grassland, and of heathland, as well as a mosaic of the two. Whereas the present wording means that there are no separate areas of "dry acid grassland" and "heathland" in Salford. They only occur in mosaic. | No change |
| 9 | 3.3.9 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Lowland | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/23 | Suggests omitting the word "however". This is taken to mean from the start of the second sentence | Disagree that omitting the word "however" would help to clarify the meaning of this paragraph | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | Raised Bog | | | | | |
| 9 | 3.3.10 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Local Priority Habitats | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/24 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean slightly rewording the first sentence to take account of a grammatical error. | Agreed. It is accepted that the English in the first sentence is slightly incorrect (i.e. targets cannot be undertaken) and should be amended. | The words "national targets and actions" of the first sentence will be deleted and replaced with the following: "actions to meet national targets". |
| 9 | c 3.3.10 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Local Priority Habitats | Government Office for the North West | 4/4 | Suggests it might be useful to identify local projects that have happened or are planned for the Habitat Action Plans, or to refer to the GMBAP and encourage developers to link into the process | Agreed. It would be useful to refer to projects taking place in accordance with GMBAP. However, reference to these will be made in Section 7 of the SPD on Implementation rather than in Section 3. | Please see proposed changes relating to Paragraphs 7.2 and 7.5 below. |
| 9 | 3.3.11 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Local Priority Habitats | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/25 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the second and third sentences of this paragraph with the following wording "Although the titles of some GMBAPs are similar to those of national priority habitats (e.g. lowland dry acid grassland), they may not always be of similar quality (see Appendix B for definitions of the various habitat types)" | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |
| | | | | | | Because of the proposed change to the labelling of the Appendices in line with the | In the explanatory note in italics at the end of Para 3.3.11 the letter B will be |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|--------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | response to Representation 5/16 by the Greenspace consultancy on Para 3.3.1 above, the reference to Appendix B at the end of Para 3.3.11 needs to be amended. | deleted and replaced with "C". |
| 10 | 3.3.16 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Sites of Biological Importance | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/26 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the existing 3 words at the start of the first sentence with "33 SBIs have been .." | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |
| | | | | | | Because of the proposed change to the labelling of the Appendices in line with the response to Representation 5/16 by the Greenspace consultancy on Para 3.3.1 above, the reference to Appendix C at the end of Para 3.3.16 needs to be amended. | In the explanatory note in italics at the end of Para 3.3.16 the letter C will be deleted and replaced with "D". |
| 6 – 15 | | Salford's Biodiversity Resources | Red Rose Forest Team | 1/2 | Queries whether there is any Ancient Woodland in Salford, the protection of which is required in PPS9 Para 10 | PPS9 Para 10 refers to the need for local planning authorities to identify any areas of Ancient Woodland in their areas, that do not have statutory protection and should not grant planning permission for any | The title "Other Habitats and Landscape Features" on Page 10 will be deleted, and replaced with "Ancient Woodland, Other Natural Habitats and |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>development that would result in loss or deterioration of that habitat unless the need for, and benefits of the development in that location, outweigh the loss of the woodland habitat. At present, no reference is made in the SPD to Ancient Woodland. It is accepted that the SPD should make reference to this habitat and therefore the text will be amended to take account of the guidance in PPS9. The very small area of Ancient Woodland in Salford occurs in Clifton Country Park and is therefore within and protected by the Oakwood, SBI designation.</p> <p>The inclusion of a new paragraph after existing Para 3.3.16 to deal with Ancient Woodlands will require the renumbering of subsequent paragraphs in Section 3.</p> | <p>Landscape Features". A new Para will be inserted at 3.3.17 with the following wording:</p> <p>"Ancient Woodland is also recognised as a valuable biodiversity resource, both for the diversity of species it supports and its longevity as woodland. PPS9 advises that planning permission should not be granted for any development that would result in loss or deterioration of this habitat, unless the need for and benefits of the development in that location outweigh the loss of the woodland habitat. In Salford there is a small area of Ancient Woodland in Clifton Country Park, which is currently protected by its designation as the Oakwood, SBI. (See Figure 2 for location)".</p> <p>Existing Para 3.3.17 will</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | be renumbered as 3.3.18, and the opening section of its first sentence will be amended by the inclusion of the words "and paragraphs" after "sections". |
| 10 | 3.3.17 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Other Habitats and Landscape Features | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/27 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean that it is being suggested that the first sentence should be reworded as follows "The above sections on national and local priority habitats refer to a range of semi natural habitats and man made habitats that are of particular importance for the conservation of biodiversity. This does not mean that other habitats in the city are not important. Examples of additional semi natural habitats and features include..." | Disagree. It is not thought that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |
| 11 | 3.3.18 | Salford Biodiversity Resources: Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/28 | Suggests putting the words "stepping stones" in the third sentence, into inverted commas | Agree. It is thought that the proposed change helps to make clear that the use of the words "stepping stones" is more a "concept" rather than being meant literally. | The words "stepping stones" will be placed in inverted commas, and, because of the renumbering of Para 3.3.17 above the paragraph will be renumbered as 3.3.19. |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| 11 | 3.3.19 | Salford Biodiversity Resources: Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/29 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean that the last sentence should be reworded as follows, "However, more isolated habitat 'islands' and 'stepping stones' can be of importance for migrations of more-mobile species" | Agree. It is thought that the proposed change clarifies that even "isolated" areas of habitat can be of importance for more mobile species. However, it is thought to be useful to give examples of more mobile species, which could benefit from such islands. | The words "even isolated" will be inserted in the last sentence of existing Para 3.3.19 and, because of the renumbering of Para 3.3.17 above the paragraph will be renumbered as Para 3.3.20. |
| 11 | 3.3.19 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones | British Trust for Ornithology (County Bird Recorder) | 2/5 | States that mossland farmers should be encouraged to manage their land for the benefit of wildlife and to participate in DEFRA funding schemes | Disagree. It is agreed that it would probably be of benefit to biodiversity for farmers to participate in the new DEFRA funding schemes. However, in terms of farming on the mosslands there is a need to balance biodiversity benefits with other issues such as the need to keep drainage ditches free of vegetation, so that land is not flooded. Therefore, although a reference to the new Environmental Stewardship scheme is made in Para 5.1.5, this issue will not be dealt with in detail within this SPD. | No change, however please see that reference is now made in Para 5.1.5 to the new DEFRA Environmental Stewardship Scheme. |
| 11 | 3.3.18 – | Salford's | Environment | 9/17 | Recommends that reference is | Agree. It is thought that it | See below for proposed |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| | 3.3.19 | Biodiversity Resources: Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones | Agency | | made to the recent report "Green Infrastructure for the Liverpool and Manchester City Regions" (2005) and points out that Red Rose Forest, together with partners Salford, Bolton and Bury metropolitan councils, are now proposing the Croal Irwell Regional Park. | would be useful to make reference to the report and the Regional Park in the SPD. However, it is not thought that Para 3.3.18 to 3.3.19 is the most appropriate place for such references to be made. | changes to Section 7 Implementation, to take account of this issue. |
| 12 | 3.4.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/30 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean the replacement of the word "most" with the words "most of these" | Disagree that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |
| 12 | 3.4.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Environment Agency | 9/1 | States that the EA has had no records of otters in Salford in recent times. However, points out that as the River Irwell and its tributaries improve in respect to water quality and fisheries interest and surrounding populations of otters expand, it is hoped that the otter will be found in Salford once again. | Agree that it would be appropriate to amend the text to Para 3.4.4 to explain that no otters have been recorded recently in Salford but that with water quality and fisheries improvements, and the expansion of the populations of otters in surrounding areas, then they may occur in Salford once again. | In Para 3.4.4 the words "European otter" will be deleted from the bullet point list. The following additional sentence will then be included after the bullet point on great crested newts: "Although no otters have been recorded recently in Salford, it is hoped that with continuing water quality and fisheries improvements on the River Irwell's tributaries, and the expansion of otter populations in the |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|-------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | surrounding areas, that they may occur naturally in the area once again". |
| 11-15 | 3.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Government Office for the North West | 4/5 | <p>Suggests that it would be helpful to make reference to the Public Sector Agreement (PSA3) relating to wildlife, as it would show further commitment to facilitating wildlife change. PSA3 is also given as follows:</p> <p>PSA3. Care for our natural heritage, make the countryside attractive and enjoyable for all and preserve biological diversity by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reversing the long term decline in the number of farmland birds by 2020, as measured annually against underlying trends Bringing into favourable condition by 2010, 95% of all nationally important wildlife sites | It is accepted that it would be appropriate to incorporate the elements of PSA3 into the SPD. However, it is not thought that Section 3.4 is the most appropriate place for all of it to be included. Therefore, that element relating to bringing 95% of all nationally important wildlife sites into favourable condition by 2010 will be included in Para 3.3.3 above. The element relating to farmland birds will be included in Para 3.4.6, 3.4.10 and 3.4.13 below. | <p>The following words will be included at the end of Para 3.4.6:</p> <p>"The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has a Public Service Agreement Target of reversing the long term decline in the number of farmland birds (such as Barn Owl) by 2020, as measured against underlying trends".</p> |
| 12 | 3.4.8 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Wild Plants | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | | Following a later check with the Unit, it has been found that another protected plant species occurs in Salford and therefore | The wording of Para 3.4.8 will be amended to take account of this point. | The word "two" will be inserted after "only", the word "is" will be deleted and replaced with "are", |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|---|----------------|---|--|---|
| | | Protected by Legislation | | | should be referred to in Para 3.4.8 | | and the following words added at the end of the sentence "and Luronium natans". |
| 12 | 3.4.6 | Wild Birds Protected by Legislation | British Trust for Ornithology (County Bird Recorder) | 2/2 2/6 | 3 additional birds listed in Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 1 have recently been recorded in the city and should be included in the SPD. States that Hen Harrier has been recorded at Ringing Pits on Chat Moss. | Agreed. The 3 additional bird species will be added to Para 3.4.6. Given its status as a bird protected under Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Schedule 1 it will be included in Para 3.4.6 | Quail, Black Redstart, and Green Sandpiper will be added to list of birds in paragraph 3.4.6 Hen Harrier will also be added to Para 3.4.6 |
| 12 | 3.4.8 | Wild Plants Protected by Legislation | Moorside South Residents Association | 6/2 | Objects. Points out that there are orchids within Salford's bounds. Queries whether these are not also protected. States that if they are relevant, then they should be added to bluebell in this paragraph. | Disagree. Those orchids, which occur in Salford, are not legally protected. However, following a check with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, it has been found that one additional plant species that is protected by legislation is found in Salford and that will be included in Para 3.4.8. | The wording of Para 3.4.8 will be reworded as follows: The word "two" will be inserted after the word "only", the word "is" will be deleted and replaced with "are", and the following words will be added to the end of the sentence "and Luronium natans". |
| 13 | 3.4.10 | Wild Animals and Plants of UK Priority | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North | 11/2 | States that all species of bats are protected national priority species and should be included here. Points out that the presence and populations of bat | Agreed that other bats species should be included in this paragraph. | In Para 3.4.10 the following bat species will be included in the bullet point list: |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | West | | species in many areas is not really known and almost certainly there will be species other than pipistrelle bats (e.g. Daubenton). Suggests that the Greater Manchester or the South Manchester Bat Group be consulted about this. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daubenton's bat (also protected species) • Noctule bat (also protected species) • Brown long-eared bat (also protected species) • Whiskered bat (also protected species) |
| 13 | 3.4.10 | Wild Animals and Plants of UK Priority | British Trust for Ornithology (County Bird Recorder) | 2/3 | Points out that Grey Partridge is included twice in the list of birds of UK Priority status | Agreed that the second reference to grey partridge should be deleted. | The second reference to "Grey Partridge" will be deleted from bullet point list in Para 3.4.10 |
| | | | Government Office for the North West | 4/5 | | In order to take account of Representation 4/5 above, additional wording is proposed for Para 3.4.10 | <p>The following words will be included at the end of Para 3.4.10:</p> <p>"For farmland birds such as Corn Bunting, see the DEFRA target in paragraph 3.4.6 above".</p> |
| 13 | 3.4.10 | Wild Animals and Plants of UK Priority | Moorside South Residents Association | 6/3 | Objects and questions whether the list of birds of national priority occurring in Salford is complete. The council is asked to check whether the following species which have been seen and heard in the bounds of | It can be confirmed that the list of species provided by the Residents Association has been checked, but that none of the list of birds supplied are nationally protected or of UK Priority. | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Salford should be included:- nuthatch, lapwing, willow warbler, blackcap, siskin, great spotted woodpecker, grey wagtail, house sparrow. If applicable the list should be extended. | | |
| 14 | 3.4.12 | Red, Green and Amber Lists of Birds | British Trust for Ornithology (County Bird Recorder) | 2/4 | Corn Bunting and Yellowhammer are 2 Red listed bird species which occur in Salford. Yellow Wagtail an Amber listed bird also occurs in Salford. Also states that no other borough (presumably in Greater Manchester), can match the numbers of Corn Buntings and Yellow Wagtails in Salford. | Agreed. Given the Greater Manchester importance of the numbers of Corn Buntings and Yellow Wagtails in Salford, it is thought that these species should be referred to in the SPD. | <p>Para 3.4.13 will be split into 2 paragraphs, with the second beginning at the words "The Amber List..." At the end of the new first paragraph the following words will be included:</p> <p>"Two Red Listed birds which occur in Salford are Corn Bunting and Yellowhammer".</p> <p>The new second paragraph will be numbered 3.4.14. At the end of this Para the following words will be included:</p> <p>"One Amber Listed bird that occurs in Salford is the Yellow Wagtail".</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | <p>The existing Para 3.4.14 and 3.4.15 will be renumbered as 3.4.15 and 3.4.16 respectively.</p> <p>The following wording will also be inserted after Para 3.4.14:</p> <p><i>"(It is worth noting that noting that no other local authority in Greater Manchester has the numbers of Corn Bunting and Yellow Wagtails that occur in Salford)".</i></p> |
| 14 | 3.4.14 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/31 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean the replacement of the phrase "published by a range of nature conservation organisations" with "published by a consortium of UK nature conservation organisations" | Disagree that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |
| 14 | 3.4.15 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/32 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean the replacement in the first sentence, of the word "on" with "about" | Disagree that the proposed change adds to the interpretation and or clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|-------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| 11-15 | 3.4 | Salford's Biodiversity Resources: Species | Government Office for the North West | 4/6 | <p>Suggests that it would be helpful to make reference to Non Native/Invasive Species, which can affect indigenous species in a number of ways as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat alteration or degradation • Competition for resources • Direct predation • Toxicity of plant breakdown products • Genetic pollution • Spread of disease <p>Examples of each of these situations are given. For example, the spread of Rhododendron can shade out native plant species thereby causing habitat degradation and the prevalent spread of Japanese Knotweed along many waterways in the northwest causes challenges in removal and control.</p> <p>Points out that the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is the only legislation that generally</p> | <p>Agreed. It would be useful to explain that Non Native/Invasive Species can be harmful, not only to indigenous species but also habitats. However, it is not thought that Section 3 of the SPD, which deals with biodiversity resources to be found in Salford, is the most appropriate place to make this point. Instead changes are proposed for Section 5 and Policies NCB2 and 3. See relevant sections below for the proposed changes.</p> <p>See above</p> | <p>See below for proposed changes to Section 5 Issues and Objectives, and Policies NCB2 and 3, to take account of this issue.</p> <p>See above</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | addresses non-native species. Article 8(h) calls for contracting parties to "prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species". Indicates that it would be "a major step forward for SCC to make reference to the prevention and control of non-native species during development and future management of sites". | See above | See above |
| | | | | | Provisions for control or eradication of some specific types of non-native species exist under some pieces of legislation. | See above | See above |
| | | | | | It would be a major step forward for the council to make reference to the prevention and control of non-native species during development and future management. | | |
| 17 | 4.1.6 | Policy Context: Regional Planning | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/6 | Suggests deleting the last sentence and replacing with "This is because habitat creation is often very difficult and sometimes impossible – at least within a reasonable timescale" | Agreed. The English of the current text is a little clumsy, and the proposed change would make the point more clearly. | The last sentence of Para 4.1.6 will be deleted and replaced with the following wording: "This is because habitat |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | creation is often very difficult and sometimes impossible – at least within a reasonable timescale” |
| 17 | 4.1.5 to 4.1.7 | Policy Context: Regional Planning Guidance | Government Office for the North West | 4/7 | Suggests that council may wish to refer to the review of RSS, and gives a link to the relevant website | Agreed. The text will be amended to refer to the Review of RSS13 after Para 4.1.7. | The following words will be included in italics after the end of Para 4.1.7: “RSS13 is under review. For further information visit the website for the North West Regional Assembly” In addition, the letters RPG in italics at the end of the title to this section will be replaced with RSS13. |
| 17 | 4.1.7 | Policy Context: Regional Planning | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/33 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacement of the second sentence with the following wording, “It also indicates those Natural Areas, as identified by English Nature in which the priority habitats are found” | Agreed. The English of the current text is a little clumsy, and the proposed change would make the point more clearly. | The last sentence of Para 4.1.7 will be replaced with the following wording: “It also indicates those Natural Areas, as identified by English Nature in which the priority habitats are found” |
| | 5 | Issues and Objectives | | | Given the representations received from GONW, GMEU | | The re-ordered/renumbered |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | and the Greenspace consultancy, it was thought appropriate to re-order the existing paragraphs of Section 5 and that re-ordering is given in the Proposed Changes column. However, the representations to the existing paragraphs have been dealt with below, in the order in which they currently appear in the SPD. | | existing and proposed new paragraph(s) will be as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1.4 (becomes 5.1.2) • 5.1.3 (remains 5.1.3) • New (becomes 5.1.4) dealing with non native/invasive species • 5.1.2 (becomes 5.1.5) • New (becomes 5.1.6) dealing with benefits of development • 5.1.5 (becomes 5.1.7) |
| 19 | 5.1.2 | Issues and Objectives | Government Office for the North West | 4/8 | <p>Points out that although some activities on agricultural land are not subject to planning permission, this paragraph gives the impression that farmers can do anything with their land, and so do not help towards biodiversity. This is not entirely true.</p> <p>When wishing to make changes to uncultivated land and semi natural areas, farmers and landowners are subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations applied by DEFRA. These</p> | <p>Agreed that the text should be amended so that it more accurately reflects, the type of agricultural activity, which in the past did not need planning permission, and which has affected an important national priority habitat.</p> <p>It is accepted that those farming activities relating to land management now have to take more account of biodiversity. However, it is not thought that the SPD, which is predominantly about land</p> | <p>Para 5.1.2 will be renumbered/re-ordered as Para 5.1.5.</p> <p>In the first sentence of Para 5.1.2 the word "did" and a forward slash will be inserted before "do not", the words "agriculture and general" will be deleted, and replaced with "some types of ", and the bracketed words "lack of it" will be deleted. In the second sentence, the word "past" will be inserted before the</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | regulations are designed to complement other environmental initiatives and to reinforce good farming practices such as DEFRA Codes of Good Agricultural Practice | use planning issues, needs to go into this point in any detail. | word agricultural, the words "activity has" will be deleted and replaced with "activities, such as the installation of drainage pipes, the construction of ditches and the application of fertiliser, have". A full stop will then be placed after the word "habitat", and new wording as follows will be inserted: "In the future, it is understood that when wishing to make substantial changes to uncultivated land and semi natural areas, farmers and landowners will need to take account of impacts on biodiversity features. As well as adverse effects arising as a result of damaging land management measures a lack of management can also be harmful to biodiversity." |
| 19 | Stated as being | Issues and Objectives | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/34 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done | Agree that the proposed change adds to the | Existing Para 5.1.3 will retain same number but |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | 5.12 but this is thought to be an error and should be 5.1.3 | | | | with it. It is taken to mean replacement of the second and third sentences of paragraph 5.1.3 with the following wording, "An example of an indirect impact may arise where a housing development is sited close to a woodland or other semi natural habitat, which may be damaged as a result of increased public pressure – for example through trampling on vegetation or dumping of garden refuse" | interpretation and clarity of the existing sentence and paragraph. In addition, it is also proposed to refer to predation of bird and animal species by household pets, and the accidental spread of non native / invasive species, as further examples of indirect impacts arising from development proposals. | its second and third sentences will be replaced with the following wording: "An example of an indirect impact may arise where a housing development is sited close to a woodland or other semi natural habitat, which may be damaged as a result of increased public pressure – for example through trampling on vegetation, the dumping of garden refuse, the predation of birds and animals by household pets, and the spread of non native / invasive species" |
| | | (See comments above in relation to representations on Section 3) | Government Office for the North West | 4/6 | See the representation details above in relation to Section 3.4 of the SPD. | <i>(See also the council's response details above in relation to Section 3.4 of the SPD).</i> The council thinks that the issue in relation to Non Native/Invasive Species should be dealt with more appropriately in Section 5 Issues and Objectives, and | A new paragraph with the following wording will be inserted and numbered as Para 5.1.4: "There are a number of ways in which non-native / invasive species can be detrimental, these |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>Policies NCB2 and 3.</p> <p>The council is proposing a reference to the accidental spread of non-native / invasive species, as referred to in the representation above.</p> <p>However, it is also proposed to include a new paragraph explaining this issue in more detail. See adjoining column.</p> | <p>include: habitat alteration / degradation, competition for resources between native and non native species, genetic pollution of native with non native species, direct predation and the spread of disease. Obviously, it would be unrealistic to expect every development proposal to be assessed in terms of its likely impact arising from any non-native species that are intentionally proposed within it (e.g. as part of landscaping schemes), or which may accidently arise from it. However, there should be a general awareness of these potential issues”.</p> |
| 19 - 20 | 5 | Issues and Objectives | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/7 | Points out that as well as resulting in damage to habitats, development can offer opportunities for habitat enhancement and creation that would otherwise be difficult to achieve. Therefore these opportunities should be taken | Agreed. It is accepted that some types of development can offer opportunities for habitat enhancement. However, the extent to which developers are required to provide enhancement and creation, need to be | <p>A new paragraph (numbered 5.1.6) with the following wording will be inserted after new Para 5.1.5:</p> <p>“As well as resulting in damage to habitats,</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | full advantage of. Gives the example of the opportunity to control the spread of exotic invasive species as part of development proposals, which could otherwise cause losses to biodiversity. | commensurate with the policy guidance and the type, scale and impact of the proposed development. The text will be amended to reflect these 2 points. | development can offer opportunities for habitat enhancement (e.g. control of invasive species) and creation that would otherwise be difficult to achieve. Therefore, there is a need to recognise such opportunities. However, the extent to which developers are required to provide enhancement and re-creation needs to be commensurate with the policy guidance and the type, scale and impact of the proposed development, and the status of any biodiversity features concerned". |
| 19 | 5.1.4 (referred to as being 5.14) | Issues and Objectives | Greenspace (consultancy) | 5/35 | Provides wording but does not indicate what should be done with it. It is taken to mean replacing the wording of paragraph 5.1.4 with the following "The fragmentation of natural habitats is a problem, both locally and worldwide. It impedes the movement of | Agreed. It is thought that the existing paragraph should be reworded to make its meaning clearer, and to include the point that the movement of species between areas of existing habitats (and not just within habitats), is also an issue. | Existing Para 5.1.4 will be reworded as follows: "The fragmentation of semi natural habitats as a result of development activity is a problem, both locally and worldwide. It impedes the movement of |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|-------|-------------------------|----------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | species within the habitat. Smaller parcels of habitat tend to be less robust and consequently more vulnerable to adverse change than large ones” | | species both within areas of semi natural habitat, and with other areas. Generally, smaller parcels of habitat, tend to be less robust and are consequently more vulnerable to adverse change than large ones. Climate change could increase this problem, if existing areas of habitat shrink in size”. |
| 19/20 | 5.2.1 | SPD Objectives | Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Park Area) | 3/1 | Supports objectives of SPD. | Support noted | No change |
| 19/20 | 5.2.1 | SPD Objectives | Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Park Area) | 3/2 | Suggests an additional objective, which proposes promoting the biodiversity of Salford as a recreational and educational asset | It is accepted that biodiversity can be a recreational and educational resource. However, there may be some situations where it is not appropriate to promote public access to particularly sensitive habitats. Therefore although it is agreed that there should be an additional objective, it needs to be qualified. | The following wording will be included as an additional bullet point: “To promote where appropriate, biodiversity as a recreational and educational asset” |
| 21 - | Policies | | John Kelcey | 8/1 | Objects. The SPD policies | Disagree. It is not thought | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------|---|---|------------------|
| 27 | NCB1 - 4 | | | | should be deleted and included in the modified UDP, which is the most appropriate place for them and where they can be properly examined via the second UDP inquiry. In his view the SPD is not the place to seek to supplement emerging UDP policies, especially when the replacement UDP has yet to go through the modification and adoption process. | that a strategic land-use planning document such as the Replacement UDP is the most appropriate document for the inclusion of a significant level of background information and detail such as that contained in the draft SPD. It is thought that the draft SPD policies help to supplement and support the nature conservation policies of the Replacement UDP, which is nearing final adoption. This is thought to be fully consistent with government guidance and regulations. | |
| 21 | NCB1 | SPD Policies: Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Environment Agency | 9/2 | However wishes to add additional comments (<i>see relevant sections below</i>). | Noted – please see relevant responses below. | No change |
| 21 | Policy NCB1 | Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Environment Agency | 9/6 | There needs to be a clear emphasis in the SPD to get planners and developers to actively assess the feasibility of incorporating new environmentally sympathetic techniques at the earliest possible stage in the planning process. | Disagree that the SPD is the most appropriate policy document to require an early assessment of the feasibility of incorporating environmentally sympathetic techniques into the design of a development – biodiversity is only one element of | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | environmentally sympathetic schemes, and there are other issues such as energy consumption, and use of recycled materials. However, the council would point out that the first supplementary policy (i.e. NCB1) already requires in its first paragraph that wherever practicable development proposals should incorporate features that are of benefit to wildlife. | |
| | NCB1 | SPD Policies: Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/11 | Queries whether reference should be made in Policy NCB1 to the need to manage new habitat areas in the medium to long term, rather than, or in addition to, mentioning this as part of the reasoned justification for Policy NCB2 | Agree. It is accepted that as Policy NCB1 deals with key principles in relation to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in Salford, then that policy is the most appropriate location for the wording relating to the key requirement for appropriate mitigation, compensatory and / or management measures are resourced and implemented. | The words "possible and" will be inserted after the word "Where" in the second sentence of the first paragraph of Policy NCB1, and the third paragraph (beginning Wherever possible...) of Policy NCB1, will be deleted. With this amendment, the requirements of this third paragraph will still be included in Policy NCB1. Then the wording of the second paragraph of Policy NCB2 (beginning Planning conditions...) at |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | <p>the top of Page 23 will be included as a new third paragraph in Policy NCB1, and its wording amended as follows. The words "see Policy NCB2" will be inserted after the word "appraisals" and the words "proposed as part of any habitat creation, landscaping (see Policy NCB3) and / or compensatory provision" will be placed in brackets after the word "measures"</p> <p>The last paragraph of the reasoned justification to Policy NCB2 at the bottom of Page 23 will also be moved, so that it becomes the penultimate paragraph of the reasoned justification of Policy NCB1.</p> <p>(See also proposed change to reasoned justification of Policies NCB2, 3 and 4 to explain the need to refer to the relevant paragraph of</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | NCB1 in relation to the requirement for planning conditions for mitigation, and management agreements for landscaping, new habitats and compensatory measures). |
| 21 | NCB1 Policy Wording Para 2 | SPD Policies: Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/9 | Queries whether the word "any" should be substituted with the word "significant" so that it is in line with PPS9 Key Principles Para 1 (vi). This is taken to refer to the word "any" in the first sentence of Para 2 rather than "any" at the start of the second sentence. | Agreed. It is accepted that the proposed change would bring the policy more in line with the key principles of PPS9, and therefore the word "any" in the first sentence of Para 2 should be replaced by the word "significant". | The word "any" in the first sentence of Para 2 should be replaced by the word "significant". |
| 21 | NCB1 Policy Wording Para 3 | SPD Policies: Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/10 | Particularly welcomes the requirement wherever possible, for new development to incorporate new wildlife habitat. | Support noted. <i>(See the proposed requirement relating to new development being moved from Para 3 to Para 1 of the policy wording).</i> | <i>(See the proposed requirement relating to new development being moved from Para 3 to Para 1 of the policy wording as explained in response to representation 7/11 above).</i> |
| 21 | NCB1 | SPD Policies: Maintaining and Enhancing | Environment Agency | 9/3 | Where mitigation cannot resolve adverse effects there is a need to point out that compensatory measures are not a panacea. | Agreed. The council accepts that due to the great difficulties of re-creating good quality new habitats within | The second bullet point on translocation at the top of Page 22 will be deleted, and a new |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | Biodiversity | | | <p>Compensation should only be considered as a last resort, if the said habitat or species cannot be maintained in its present location. It should not be an afterthought if impacts cannot be avoided or mitigated, but clear thought should be shown to have gone into this process, to adequately provide a truly viable compensation package.</p> <p>Previous habitat or species mitigation schemes have been found highly variable in their final outcomes, even when enough monitoring has been included as part of the compensation scheme. Re-creation of mature ecological habitats, of similar diversity and complexity, is almost impossible to construct elsewhere. The clear message to get across in this section, is that mitigation/compensation for the loss of a mature habitat, such as ancient woodland, mossland or species rich meadow is a last resort, and all other options should be pursued before going</p> | <p>reasonable timescales, it would be appropriate to reflect that point within the reasoned justification to Policy NCB1.</p> | <p>paragraph with the following wording will be included after the last bullet point:</p> <p>“Where mitigation measures cannot resolve any significant adverse effects on habitats and species in an appropriate manner, the use of compensatory measures (such as translocation) will only be considered as a last resort, if the habitat(s) and/or species in question, cannot be maintained in their present location. This is because of the great difficulties in re-creating good quality habitats in new locations within reasonable timescales.</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | 9/4 | <p>down this approach. Once these habitats, and the species that rely on them are lost, they are lost forever, no matter how much mitigation.</p> <p>In addition, compensation packages or schemes should not compromise other biodiversity assets.</p> | <p>Agreed. It is accepted that the sites to which any habitat(s) and/or species are moved, should not be at the expense of any semi natural habitat(s) and/or species already in that location(s).</p> | <p>The following new sentence will be inserted at the end of the above mentioned new paragraph:</p> <p>“The sites to which any habitat(s) and/or species are moved, should not be at the expense of any semi natural habitat(s) and/or species already in that location(s)”.</p> |
| | | | | 9/5 | <p>Larger and more imaginative compensatory options should be sought than purely the addition of bird and bat boxes. Examples of these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems with features such as retention ponds, swales, green roofs - Opening up of culverted watercourses | <p>Agreed although the council does not accept that only the provision of bird and bat boxes are being proposed as the only types of compensatory measures that would be acceptable – there are 3 other bullet points covering measures such as provision of public access/interpretation, other wildlife corridors and the</p> | <p>The following bullet points will be included after the last one of the second set in the reasoned justification on Page 22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De-canalisation / restoration of streams / rivers and opening up of culverts • Incorporation of ponds/swales |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - De-canalisation and restoration of rivers and streams - Incorporation not just of large buffers, but linking these corridors with adjoining semi natural/greenspace habitat - Invasive weed eradication programmes - Long term conservation management/monitoring of remaining biodiversity within the site and/or adjoining wildlife resource | <p>creation of buffer strips.</p> <p>It should be noted that the suggestion of linking new corridors to existing habitat is already referred to in the reasoned justification to Policy NCB3, and the suggestion re management/monitoring are included at present in Policy NCB2 (and to be moved to Policy NCB1)</p> <p>However, it is accepted that the other examples of measures of benefit to biodiversity can be included.</p> | |
| | NCB1 | Maintaining and Enhancing Biodiversity | Government Office for the North West | 4/6 | See the representation on Section 3 above concerning need for reference to non native / invasive species | See relevant response above | <p>An additional bullet point with the following wording will be inserted after the last bullet point in the reasoned justification on Page 22</p> <p>"Where appropriate the control of non native and / or invasive species"</p> |
| 22 - 23 | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/12 | States that it is important that an ecological appraisal is undertaken at the earliest possible stage of the | Agreed. It is considered worthwhile making the point that an ecological appraisal should be undertaken as | The following sentence will be added at the end of the first paragraph of the reasoned justification |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | development process. This will enable any necessary design for biodiversity to be incorporated into the development proposal at an early stage, and will allow developers to identify possible ecological constraints at an early stage | soon as possible in the process for identifying the suitability of sites for different development proposals, and identifying any constraints that need to be dealt with as soon as possible. | on Page 23: "It is important that an ecological appraisal is undertaken at the earliest possible stage of the development process. This will allow developers to identify possible ecological constraints at an early stage, and thereby also enable any necessary design for biodiversity to be incorporated into the development proposal as soon as possible". |
| | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | Government Office for the North West | 4/6 | See the representation on Section 3 above concerning need for reference to non native / invasive species | See relevant response above | The words "presence of non native / invasive species" will be inserted in the first of the second set of bullet points, after the words "landscape features" |
| 22 - 23 | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | Environment Agency | 9/8 | States that if the ecological appraisal is to assess indirect as well as direct effects of a proposed development, then the adjacent biodiversity features to any proposed development also need to be surveyed by a | Agreed that the potential impacts of a development on the biodiversity features on adjoining sites also need to be considered as part of an ecological appraisal. It should be noted that in the second | The existing words in brackets in the second bullet point of the second paragraph of the policy wording will be moved and placed after the word "impacts". Then the words |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | 9/9 | <p>qualified ecologist</p> <p>Recommends a change of wording (taken to refer to the first bullet point on Page 23) to enable the ecological appraisal to fully assess any application's impact. The proposed new wording is as follows:</p> <p>"An explanation of the likely impacts <i>during and post development</i> on each of the key biodiversity features on the site (including in terms of type, timing, source, duration, likelihood, scale and significance of the impacts)"</p> | <p>set of bullet points in the policy wording on Page 22 reference is already made to an assessment of the "local context" (i.e. the area surrounding the site in question), however it is conceded that this reference may not be sufficient to make the point, and therefore additional wording is proposed.</p> <p>Agreed that all potential impacts of a development need to be assessed. It is thought that the existing wording of the bullet point, where it refers to the "timing" of the development already covers this point. However, it is conceded that it could be made clearer by an explanation of this point in the reasoned justification. Therefore a change to the wording of the reasoned justification will be made.</p> | <p>"and on any relevant adjacent biodiversity features" will be inserted before the semi colon at the end of the bullet point.</p> <p>The following new paragraph will be inserted after the third paragraph of the reasoned justification:</p> <p>"Appraisals will need to take account, not only of biodiversity features on the site itself, but also in the adjoining area. In addition they need to address any issues arising during the construction phase of the development, as well as from its completed form".</p> |
| 23 | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | Government Office for the | 4/9 | Would be beneficial to have a footnote explaining that from 1 st | Agreed that it would be beneficial to have a footnote, | A Footnote with the following wording will be |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | North West | | January 2007 there will be a new agency combining the agri-environment activities of the Rural Development Service, English Nature and the Landscape, Access and Recreation division of the Countryside Agency. This new organisation would be called Natural England. | explaining that English Nature is to be merged with the Countryside Agency and some activities of the Rural Development Service. However, the Council would point out that this change is due to take place in October 2006, rather than from January 2007 as stated by GONW. | added at the bottom of the page relating to Policy NCB2: "Please note that from October 2006, English Nature, the Countryside Agency and the agricultural / environmental activities of the Rural Development Service are being merged to form a new organisation called 'Natural England'". |
| 23 | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/4 | In the new wording provided, the trust is suggesting an amendment that would reflect the need for English Nature / Natural England to be consulted on applications that could impact on internationally or nationally important "species" as well as sites. | Agreed. It is thought that it would be appropriate to include the requirement to consult English Nature (and its successor) on any proposals that might have a direct or indirect impact on nationally and internationally important species | The third paragraph of the policy wording on Page 23 will be amended as follows: The word "an" will be deleted, a comma will be placed after the word "site", and the words "and / or species" will be put at the end of the sentence. |
| 23 | NCB2 | Ecological Appraisal | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/3 | States that as the trust understands the position, English Nature is now known as Natural England. Suggests deleting the last paragraph of the policy wording and replacing | The Trust is incorrect in stating that English Nature is now known as Natural England. The proposed change (which involves the merger of English Nature, the | See the proposed change for Policy NCB2 in relation to representation 4/9 by the Government Office for the North West above. |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>it with the following wording to take account of this point.</p> <p>“Natural England will be consulted on any applications that could either directly or indirectly affect an internationally or nationally important habitat or species”</p> | <p>Countryside Agency and the agricultural / environmental activities of the Rural Development Service) will not take place until October 2006. However, it would be useful to include a footnote to this effect at the bottom of the page.</p> | |
| (See Page 21) | (See Policy NCB1 Para 3) | Ecological Appraisal | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | (See 7/11) | See above for representation relating to management requirements | <p>Because it is proposed to include the main requirements concerning the management of any landscaping, habitat creation and compensatory provision in Policy NCB1, there is a need to make a cross reference from the Policies/Reasoned Justifications of Policies NCB2, 3 and 4, back to Policy NCB1.</p> | <p>The following wording will be included as a penultimate paragraph in the Reasoned Justification of Policy NCB2:</p> <p>“Please see Policy NCB1 for requirements concerning planning conditions and legal agreements in relation to mitigation and compensatory measures”.</p> |
| 24 - 25 | NCB3 | Provision of Habitats and Landscaping | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/13 | Policy NCB3 (which aims at providing new habitats irrespective of whether the development affects existing habitats) represents an important step forward in contributing to nature | Support noted | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | | conservation through the land use planning system. | | |
| 24 - 25 | NCB3 | Provision of Habitats and Landscaping | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/14 | The requirement to link new habitats to existing areas of habitat wherever practicable is particularly welcomed | Support noted | No change |
| 24 - 25 | NCB3 | Provision of Habitats and Landscaping | Environment Agency | 9/10 | States that any new landscaping schemes should also incorporate locally native species. | It is noted that Policy NCB3 already refers to the use of "native" species, but does not specify that these should be "locally" native. It is accepted that the term native species covers all naturally occurring species within the British Isles, and that therefore unless the term is qualified as being appropriate to the local area, then inappropriate species for the Salford area may be proposed. Therefore the wording of NCB3 will be slightly amended to take account of this point. | The word "locally" will be inserted before the word "native", in the rewording of the last paragraph of Policy NCB3, and in the existing fourth paragraph of the reasoned justification on Page 25. |
| | | | | 9/11 | States that any new landscaping schemes should aim to integrate with neighbouring boundary habitats, particularly adjoining semi natural habitats and/or wildlife corridors. | Agreed. The council accepts that new landscaping areas should be linked to neighbouring habitats and / or wildlife corridors wherever possible. | The fourth paragraph of NCB3 will be deleted and replaced with the following: "Landscaping schemes should be appropriate to |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | 9/12 | <p>States that any new landscaping scheme should be appropriate to the locality, and use suitable species e.g. avoidance of dense tree planting schemes directly adjacent to species rich grasslands, rivers or mosslands.</p> <p>There would be significant opportunity for ecological enhancement if landscaping schemes have some ecological input from their initial design, rather than purely from a landscape, amenity aspect, as many do at present moment</p> | <p>The council accepts that areas of new landscaping should be appropriate to the locality of the proposed development, should incorporate appropriate species and where practicable be linked to neighbouring habitats / Key Areas of Search for Wildlife Corridors. See the proposed change relating to the point above.</p> | <p>the locality. Where practicable they should incorporate locally native species, and priority and semi natural habitats, except where the design benefits of alternative species are considered to outweigh potential biodiversity benefits. In addition, they should where practicable be integrated with neighbouring habitats and Key Areas of Search for Wildlife Corridors".</p> |
| | | | | 9/13 | <p>Queries whether the creation of new lodges is being advocated or purely the maintenance and positive management of the remaining ones. Points out that the EA is not aware of the construction of new lodges, which are generally a feature of past industrial development. Goes on to state that new lodges would be very difficult and costly to construct, would require a high degree of</p> | <p>The council accepts the point that it would be unsustainable to re-create new lodges because of the high degree of maintenance that they would require.</p> | <p>The words "and lodges" will be inserted in the second paragraph of the reasoned justification of Policy NCB3, after the word "canals", and the words "and lodges" will be deleted from sixth bullet point.</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | maintenance and would be a liability to their owners | | |
| | | | | 9/14 | States that if new compensation wetlands were identified as part of mitigation, then the EA would recommend the creation of more natural ponds, lakes or even washlands. | The council accepts that the creation of ponds may be suitable, and they are referred to in the bullet point list of Greater Manchester habitats in the GM Biodiversity Action Plan, which is given in the reasoned justification to Policy NCB3. | No change |
| | | | | 9/15 | Recommends that the paragraph on habitat creation/re-creation should be omitted, as the actions given in the bullet points are overly general and would be misleading to respective developers. Instead, the EA suggests ensuring that any habitat creation/re-creation measures should be based on the scientific literature relevant to the habitat in question, and that the relevant documentation could be referenced in the Appendix for the national and local priority habitats. | Disagree. It is not accepted that this paragraph is very general but rather that it includes some specific measures. During the consultation process and at the early stakeholder meeting before the SPD was drafted, advice was sought from the nature conservation bodies (and including the EA) as to what information there was on habitat creation (other than for lowland raised bog restoration). None of the organisations suggested good sources of information. | The wording of the second paragraph of the reasoned justification on Page 25 should be amended as follows: The words "should be based on best available guidance" should be inserted after the words "creation / re-creation", and the words "measures such as", should be inserted after the word "include". |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>The EA's suggested rewording of the paragraph is as follows:</p> <p>"Any habitat creation/re-creation scheme should be based on the most relevant and current scientific literature"</p> | <p>Therefore, it is proposed that specific reference is made to the fact that re-creation measures should be based on relevant scientific literature but the measures that are included at present, are retained as examples of what might be needed.</p> | |
| 24 - 25 | NCB3 | Provision of Habitats and Landscaping | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/15 | <p>Reference should be made to the need to manage habitat areas in the medium to long term, and that developers will be asked to contribute to this management</p> | <p>Because it is proposed to include the main requirements concerning the management of any landscaping, habitat creation and compensatory provision in Policy NCB1, there is a need to make a cross reference from the Policies/Reasoned Justifications of Policies NCB2, 3 and 4, back to Policy NCB1.</p> | <p>The following wording will be included as a penultimate paragraph in the Reasoned Justification of Policy NCB3:</p> <p>"Please see Policy NCB1 for requirements concerning planning conditions and legal agreements in relation to mitigation and compensatory measures".</p> |
| 26 | NCB4 | Lowland Bog Restoration | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/4 | <p>Suggests that the restoration technique in the second bullet point should be deleted and reworded. The suggested rewording is as follows:</p> <p>"Ensure that sites are fed purely by rainwater and are isolated</p> | <p>It is not accepted that there is a need to change the wording of the bullet point. However, reference will be made in the penultimate paragraph of the reasoned justification to the importance of an acidic water supply, fed directly by rainfall</p> | <p>The wording of the penultimate paragraph of the reasoned justification of NCB4 will be amended as follows:</p> <p>The following will be inserted after the word</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | from the impurities of groundwater". | and without enrichment by nutrients from other sources, such as from mineral deposits underlying the peat, or from adjoining agricultural land. | "but", "will require provision of an acidic water supply, fed directly by rainfall and without enrichment by nutrients from other sources, such as from mineral deposits underlying the peat, or from adjoining agricultural land". A new sentence will then start with the word "Wherever". |
| 32 | 7.5 | Implementation | Environment Agency | 9/17 | See representation made on Para 3.3.18 and 3.3.19 above | The text is to be amended to refer to the Green Infrastructure report | The following new wording will be inserted after the first sentence of Para 7.5: "A number of environmental bodies in Greater Manchester (including the Countryside Agency, English Nature, Forestry Commission, National Trust, Northwest Regional Assembly, Northwest Development Agency, Environment Agency, English Nature and Community Forests Northwest and several local authorities) have contributed to the |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | | | preparation of a prospectus by TEP in 2005 called "Green Infrastructure for the Liverpool and Manchester City Regions". This sets the context and identifies the priorities for improving the delivery of Green Infrastructure, the quality and accessibility of which is seen as a fundamental backdrop of social progress and economic growth in the northwest. Biodiversity is seen as a key component of Green Infrastructure". |
| 32 | 7.5 | Implementation | Government Office for the North West | 4/4 | See representation made on c 3.3.10 above | The text is to be amended to refer to the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan work, especially concerning the mosslands. | A new paragraph numbered 7.6 will be formed, beginning with the words "At a more local level", which will be inserted before "English Nature". The words "bog restoration issues" at the end of the second sentence will be deleted, and replaced with the following words: |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | "implementing the GM Mosslands Action Plan. Preparation of this SPD, which includes identification of areas of local priority habitats, followed by policies which seek to protect, and where practicable, to extend them, is also seen as fulfilling some of the basic requirements of all of the GM Habitat Action Plans". |
| | Figure 1 | Distribution of UK Priority Habitats in Salford | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/17 | Points out that this plan has no title | The council accepts that there has been an error. The plan will also show areas of Ancient Woodland. | Figure 1 will be titled "Distribution of UK Priority Habitats and Ancient Woodland in Salford". |
| | Figure 2 | Distribution of Greater Manchester Priority Habitats in Salford | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/18 | Points out that this plan has no title | The council accepts that there has been an error. | Figure 2 will be titled "Distribution of Greater Manchester Priority Habitats in Salford". |
| | Potential additional plan | Distribution of SBIs in Salford | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/19 | Queries whether there should be an additional plan in the SPD showing the locations of the SBIs in Salford. Acknowledges that they are shown in the main plan. | Because the SBIs are shown on the Replacement UDP Proposals Map, it is not thought that they should also be shown in the SPD. | No change |
| | Appendix D (thought | List of Sites of Biological | John Kelcey | 8/2 | Objects. Item 12 of the SBI list referring to the Marsh and | This point has been checked with the Greater Manchester | No change |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|--|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--|---|------------------|
| | that this reference is an error, and should be Appendix C) | Importance (at December 2005) | | | <p>Pools, Greenheys, Area 0.4 ha, is a major error. Points out that, as the council knows following the UDP Inspector's recommendations, the present in situ area has been identified by the Greater Manchester Countryside Unit as being confined to 280 sq m of marsh. States that the reason given is that the larger area contains some scrub, which it was not practical to include.</p> <p><i>(Believe the reference to the Greater Manchester Countryside Unit is an error, and the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit is intended)</i></p> <p>Suggests that the entry is changed so that the area covered is given as 250 sq metres (or 0.025 ha if the council prefers). States that this is without prejudice to the opinion of his client and himself, that they do not consider the in situ or ex situ sites as meriting identification as an SBI. The reasons for this are contained in the evidence to the UDP inquiry.</p> | <p>Ecology Unit (the body which identifies SBIs). The unit points out that the area being referred to by Mr Kelcey relates to that area supporting the most important/dense plant populations. Other important plants occur in the wider 0.4 ha area. However it may be that once the proposed translocation of plants (in connection with a past planning permission) is completed then the area of the SBI will be reduced. In any case a site visit to confirm the extent of the SBI would not have been undertaken during 2005 and therefore would not affect the information given in Appendix C (which covers the situation up to the end of 2005).</p> | |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | Suggests another section | Contact List of organisations | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | 7/16 | Suggests that a contact list of organisations able to provide advice may be useful. Provides examples as follows, City Council, English Nature for SSSIs and Protected Species, Red Rose Forest for habitat creation initiatives and GMEU for SBIs | It is accepted that it would be useful to have a contact list of other organisations involved in biodiversity initiatives in Salford. | <p>The following list will be inserted as Appendix F:</p> <p>“Telephone List of Nature Conservation Organisations</p> <p>Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (provides an advisory service to and on behalf of the ten district councils of Greater Manchester) 0161 371 8545</p> <p>Environment Agency 08708 506506</p> <p>English Nature (to be merged with the Countryside Agency, and the agricultural and environmental activities of the Rural Development Service from October 2006) 01942 820342</p> <p>The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West</p> |

| Page | Section, Para or Policy | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes |
|------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | Bolton Office 01204 361847 Greater Manchester Bat Group 0161 797 4745 South Lancashire Bat Group 0161 764 8850 The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds 01484 861148 British Trust for Ornithology 01942 712615 |

Appendix G Schedule of Representations on Sustainability Appraisal and Council Response

| Page | Para | SUBJECT | Organisation | Resp /Rep Nos | Summary of Representation | Council's Response | Proposed Changes to SPD |
|------|------|---|--|---------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | General | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/10 | States that no reference is made to the management of the council's own land, or to privately owned sites of wildlife interest. Suggests that identification of important wildlife habitats should provide opportunities for managing the sites to become "key flagship sites". | It is accepted that the council should address biodiversity issues on its own land and reference is made in Para 7.8 of the SPD to this point. It should be noted that the Environmental Services Directorate has already identified a number of its own sites as Local Nature Reserves. In terms of the management of other sites, discussions are needed with the ES Directorate on how to take such issues forward. | No change to the SPD |
| 6 | 1.8 | Baseline Characteristics for Biodiversity | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/5 | States that the report called "Mosslands of the Northwest: State and Extent of Surviving Mossland Habitats" by Paul Thomas (Environment Agency) comments on the condition, quality and extent of lowland peat bog and offers guidance on management options for each site in re-creating lowland raised bog. | The council notes this reference and will include it in the Sustainability Appraisal report. | No change to the SPD |
| 18 | 4.9 | Local Priority Habitats in 2000 | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester | 11/6 | States that the trust thought that "Lowland raised bog" had been identified as a local priority habitat in 2000. | It is accepted that an error was made to list of local priority habitats in the SA but this does not affect the SPD, | No change to the SPD |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|--|--|------|---|---|----------------------|
| | | | and the North West | | | which has a correct list of all local priority habitats in Para 3.3.11. However, the SA report will be amended appropriately to take account of this point. | |
| 24 | 6.13 | Summary of Detailed Appraisal of Lowland Raised Bog Restoration Policy | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/7 | States that the Northwest Mosslands Network intends to enhance wetland sites for visitors. | The point is noted. Please see the proposed new objective to the SPD in Para 5.2.1 which states that a further objective to "To promote where appropriate, biodiversity as a recreational and educational asset". | No change to the SPD |
| 26 | 7.3 | Implementation and Monitoring | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/8 | Queries whether the proposals in this paragraph would provide adequate monitoring. States that no reference is made to important habitats, which might occur outside Sites of Biological Importance or about the monitoring of important species. | The council does not have the resources to check all habitats on an annual basis. In addition, it would be very impracticable to record the population levels, even of protected species, let alone priority species, on all the open land across the city. That is part of the reason that developers will be required to undertake ecological appraisals on proposed development sites. | No change to the SPD |
| 26 | 7.6 | Implementation and Monitoring | The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and the North West | 11/9 | Suggests that it should be possible to establish the extent of areas of habitat and changes that might take place with the help of GIS. | It is accepted that GIS would be helpful to record the extent and changes in habitat areas, but all these would still need to be backed up by checks on the ground. The council has already stated that it does not | No change to the SPD |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|-----|--|--|----------------------|
| | | | | | | have the resources to undertake checks on all priority habitat areas on an annual basis. Therefore no additional monitoring is proposed. | |
| 19 and 33 | | Air Quality and Traffic Volumes | Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Park Area) | 3/3 | Given that provision of biodiversity assets in the city should reduce need to travel to enjoy them, and that air quality data for 2004/05 shows that objectives were exceeded probably because of traffic volumes, then it is vital to provide biodiversity interest nearby thus reducing the need to travel | Noted. The SPD is seeking retention, and where possible an enhancement in the city's biodiversity interest. | No change to the SPD |
| Page 44 | | Objective: To protect and enable appreciation of city's heritage | Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Park Area) | 3/4 | Very supportive of provision of opportunities to appreciate and positively promote "lowland raised bog" as a significant element of the area's past natural heritage, and Chat Moss as a place to enjoy wildlife as a recreational experience | Support noted | No change to the SPD |
| Page 52 | | Objective: To improve physical and mental health | Ramblers Association (Manchester and High Park Area) | 3/5 | Very supportive of concept of an attractive environment encouraging residents to enjoy it, and undertaking recreational opportunities, thereby enhancing their health | Support noted | No change to the SPD |

APPENDIX H

| Library Opening Hours | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Boothstown (Standfield Drive) Monday: 1.30pm – 7.00pm Tuesday: 9.30am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.00pm Wednesday: Closed Thursday: 9.30am – 12.30 & 1.30pm – 5.00pm Friday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.00pm Saturday: 9.30am – 12.30pm</p> | <p>Broadwalk (Broadwalk, Salford) Monday: 9.30am – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Thursday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Broughton (400 – 404 Bury New Road) Monday: 9.30am – 12.00pm & 1.00pm – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 12.00pm & 1.00pm – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.30am – 12.00pm & 1.00pm – 5.30pm Thursday: 9.30am – 1.00pm Friday: 9.30am – 12.00pm & 1.00pm – 5.30pm Saturday: Closed</p> |
| <p>Cadishead (126 Liverpool Road) Monday: 9.00am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 6.30pm Tuesday: 9.00am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.00am – 1.00pm Thursday: 9.30am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Friday: 9.00am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Charleston (Albion High School, London Street) Monday: 9.00am – 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 5.30pm Tuesday: 1.30pm – 5.30pm Wednesday: Closed Thursday: 9.00am – 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 5.30pm Friday: 9.00am – 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 5.30pm Saturday: Closed</p> | <p>Clifton (Community Centre 6 Wynne Avenue) Monday: 2.00pm – 5.00pm & 5.30pm – 7.00pm Tuesday: Closed Wednesday: 2.00pm – 5.00pm Thursday: Closed Friday: 2.00pm – 5.00pm & 1.00pm – 5.30pm Saturday: Closed</p> |
| <p>Eccles (Church Street) Monday: 9.30am – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Thursday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Height (King Street) Monday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Wednesday: Closed Thursday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Hope (Eccles Old Road) Monday: 2.00pm – 5.30pm Tuesday: Closed Wednesday: 9.30am – 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 5.30pm Thursday: Closed Friday: 2.00pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> |
| <p>Irlam (Hurst Fold) Monday: 9.00am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 6.30pm Tuesday: 9.00am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.00am – 1.00pm Thursday: 9.00am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 6.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Little Hulton (Longshaw Drive) Monday: 8.30am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 6.00pm Tuesday: 8.30am- 12.30pm Wednesday: 8.30am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Thursday: 8.30am- 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Friday: 8.30am – 12.30pm & 1.30pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> | <p>Swinton (Chorley Road) Monday: 9.30am – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Thursday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm</p> |

Library Opening Hours

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Walkden</i> (Memorial Road) Monday: 9.30am – 7.30pm Tuesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Wednesday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Thursday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.00am – 1.00pm | <i>Winton</i> (Old Parrin Lane) Monday: 9.30am- 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 7.00pm Tuesday: 2.00am – 5.30pm Wednesday: Closed Thursday: 2.00am – 5.30pm Friday: 9.30am- 1.00pm & 2.00pm – 5.30pm Saturday: 9.30am – 1.00pm | <i>Worsley Village</i> (Worsley Road) Monday: 10.00am- 1.00pm Tuesday: 1.30am – 5.30pm Wednesday: Closed Thursday: 1.30am – 5.30pm Friday: 10.00am – 1.00pm Saturday: 10.00am – 1.00pm |
|--|--|--|