**Appendix 2: Consultation Results**

Oxford City Council received a total of 91 responses to its consultation on the Draft Corporate Biodiversity Strategy in early 2015. This is a relatively high response rate which, in itself, indicates that biodiversity is an important issue for many residents and organisations in Oxford.

**The Results**

Overwhelmingly, respondents agree that it is important that the city council has a strategy in place setting out how the council will contribute to the protection and enhancement of Oxford’s biodiversity. However, the results are split on whether the proposed actions are appropriate. An equal number of respondents agree that the level of action proposed is about right against those who feel that more action is required. Almost 60% of respondents had ideas of how the council could improve how council services are delivered for the benefit of biodiversity. These results are shown in the graphs below:

Many residents submitted detailed comments in additional to the questions above.

The top 10 issues raised are shown in the diagram below. A complete log of the detailed responses received are set out in Table 1 including how the comments have been taken into account.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1. Detailed Comments from the Public Consultation** | | | | | |
| **No.** | **Subject/Issue raised in the public consultation exercise** | **Action or comment?** | **What can we do about it?** | **Would this require additional resource?** | **Has this issue been addressed in the updated Action Plan?** |
| **Partnership Working** | | | | | |
|  | Partnership working – realise more opportunities. | Action | Identify it as an action for Environmental Policy and other relevant service areas. | Possibly | Yes |
|  | More collaboration with local businesses/ corporate sponsorship. | Action | Identify more partnership opportunities. Include as an action for relevant service areas. Assess potential of linking up with LCO pathfinders. | No | Yes |
|  | Experts and enthusiasts need to be engaged to work together. | Action | Identify more opportunities for partnership working. Action in the updated Action Plan. | Possibly | Yes |
|  | Work closer with Oxford University. | Action | As above OU is a LCO pathfinder. | No | Yes |
|  | City council departments should work better together | Comment | This will come out of implementing this action plan. | No | Yes |
| **Strategy General** | | | | | |
|  | Strategy should refer to new corporate plan | Action | Refer to new corporate plan in revised strategy | No | Yes |
|  | Change biodiversity champions to biodiversity advocates. | Action | Refer to advocates instead of champions. | No | No – not significant and champions mirrors carbon champions |
|  | Corporate strategy title should be city or Oxford biodiversity strategy | Action | Amend title to better reflect content of strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | Encouraging to see the council thinking about such issues. | Comment |  |  | n/a |
|  | Biodiversity map needs to include areas other than CTA and designated as strategy states must protect outside these areas too. Add corridor map from core strategy and Green Spaces strategy. | Action | Include more detailed designations maps and maps showing wealth of biodiversity in Oxford. | No | Yes, new maps included using TVERC data. |
|  | Should refer to Angst – access to green space | Action | Make reference to the green spaces strategy | No | No, this is covered in the Green Spaces Strategy. |
| **Habitat Protection/Biodiversity Value** | | | | | |
|  | Action needed at Lye Valley – damage due to poor hydrological planning. | Action | Reference to be made on the importance of hydrological impacts. Commitment to producing management plans for particularly sensitive sites. | Possibly | Yes |
|  | Habitat creation required including ponds | Action | Reference can be made to habitat creation through planning and in our own parks – a specific programme for the council to create new habitat eg ponds is likely to require additional resources. | Possibly | Yes, but more resource required to put a project in place to create significant areas of new habitat. |
|  | Designated sites need to be maintained properly with management plans in place. | Action | Create management plans for all sites of particular importance. Currently only have management plans for certain sites. For all designated sites would need more resource. | Yes | Yes, but additional resource would be required to produce and monitor management plans for all designated sites. |
|  | Upgrade designations on specific sites/ designate more sites. | Action | Upgrading sites depends on quality of the site. Additional resourcing for site management to improve quality and funding for surveying (eg TVERC) would be required. | Yes | No – the city council can support this, but TVERC manages Local Wildlife Project. Additional resources would be required. |
|  | Re-introduce wild boar to Shotover and Brasenose Wood. | Action | This is a very specific project request and ecological impacts would have to be fully investigated. There would be resource implications for assessing the impacts and managing the project. | Yes | No |
|  | Biodiversity top topic of concern out of 18 issues in Headington. | Comment | Demonstrates how important biodiversity is to many Oxford residents. Reference should be made to this in the updated action plan. | No | Yes |
|  | Biodiversity is declining due to the many threats to biodiversity. | Comment | Include a section on threats to biodiversity in the updated document. Additional resources would be required to properly assess our biodiversity resource and measure species decline. | No/Yes | Yes |
|  | Hydrological impacts on important sites must be properly assessed. | Action | Include an action to ensure that planning is properly assessing new developments for hydrological impacts. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Council must take responsibility for protected habitats and species. | Comment | State council’s responsibilities more clearly in the updated action plan. | n/a | Yes |
|  | Biodiversity resource in Oxford is unique for city of its size and should be celebrated. | Comment | Ensure there is emphasis on celebrating Oxford’s wealth of biodiversity. | n/a | Yes |
|  | Biodiversity brings health, wellbeing, cultural benefits. | Comment | Ensure all the benefits of biodiversity are clearly communicated in the updated action plan. | n/a | Yes |
|  | Biodiversity must be conserved for its own sake | Comment | Make reference to it in the updated action plan. | n/a | Yes |
|  | Value of trees and ancient woodland vital to be recognised. | Comment | Make reference to it in the updated strategy. Ensure references to tree strategy are clear. | n/a | Yes |
| **Resourcing** | | | | | |
|  | More staff resource and in house expertise needed. | Action | Provide more staff resources for biodiversity. | Yes | No, further resources required |
|  | Council staff education needed including councillors. | Action | Provide training – currently no in house expertise to provide any formal training. Environmental Policy team can provide some support eg sign-posting to guidance etc. Environmental Policy team to provide basic training for biodiversity champions. | Yes | Yes, but only internal training through biodiversity champion scheme. |
|  | Costs and consequences of not managing biodiversity properly should be spelt out and should be honest about the scale of work involved. | Comment | Add ‘threats to biodiversity’ section in plan – acknowledge that more partnership working and community input is required for effective management of our biodiversity. | No | Yes |
| **Leadership** | | | | | |
|  | Essential for council to provide more of a leadership role | Action | A greater leadership role by the council has been called for – more resources would be needed to fully achieve this. The action plan includes a whole section on how the council will fulfil its role as advocate and facilitator. | Yes | No |
|  | World-class city needs biodiversity | Comment | Make reference to this in the updated action plan. | n/a | Yes |
|  | Strategy provides insufficient protection to biodiversity/ no clear commitment to protection and enhancement of existing resource. | Comment | Objective 2 states clearly that the council is committed to protection and enhancement. More enhancement opportunities could be realised with greater resource and upgrading designations would afford more protection but this would also require additional resources. | Yes/No | Yes – reference is made in the strategy but more work would require additional resource. |
|  | Strategy vague/ not strong enough/the minimum/not deliverable/ not ambitious enough/not proactive enough | Comment | Highlight more examples of what the council is doing in the updated strategy. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Lack of clarity on how actions/policies are to be implemented/monitored/ clear measurable objectives needed. | Action | Make clearer in updated action plan. Each service area would be responsible for delivering their actions. Specific targets such as increase amount of x habitat would require more resource. | Yes/No | No changes made in updated action plan. Individual service areas must take ownership. |
|  | Council should take a strong stance on protection of our biodiversity/ should be given higher priority. | Comment | Biodiversity is afforded protection though national and local legislation and policy. Additional resources would allow the city council to do more to highlight its work in this area. | Yes | No |
|  | Minimise council’s role and leave it let specialist’s do it. | Comment | We have statutory duties to biodiversity so this is not an option. However, we could employ more in house specialist resource. | No/Yes | No |
| **Council Land Management** | | | | | |
|  | Mowing regimes in parks and verges properly managed for wildflowers. | Action | This is already set out as an action in the strategy but further details can be added. | No | Yes |
|  | Minimise use of pesticides and fertilisers. | Action | This is already set out as an action in the strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | Provide/improve interpretation boards in sites. | Action | Wild Oxford project is delivering some improved interpretation. Ensure this is highlighted. More resources would be needed to roll out across the city. More partnership working with BBOWT could help us deliver this. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Bee action plan – needed in context of national pollinator strategy – not just bees. Planting for pollinators. | Action | Amend strategy to acknowledge all pollinators, not just bees. Refer to National Pollinator Strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | Biodiversity should be viewed in context of Oxford’s housing crisis etc. | Comment | The council has statutory duties to protect biodiversity regardless. Actions proposed to ensure new developments incorporate biodiversity into the design. | No | Housing crisis not addressed specifically but using development for biodiversity is included. |
|  | Plant wildflowers wherever suitable. | Action | Include actions for further increasing unmown areas in parks and other council land etc. There is a specific action on road verge management etc. | No | Yes |
|  | Increase number of allotment plots. | Action | Oxford has a higher than national average number of allotment plots per capita. Can make more reference to the importance of allotments to biodiversity but increasing number of allotment plots is unlikely to be a priority for the council. | Yes | No |
|  | Include trees for pollination in the tree strategy | Action | Can request that the tree strategy makes reference to pollinator friendly trees. Action on new planting now includes reference to pollinator friendly trees. More an action for the tree strategy. | No/possibly | Not specifically but have included details of planting for pollinators including trees. |
|  | Tree strategy – BS5837:012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction should be highlighted. | Action | Can request that the tree strategy makes reference to this. Action to be included in the tree strategy. | Possibly | No |
|  | Council should manage own bee hives/ open up land for local bee keepers | Action | Include reference to the hives that are now in Cutteslowe Park. To roll this out wider may require more resources. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Purchase UK grown trees to reduce risk of tree disease | Action | Commitment sought from Leisure and Parks to purchase only UK grown trees. | No/possibly | Yes |
|  | Shred and mulch green waste in parks | Action | This is already happening – make reference to it in the strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | Council should plant more trees to reduce flooding etc. | Action | Tree planting is undertaken by Leisure and Parks. Benefits of planting trees for flooding to be referred to in updated action plan. Include action for Leisure and Parks to consider flooding when undertaking new tree planting. Action to be included in Tree Strategy. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Introduce deciduous hedging instead of fencing and wall building many benefits wildlife, air quality, sound, no graffiti. | Action | Could be considered in council developments – there would be long term maintenance costs but could introduce cost savings in the long run eg no graffiti cleaning etc. Action to be included to assess opportunities for deciduous hedging. | Yes | Yes |
| **Regulator and Policy Maker** | | | | | |
|  | All depts must have access to clear strategy to respond to statutory obligations NERC, NPPF, Habitats Directive) | Action | Should be achieved as a result of implementing this strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | SLINCS not referred to or shown on maps | Comment | Designations to be made clearer in strategy document and maps. Map now shows SLINCS as well as other designations. | No | Yes |
| **Planning** | | | | | |
|  | Council must protect land from damaging development and all new development must seek to provide biodiversity enhancements. | Action | Strategy should make it clearer that our planning policy should be achieving this. Greater resourcing may be required in order to maximise the enhancement opportunities. | Yes/  possibly | Yes |
|  | Target of no net reduction in protected sites/species… aim is too low – is that the best the council can do? | Action | Current core strategy biodiversity target monitored in annual report is the bare minimum. Core strategy to be reviewed and presents an opportunity to introduce more ambitious biodiversity targets. This would rely on additional resourcing for activities such as surveying in order to properly monitor the policy. Resource planned for assessment of our biodiversity resource already included. Targets not yet set so resourcing requirements not yet known. | Yes | No, resourcing requirements not yet known. |
|  | Increase funding for biodiversity from CIL of S.106 | Action | Strategy already mentions that applications are screened and obligations imposed where relevant. Action to ensure that planning are maximising opportunities through new development for contributions for biodiversity enhancement etc. It is possible that in order to maximise this opportunity, planning would need more expert in house biodiversity resource. | Yes/  possibly | No |
|  | All developments of 3 or more houses to have biodiversity strategy for the site. Biodiversity advice created for developers should be based on soil type and location. | Action | Location/soil specific guidance would be great but would require additional resource to produce. Currently all applications are screened on an individual basis as to whether the development/location requires assessment. | Yes | No |
|  | Bat/bird boxes should be built in not surface-mounted. | Action | Currently this advice is already being given to developers where applicable. Any advice to developers that is created will make this point. Action to be amended to reflect this in the updated action plan. | No | Yes |
|  | Strong commitment to BS42020 needed | Action | Achievement of the standard is incorporated as an aspirational action at this stage. More in house resource required in order to undertake the process to achieve the standard. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Introduce policy on light pollution. | Action | The update of the core strategy may present an opportunity to address this through planning policy. | No | No |
|  | Wildlife corridors should be connected | Action | There is an action for planning to identify opps for improving wildlife and habitat connectivity. The importance of wildlife corridors is addressed in the strategy. Update maps to show wildlife corridors. |  | Yes |
|  | Floodplain should be protected from development. | Comment | Existing policies relate to this. Importance of floodplain for biodiversity is addressed. |  | No |
|  | Planning enforcement and monitoring needed to ensure biodiversity requirements complied with. | Action | Conditions to secure biodiversity enhancement are imposed and conditions discharge applications reviewed and checked. However, more resource needed to monitor and enforce conditions properly. | Yes | No |
|  | Planning applications should be scrutinised for impacts and clearer guidelines for how decisions are reached available. | Action | Planning applications are all screened. Screening process and mitigation hierarchy to be added into the strategy. | No | Yes |
|  | Offsetting to be used only as an absolute last resort | Comment | Strategy should make this point. Additional text to be added to reiterate that mitigation hierarchy still applies. | No | Yes |
|  | Strategy says nothing on how decision of “need for development outweighs the loss” is made. | Comment | This statement comes from the NPPF. Strategy should set out mitigation hierarchy approach etc. | No | Yes |
|  | Technical guidance note – reference should be made to County’s guide to Biodiversity and Planning | Action | Reference to be made in the strategy document and a link provided on the planning pages. | No | Yes |
| **Surveying** | | | | | |
|  | More surveying/assessment of our resource needed. | Action | Planning are committed to doing survey work in preparation for the updated core strategy. Regular surveying and assessment of our biodiversity resource is needed. Currently we are dependent on volunteers – some resource should be put up to supporting volunteer surveyors or provide TVERC with regular funding as the other districts do. | Yes | No, additional resourcing required in the long term. |
|  | TVERC needs more funding and all data shared with them. | Action | Strategy already commits to sharing data with TVERC. More support and funding could be given to TVERC in exchange for surveying/ monitoring etc. | Yes | No, additional resourcing required. |
| **Advocate and Facilitator** | | | | | |
|  | Volunteers/friends of groups etc very important/need to be better supported and acknowledged. | Action | We are currently very dependent on volunteers and we should be acknowledging/supporting them more. Strategy to acknowledge in stronger terms the invaluable contribution volunteers make. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Council land biodiversity management is too dependent on volunteers. | Comment | As above –Provided volunteers are properly acknowledged and supported, some dependency on volunteers is ok as it strengthens communities, creates more active communities etc. Ensure action plan acknowledges benefits and contribution of volunteering. | Yes | Yes |
|  | Improve education/awareness of biodiversity eg schools/ general public - Communication | Action | There are many opportunities for biodiversity outreach and education but there is currently no budget for this kind of work. Action to be added on partnership working to deliver more biodiversity events/engagement etc. | Yes | No |
|  | Encourage Oxford’s twinned cities to do more for biodiversity. | Action | Promotional materials and experience sharing etc could be produced. No budget allocated for such work. | Yes | No |
|  | Do more to promote wildlife in private gardens | Action | Wildflower seed giveaway being undertaken as part of Cleaner Greener Campaign – with a budget available which covered the seed costs. This could be a regular feature of Cleaner Greener Campaigns provided the budget for them stays in place. | Possibly | Yes |
|  | Giveaway wildflower seeds | Action | As above | Possibly | Yes |
|  | More biodiversity events – eg incorporate into LCO week | Action | Can easily mobilise groups such as BBOWT, FOE etc to have a presence at city events to promote their projects. Action on this to be included. | No | Yes |
|  | Encourage people to keep lawn and plants not pave over gardens/land in general. | Action | Could run a campaign on benefits of gardens. Could perhaps come out of existing budgets for campaigns eg Cleaner Greener Campaigns. Commitments sought from planning and direct services etc. | Possibly | Yes |
|  | Offer free bird/bat boxes, green roof installation/promote more green roof etc | Action | Could run a box/roof campaign but it would require budget. Benefits of green roofs/bat/bird boxes included in strategy already. | Yes | No |
|  | Introduce Oxford in bloom category of pollinator-friendly flowers. | Action | This year’s Oxford in Bloom has a pollinator theme – the introduction of a category for this may be possible. Will discuss with L&P about committing to this for next year. | No | Yes |
|  | Promote/support local initiatives such as “bringing back Headington’s Limestone Wild Flowers” etc. | Action | There is a council grant scheme that groups like this could apply for –reference already made to this fund in the strategy. A specific biodiversity budget for small groups/specific projects to apply for would be very welcomed by biodiversity interest groups. This particular project not specifically referred to but an action is already included on the council grant scheme etc. | Yes | No |
|  | Oxford should build a reputation for biodiversity. | Action | Update strategy to celebrate Oxford’s unique biodiversity and what the council is currently doing. The council should be building a reputation for great biodiversity work. More resources needed to be more ambitious. | Yes | No |
|  | Green roofs not always suitable/not long term solution – only offer small contribution – limits possibilities for solar panels. | Comment | Green roofs offer a good contribution which would otherwise not be achieved. Solar panels and green roofs are not mutually exclusive. | No | No |
| **Environmental Management for Biodiversity** | | | | | |
|  | Reduce vehicle emissions and other pollution | Action | This point should be made in the strategy making more of the links to the Air quality strategy docs etc. | No | Yes |
|  | Air quality vital for biodiversity health – should be mentioned. | Action | As above | No | Yes |
|  | City’s stance on the flood relief channel should be mentioned/impacts discussed. | Comment | Oxford City Council supports the flood relief channel project. The environmental impacts will be thoroughly assessed through the development process. | No | No |