

**Haysden Country Park Management Plan
Summary of Consultation Comments**

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
1. Healthy Walks leader/User Panel member	Bridge naming signs have been vandalised so potentially replace with metal ones	In general, wooden signs are provided to be sympathetic to the nature of the site. These signs will be monitored during the day to day management of the site. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
2. Penshurst Place Estate/User Panel member	Maps not very clear on web site [consultation] version	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – Final copy maps will be clearer. Following this comment a revised Master Plan was placed on the website during the consultation period.
	Seeking clarification on the proposals to allow canoeists better access to the Medway and will this include sections upstream of the Flood Barrier.	This proposal has been brought forward by the Environment Agency and should it be progressed consultation would be carried out with relevant stakeholders including local land owners. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
3. User Panel member	A good draft	-
4. User Panel member	A good plan overall with lots of positive action re biodiversity etc. How will you actually know that biodiversity is being enhanced – how will this be monitored?	Project 26 of the Five-Year work programme identified the need to monitor wildlife on a regular basis and this information can be used to judge the success of actions undertaken. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	<p>The list of key species is weak as it does not recognise the importance of the Park for declining migrant birds such as Willow Warbler and Reed Warbler.</p>	<p>The list of key species at Table 5 focuses on frequently occurring species in the Park and has been developed in consultation with the Kent Wildlife Trust. It should, however, be noted that additional consultation with relevant organisations will be carried out prior to the implementation of Project 26 – Wildlife Monitoring. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>
	<p>The habitat descriptions are not linked to specific species i.e. Great Crested Newt is listed in Appendix 9 as present but its habitat requirements are quite specific. The Plan needs to link key species to specific areas/ habitats within the Park.</p>	<p>There are a wide range of species associated with different habitats, and many species which are present in more than one compartment. Only the key species have been noted at present though more knowledge of where species are found on site and their spread within the park will be gained during the monitoring carried out as part of Project 26. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>
	<p>As an objective "to consider biodiversity before changes are made..." is pretty weak as is "to give consideration to biodiversity..."</p>	<p>These statements reflect the need to address biodiversity in management decisions taken, though at this stage it is difficult to give more detailed information as the requirement will vary depending on the action proposed. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed, although issue noted as being very important.</i></p>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	Why plant more trees? What rationale for this is given?	Project 44 recognises the fact that trees should not be planted to the detriment of other habitats in the Park. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
5. Medway Valley Countryside Partnership/User Panel member	SNClS are now known as Local Wildlife Sites.	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – to reflect comments received
	I'm sure the Kent Bat Group would be able to give you a more detailed bat species.	The most up to date information about confirmed sightings has been included and the Kent Bat Group was consulted on the draft Plan. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
	Opportunities for 'Scrub Clearance' - for what benefit? Scrub clearance for increase in habitat diversity?	The rationale behind scrub clearance has been highlighted under Projects 33 and 41. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
	Misspelling Giant Hogweed and a minor grammatical error in Project 43	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – to reflect comments received
	Ensure trees are assessed for bat roosts prior to felling.	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – add 'Ensure trees are assessed for bats prior to felling' to relevant identified projects.

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	<p>Wider role - There is no specific objective for the wider role of Haysden Country Park. How will the Park ensure the impact of climate change is minimised/ benefits the Park for species present/ use the site as a corridor.</p>	<p>The plan does take into consideration sustainability as one of the key criteria for the Green Flag Award. Its role in the wider environment will be highlighted in the Council's developing Managing Development and the Environment DPD and the Park will be managed to take this documentation into consideration. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>
<p>6. TMBC Councillor</p>	<p>Concerned about the presence of Mink in the Park and that action should be taken to address them sooner than highlighted in the Management Plan (Currently under year 3).</p>	<p><i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> –This issue has been reflected in the proposed Plan for consideration in years 3 and 4. The reason why immediate action is not being taken is that at present there is not a perceived problem in the Park as, although Mink is noted in the species list, sightings are very low and infrequent. The Site Manager has discussed this issue with Natural England and the Park Ranger is also in regular contact with Anglers at the Park. This is an issue that will be monitored and should action be required it would be carried out. On reflection and taking these comments into consideration Project 29 will now read "Monitor the level of Mink present at the site and take action as required in liaison with appropriate outside bodies including Natural England".</p>

Respondent	Comment	<i>Recommended Amendment</i>
	Concerned about the rationale behind the control of Canada Geese. Consideration needs to be given to if this is required and if so appropriate control methods should be applied.	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – Project 28 identifies the growing population of Canada Geese and the need therefore to consider whether control should be carried out. At this stage no method of control is proposed and both the need and any method will only be established in liaison with appropriate external organisations such as the Kent Wildlife Trust or the Kent Ornithological Society. The need for prior consultation will be added to the wording under Project 28.
7. Tonbridge Town Sailing Club/ User Panel member	The Club notes that in the Five Year Work Programme, project 31 refers to silt removal from Haysden Water. This is a matter of real concern to our members. However, the Plan shows this as being proposed for year 5, 2014. We would ask if this project can be rescheduled for an earlier date	<i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> – The Club comments have been noted and it is proposed that Project 31 be moved from year 5 to year 2. The project is currently on List C of the Council’s Capital Plan and it is essential that external funding opportunities are investigated.
8. Park Visitor/Local Resident	A safe pedestrian path should be provided along Lower Haysden Lane to access the Country Park.	Responsibility for the Lower Haysden Lane highway falls to Kent County Council. This Council has looked into the feasibility of such a proposal in the past, as such a path would be considered to be desirable. Possible implementation is, however, extremely complex as it involves various landowners and would be costly. Liaison ongoing with KCC Countryside Access. No amendment to the Plan proposed.

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	<p>Feels that the collection of money from the car parks only recovers a very small percentage of the total costs. Would like to see the removal of car parking charges, as this also goes against your stated aim of encouraging people to use the Park.</p>	<p>The total expenditure shown at Appendix 10 for the Park is £136,550. During the first seven months of the 2009/10 financial year a total income of £18,082 has been taken from car parking and it is felt that this represents good value for money. Income from concessions and car parking raises around 20% of the total expenditure for the Park. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>
	<p>Concerned that vegetation is not being maintained along the stretch of the Tonbridge to Penshurst cycle route between the Sailing Club and Ensfield Road.</p>	<p>This section of the route falls outside the boundaries of the Park and is the responsibility of Penshurst Place. These comments will be passed on to the management of Penshurst Place. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>
	<p>Concerned that bylaws are being proposed within the Plan. Takes the view that we have quite enough laws in our life. Please refrain from introducing any more!</p>	<p>The Council is committed to tackling anti-social behaviour. With this in mind any long term solutions; deterrents to reduce crime and; enforcement must be considered. In this instance one option open to the Council is the powers the Council has to introduce Bylaws. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i></p>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	Does not support the introduction of CCTV in the Park and feels the initial investment and ongoing revenue costs could be spent in more beneficial areas of the Park.	The draft Plan identifies that a feasibility study will be carried out for the provision of CCTV in the main car park (Project 50). This study will take into account provision in the Council's other facilities across the borough and cost benefit assessment. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
	I have seen lots of wonderful wildlife this summer such as Colbalt blue butterflies. Keep up the good work!	-
9. A Park visitor	Concerned that the existing sleeping policemen along the main entrance drive cause a large jolt that is a danger to disabled drivers. Can you not, at small cost, arrange for narrow, smooth, tarmac bypasses of the sleeping policemen for the use of users of buggies, electric wheelchairs and the like?	This issue was noted during the Park's last Access Audit carried out in 2003 where it was identified that alterations could be considered when the existing speed ramps come to the end of their life. A new Audit is due to be undertaken in the next financial year and this issue will be raised again and the comments from the Park user taken into consideration. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
10. A Park visitor	Could the Plan include improvements to the access paths to the east and west of the park that are outside of the Park's boundaries.	Whilst the Plan may not specifically address the management of paths outside of the Park, the Council recognises the importance of these access routes and would always liaise with other bodies such and Kent County Council Public Rights of Way and Penshurst Place in an attempt to ensure they are appropriately maintained. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	Concerned about the affect of the car parking charges at the Haysden Water end of the Park as there are no amenities to justify these charges and vehicles park in the narrow lane to avoid paying.	Measures to prevent vehicles parking in the lane currently being progressed by Transportation services, including double yellow lining. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
11. Park Volunteer	Proposes the creation of a new path within Friendship Wood.	Whilst Project 39 highlights the need to keep more remote areas of the Park more rural in nature, it is suggested that officers discuss the feasibility of this proposal direct with the Volunteer group. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
12. Kent Wildlife Trust	Is there a system for good communication between those doing arboricultural surveys and the Kent Bat group?	The Council does work with the Kent Bat Group and uses Licensed Bat workers to indentify potential roosts before tree work is undertaken. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
	With regards to a new use for Tilebarn field - we would advocate it being managed as low stocked rough grassland or summer meadow.	These comments will be taken into consideration during investigations in to the progression of Project 24. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed.</i>
	The management Plan identifies Dyers greenwood (<i>Genista tinctoria</i>) growing around Barden Lake. If any mowing or cutting does occur in this compartment and around the woodland edge, collecting the arisings (perhaps into piles of vegetation which can be left for use by reptiles and invertebrates) would create a more varied and attractive flora and would favour species such as Dyers greenwood.	These areas are only occasionally cut at present though the Trust's comments will be taken into consideration next time they are cut. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed</i>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
	<p>We would support any opportunities to create areas of wet woodland and permanent ponds on the site and are very encouraged by plans to create new mini ponds within the old river channels. However elsewhere, encouraging water drainage from the site is prioritised. In particular, as the Plan acknowledges, an increased water level in the shallows area (compartment 7) would be beneficial for wildlife. From the management Plan, it suggests that you might be keen to do this, but elsewhere suggests increasing drainage around this area. Would it be possible to increase drainage into this area from elsewhere (and allow it to increase drainage into this area from elsewhere (and allow it to collect) or would the topography of the surroundings prevent this. In which case, mud scrapes would help create areas of permanent water.</p>	<p>Comments noted and consultation with other agencies on the implementation of Project 35 (Water course management) will be carried out as highlighted. This will provide an opportunity for the Trust to discuss these possibilities in more detail with the Council. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed</i></p>
	<p>Mink Control - the 2004-2009 Plan suggested surveying for water voles and otters in the area. Was this ever completed and if so what were the results? Also, could we consider water vole reintroductions to the area in the future (after mink control)?</p>	<p><i>Proposed Plan Amendment</i> - Whilst no official survey has been commissioned to investigate the presence of Otter, Mink and Water Vole informal monitoring has taken place indicating low and infrequent numbers of mink and no confirmed sightings of Otter and Water Voles. Whilst Project 26 identifies the need to monitor wildlife, no formal</p>

Respondent	Comment	Recommended Amendment
		programme has been established. Taking the Trust's comments into consideration it is proposed that this could be carried out in liaison with them and the wording under Project 26 will be altered to reflect this. The introduction of any additional species could then be considered following the completion of appropriate surveys.
	We are very encouraged by plans to create mud scrapes, marsh areas or permanent ponds in the water meadow area (compartment 3) and would be willing to offer our advice and support to do this.	Comments noted. <i>No amendment to the Plan proposed</i>