

**Haysden Country Park Management Plan 2020-2024 consultation draft Summary of Consultation Comments  
and Proposed Amendments**

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Proposed Amendment																				
1. <b>Ward Member</b>	Punctuation and layout needs improvement in the final document.	<b>Proposed amendment</b> - Plan to be proof read again prior to publication.																				
2. <b>Bird Recorder and User Panel member</b>	<p>The list of birds on table 7. Its a rather curious list and the result of trying to do two things...as it says on page 2, the list pay particular importance to species “within the park due to their conservation status and the frequency/likelihood of occurrence in the park.” You have ended up with a list which does both inadequately, none which use key watery habitats (kingfisher ?), some such as Blackbird that can be seen anywhere and some important absences ie birds which of national conservation concern that are not listed at all.</p> <p>My suggestion is that you make the list about birds for which the Country Park <b>provides important habitats and thus are not regularly seen elsewhere</b> (there really is no point in having Blackbird there).</p> <p>So, a short list like this, with key habitats, would include:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Whitethroat *</td> <td>woodland edge and scrub</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lesser Whitethroat *</td> <td>woods and scrub</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reed Warbler</td> <td>reed-beds</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reed Bunting *</td> <td>marshy areas, scrub (note this is an Amber-listed species)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kingfisher</td> <td>lake, river (Amber listed)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Great Crested Grebe</td> <td>lake</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goosander</td> <td>lake</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Rail</td> <td>marshy areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Little Egret</td> <td>lake</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bullfinch</td> <td>woodland, scrub (Amber listed)</td> </tr> </table>	Whitethroat *	woodland edge and scrub	Lesser Whitethroat *	woods and scrub	Reed Warbler	reed-beds	Reed Bunting *	marshy areas, scrub (note this is an Amber-listed species)	Kingfisher	lake, river (Amber listed)	Great Crested Grebe	lake	Goosander	lake	Water Rail	marshy areas	Little Egret	lake	Bullfinch	woodland, scrub (Amber listed)	<b>Proposed amendment</b> – Further liaison to be undertaken and the list to be updated accordingly.
Whitethroat *	woodland edge and scrub																					
Lesser Whitethroat *	woods and scrub																					
Reed Warbler	reed-beds																					
Reed Bunting *	marshy areas, scrub (note this is an Amber-listed species)																					
Kingfisher	lake, river (Amber listed)																					
Great Crested Grebe	lake																					
Goosander	lake																					
Water Rail	marshy areas																					
Little Egret	lake																					
Bullfinch	woodland, scrub (Amber listed)																					

	<p>Song Thrush * woodland (Red listed.....ie of highest conservation concern))  Great Spotted Woodpecker woodland  Linnet meadow, scrub (Red listed)</p> <p>Note that the Red and Amber listing system is used by the British Trust for Ornithology to show levels of conservation concern. The park is habitat for at least 4 on the list and others seen less frequently using the park such as Swift and Mistle Thrush, which I have not included.</p> <p>I understand that a fuller list of birds appears in Appendix 9, but this is very confusing list as some species were recorded once historically and would quite a stir amongst birders if they appeared again...Arctic Tern, Willow Tit and Red Breasted Goose (these are seriously rare birds in West Kent) for example.....so in that sense it is not very helpful. Turtle Dove has not been recorded there for many years. Why not include the breeding bird list that I have sent you previously, as an additional appendix.</p> <p>I also note (being an ex teacher) a number of spelling mistakes within the bird names in Appendix 9.....corrected versions follow.....Bittern, Cetti's warbler, Barnacle goose, Brambling, Shoveler, Snipe. And note, the word "duck" does not need to appear after Gadwall, Goldeneye, Shoveler, Smew, Teal, Wigeon and Sparrowhawk is one word.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p><b>Proposed amendment</b> - Add latest breeding bird data to Appendix 9 by using the symbol † by the species.</p> <p>Update spelling</p>
<p>3. Heusenstamm Friendship Circle</p>	<p>I am pleased that the Heusenstamm Friendship Circle is a stakeholder. Our main interest, of course, is the Friendship Wood, created from saplings donated by Heusenstamm after the 1987 storm, and the Friendship bridge.</p> <p>We welcome the draft plan, which could not be more thorough. The aim to make the park more user friendly, without</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p><b>Comments noted</b></p>

	<p>compromising it as a Nature Reserve, including access to the Friendship Wood, will help more people to become aware of the twinning link. We will continue to work closely with the Volunteers and yourselves for our mutual benefit - and look forward to seeing the bluebells in bloom! Keep up the good work.</p>	
<p><b>4. Leigh Parish Council</b></p>	<p>Leigh Parish Council supports the new management plan for Haysden Country Park.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p>
<p><b>5. Tonbridge Town Sailing Club</b></p>	<p>P7 table 2 TTSC operate March to November</p> <p>P34 - No longer do taster days</p> <p>P43 Triswim operate Monday / Wednesday / Fridays evenings</p> <p>P13 - Should there be mention of the Leigh Barrier flood relief scheme?</p> <p>P24 - Should there be mention of mink and other invasive species here – there is in on p60 No 37</p> <p>P44-46 - Constraining factors – should there be mention of the Flood relief scheme here and the impact over the next few years of the work?</p>	<p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – update as requested.</p> <p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – update as requested.</p> <p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – update as requested</p> <p>See comments below</p> <p>Mink appears in Appendix 9, but is not a protected species so is not listed in table 6.</p> <p>See comments below</p>
<p><b>6. Local Resident</b></p>	<p>Parts are a bit confusing.</p> <p>P14 para 5, 6 - Cycle paths need to be levelled and extended around both sides of the lake.</p>	<p><b>Comments noted</b></p> <p>The cycle route passes through the park and already has a dedicated path around one side of Barden lake. As cycling is not permitted in other parts of</p>

	Also the surface in the wooded area needs to be safer.	the park no changes are necessary.  Paths are inspected for safety and repairs are carried out as required.
<b>7. Environment Agency</b>	<p>For information you should be aware of the Leigh flood storage area expansion scheme, which is ongoing. This will increase the amount of flood water stored within the storage area in the future.</p> <p>A flood risk activity permit may be required for any proposed activities near watercourses classified as Main River, or near Environment Agency maintained flood defences. Please refer to the below information.</p> <p><b>Environmental permit - advice to applicant</b> The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal);</li> <li>- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal);</li> <li>- on or within 16 metres of a sea defence;</li> <li>- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert;</li> <li>- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.</li> </ul>	<b>Proposed amendment</b> – Add information requested to the constraints section within the Plan and review and expand reference to the Leigh flood storage expansion scheme in liaison with the Environment Agency.
<b>8. Tonbridge Bicycle User Group</b>	<p>Comments related to the Tonbridge the Penshurst Cycle Route which passes though the park:</p> <p>PROPOSALS 1: HAYSDEN WATER We propose the re-establishment of the paths around the north</p>	Project 70 within the Action Plan identifies the need to 'Review cycling provision within the site'. It is, therefore proposed that the comments from the Tonbridge Bicycle Club User Group be

	<p>side of Haysden Water for the use of cyclists and wheelchair users in addition to its current designation as part of the Eden Valley Walk long distance path, using the existing concrete roadway to cross the flood barrier. The Sailing Club's security measures currently make access difficult to everyone except walkers along that roadway.</p> <p><b>PROPOSALS 2: FLOOD BARRIER</b>  The flood barrier is a significant obstacle if approached at right angles, as it is with the current bridleway. An easier crossing can be achieved by a diagonal approach, reducing the gradient and the effort needed. There is an opportunity to incorporate a new multi-use crossing, [which could also benefit the Sailing Club], as part of the proposed works to strengthen the flood barrier. The detailed form of this needs to be discussed with the Environment Agency, particularly regarding the future linking with routes avoiding Lower Haysden Lane.</p> <p><b>PROPOSALS 3: LOWER HAYSDEN LANE</b>  We propose making the lane a 'cycling priority' route from the Haysden Country Park access to the A21 bridge by painting white lines 1.5 metres apart down the centre of the road and limiting vehicle traffic to 20mph.</p>	<p>fed into that review.</p> <p>The specific comments relating to the Leigh Flood Barrier will be passed to the Environment Agency.</p>
<p><b>9. Tonbridge River Trips</b></p>	<p>Misspelling of Bream</p> <p>Glow worms suggest adding to P26 Table</p> <p>Name correction P7 tables 2 &amp; 28 to Tonbridge River Trips</p> <p>P13 or 44/45 Land flooding – should there be more or a separate section relating to access control during flooding to</p>	<p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – correct spelling</p> <p>Whilst all insects are important, Glow worms have little protective designation at this time</p> <p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – amend as requested.</p> <p>See comments above</p>

	safeguard the public?	
<b>10. Local Resident</b>	<p>The speed limit on the lane is too high for motor traffic mixing with cyclists and pedestrians. This should be maximum 20mph. I said people are forced to drive their kids to park because they feel unsafe walking or cycling.</p> <p>Investing in cycling should be a priority both because of health (air quality) and the Climate Emergency. I suggested that if the new development take place, the developer be required to provide off road walking and cycle routes parallel to the existing lane as far as the sailing lake.</p>	<p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – Add pedestrian/cycling access along Lower Haysden Lane to ‘Weaknesses’ in the SWOT analysis and add a corresponding ‘Opportunity’ to improve. Add a Project to the Action Plan to support the provision of designated pedestrian/cycle access along the section of road. Speed limits on the road are, however, not set by the Borough Council.</p>
<b>11. Covid 19 (added after public consultation – see section 1.3 in main report)</b>	See Section 1.3 in main Report	<p><b>Proposed amendment</b> – Add ‘Civil Emergencies’ to ‘Threats’ in the SWOT at Table 11. Add a new Project to the Action Plan to ‘Review the impact of Covid 19 on management of the site in both the short and long term.’</p>