



The Cam Valley Forum is an unincorporated association, registered with HMRC as a charity.

info@camvalleyforum.uk
<https://camvalleyforum.uk>

Stephen Tomkins
Chairman
Cam Valley Forum

27th March 2022

This response is from a small group of the Cam Valley Forum committee.

We do congratulate the City team on their efforts for this important wetland /meadows site at the heart of the city. It is hugely valued by a small but significant group of supporters.

Our issues are with (a) Management aspects (b) Hydro-topological aspects (c) Ecological aspects and (c) Introductions of flora.

(a) **Management.** Many wildlife site future plans are built up without some cast-iron guarantee of future financial support, authority support and manpower & machinery support. All these are pretty vital. Ideally there needs to be some strong link between the 'Friends' of Logan's Meadows and the City Councils management team, and other bodies. Guy Belcher is very familiar with the operation of other sites in this regard, but Officers and Councillors need to understand this aspect of sites as well. Neglect of good ecological management, working to an evidence-based approach in conjunction with, for example, the Wildlife Trust could, if neglected, make all such good intentions to fail. One element of this is what one might call 'consensual community wardening'. Whose 'say-so' is followed? Is signage appropriate and positive in its messaging, etc.

(b) **Hydro-topology.** Open freshwater sites are rare in the City. Ideally they should be served by a near continuous in flow of water appropriate in quality and quantity. Might it be possible to engineer better water supplies to the site. In terms of existing natural streams and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS), or in terms of small stream diversions to the site is there any possibility of avoiding the eutrophic silted stagnant pond scenario? Could this question be more fully examined? In terms of pre-planning we see this as the weakest link.

(c) **Ecological aspects.** In terms of ponds, all ponds will silt up eventually. Either de-silting needs to be in the management cycle or some ponds should usefully, for wildlife, be quite deep (always >1.0 metre deep). Newt and frog ponds need to fish free and need to occasionally dry up to continue to be fish free. A diversity of depths of small ponds favours a greater diversity of damsel and dragon flies. etc. Achieving a stable flower rich meadow flora requires avoidance of trampling and a regular mowing regime. Can this be clear to visitors? The provision of open ball playing space is clearly important and wanted. Does playing field status mean that dogs are excluded? This might be hard to police, but dogs off leads will not be nearly so conducive to good wildlife management as their being on leads and this less good than them being not there at all. Is it to be primarily or secondarily a Nature Reserve?

(d) **Introduction of Flora.** There is much to be said for appropriate introductions. There are many good reasons for tree planting. Focus on appropriate native species of alder and willow will support insect life, as will appropriate meadows management of trees by pollarding, etc. Trees like *Salix babylonica* (weeping willow) are popular but are non native and add less to biodiversity. The most endangered of all environments is wet meadow communities and grazing pasture. These two do require a lot of ground water and a lot of unshaded area. Where there are wet ditches Purple Loosestrife and Meadow Sweet could usefully be encouraged. Great Reedmace is an over ready invader and may well need weeding out of wetlands.