

## Appendix 1 - Grassland types and management

### 1. Types of grassland

One or more may apply:

- Ryegrass or short-term ley (grazed or cut)
- Herbal or multi-species ley (grazed or cut)
- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland (tall grasses, little or not managed, +/- scrub)
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded)
- Heathland (grassland, small shrubs such as heather and gorse, +/- trees)
- Wood pasture (large trees, grazed grass, often old parkland)
- Horse or other eg llama paddock
- Large lawn or garden
- Amenity, recreation or school ground
- Churchyard
- Land by railway or highway
- Other grassland

### 2. Soil types

One or more may apply:

- Heavy (clay)
- Light (sand or chalk)
- Medium (loamy)

### 3. Soil acidity

One or more may apply:

- Acid (pH generally <5.5)
- Neutral (pH generally 5-6.5)
- Alkaline (pH generally > 6)

### 4. Species richness

- Difficult to evaluate, or mainly scrub or non-grassland habitat

Or if can be evaluated, at least 2 of the 3 must apply in each category:

- Species-rich:** 15+ species/m<sup>2</sup> including grasses **OR** less than 10% ryegrass/amenity grass and white clover **OR** more than 30% wildflowers and sedges, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds
- Semi-improved:** 9+ species/m<sup>2</sup> including grasses **OR** less than 10% ryegrass/amenity grass and white clover **OR** more than 10% wildflowers and sedges, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds

- Species poor improved:** more than 30% ryegrass/amenity grass and white clover **OR** up to 8 species/m<sup>2</sup> including grasses **OR** less than 10% wildflowers and sedges, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds

## 5. Management

- Unmanaged

Or if managed, one or more may apply:

By cutting:

- Cut for hay
- Cut for silage
- Cut for haylage
- Topped or mown, cuttings removed
- Topped or mown, cuttings not removed

By grazing:

- Grazed by cattle
- Grazed by sheep
- Grazed by horses
- Grazed by other livestock

## Appendix 2 - Costs and returns for grassland management relevant to grassland

### From John Nix farm Management Pocketbook 2019

		£ low	£ high	Unit
<b>Fencing (labour and materials)</b>	stockproof, posts, stock netting and 2 strands barbed wire	£ 5.15	£ 8.74	m
<b>Brush cutting</b>	(from 'conservation costs' section)	£	16.00	hr
<b>Grazing and rearing charges:</b>	Summer grazing with sheep (ewes with lambs)	£ 0.45	£ 0.70	per head per week
	Winter grazing with sheep	£ 0.30	£ 0.50	per head per week
	Summer grazing with store cattle	£ 2.00	£ 3.00	per head per week
<b>Grass keep, low quality</b>	NB little or no charge where maintenance is the driving factor	£ 62.00	£ 90.00	ha
<b>Grassland establishment</b>	wildflower meadow ground preparation	£ 210.00	£ 310.00	ha
	red clover ley seed price		£ 132.00	ha
	wildflower meadow seed price		£ 330.00	ha
<b>Gross margins:</b>	Store cattle keeping summer	£	215.00	head
	Upland spring lambs	£	39.00	head
	Lowland spring lambs	£	48.00	head
<b>Standard man days requirements</b>	For rough grazing		0.2	ha
	For haymaking		1.8	ha

### From McVeigh Parker (all plus VAT)

		£	Unit
<b>Portable cattle handling system</b>		£ 1,387.31	each
<b>6 rail hurdle for cattle</b>	3+ m width	£ 93.79	each
<b>Cattle hurdles kit</b>	3+ m width 10 hurdles + bars	£ 879.80	each
<b>Portable sheep race</b>		£ 606.08	each
<b>6 rail hurdle for sheep</b>	3+ m width	£ 79.55	each
<b>Electric netting for sheep</b>	50 m roll x 0.9 m height + 15 insulated posts + 9 electroplastic twines	£ 71.40	each
<b>Livestock water trough</b>	4' length	£ 72.64	each
<b>Sheep water trough</b>	15 gallon capacity	£ 57.52	each
<b>Float ball valve kit for trough</b>		£ 10.87	each
<b>Service box for trough</b>		£ 22.02	each

### Enterprise costs relevant to grassland management

<b>Output</b>	Sales of stock (less purchases)	
	Sales of wool	
	Sales of forage or seed	
	Other produce	
<b>Costs - variable</b>	Feed	Concentrate
	Forage feed	Hay, grass, silage, haylage
	Vet and med	
	Bedding	Straw
	Forage estab	Seed, ferts, sprays
	Other costs	Transport, market expenses and levies, recording, consumable stores, e.g. tags, markers etc
<b>Costs - fixed</b>	Labour	Wages, contract labour and casual wages
	Power & machinery	Machinery repairs, depreciation & leasing, fuel, electricity, general contract and hire, tax and insurance
	Administration	Insurance, office costs (incl. fees for professional services) and misc. sundries
	Property charges	Water, council tax, and farm and property repairs
	Land resource costs	Rent and rented land
	Machinery & fixtures	Machinery depreciation, fixtures depreciation, machinery and equipment leasing
	Finance costs	HP interest, mortgage interest, loan interest, current account charges and interest
	Other costs	



(/index.php)

Search ...

MENU

Go

You are here:

## High Weald Grassland Management Questionnaire

The High Weald is a known refuge for species-rich grassland and the area is well placed to benefit from future government investment in it as a 'public good'. However, we are aware that land managers need more support to manage and restore these grasslands.

If you have grassland in or around the High Weald, please take 10-15 minutes to answer this questionnaire; the information will be used to guide future support for grassland management. All completed forms will be entered into a draw to win a mixed crate of Harvey's bottled beers.

Please respond by **Monday 18 February**.

If you would like a paper copy of this survey please call 01424 723011 or email [info@highweald.org](mailto:info@highweald.org).

Area of your holding (please specify if area is ha or acres)

Nearest village or town

### Types of grassland

**Q1: What types of grassland do you have on your holding? (Please tick all relevant)**

- Ryegrass or short-term ley (grazed or cut)
- Herbal or multi-species ley (grazed or cut)
- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland (tall grasses, little or not managed, +/- scrub)
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded)
- Heathland (grassland, small shrubs such as heather and gorse, +/- trees)
- Wood pasture (large trees, grazed grass, often old parkland)
- Horse or other e.g. llama paddock
- Large lawn or garden
- Other

If you selected Other please specify what that is?

In future, would you like / do you plan to make either of these changes to your grassland?  
Please tick all relevant.

- Increasing production from your grassland
- Making it more species-rich/improving its value for wildlife

### Managing your grassland

**Q2: How do you manage your grassland?** (Please tick all relevant)

#### By cutting:

- Cut by you
- Cut by a contractor
- Cut for hay
- Cut for silage
- Topped only, cuttings removed

Topped only, cuttings not removed

Other

**If you selected Other please specify what that is?**

**By grazing:**

Your own stock

A grazier brings stock in

A neighbour grazes for you

Tenanted out

Other

**If you selected Other please specify what that is?**

**Paying for management**

**Q3: How do you pay for the management of your grassland? (Please tick all relevant)**

Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales

Supported by agri-environment scheme and/or Basic Payment Scheme

Both of the above

A hobby or interest and entirely self-funded

Other

**If you selected Other please specify what that is?**

**In your view, does your grassland provide any other services of value? (Please tick all relevant).**

Flood alleviation

Water purification

Carbon storage

- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being
- Other

**If you selected Other please specify what that is?**

### Advice and information

**Q4: What sources of advice and information do you use for grassland management?  
(Please tick all relevant)**

- Land agent e.g. CLM, Batcheller Monkhouse, Cluttons, Strutt and Parker
- Industry bodies such as AHDB (Agriculture & Horticulture Development board)
- Local group such as Small Farm Training Group (SFTG)
- Natural England
- High Weald AONB Partnership/ Weald Meadows Initiative
- Other agents e.g. FWAG
- Conservation organisation e.g. Sussex or Kent Wildlife Trust, Buglife
- Websites / online
- Other

**If you selected Other please specify what that is?**

### Environmental schemes

**Q5: Do you manage, or have you in the past managed, your grassland in any environmental (agri-environment) scheme? (Please tick all relevant)**

- None
- Countryside Stewardship Mid Tier
- Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier

- Environmental Stewardship (current)
- Environmental Stewardship (expired)
- Old Countryside Stewardship

#### Future scheme

**Q6: The future 'Environmental Land Management (ELM)' agri-environment scheme could work very differently - with payment by results, leaving the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates. Would this kind of scheme appeal to you in managing your grassland?**

- Yes
- No

**If no, why not (and/or any other comments)?**

#### Land management plan

**Q7: ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser. Does this approach appeal to you?**

- Yes
- No

**If no, why not (and/or any other comments)**

#### What help would be useful?

**Q8: If you answered yes to Q7, what kind of help would be most useful? (Please give numerical answers on a scale of 1-4 where 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important)**

##### Management information – paper based

1  2  3  4

##### Management information – web based

1  2  3  4

**Training courses and workshops**

1  2  3  4

**Group visits to other grassland sites**

1  2  3  4

**One-off visit from an adviser**

1  2  3  4

**Regular visit from an adviser**

1  2  3  4

**Adviser help to produce a land management plan**

1  2  3  4

**Other**

1  2  3  4

**If you chose other please specify****Evaluation and monitoring**

**Q9: ELM is likely to require the land manager to do some of their own evaluation and monitoring of results.**

Below are the definitions of semi-improved and species-rich grassland used in Countryside Stewardship (at least 2 of the 3 must apply):

**Semi-improved:** 9+ species/m<sup>2</sup> including grasses OR less than 10% ryegrass and white clover OR more than 10% wildflowers and sedges, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds

**Species-rich:** 15+ species/m<sup>2</sup> including grasses OR less than 10% ryegrass and white clover OR more than 30% wildflowers and sedges, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds

**How confident would you be in assessing your own grassland using these definitions?  
(Please tick the relevant box below)**

- Very confident
- Quite confident
- Not very confident
- Not confident at all

**Q10: 'Soil health' is also becoming more recognised including factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, and indicators such as earthworm numbers. How knowledgeable do you feel about soil health in general? (Please tick the relevant box below)**

- Very confident
- Quite confident
- Not very confident
- Not confident at all

**Have you recently obtained information on your soil's health?**

- Yes
- No

**If yes, did you: (Please tick all relevant)**

- Take samples and analyse them yourself
- Take samples and send them for laboratory analysis yourself
- Get someone else to take the samples and send them for laboratory analysis
- A combination of all of the above

**If no, why not (and/or any other comments)**

**Obstacles to management**

**Q11: Finally, are there any obstacles for you in managing your grassland? (Please give numerical answers on a scale of 1-4 where 1 = a very big obstacle 2 = a big obstacle 3 = a small obstacle 4 = not an obstacle)**

**Poor returns from keeping livestock**

1  2  3  4

**Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly**

1  2  3  4

**Lack of livestock management experience**

1  2  3  4

**Lack of species-rich grassland management experience**

1  2  3  4

**Unable to get a contractor to take a hay cut**

1  2  3  4

**No land or facilities to overwinter livestock**

1  2  3  4

**Lack of suitable machinery for example hay cutting, weed control**

1  2  3  4

**Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair**

1  2  3  4

**Difficult vehicular access**

1  2  3  4

**Fields do not have a water supply**

1  2  3  4

**Lack of secure tenancy on land**

1  2  3  4

**Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB**

1  2  3  4

**Lack of funds to pay for an adviser**

1  2  3  4

**Public access issues eg dogs**

1  2  3  4

**Difficulties finding a useful adviser**

1  2  3  4

**Enthusiasm to manage my grassland**

1  2  3  4

**Please specify any other important obstacles you face:****Please add any other comments or observations:**

**We do not need your contact details for this survey. However if you would like to enter the prize draw and/or keep in touch with us please supply your email address. Your personal information will be kept private and held securely and will not be shared by us.**

**Name****Email**

- Please tick if you would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grassland management events programme 2019.
- Please tick if you would like to join a focus group to discuss future support for the High Weald's grassland managers.
- Please tick if you would like to receive our monthly e-News. You can unsubscribe at any time.

**Thank you for completing this survey**

submit

*Popular Articles*

Woodland carbon storage (</420-home/research-reports/1493-carbon-storage-woodlands.html>)

Making of the High Weald (</420-home/research-reports/88-making-of-the-high-weald.html>)

[Wind energy assessment \(/420-home/research-reports/86-wind-energy-assessment-for-the-high-weald.html\)](/420-home/research-reports/86-wind-energy-assessment-for-the-high-weald.html)

[High Weald Landscape Trail \(/explore-sussex/walking/625-high-weald-landscape-trail.html\)](/explore-sussex/walking/625-high-weald-landscape-trail.html)

[Where is the High Weald? \(/learn-about/about-aonbs/high-weald-boundary.html\)](/learn-about/about-aonbs/high-weald-boundary.html)

[Self-guided circular walks \(/explore-sussex/walking/627-walks.html\)](/explore-sussex/walking/627-walks.html)

## *Latest Articles*

[Help with Sussex Lund grant applications \(/news/2353-help-with-sussex-lund-grant-applications.html\)](/news/2353-help-with-sussex-lund-grant-applications.html)

[Dark skies and starry nights in the High Weald \(/news/2352-dark-skies-and-starry-nights-in-the-high-weald.html\)](/news/2352-dark-skies-and-starry-nights-in-the-high-weald.html)

[Explore the High Weald this winter \(/news/2342-explore-the-wild-high-weald-this-winter.html\)](/news/2342-explore-the-wild-high-weald-this-winter.html)

[70th Anniversary celebrations for High Weald AONB \(/news/2350-70th-anniversary-celebrations-for-high-weald-aonb.html\)](/news/2350-70th-anniversary-celebrations-for-high-weald-aonb.html)

[Grants of up to £10,000 available to conserve and improve High Weald landscape \(/news/2351-grants-available-to-conserve-and-improve-high-weald-landscape.html\)](/news/2351-grants-available-to-conserve-and-improve-high-weald-landscape.html)

## *Quick Links*

[Boundary map \(/learn-about/about-aonbs/high-weald-boundary.html\)](/learn-about/about-aonbs/high-weald-boundary.html)

[High Weald Species \(/learn-about/eye-spy/high-weald-species.html\)](/learn-about/eye-spy/high-weald-species.html)

[Exploring Ideas \(/explore-sussex.html\)](/explore-sussex.html)

[Walks and Rides \(/explore-sussex/walking.html\)](/explore-sussex/walking.html)

## *Your High Weald*

[Schools & education \(/learn-about/education.html\)](/learn-about/education.html)

[Landowners \(/look-after/land-management.html\)](/look-after/land-management.html)

[Visitors & leisure \(/explore-sussex.html\)](/explore-sussex.html)

[Local authority & policy makers \(/downloads/publications/high-weald-aonb-management-plan-documents.html\)](/downloads/publications/high-weald-aonb-management-plan-documents.html)

[Contact Us \(/contact-us.html\)](/contact-us.html)

[About Us \(/about-the-high-weald-unit.html\)](/about-the-high-weald-unit.html)

[Site Map \(/site-map.html\)](/site-map.html)

[Contacts DB \(http://www.highwealdaonb.co.uk/index.php\)](http://www.highwealdaonb.co.uk/index.php)

(<http://www.landscapesforlife.org.uk/>)



## Appendix 3a- Interview 1

**Location: Rolvenden**

**Area: 1012 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: woodland, arable, fruit, grassland, diversification**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Ryegrass or short-term ley (grazed or cut) – mostly for silage
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland - 30 year ex set aside
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded) – along the Hexden
- Wood pasture - parkland
- Arable reversion to grassland in HLS
- Horse paddock – 2 ha
- Large lawn or garden

Future plans to make changes to grassland:

- Increasing production from my grassland
- Making it more species rich / improving its value for wildlife

Other remarks / discussion points: estate management rather than farming, running a diversified business including public access and events.

On changes: need to change the designation of some land to reflect aspirations and knowledge. Some will come out of ELS EK2/3 to be better utilised, some will go into low/no input grassland in the parkland

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor - tenant
- Cut for hay – a bit
- Cut for silage – mostly
- Other - weed wiping

By grazing:

- Tenanted out
- Grazed by cattle
- Grazed by sheep – the [slight] majority of stock

Other remarks / discussion points: all the grassland is grazed at some point

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Supported by HLS and Basic Payment Scheme
- Other - grazing rent at £15/acre; without HLS/BPS income this would have to be £40/acre

### Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Water purification
- Carbon storage
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being
- Other - diversity

Other remarks / discussion points: the land is in an NVZ and no nitrates are applied

### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Other agent – FWAG (past Stewardship scheme applications)
- Weald Meadows Initiative – created 2 small wildflower areas
- Conservation organisation e.g. Sussex or Kent Wildlife Trust, Buglife
- Other – press

Other remarks / discussion points: High Weald AONB information is aimed at people with bits of land, not at estates; I am doing a good job, if not perfect

### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Environmental Stewardship (current) – ELS/HLS done 10 years, got an extension in 2019 then apply for Countryside Stewardship to start 2021, which will include the woods
- Old Countryside Stewardship Scheme
- Other - Sussex Lund, EWGS

### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

It has to appeal, because that's where the money will be. I've got Stewardship scheme land, I can't plough it, so I feel they've got us – we have to do what they say.

I'm not keen on some of the things I might have to do, like proving an orchid is flowering – it will be more work.

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

This approach appeals to me

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

Other remarks / discussion points: I will not be able to do this myself. I would not be able to apply to the (current) Countryside Stewardship without help

#### Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

1 Management information – paper based

1 Management information – web based

1 One-off visit from an adviser

1 Regular visit from an adviser

1 Adviser help to produce a land management plan

2 Training courses and workshops

2 Group visits to other grassland sites

Other remarks / discussion points: if I were to be a 'guinea pig' in a new scheme, I would need help. There are advantages and disadvantages of being the first in a new scheme.

#### Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

Quite confident – I would need help in the first instance to explain it

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

Not knowledgeable at all

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

No

Other remarks / discussion points:

## Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

1 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair - not worth fencing in some places for the returns

1 Public access issues eg dogs – round the village; danger to pedestrians, and animals; there is a lack of knowledge in people now

2 Other - aspirations of outside bodies eg Wildlife Site designation, KWT saying what they want from the land

4 Lack of livestock management experience - I get it through my grazier

4 Poor returns from keeping livestock – the grazier takes the risk

4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly – people are desperate for grass

4 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock – got this

4 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control

4 Fields do not have a water supply – OK here

4 Lack of secure tenancy on land – grazier has 12 month licence

4 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB – not in this area

4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland

4 Difficult vehicular access

4 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser

4 Difficulties finding a useful adviser

Other comments or observations:

There is some land that EA won't stop draining – turning off the pump and turning it into an environmental site would be an alternative and at no cost

Other remarks / discussion points: I won't be able to change my HLS if I extend but it's a guaranteed income for a year, and Natural England are keen to encourage it. There is no straight option for option swap in CS – grassland will have to get in on its merits

- Would like to join a focus group to further discuss future support for grassland managers - if I thought it would have an effect on the process or be educational
  
- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Very well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

It's covered cutting the hedges every other year, weed wiping thistles, fencing. I can't put a figure on these costs, but it's less than the income figure below. If I was farming myself, growing wheat wouldn't cover the costs – I get BPS, £15/ac grass rent and HLS, producing >£200/ac [total] income. That's the dilemma coming out of schemes – what replaces that £200?

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

It has not worked as well as it might. There's a conflict; the grazier wants to maximise his outputs - he can't put fertiliser on but will put as many sheep on as he can to recover the cost of the rent – and I want to deliver Stewardship. I should have put a stocking density on [the land] – it's grazed too hard to let the wildflowers flourish

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

QUESTION NOT ASKED IN THIS INTERVIEW

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Quite well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

There have been some successes eg Beech estate. Stewardship schemes will have worked to help the NVZ too. But a lot of farmers think they shouldn't be looking at Stewardship schemes at all; they don't like being public information, or having designations

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes

Why / why not and/or any other comments

Yes with the right management and the right local knowledge; advisers all having an input.

A scheme has got to be prescriptive – if you are told what to do eg x LU/ha, you will understand.

There have to be simple instructions / guidelines, based on local input and knowledge.

## Appendix 3a - Interview 2

**Location: Battle**

**Area: 809 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: woodland, arable, grassland, diversification**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland – a bit, being grazed
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded) – a couple of bits on the river
- Horse paddock
- Large lawn or garden

Future plans to make changes to grassland:

- Making it more species rich / improving its value for wildlife

Other remarks / discussion points: with own source of seed – better to use it ourselves and enhance what we've got

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor
- Cut for hay
- Topped only, cuttings removed – thistles
- Other – bracken cut round field edges

By grazing:

- Own stock – on the wildflower meadow, so I can move them when I want
- A grazier brings stock in – in partnership; he owns some, I own the rest
- Grazed by sheep

Other remarks / discussion points: it almost needs micro-management – get stock on and off when they are needed

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Supported by agri-environment scheme and/or Basic Payment Scheme

Other services of value the grassland provides

- Carbon storage
- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being
- Other – visits for local schools and interested conservation groups

Other remarks / discussion points: I did have permissive access but I removed it – there were control issues

#### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Land agent e.g. CLM, Batcheller Monkhouse, Cluttons, Strutt and Parker
- Natural England
- High Weald AONB Partnership, Weald Meadows Initiative
- Websites / online

Other remarks / discussion points: I did not get a response from the Wildlife Trust about assessing my grassland. Would I work in collaboration with others in a future scheme; I don't at the moment, though I'm applying for a Lund grant for machinery that will be a group resource. I'd welcome more cooperation, I think it's a hugely unfulfilled area at the moment, and it would be hugely beneficial.

#### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier – woodland, grassland, arable margins, wild bird seed mix
- Environmental Stewardship (expired) - HLS
- Old Countryside Stewardship Scheme – not to the same extent as now
- Other – Sussex Lund for hedging along farm drive)

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

Yes as long as it values what you have already got

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

This approach appeals to me

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

Yeas as long as that person exists and if it an external advise that I choose

Other remarks / discussion points:

Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Management information – paper based
- 1 Management information – web based
- 1 Adviser help to produce a land management plan
- 1 One-off visit from an adviser
- 2 Regular visit from an adviser
- 3 Group visits to other grassland sites
- 3 Training courses and workshops

Other remarks / discussion points:

Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

Not confident at all – unless obviously species-rich

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

Not knowledgeable at all

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

No

Other remarks / discussion points: I got an adviser in to do a full study of the 2 fields for Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier

Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Poor returns from keeping livestock

- 2 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control – looking to buy equipment (via Lund) to share
- 2 Livestock are restricted in their movements - by management of the meadows; I want them on to the beginning of March, then off - but where do I put them after that?
- 3 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly
- 4 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock
- 4 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair – fencing the whole area through CSHT
- 4 Fields do not have a water supply
- 4 Lack of secure tenancy on land
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland
- 4 Difficult vehicular access
- 4 Public access issues eg dogs
- 4 Difficulties finding a useful adviser

Other comments or observations:

Other remarks / discussion points: Countryside Stewardship is too restrictive - even if you want to do something that's better, you can't do it eg put wildflower seed into a field margin, because you would need to harrow it, although it is 'over and above', and no cost to the scheme. A rule that cuts across what is otherwise ideal management. The scheme is always looking for people trying to dodge the rules, it doesn't allow for people doing more

- Would like to join a focus group to further discuss future support for grassland managers
- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Very well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

CSHT is worth about £26K / year, with management payments + supplements, and capital works covering about 50% of costs are £45K.

Costs are about £15K on 180 acres. Wildflower seed cost about £550, but I've not done it for 3 years, I'd rather spread it myself. Costs of creating more wildflower areas are not factored in (spreading, rowing, harrowing etc.) - Stewardship schemes should pay to create more, then value it once it's created. Scheme rules are useful but there should be more interpretation, and a base payment plus additional funding for creating more – there is no incentive otherwise.

There should be more encouragement to go beyond the basics - working at a higher level, so all wildflower hay has a use; it's almost a waste product at the moment (horse people don't like it though it's more diverse and has nutrients)

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

You need information on what you have to start with - dormice, yellowhammers. There should be more trust given to managers, who've been looking after [land] for a long time before schemes came along, to do the right thing

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Yes

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

Base payment rates are quite reasonable but they should attribute more value to the natural capital they bring rather than being restrictive about what you can and can't do – incentivise more, for people to do more, go above and beyond.

A payment to establish [an option] followed by a payment to look after it for eg 5 years. For example joining up with the local community for them to benefit from wildflower seed, happy if paid to do it

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Quite well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

It needs more push to get more people to do it, and a value on environmental improvement. Not just being happy with what we've got.

The High Weald is not the best farmland to have stock on over winter.

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes

Why / why not and/or any other comments

Yes if it turns out to be more flexible, if not people will not be taking it up and won't do it

### Appendix 3a - Interview 3

**Location: Hadlow Down**

**Area: 19 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: permanent grassland**

#### Q1 Types of grassland

- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland (tall grasses, little or not managed, +/- scrub)
- Horse paddock – very small
- Large lawn or garden

Future plans to make changes to grassland: none

Other remarks / discussion points:

#### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor – local farmer
- Cut for hay – thistle problem; often goes for silage even if meant for hay
- Cut for silage – often late cut

By grazing:

- Own stock – 9
- A grazier brings stock in – loose arrangement, no agreement, have had bad experiences in the past
- Grazed by cattle - will be this year
- Grazed by sheep
- Grazed by other livestock - a pony

Other remarks / discussion points: always had tenant flocks, then own flock (now down to 9) – organising cattle for this year. I have a fixed date for cutting in Stewardship scheme so I can't cut before this even if it's ready, but cutting after this date I may wait for contractor so it gets later or not cut at all.

#### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Supported by agri-environment scheme and Basic Payment Scheme

Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Water purification
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being

Other remarks / discussion points:

#### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Other agent – FWAG, Kate Ryland
- Local group such as Small Farm Training Group (SFTG)
- Natural England\*
- High Weald AONB Partnership, Weald Meadows Initiative
- Websites / online
- Other – reference books eg RSPB

Other remarks / discussion points: \*not much support from NE – started on HLS with a good adviser (accessible, common sense) and I wasn't frightened of getting penalised. That person went and after that the tone changed – I felt as if I was on the other side of the fence. Getting more help now from NE with the extension than I did before

#### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Environmental Stewardship (current) - ELS/HLS done 10 years, got an extension in 2019 (1-year rolling extension over 4 years)

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

You can't always do the right thing at the right time [in Stewardship schemes]. More support would help keep people on board, doing the right thing and not penalised

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

This approach appeals to me

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

Your observations of your land and the wildlife using it changes over time – something you didn't know at the time, you'd like to do now (like field corners in grassland). The scheme needs to evolve with the observations of what's needed

Other remarks / discussion points:

Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

1 Management information – paper based

1 Management information – web based

1 Training courses and workshops

1 Group visits to other grassland sites – I'm always wanting to visit other peoples' land

1 Regular visit from an adviser

1 Adviser help to produce a land management plan

1 Other - a list of advisers (that I pay for or to do with the scheme) who have specialities

2 One-off visit from an adviser

Other remarks / discussion points: very useful to have a third party input – to see your land contextually, and with people coming on your land who have an idea of the land around you

Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

Quite confident - wildflowers

Not confident at all – grasses

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

Not knowledgeable at all

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

No - but I'm low input and no chemicals

Other remarks / discussion points: I wouldn't want to be responsible for monitoring in a results based scheme and at the end of it they said I had not got the results

## Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Unable to get a contractor to take a hay cut – but not currently a problem
- 1 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly – ditto
- 1 Public access issues eg dogs
- 1 Other - fallow deer are a big problem and destroy habitat, see below
- 2 Difficulties finding a useful adviser –more a question of conflicting advice, I need to get a second opinion sometimes
- 3 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock – but I can only house my own stock
- 4 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control
- 4 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair
- 4 Fields do not have a water supply
- 4 Lack of secure tenancy on land
- 4 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB –responsibility of grazier
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland
- 4 Difficult vehicular access
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Poor returns from keeping livestock
- 4 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser

Other comments or observations:

Deer – I often want to use an electric fence [round grass fields] but can't because deer get caught in it or knock it down. It affects woodland management too, new cut coppice needs to be protected with a 'dead hedge' of brushwood but it doesn't always work

Other remarks / discussion points: money needed for appropriate deer fencing

- Would like to join a focus group to further discuss future support for grassland managers
- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Very well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

Stewardship scheme has enabled me to do what I would have done anyway (on a non-commercial farm). I don't know what I would have done without HLS as a non-commercial landowner. The stock are only there for conservation based ideals.

Costs – I have a tractor and topper, there is the cost of diesel. Occasionally I pay for someone to top grass. Mostly I do my own fencing

The contractor takes a late cut and doesn't see it as commercially viable so the grass gets used for low-grade silage. He takes the crop as payment I don't get any money for it.

The cutting dates are constraining – it would be better if they were agreed on a year-by-year basis instead of always after 16<sup>th</sup> July. It would help with thistle control (these are there as a direct result of not being able to cut earlier) and there could be a return on the crop

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

The funding holds the site in stasis – without NE being able to come out and give help, give derogations and say you can do this or that. Thistles are an example – you need constant advice to know you are not going to be penalised.

The aims of Stewardship are great, but it has not worked as well as it could have done.

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Not sure - I would need more information

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

If there were no support payments; most people with land in this area are self-supporting eg they have bought the land with a house. It's not feasible to be supported on this land. There is a sense of legacy, of passing the land on

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

I don't know many people in schemes so I can't really answer

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes

Why / why not and/or any other comments

Anything with more advisers, and advice.

Continued, more regular advice will be better.

A register of graziers, who are accredited, would be useful. People who need access to land, and people with areas of land looking for stock. Like e-bay, gather points if people 'like' you

## Appendix 3a - Interview 4

**Location: Windmill Hill, Robertsbridge, Bexhill**

**Area: 486 ha**

**Ownership: owned and tenanted**

**Enterprises: dairy, beef and sheep**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Ryegrass or short-term ley (grazed or cut)
- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Rough grassland – a bit
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded)
- Wood pasture – old orchard
- Horse paddock
- Large lawn or garden

Future plans to make changes to grassland:

- Increasing production from my grassland
- Making it more species rich / improving its value for wildlife

Other remarks / discussion points:

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by me
- Cut for hay
- Cut for silage
- Topped only, cuttings not removed

By grazing:

- Own stock
- Grazed by cattle
- Grazed by sheep
- Grazed by horses - a bit

Other remarks / discussion points:

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales - on new leys

- Supported by agri-environment scheme and Basic Payment Scheme – on marginal land

Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being

Other remarks / discussion points: one farm is very untouched, with floodplain, hills and orchids. Studies have been done here on grasses and mosses. It gets no sprays or fertilisers and the grassland is being enhanced by feeding hay spread to introduce seed

Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Land agent – have used CLM in the past
- Industry bodies such as AHDB – refer to their seeds information
- Local group such – Southern farmers, or ACT for seeds
- Natural England - on old HLS and new CS schemes
- High Weald AONB Partnership, Weald Meadows Initiative
- Other – agronomist, Catchment Sensitive farming on soil analysis

Other remarks / discussion points: would I work in collaboration with others in a future scheme; I do already on machinery, buying together with a neighbour, so absolutely, I wouldn't mind at all.

Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier - on one farm, started 2015
- Environmental Stewardship (current) - 2 x ELS/HLS, ending 2020 and 2023
- Old Countryside Stewardship Scheme

Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

If there was payment by results? I spend a lot of time fighting the RPA...

If there were no subsidies? I can't make the farm pay, so I need BPS, HLS and CS now

There will be a lot of abandoned land in the High Weald when BPS goes? I get a lot of calls to manage peoples' land but it's not economic even at [a rent as low as] £20/acre with eg no fencing or water. People are giving up land – it can be OK to take it on, or not.

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

This approach appeals to me

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

As long as it's sensible. I take Stewardship schemes seriously and a lot of people don't, for example [people getting] organic payments.

Other remarks / discussion points:

#### Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

1 Adviser help to produce a land management plan

2 Management information – paper based

2 Management information – web based

2 Training courses and workshops

2 Group visits to other grassland sites

2 Regular visit from an adviser

3 One-off visit from an adviser

Other remarks / discussion points:

#### Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

Not confident at all

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

Not very knowledgeable

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

Yes

If yes:

- Got someone else to take the samples and send them for laboratory analysis

Other remarks / discussion points: agronomist did sampling

#### Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB
- 1 Public access issues eg dogs
- 2 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair – if taking on new land
- 2 Fields do not have a water supply – if taking on new land
- 2 Lack of secure tenancy on land – mostly I have FBTs now, or grazing licenses
- 2 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser
- 3 Poor returns from keeping livestock
- 3 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock
- 3 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control
- 3 Difficult vehicular access
- 3 Difficulties finding a useful adviser
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland

Other comments or observations:

As an income generator, dairy beef and sheep are no return or very marginal enterprises. For example my grassland needs liming but there is not enough money to do it.

Other remarks / discussion points:

- Would like to join a focus group to further discuss future support for grassland managers
- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

HLS is quite fair – it pays me about £30K a year. It is right that more money goes into the capital works than the annual payments, as it's covering £25K of costs that I could not justify otherwise. Payment levels for capital works are more generous now – they cover about 75% of costs. I don't keep a separate record of grassland enterprise costs, it's all managed in house.

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

There is no starting point measurement, so no way of proving I have achieved what I was meant to achieve. So eg has no N inputs made a difference?

My HLS was RPA inspected; they took 2½ weeks and just measured the fields (RPA took 10 days at Beech Estate)

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Yes

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

As long as the land is farmable (40 ac of grass I graze on a nearby farm is inedible and I can't see any value for wildlife in it). If the HLS payment were any less, it would be marginal.

I have a grazing license on some land where the owners get the HLS and BPS – it's coming to an end – is it right for people to get money for just owning the land? Should there be a payment to the active land manager as well as or instead of the landowner?

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Less well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

Stewardship schemes could have worked better. The Weald is naturally a grassland area, and there is a lack of graziers. Lucy Carnaghan project [Restocking coordinator for High Weald AONB 2016/17] did some good work bringing people together.

Grazing needs fences, water and palatable grassland – if the sward is only grazed from late May to September it's not viable. Modern grass mixtures give a 9 month grazing period.

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes – depends what it is

Why / why not and/or any other comments

The scheme should encourage arable back to grassland in the High Weald, not give organic payments.

The key is to measure before, and after, and target the objectives over 5 years.

If farmers packed in there would be a lot of downstream effect – people working on farms, or supplying goods and services. There are a lot of older farmers nearing retirement.

People making a living off 100 acres need to be able to get into ELM. The margins are so low [in grassland farming] that people are just trying to get economies of scale.

## Appendix 3a - Interview 5

**Location: Heathfield**

**Area: 15 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: 4 ha woods, remainder permanent grassland**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay, or haylage)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded) – patches with springs
- Other - banks and orchard

Future plans to make changes to grassland: none

Other remarks / discussion points: I can't do more than I am now

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor
- Cut for hay
- Cut for haylage
- Other - hand cutting banks and an orchard

By grazing:

- Own stock – for the last two years
- Grazed by cattle -15 Belted Galloways (HLS allows a maximum 21)

Other remarks / discussion points: I didn't want the risk of liver fluke in sheep

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales - doubtful
- Supported by agri-environment scheme and Basic Payment Scheme

Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Water purification – natural drainage
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature – I have to pay top upkeep this!
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being - lots of footpaths here

Other remarks / discussion points: everything here is totally natural and organic. I used to get £600-700 for grazing until 2 years ago. I had to get the hay made for no return this year. I wouldn't do this without HLS

#### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Other agent - FWAG
- Small Farm Training Group (SFTG) – in the beginning
- Weald Meadows Initiative – Dawn Brickwood has been a huge help
- Other – Catchment Sensitive Farming

Other remarks / discussion points: when I was first in Stewardship scheme I had a Natural England scheme manager – they were very good but they moved on, so over a 10-year scheme I have had minimal input. I have 50 years of my own experience, passionate about wildlife

#### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Environmental Stewardship (current) – ELS/HLS with a 1-year extension

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me – apart from my age!

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

It does not give confidence in Stewardship schemes when I have had no payment for 2018

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

- This approach appeals to me

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

Good advice is very important, but if I had had to pay for someone, it [my Stewardship scheme] would not have happened.

Other remarks / discussion points: people should have to work for their funding

Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 2 Management information – web based
- 2 Training courses and workshops – good to see what other people are doing
- 2 Group visits to other grassland sites – good to see what other people are doing
- 2 One-off visit from an adviser – depends what they are advising on
- 3 Adviser help to produce a land management plan
- 4 Management information, paper based – I don't feel I need it
- 4 Regular visit from an adviser – more about availability when you're stuck

Other remarks / discussion points: advice needs to be backed by expertise, not just coming from books, unless it's just about understanding the forms and paperwork

Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

- Very confident

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

- Quite knowledgeable - if worms are a good indicator

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

- No

Other remarks / discussion points: I am not confident in the current scheme because of the words used in the document – I'm still not clear what it means. Also there is variability in sward composition through the year – if I was inspected at a certain point I could be marked down [if species were not showing]

Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control
- 1 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB – TB is a huge issue
- 1 Public access issues eg dogs
- 1 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser – I don't have any at all
- 2 Difficult vehicular access
- 2 Difficulties finding a useful adviser – it has not stopped me, but they are thin on the ground
- 4 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair
- 4 Fields do not have a water supply
- 4 Lack of secure tenancy on land
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Poor returns from keeping livestock - I don't have to live from this
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly
- 4 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock

Other comments or observations:

Climatic conditions are crucial when moving stock or you have to make hay. We get excesses now – very wet periods, then periods when springs dry up. I couldn't make hay last year – I had to cut it late and then couldn't make a judgement on what to do. Stewardship scheme prescriptions are counter productive to these changes - people get to know their fields and what they can do, but with these changes it's thrown into disarray.

Other remarks / discussion points: I am an honorary member of the farm cluster group in High Weald AONB

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Less well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

Stewardship scheme pays just less than £3K / year and has allowed me to do what I am doing and keep cattle, paid for fencing and water, troughs, to get in a mole catcher. I'd say it's done 'half a job'. If I added up the hours of my time I spend, it doesn't cover it.

I would like to do more woodland management and more work in the ghyll – will there be more money for this? But I need people to do it.

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

It has depended on my input – a partnership with the financial help.

If not for the Stewardship scheme I would not have undertaken all this. It's workable, with my own stock. If the cattle don't work I will have to go back to renting the land out.

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Not sure

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

I would struggle without the HLS payment. I have gone the extra mile but unpaid – planting seeds out, protecting plants and cutting laid hedges. This work is not programmed in the scheme – I see a need and I do it

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Quite well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

Though I can't really answer that, I think the countryside has improved thanks to Stewardship schemes. But some people take the money and do nothing

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald – no answer

Why / why not and/or any other comments

If the new scheme has no help in filling out the forms I won't do it. It's all down to the ease of application for any scheme. The [new CS] scheme has mind-boggling literature and application process

## Appendix 3a - Interview 6

**Location: Ticehurst**

**Area: 134 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: grassland, arable + game crops, woodland, rentals**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed) - in ELS
- Rough grassland – 1 field, allowed to grow tussocky and managed for different sward lengths
- Arable reversion to grassland in HLS, sown with mixed grasses and wildflowers, grazed and cut for hay
- Wood pasture - a couple of ex-woodland areas
- Large garden and orchard

Future plans to make changes to grassland:

- Making it more species rich / improving its value for wildlife

Other remarks / discussion points: most of the farm has been in a 10-year ELS/HLS scheme with arable reversion to grassland (on steep fields prone to erosion), and permanent grassland options, both followed with extensive management by grazing and cutting to encourage more species rich grassland. Reversion has taken well. Hedge planting has been done to subdivide fields, ponds restored, and woodland coppiced. Other capital works such as new gates, troughs and water supply.

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor – I have a crib sheet/calendar so I can give the contractor specific dates under HLS when this can be done
- Cut for hay
- Cut for haylage (1 field)

By grazing:

- My own stock - pedigree Sussex herd plus bull and followers
- 3 graziers bring stock in from nearby
- Grazed by cattle summer only
- Grazed by sheep

Other remarks / discussion points: graziers are established local farmers; one contracts the arable management for me

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales
- Supported by HLS scheme and Basic Payment Scheme
- Through rental income from property, business units

### Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Water purification
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature (a very public farm with Guides and DofE groups staying, visits by eg Game Conservancy)
- Beauty and landscape – in the AONB!
- Health and well-being
- Farmland birds – I do the Big Farmland Bird Count

Other remarks / discussion points: all the income produced goes back into the farm, including HLS and BPS. When BPS goes it will have a huge impact on farming – ELM will not come close to what farmers get at the moment. People do not realise the impact this will have in the HW – this is not arable country and is reliant on subsidies. We get global prices for food we produce but cost of production in other countries is less. Farm diversification is a hidden subsidy on food production. Farms will have to get bigger to spread costs and compete, but the future of this farm is the environment. NB increasing theft works against being an 'open' farm to the public

### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Other agent - FWAG
- Industry bodies such as AHDB – a bit, on cattle management
- Natural England
- Websites / online
- Game Conservancy, CLA, NFU, Brights Seeds

Other remarks / discussion points: I used to go to High Weald AONB meetings, but not now

### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Environmental Stewardship (current) – ELS/HLS done 10 years, got an extension in 2019 (1-year rolling extension over 4 years) but the woods had to be taken out
- Environmental Stewardship (expired) – ELS only

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me

#### Other comments

Some cutting dates are very prescriptive and do not take account of the weather. Ditto hedge cutting; not being allowed to cut in August makes it very difficult for contractors here to get around

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

- This approach appeals to me

#### Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Management information – paper based
- 1 / 2 Adviser help to produce a land management plan - depends how complicated the process is
- 2 One-off visit from an adviser
- 2 Group visits to other grassland sites
- 3 Management information – web based
- 3 Training courses and workshops
- 3 Regular visit from an adviser

#### Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

- Quite confident - a bit of my grass is species rich, the rest is semi-improved

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

- Quite knowledgeable – I recognise the importance of this issue and try to improve soils with use of FYM, green manures such as mustard

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

- Yes

If yes:

- Got someone else to take the samples and send them for laboratory analysis

#### Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Poor returns from keeping livestock – becomes more important without BPS
- 2 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB – has to do annual testing; a worrying issue
- 2 Public access issues eg dogs - people stray off footpaths
- 3 Lack of species-rich grassland management experience
- 3 Unable to get a contractor to take a hay cut
- 3 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control – reliant on contractors
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly - not so far
- 4 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock
- 4 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair – a constant challenge, but it is done
- 4 Fields do not have a water supply
- 4 Lack of secure tenancy on land – I own all the land
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland
- 4 Difficult vehicular access
- 4 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser
- 4 Difficulties finding a useful adviser

- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

- Would like to receive AONB monthly e-news

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Very well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

I spent more on capital works that I got back, but overall the scheme has been fantastic, over 10 years I can't complain at the outcome, except lately the timing of payments has gone awry.

I don't keep enterprise costs or do a gross margin, as so many people are doing different things. The graziers are on short-term agreements, though most are grazing through the year. They pay about £30/acre for 149 ac of grassland, plus giving me some services in kind.

Some costs; yard clearing and haylage making - £2658, rowing up £148, baling with wrap £702, hay baling £507

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Very well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

It's still a work in progress, and I need to keep going. I can't think of a better outcome, I'm pleased with the results.

How good are we though at measuring outcomes and results [in Stewardship schemes]?

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Yes

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

5-year agreements [like in the new Countryside Stewardship] are not long enough; you need 10 years to see results.

The Stewardship scheme allows people to go on farming in the HW, and to keep the land managed

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Very well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

My own experience of HLS has been positive, and I think the only complaints have been from big productive [arable] farms.

In the HW without support you would have to either 'dog and stick' farm, or have an outside source of income.

If Stewardship schemes are concentrated on areas with poorer land, trying to fit them into arable areas is difficult; you can't have one scheme that works everywhere

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes

Why / why not and/or any other comments

Potentially, but continuity is important, there should be no loss [of what was done in previous schemes]. We need to look at the best bits of the old schemes.

We need a balance between a prescriptive scheme and one with a degree of self-management; you have to know people are delivering. But the inspection process could be improved – more coordinated, not having someone come out to look at just one or two things on a visit [recent experience with RPA inspection]

How much information is there out there on the outcomes of delivering Stewardship schemes over 10 years?

Food production is crucial; we need a balance between this and the environment. We need to be realistic about what we can achieve; look at the characteristics of an area, and apply sensible options to it.

## Appendix 3a - Interview 7

**Location: Mark Cross**

**Area: 49 ha**

**Ownership: owned**

**Enterprises: permanent grassland**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay) - in summer
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed) – in winter
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded) – small patch only
- Horse paddocks

Future plans to make changes to grassland: none

Other remarks / discussion points: some fertiliser is used but not much, and species are naturally returning to the grassland

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by a contractor – buys the standing grass crop
- Cut for hay
- Cut for haylage
- Cut for silage
- Topped only, cuttings not removed – headlands with a brushcutter to control bracken and keep hedges back

By grazing:

- A grazier brings stock in - overwinter
- Grazed by sheep
- Grazed by other livestock – horses

Other remarks / discussion points: the grazier pays 30p /head on the sheep he brings – we think it's better to have someone we know to look after them. The standing hay crop brings in about £1200 for 10 acres

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales
- Supported by agri-environment scheme and Basic Payment Scheme

Other services of value the grassland provides

- Water purification - the farm has a borehole though not used currently
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being
- Other – wildlife eg barn owls, recreation (well used byway on the farm)

Other remarks / discussion points: sale of standing grass covers costs of managing hedges. Sheep keep income +/- covers costs of fencing. BPS income £10K goes back into the farm for machinery etc. – it would be hopeless without it, eg farm insurance costs £5K/year. The farm made a profit of £500 in 2017/18 – mainly it covers its cost, it has lost money eg during foot and mouth. Access to nature etc are part of a farm-based business running holistic and therapy courses.

#### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Websites / online – NFU newsletter, also research into topics eg weed control
- Other - farming press

Other remarks / discussion points:

#### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Environmental Stewardship (expired) – ELS for 10 years

If not in a scheme now, why not?

Advised (by solicitors) not to apply for Countryside Stewardship as it was 'too complicated' and 'not worth it for the hassle'

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme does not appeal to me

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

Too old now

#### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

- This approach appeals to me - not sure

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

I'm more positive than negative about this, but every farm is different, most farmers want to look after the land, but they just want to farm and not have take on the schemes

Other remarks / discussion points: anyone taking on [this] farm could take it on environmentally and not farm, or they could go the other way and intensify. There could be a premium to High Weald grass-fed meat production

Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

1 Management information – paper based

1 Management information web based – but it's not the same looking at something on the net, you have to print it off; you feel differently if you are researching something for yourself

2 One-off visit from an adviser

2 Regular visit from an adviser

2 Adviser help to produce a land management plan

4 Training courses and workshops – used to in the past but too old now

4 Group visits to other grassland sites – ditto

Other remarks / discussion points: the adviser expert should come in over several sessions and agree the plan with the farmer. They need to be a specialist like an agronomist, understanding farming and the farm business. They need to be consistent and need to know where to find people

Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

Not confident at all

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

Not knowledgeable at all

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

Yes – 4/5 years ago

If yes:

Got someone else to take the samples and send them for laboratory analysis

Other remarks / discussion points:

Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Poor returns from keeping livestock
- 2 Lack of species-rich grassland management experience
- 2 Other – climate change; wet periods followed by very dry
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Unable to get a contractor to take a hay cut
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly
- 4 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock
- 4 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control
- 4 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair
- 4 Fields do not have a water supply
- 4 Lack of secure tenancy on land
- 4 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland
- 4 Difficult vehicular access
- 4 Public access issues eg dogs – did have
- 4 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser
- 4 Difficulties finding a useful adviser

Other comments or observations:

Other remarks / discussion points: new owners coming in who know nothing about farming – ‘people who don't know what they don't know’. They have money to do work, but don't know where to go for advice or information. It needs a proactive approach to get to these people

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Quite well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

It's nice to know someone cared about the HW as an area. It's nice to keep it as it is for its uniqueness

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald – not sure

Why / why not and/or any other comments

Stewardship schemes don't understand people and what their motivations and passions are. Success is about understanding people and not how the schemes work. Do potential applicants know enough to work the new scheme?

Perhaps it could work by if you put a % of the farm into ELM you get a proportion of the funding available

## Appendix 3a - Interview 8

**Location: Udimore, Beckley, Romney Marsh**

**Area: 607 ha**

**Ownership: owned and rented**

**Enterprises: sheep, beef and forage crops**

### Q1 Types of grassland

- Ryegrass or short-term ley (grazed or cut)
- Herbal or multi-species ley (grazed or cut)
- Traditional meadow (mainly cut for hay)
- Traditional pasture (mainly grazed)
- Wet grassland (regularly waterlogged or flooded)

Future plans to make changes to grassland: none

Other remarks / discussion points: I doubt if I will change from my current long-term rotational management, though this does include reseeding if that counts as improvement. If I don't do this grassland in the High Weald does not stay very productive. I have areas of nectar flower mixes on the farm but I can't combine these with grazing. The same goes for hay cutting, it has to be at the right time to have any feed value. You have to dedicate areas and manage them accordingly – you can't have it both ways.

### Q2 Managing grassland

By cutting:

- Cut by me
- Cut for hay
- Cut for haylage
- Cut for silage
- Other – nectar flower mix will be cut after flowering

By grazing:

- Own stock
- Grazed by cattle
- Grazed by sheep

Other remarks / discussion points: can be mixed grazing or either cattle or sheep

### Q3 Paying for grassland management

- Self-supporting through fodder, stock or meat sales
- Supported by agri-environment scheme and/or Basic Payment Scheme

#### Other services of value the grassland provides

- Flood alleviation
- Water purification
- Carbon storage
- Access to nature
- Beauty and landscape
- Health and well-being

Other remarks / discussion points: old permanent pasture is not viable without Stewardship scheme and BPS support. More productive grassland is, just. All our grassland is mixed leys with a lot of legumes including clovers – it returns N to keep the grasses going and benefits soil structure

#### Q4 Sources of advice and information for grassland management

- Other agent FWAG
- Online forums – useful for discussions about grass mixes etc.
- Other – a loose group of farmers on/around R Marsh that talks to each other

Other remarks / discussion points: would I work in collaboration with others in a future scheme; I've always felt that this and a landscape-based scheme is the way forward. It needs to be a working together on a farming basis as well – eg we could share machinery and equipment. In this we need to consider what we do about woodland in the High Weald where it is an integral part of the landscape

#### Q5 Environmental schemes the grassland is or has been managed in

- Countryside Stewardship Higher Tier – entered a new 5-year agreement
- Environmental Stewardship (expired) – had ELS/HLS
- Old Countryside Stewardship Scheme

#### Q6 Future scheme

The future 'ELM' agri-environment scheme could work very differently through eg payment by results, and with the land manager in control of deciding when to do what, rather than following set instructions and dates.

- This kind of scheme appeals to me – not sure

If no, why not (and/or any other comments)

I'm nervous of this. Who is measuring the results, and when, is it at the right time? Overall we've got more birds than before, but if you were inspected on the wrong day they won't be there. You can't quantify results after 1 year, maybe not after even 5 years. If you've had a good go at establishing something, an inspection should recognise this

### Q7 Land management plan

ELM is intended to work through the land manager developing their own land management plan, with the opportunity to get help through an adviser.

This approach appeals to me – not sure

If not, why not (and/or any other comments)

It does and it doesn't. If you are not getting BPS on marginal land, to get the [new ELM] payments you have to have some eligibility criteria. What I do is on a whole farm system and it stands up well. If you are going to say continue what you've been doing, people should be well rewarded.

Other remarks / discussion points: the HW does not grow crops well but it grows grass, and it's surrounded by woodland. It's high on visual values, low on economic. It needs additional funding to make it work

### Q8 If answered yes to Q7, what help would be most useful

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 Management information web based – if put in the right way
- 1 Other – trying to maintain agricultural infrastructure in the HW, eg we are down to one abattoir; if not it will continue to decline
- 1 Regular visit from an adviser
- 2/3 Adviser help to produce a land management plan
- 2 Group visits to other grassland sites – yes, useful
- 3 Management information – paper based
- 3 Training courses and workshops – this has to be targeted, not vague
- 4 One-off visit from an adviser – irrelevant

Other remarks / discussion points: in Countryside Stewardship we've made a plan for a 5-year term, so we can get some funding. If [the plan is for] a combination of annual and capital costs, with a focus on capital costs, it's worth it, otherwise not

### Q9 Evaluation and monitoring

How confident in assessing own grassland using Countryside Stewardship definitions of semi-improved and species rich grassland:

- Very confident - at the right time of the year, on species rich grass

How knowledgeable about soil health (factors such as soil chemistry and microbiology, indicators such as earthworm numbers):

- Very knowledgeable

Have obtained any recent information on own soil's health:

- Yes – take regular samples at least 1 year in 4

If yes:

- Got someone else to take the samples and send them for laboratory analysis

Other remarks / discussion points:
------------------------------------

### Q10 Main obstacles in managing grassland

1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = less important, 4 = not important

- 1 No land or facilities to overwinter livestock – an increasing issue
- 1 Poor returns from keeping livestock – an increasing issue
- 1 Fields not fenced or fences in need of repair – we use 40-50 miles of electric fencing; surrounding woods are a problem drop branches on fences
- 1 Lack of secure tenancy on land – short term lets are a problem in the HW; I won't take anything on now for less than a 5-year term
- 1 Livestock are restricted in their movements e.g. due to TB – a major problem; with the difficulties of movements and testing small people will give up
- 1 Public access issues eg dogs – increasing, I have 3-4 incidents a year in which stock are injured or killed
- 1 Difficulties finding a useful adviser – agricultural and conservation knowledge needed; advice to help you get into ELM needs to be fully funded
- 2 Lack of funds to pay for an adviser – what do I get back?
- 3 Fields do not have a water supply - vital, but not often a problem
- 4 Lack of livestock management experience
- 4 Unable to get a grazier or to get a grazier to graze the land regularly
- 4 Lack of suitable machinery for eg hay cutting, weed control
- 4 Enthusiasm to manage my grassland – it might not be managed in some places if we didn't do it
- 4 Difficult vehicular access

Other comments or observations:

Traditionally I away winter stock but it is getting harder. There are fewer areas of land available and grasses are poor quality and not worth grazing – you need palatable grasses with clovers and other legumes.

Other remarks / discussion points: Brexit could mean loss of markets and/or tariffs, but regardless it is unlikely the new scheme will make up the profitability on keeping livestock on marginal land. There is not much money in grassland now and there are other issues. But you can't just leave grass – it takes 5 years to get it back unless you plough it and start again.

- Would like to join a focus group to further discuss future support for grassland managers
  
- Would like further information on the AONB Partnership's grasslands events programme 2019

### Additional questions specific to landholders in Stewardship schemes

[A] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in covering the costs of managing my grassland

Quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

I don't cost Stewardship scheme grassland as a separate enterprise, though it is a large part of the business. The cost covering is just about acceptable; if I had not got the Native Breeds supplement in my new CS I might not have continued at all, it is 1/3 of the value.

Stewardship scheme land needs a lot of management, and these are blanket schemes not locally specific. I have been in schemes since the 80ies and with the payments on an income foregone basis I have become concerned about the eroding asset value of the land. Payments do not cover income foregone.

[B] How well my Stewardship scheme has worked for me in achieving the aims and outcomes of managing my grassland

Very well or quite well

Comments / How the scheme could have worked better

Within the [marshland] SSSI grassland very well but on the basis of preservation not conservation. On other grassland areas, less well.

I have had the Stewardship scheme funding to do nectar flower mix and wild bird seed mix, and these have done well. I would like to have done more eg supplementary feeding, but I was not allowed to do it.

[C] Would I support a future 'ELM' (Environmental Land Management) scheme approach if it provided incentives to do more to achieve eg a wider range of grassland types, more species rich grassland, or grassland with other values, rather than simply covering 'profit foregone' like previous schemes.

Yes - if the rest [the agricultural part] is profitable

What additional incentives are needed / do I need eg higher payment rates

A lot more money will have to go into ELM, but will need to be careful this does not subsidise the agricultural part of the business (like BPS does now).

The waders payment in CS is less than it was in HLS and not enough without the supplement. The species rich grass payment pays enough but is not generous – we have some naturally species rich grass but it is not easy to manage, and not productive (can't be grazed in summer). The very low input grass payment in CS is not enough payment at [large] farm scale

[D] How well Stewardship schemes have worked for grassland management in general in the High Weald in my opinion

Not well

Comments / How the schemes could have worked better

Grassland has continued to deteriorate. There was a network of small farms in the HW mostly mixed and dairy and as they became uneconomic have deteriorated. You need enough stock to manage at scale – we can't go back to 100 acre farms they do not have the yards or buildings.

Mixed grassland has gone; it gets cut in the summer and taken grazing but is not productive for agriculture or conservation (has lost its species richness). If improved for agriculture it could be improved for species, eg put into well-managed herb or clover rich long-term leys – these will do 4-5 years and are good for pollinators and soil structure.

[E] If I think the future ELM scheme could work better for grassland management in general in the High Weald

Yes

Why / why not and/or any other comments








Anything would be better. It has got to be approached on a landscape scale and from an agricultural viewpoint, not from a small hobby-farming viewpoint. You can't isolate woodland from this in the HW, it is a mixed grassland and woodland landscape

#### Appendix 4 Evolution of non-woodland agri-environment schemes (England)


































Year	Scheme	Comments
1987	Environmentally Sensitive Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple 'tier' structure, lowest compulsory</li> <li>• Maintained wildlife and landscape values</li> <li>• Limited success in enhancing/restoring</li> </ul>
1991	Countryside Stewardship Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First long term land management payment</li> <li>• Focus on grassland, hedges, field margins</li> <li>• Good for infrastructure but no 'in field' options</li> <li>• Emphasis on adviser-landholder-officer relationship and informal application process</li> </ul>
2002	CSS arable options added	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Game and set aside evidence of value of eg. crop headlands and overwintered stubbles</li> <li>• Limited but useful range of arable options of benefit to game and wildlife</li> </ul>
2005	Environmental Stewardship 'Entry Level' (ELS) and 'Higher Level' (HLS) schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim for inclusiveness – 70% land area coverage</li> <li>• Aimed to be a whole farm scheme</li> <li>• ELS points system with guaranteed entry, but easy to get in with low-value grassland</li> <li>• HLS targeted to special landscapes with competitive application process</li> <li>• 10 year agreements standard</li> <li>• More formal processes, but ELS could be self assessment, also with online application</li> </ul>
2015	Countryside Stewardship 'Mid Tier' (MT) and 'Higher Tier' (HT) schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aim for quality not quantity – competitive</li> <li>• Part-farm scheme – choose land for options</li> <li>• Scoring system replaces points threshold</li> <li>• Capital items available in both tiers</li> <li>• Facilitation Fund encourages landscape scale cooperation</li> <li>• Evidence required eg. soil analysis, photos</li> <li>• More emphasis on soil and water protection</li> <li>• 5 year agreements standard</li> <li>• Highly formal processes; HT applications NE assisted, but MT difficult to steer through without adviser input, and NE absent</li> </ul>
2015	Hedges & Boundaries grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stand-alone capital scheme for hedge management and gapping</li> </ul>
2015	Water Capital Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stand-alone capital scheme for water protection measures (Ex CSF grants)</li> </ul>
2018	Some HT options made available in MT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly grassland options</li> <li>• Require NE approval</li> </ul>
2018	Arable, grassland and mixed 'offers'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplified pick-and-mix menu, online process and guaranteed entry</li> <li>• Restricted range of options disadvantages applicants with potential to choose widely</li> </ul>

## Appendix 5 - Countryside Stewardship management payments relevant to grassland in the High Weald












### Key to Option Types

	trees, scrub and orchards		grassland management		grassland creation/ diversification
	heathland		wetland / wet grassland		historic
	organic				

### Higher Tier only

Type	Option	Term	£/ha	available on			other land / notes
				P	T	A	
	BE5: Creation of traditional orchards	10 years	£ 281.00				former traditional orchard sites or link
	GS7: Restoration towards species-rich grassland	10 years	£ 145.00				
	GS8: Creation of species-rich grassland	10 years	£ 267.00				and set aside
	GS11: Creation of wet grassland for breeding waders	10 years	£ 406.00				and fallow
	GS12: Creation of wet grassland for wintering waders and wildfowl	10 years	£ 310.00				and fallow
	GS13: Management of grassland for target features	5 years	£ 90.00				
	GS14: Creation of grassland for target features	10 years	£ 253.00				and set aside
	HS7: Management of historic water meadows through traditional irrigation	5 years	£ 440.00				functioning watermeadows
	LH1: Management of lowland heathland	5 years	£ 274.00				heathland can include acid grassland
	LH2: Restoration of forestry and woodland to lowland heathland	10 years	£ 184.00				lowland heathland with trees
	LH3: Creation of heathland from arable or improved grassland	10 years	£ 517.00				and improved permanent grassland
	SP1: Difficult sites supplement	5 years	£ 62.00				grazing [may be] abandoned or >1 ha stockproof sites
	SP2: Raised water level supplement	5 years	£ 127.00				with GS6, GS7, GS8
	SP3: Bracken control supplement	5 years	£ 153.00				with a land management option eg LH1,2,3
	SP4: Control of invasive plant species supplement	5 years	£ 324.00				not for rush control
	SP5: Shepherding supplement	5 years	£ 7.00				where shepherding needs to be [re]introduced + with specific options
	SP8: Native breeds at risk supplement	5 years	£ 94.00				with a land management option, not with SP6
	SW12: Making space for water	20 years	£ 640.00				and improved permanent grassland
	SW15: Flood mitigation on arable reversion to grassland	5 years	£ 488.00				
	SW16: Flood mitigation on permanent grassland	5 years	£ 256.00				
	WD6: Creation of wood pasture	10 years	£ 409.00				where wood pasture existed or link/buffer/extend
	WD8: Creation of successional areas and scrub	5 years	£ 87.00				next to existing scrub/woodland, already w target species
	WT8: Management of fen	5 years	£ 39.00				fen and reedbed
	WT9: Creation of fen	5 years	£ 446.00				improved permanent grassland, other approved wetland
	WT10: Management of lowland raised bog	5 years	£ 164.00				priority lowland raised bog
	WT12: Wetland grazing supplement	5 years	£ 304.00				with WT8, WT9, WT10

### Higher Tier Mid Tier

Type	Option	Term	£/ha	available on			other land / notes
				P	T	A	
	AB15: two-year sown legume fallow	5 years	£ 522.00				rotational option
	BE4: Management of traditional orchards	5 years	£ 212.00				former traditional orchard sites or link
	GS1: Take small areas out of management	5 years	£ 365.00				not on historic or archaeological features
	GS2: Permanent grassland with very low inputs (outside SDAs)	5 years	£ 95.00				
	GS3: Ryegrass seed-set as winter food for birds	5 years	£ 331.00				permanent grassland if cultivated and resown within last 5 years
	GS4: Legume and herb-rich swards	5 years	£ 309.00				permanent grassland if cultivated and resown within last 5 years
	GS6: Management of species-rich grassland	5 years	£ 182.00				on grassland priority habitat, with NE approval
	GS9: Management of wet grassland for breeding waders	5 years	£ 264.00				on grazing marsh priority or other identified W&W habitat, with NE approval
	GS10: Management of wet grassland for wintering waders and wildfowl	5 years	£ 157.00				on grazing marsh priority or other identified W&W habitat, with NE approval
	GS15: Haymaking supplement	5 years	£ 85.00				with a land management option eg GS6, GS7
	GS16: Rush infestation control supplement	5 years	£ 73.00				with a land management option eg GS6, GS7
	GS17: Lenient grazing supplement	5 years	£ 44.00				with GS2, one boundary = hedge and/or scrub within 200m
	OP4: Multi species ley	5 years	£ 115.00				rotational, if sown to grass must be < 7years
	OP5: Undersown cereal	5 years	£ 86.00				

OR1: Organic conversion – improved permanent grassland	up to 2	£ 75.00	[semi] improved grass, arable if it is to be reverted to grass under CS
OR2: Organic conversion – unimproved permanent grassland	up to 2	£ 50.00	
OR3: Organic conversion – rotational land	up to 2	£ 175.00	permanent grassland if cultivation is part of conversion plan
OT1: Organic land management - improved permanent grassland	5 years	£ 40.00	[semi] improved grass, arable if it is to be reverted to grass under CS
OT2: Organic land management - unimproved permanent grassland	5 years	£ 20.00	
HS4: Scrub control on historic and archaeological features	5 years	£ 137.00	on features with >5% scrub cover
HS5: Management of historic and archaeological features on grassland	5 years	£ 30.00	
SP6: Cattle grazing supplement	5 years	£ 45.00	with GS6, WD4 (MT); where cattle grazing needed (HT)
WD4: Management of wood pasture and parkland	5 years	£ 45.00	
WD7: Management of successional areas and scrub	5 years	£ 45.00	where scrub = at least 10% of area; not on historic or archaeological features
WD9: Livestock exclusion supplement - scrub and successional areas	5 years	£ 121.00	with WD7, WD8

### Countryside Stewardship capital items payments relevant to grassland in the High Weald

#### Key to Capital Item Types

trees, scrub and bracken	livestock management	other
historic	wetland features	habitat, species

#### Higher Tier only Item

Item	rate
FG5: Fencing supplement - difficult sites	£1.24/m
FM2: Major preparatory works for priority habitats & priority species	up to 100% actual costs
HE1: Historic and archaeological feature protection	up to 100% actual costs
HE3: Removal of eyesore	£290 each
LV1: Cattle grid	£835 each
LV2: Livestock handling facilities	up to 80% actual costs
SB1: Scrub control and felling diseased trees	£260-£1680/ha
SB2: Scrub control - difficult sites	up to 80% actual costs
SB3: Tree removal	£144/tree
SB4: Chemical bracken control	170/ha
SB5: Mechanical bracken control	169/ha
TE12: Stump grinding	£24/stump
WN2: Creation of scrapes and gutters	£2.80/m <sup>2</sup>
WN3: Ditch, dyke and rhine restoration	£7.30/m
WN4: Ditch, dyke and rhine creation	£8.40/m

#### Higher Tier Mid Tier Item

Item	rate
FG1: Fencing	£4.00/m
FG2: Sheep netting	£4.90/m
FG3: Permanent electric fencing	£4.90/m
FG4: Rabbit fencing supplement	£2.50/m
FG12: Wooden field gate	£390 each
FG14: Badger gate	£135 each
LV3: Hard bases for livestock drinkers	£110 each
LV4: Hard bases for livestock feeders	£170 each
LV5: Pasture pumps and associated pipework	£220 each
LV6: Ram pumps and associated pipework	£1480 each
LV7: Livestock troughs	£110 each
LV8: Pipework associated with livestock troughs	£2.65/m

## Appendix 6 - Possible elements of a plan-based ELM

