# How diverse is the flora in old woods in Heartwood Forest?

# Alla Mashanova, Agneta Burton and Ian Denholm

Heartwood Forest is a 347 hectare site owned and managed by the Woodland Trust. Old woodlands in Heartwood Forest formed the foundation for the planting scheme so that the new forest would link and extend the existing woodlands. They are expected to be the source of woodland species for colonising the new forest. Therefore, it is important to keep them in good condition. Traditionally, woodlands of this kind were managed as coppices, but this management has been largely abandoned in the last few decades leading to the closed canopy restricting the light reaching the ground and limiting the diversity of the ground flora. This has been happening in many woods for many decades, but it has started to be reversed with the reintroduction of coppicing for conservation purposes.

Woodland diversity is also affected by the size of the wood, as the larger the wood, the more species it can support (Dony & Denholm, 1985). Also, it can be expected that large open woods would support more ground flora species than small dark woods. At Heartwood Forest, Langley and Pudler's are the two large woods. Pudler's is a bit more open due to a larger proportion of maiden (uncoppiced) trees in some parts and gaps due to Ash trees killed by Ash dieback disease. Pismire Spring and Round Wood are small and both had a closed canopy until winter 2021-22 when part of Round Wood was coppiced as a trial (Wright et al. 2022). Another part of Round Wood was coppiced in winter 2023-24. Therefore, one can expect that Pismire Spring might have the lowest diversity and that Langley might have fewer species compared to Pudler's.

To assess the diversity of the woods compared to other woods, we used the Dony & Denholm (1985) study where they developed a model to estimate the expected number of species based on wood size for woods in Bedfordshire. We estimated the area of the woods using Google Maps measuring tool and calculated the predicted number of species using the equation Log(N of species) = 1.704 + 0.31\*Log(area) suggested as the best fit by Dony & Denholm (1985) (Table 1). The numbers of observed species came from the Heartwood Monitoring Group (Flora) regular surveys; a short visit during the BSBI meeting at Heartwood Forest in June 2022 and additional surveys by AM during 2016-24. A more detailed survey

of Round Wood in early August 2023 focussed on potential changes following coppicing.

**Table 1.** Expected and observed number of flora species in old woods in Heartwood Forest.

Wood	Area (ha)	Expected N	Observed N	% of expected
Pudler's	8.15	97	68	70
Langley	7.03	93	61	66
Pismire	2.58	68	54	80
Round	2.13	64	87	136

As expected, the number of species in Pudler's (68) was larger than in Langley (61) although the percentage of the expected number was similar (70% and 66%). As expected, Pismire Spring had fewer species (54) but the percentage of the expected number (80%) was higher than in Langley and Pudler's. In all three woods, the diversity was lower than expected for the woods of this size in Bedfordshire. The diversity in Round Wood with 87 species, however, exceeded the expected number of species. To emphasise the effect of coppicing, we compared the recently coppiced areas ("new") (Photo 1) with the area not coppiced in recent times ("old") and found that 31 species occurred in both areas, 10 only in the old part and 46 only in the recently coppiced area (Table 2).

Overall, 127 species including 28 Ancient Woodland Indicators (AWI) were recorded in the woods. The AWI



Photo 1. Recent coppice management in Round Wood, April 2024 (photo A. Mashanova).

Table 2. Species composition of old woods in Heartwood Forest.

Ancient Woodland Indicator species (AWI) are marked with an asterisk \*. 1 Present as saplings. For Round Wood, it is stated whether the species was found in the "old" part, "new" (recently coppiced) part or in both.

Latin name	English name	Langley Wood	Pismire Spring	Pudler's/ Well Wood	Round Wood	Frequency
Acer campestre*	Field Maple	у	у	У	both	1
Aesculus hippocastanum1	Horse-chestnut	у				0.25
Agrostis stolonifera	Creeping Bent				new	0.25
Ajuga reptans*	Bugle	у		У	new	0.75
Alliaria petiolata	Garlic Mustard	у	y	У	new	1
Anemone nemorosa*	Wood Anemone	у		У	both	0.75
Anthriscus sylvestris	Cow Parsley	у	у	У	both	1
Arctium minus agg.	Lesser Burdock		y	У		0.5
Arrhenatherum elatius	False Oat-grass				new	0.25
Arum maculatum	Lords-and-Ladies	у	y	У	both	1
Betula pendula/pubescens/x aurata	Birch			У	both	0.5
Brachypodium sylvaticum	False Brome	у				0.25
Buddleja davidii	Butterfly Bush				new	0.25
Carex sylvatica*	Wood Sedge	у				0.25
Carpinus betulus*	Hornbeam	у	у	у	both	1
Cerastium fontanum	Common Mouse-ear				new	0.25
Chaerophyllum temulum	Rough Chervil				new	0.25
Chamerion angustifolium	Rosebay Willowherb			у	new	0.5
Circaea lutetiana*	Enchanter's Nightshade			У		0.25
Cirsium arvense	Creeping Thistle	у			new	0.5
Cirsium vulgare	Spear Thistle				new	0.25
Clematis vitalba	Traveller's Joy		у	у		0.5
Conopodium majus*	Pignut	у	у			0.5
Cornus sanguinea subsp. sanguinea	Dogwood		у			0.25
Corylus avellana*	Hazel	у	у	у	both	1
Crataegus monogyna	Hawthorn	y	у	у	both	1
Crepis capillaris	Smooth Hawksbeard				new	0.25
Dactylis glomerata	Cocksfoot			У	new	0.5
Daucus carota	Wild Carrot				new	0.25
Digitalis purpurea*	Foxglove			У	new	0.5
Dryopteris dilatata*	Broad Buckler Fern	у	у	У	both	1
Dryopteris filix-mas	Male Fern	у		У	both	0.75
Epilobium ciliatum	American Willowherb				new	0.25
Epilobium montanum	Broad-leaved Willowherb				new	0.25
Epilobium tetragonum	Square-stemmed Willowherb				new	0.25
Euonymus europaeus	Spindle		у		old	0.5
Fallopia convolvulus	Black Bindweed				new	0.25
Festuca rubra agg.	Red Fescue				new	0.25
Ficaria verna	Lesser Celandine	у	у	у	both	1
Fraxinus excelsior	Ash	у	у	y	both	1
Galeopsis tetrahit	Common Hemp-nettle				new	0.25
Galium album	Hedge Bedstraw				new	0.25
Galium aparine	Cleavers	у	у	у	both	1

Trans. Herts. Nat. Hist. Soc. 56 (2) 2024

Latin name	English name	Langley Wood	Pismire Spring	Pudler's/ Well	Round Wood	Frequency
				Wood		
Geranium dissectum	Cut-leaved Crane's-bill				new	0.25
Geum urbanum	Herb Bennet	у	у	У	both	1
Glechoma hederacea	Ground Ivy	y	у	У	old	1
Hedera helix	Ivy	у	y	У	both	1
Heracleum sphondylium	Hogweed	у	у	У		0.75
Holcus lanatus	Yogshire Fog				new	0.25
Hyacinthoides non-scripta*	Bluebell	У	y	У	both	1
Hypericum perforatum	Perforate St. John's Wort				new	0.25
Hypochaeris radicata	Cat's-ear				new	0.25
Ilex aquifolium*	Holly	У	у	У	both	1
Juncus effusus	Soft Rush				new	0.25
Lamiastrum galeobdolon ssp. argentatum	Yellow Archangel (cultivar)			У		0.25
Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. montanum*	Yellow Archangel	у	у	у	both	1
Lamium album	White Dead-nettle		у	у		0.5
Lamium purpureum	Red Dead-nettle	v				0.25
Lolium perenne	Perennial Ryegrass	J			new	0.25
Lonicera periclymenum	Honeysuckle	v	v	v	new	1
Malus pumila	Cultivated Apple	J	J	J	both	0.25
Malus sylvestris*	Crab Apple		у			0.25
Melica uniflora*	Wood Melick		J	у		0.25
Mercurialis perennis*	Dog's Mercury	у	у	y	both	1
Moehringia trinervia*	Three-nerved Sandwort	y	y	y	both	1
Mycelis muralis	Wall Lettuce	y	J	,	Dom	0.25
Myosotis arvensis	Field Forget-me-not	J	у		new	0.5
Narcissus agg.	Daffodil Daffodil		J	у	new	0.25
Orchis mascula*	Early Purple Orchid			J	old	0.25
Phleum bertolonii	Smaller Cat's-tail			у	old	0.25
Picea abies	Norway Spruce	у	у	у		0.75
Pilosella aurantiaca	Fox-and-cubs	y	y	J	new	0.25
Plantago lanceolata	Ribwort Plantain				new	0.25
Plantago major	Greater Plantain			37	new	0.25
Poa annua	Annual Meadow-grass	V	y	y	new	1
Poa trivialis	Rough Meadow-grass	У	y	y	both	1
Polygonum aviculare	Knotgrass	У	y	y	new	0.25
Populus tremula*	Aspen	W			new	0.25
Potentilla sterilis	Barren Strawberry	У				0.25
	Selfheal	У	**		nou	
Prunella vulgaris Prunus avium*	Wild Cherry	**	У	**	new both	0.5
Prunus laurocerasus	a second processor.	у	У	у	DOLII	1
	Cherry Laurel Blackthorn			у	both	0.25
Prunus spinosa	Bracken	у	У	у	old	1
Pteridium aquilinum			У	у		0.75
Quercus robur Ranunculus acris	Pedunculate Oak	у	У	у	both	1
	Meadow Buttercup	у	у		014	0.5
Ranunculus auricomus*	Goldilocks Buttercup	У	У	у	old	1
Ranunculus bulbosus	Bulbous Buttercup				new	0.25
Ranunculus repens	Creeping Buttercup		У	у		0.5
Ribes rubrum*	Red Currant	У			11	0.25
Ribes uva-crispa	Gooseberry				old	0.25
Rosa agg.	Rose	у			new	0.5

Latin name	English name	Langley	Pismire	Pudler's/	Round	Frequency
		Wood	Spring	Well Wood	Wood	
Rosa arvensis*	Field Rose	у		у		0.5
Rubus fruticosus agg.	Bramble	у	у	у	both	1
Rubus idaeus	Raspberry				both	0.25
Rumex obtusifolius	Broad-leaved Dock		у	у	new	0.75
Rumex sanguineus	Wood Dock	у	у	у	old	1
Salix caprea/cinerea/x reichardii	Willow				old	0.25
Sambucus nigra	Elder	у	у	у	both	1
Scrophularia nodosa*	Common Figwort			y	both	0.5
Jacobaea vulgaris	Common Ragwort				new	0.25
Senecio vulgaris	Groundsel			у	new	0.5
Silene dioica	Red Campion				new	0.25
Silene latifolia	White Campion				new	0.25
Solanum dulcamara	Bittersweet				new	0.25
Sonchus oleraceus	Smooth Sow-thistle				new	0.25
Sorbus aucuparia	Rowan	у		у	new	0.75
Stachys sylvatica	Hedge Woundwort		у	у	new	0.75
Stellaria holostea	Greater Stitchwort	у	y	у		0.75
Stellaria media	Common Chickweed	у	у	у		0.75
Tamus communis	Black Bryony		у			0.25
Taraxacum agg.	Dandelion	у	у	y	new	1
Taxus baccata	Yew	У				0.25
Tilia platyphyllos	Large-leaved Lime	у		y		0.5
Trifolium pratense	Red Clover			у		0.25
Trifolium repens	White Clover			у		0.25
Ulmus glabra*	Wych Elm		у			0.25
Ulmus minor agg.	Elm	У		у		0.5
Urtica dioica subsp. dioica	Stinging Nettle	У	у	у	both	1
Veronica chamaedrys	Germander Speedwell	У	у	у	both	1
Veronica hederifolia	Ivy-leaved Speedwell	У		у		0.5
Veronica montana*	Wood Speedwell	У		у		0.5
Vicia sepium	Bush Vetch			у		0.25
Viola hirta	Hairy Violet				old	0.25
Viola odorata	Sweet Violet	у				0.25
Viola reichenbachiana*	Early Dog-violet	у	у			0.5
Viola riviniana*	Common Dog-violet	у	У		old	0.75
Number of species		61		68	0=	10=
rumber of species		01	54	08	87	127

included 8 tree species: Field Maple Acer campestre, Hornbeam Carpinus betulus, Hazel Corylus avellana, Holly Ilex aquifolium, Wild Cherry Prunus avium, although only a dead tree in Pismire Spring in all woods; Wych Elm Ulmus glabra and Crab Apple Malus sylvestris in Pismire Spring, only and Aspen Populus tremula in Langley only; 2 shrub species: Red Currant Ribes rubrum in Langley and Field Rose Rosa arvensis in Pudler's; 1 fern: Broad Buckler Fern Dryopteris dilatata in all woods (Photo 3); and 15 ground flora species: Bluebell Hyacinthoides nonscripta, Yellow Archangel Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. montanum, Dog's Mercury Mercurialis

perennis, Three-nerved Sandwort Moehringia trinervia, Goldilocks Buttercup Ranunculus auricomus in all woods; Bugle Ajuga reptans, Wood Anemone Anemone nemorosa, Pignut Conopodium majus, Foxglove Digitalis purpurea, Common Figwort Scrophularia nodosa, Wood Speedwell Veronica montana, Early Dog Violet Viola reichenbachiana, Common Dog Violet Viola riviniana in 2 or 3 woods; Enchanter's-nightshade Circaea lutetiana in Pudler's and Early Purple Orchid Orchis mascula in Round Wood (Photo 2). Early Purple Orchid was first found in Round Wood in 2024 although it had been on the "wish list" (Wright et al. 2022).



**Photo 2.** Early Purple Orchid in Round Wood, April 2024 (photo A. Mashanova).

There was a noticeable number of hedge species like Rosebay Willowherb Chamerion angustifolium, White Dead-nettle Lamium album, Small Cat's-tail Phleum bertolonii and Hedge Woundwort Stachys sylvatica in wood margins, especially in the wide margin in Pudler's Wood which opened up due to Ash dieback. Coppicing in Round Wood gave an opportunity to a few "ruderal" species like Broad-leaved Willowherb Epilobium montanum, Square-stemmed Willowherb Epilobium tetragonum, Common Ragwort Jacobaea vulgaris and Smooth Sow-thistle Sonchus oleraceus to name a few but also encouraged "desirable" species like Bugle and Foxglove as well as Hedge Bedstraw Galium album, Ribwort Plantain Plantago lanceolata and Bulbous Buttercup Ranunculus bulbosus which are usually associated with woodland rides and gaps in the canopy and were not seen in other areas.

Langley Wood was marginally the least diverse wood for its size. The reason for this is probably because it is a very old Hornbeam and Lime coppice (Photo 4). Lime casts heavier shade than Hornbeam (Rodwell, 1991) making the wood floor even darker than in a Hornbeam coppice of similar age. This makes coppicing even more important for improving diversity in Langley. On the other hand, Pudler's Wood suffered from trampling more than Langley until recently when fences were put in place to steer visitors to the official paths. There is a hope that the floral diversity



**Photo 3.** Broad Buckler Fern and Bluebells in Pismire Spring Wood, May 2024 (photo A. Mashanova).

in Pudler's Wood might increase if this management measure works.

#### References

Dony, J.G. and Denholm, I. (1985). Some quantitative methods of assessing the conservation value of ecologically similar sites. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **22**: 229-238.

Rodwell, J.S. (1991). British Plant Communities. Vol. 1. Woodlands and scrub. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, T. et al. (2022). Long-term monitoring at Heartwood Forest – 2022 update. Hertfordshire Naturalist 54: 15-35.



**Photo 4.** Old coppiced Lime stool in Langley Wood, May 2024 (photo A. Mashanova).

Trans. Herts. Nat. Hist. Soc. 56 (2) 2024

# Water Voles in the Lee Valley

#### **Martin Ketcher**

### Abstract

Thirty-two 500 metre transects to survey for Water Voles *Arvicola amphibius* were carried out in the spring of 2022 on the River Lee catchment, from Ware to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, a distance of about 31km. Twenty-two were repeat transects from a 2012 survey. The survey methodology is described and the results tabulated and discussed, including a comparison between the two survey years. A map of the whole area shows the distribution of the 32 transects. The survey found that the proportion of occupied sites in 2022 was very similar to that in 2012 but that some sites had lost the species, while others had gained Water Voles.

## Introduction

The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority (LVRPA) commissioned the Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust (HMWT) to carry out a survey for Water Voles in the Park. Amanda Proud and Martin Ketcher were employed by HMWT as surveyors, although one site was surveyed by Cath Patrick and Dawn Richardson from the LVRPA. The surveys were undertaken in March and April 2022 with one site being surveyed at the end of February. The 2022 survey repeated 22 sites that were surveyed in 2012 by Graham White (White 2012) with an additional 10 new sites. As well as recording Water Vole signs, evidence of Otter Lutra lutra, Mink Neovison vison and Brown Rat Rattus norvegicus were noted. The habitat at each site was also recorded, a judgement made as to its suitability for Water Voles and management recommendations were made that could improve the site for Water Voles, all contained within a survey report (Ketcher 2022).

The methodology and results are considered below. This article is for the *Hertfordshire Naturalist* and the focus is on the northern sites, i.e. those outside the M25. A similar article for the *London Naturalist* focused on sites inside the M25. Inevitably, much of the content is identical in both articles.

# Methodology

The survey was carried out according to the best practice guidance as set out in the 'Water Vole Conservation Handbook' (Strachan *et al* 2011) and



Water Vole at Tewinbury, October 2024 (photo Rose Newbold).

used the standard Water Vole Survey recording sheets modified for use in Hertfordshire.

The survey was carried out between February 28th and April 12th 2022. All but transect 1 (February 28th) were surveyed between March 21st and April 12th. This is the ideal time to survey for Water Voles as signs are at their easiest to see as they are less likely to be obscured by growth of vegetation.

The 32 transects were surveyed by walking the entire stretch surveying from one bank (sometimes two banks) and, where possible, by walking in the watercourse. Where access was not possible it was noted on the survey sheet. A 10-figure GPS reading was taken at the start and end of each survey section. The following signs were used to note the presence of Water Voles: a sighting, latrines, droppings (dropping piles not considered to be latrines), feeding signs, nests, holes in the bank, runs in the vegetation and footprints. Latrines, droppings and large extensive feeding signs were the only signs considered to be definitive for the presence of Water Voles. The number of latrines, droppings, feeding signs and holes were recorded.