

**CIEEM**  
**Autumn Conference 2017**

**Meeting Local Planning Authorities'  
needs from  
Mitigation & Monitoring Proposals**

**Karen Colebourn FCIEEM**  
**Ecological Planning & Research Ltd**



**November 2017**

# What are Local Authorities Required to Achieve for Biodiversity through their Planning Policies?

1. Plan for Biodiversity at Landscape Scale across LPA borders
2. Identify & Map components of Ecological Networks;  
Designated sites, wildlife corridors and stepping stones, and  
Areas identified by Local Nature Partnerships for habitat restoration or creation
3. Preserve, Restore, and Re-Create Priority Habitats and Networks
4. Protect and Promote Recovery of Priority Species' Populations
5. Specify Indicators to Monitor Biodiversity against National and Local targets

# What are LPAs Achieving for Biodiversity through their Planning policies?

## Plans Reviewed:

Durham, Tyne & Wear and Northumberland, Guildford, Southampton, Norfolk, Sunderland, Surrey Heath, Essex Minerals, Cotswold, Warwick, Stroud

## Summary of Reviews Against Requirements of NPPF

Requirement	Yes	Partial	No
Plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries	1111	111	11
Identify and map components of the local ecological networks	1111	11111	
Promote the restoration and recreation of priority habitats and ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations linked to national and local targets		1111111111	1
Identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan	1	11111	11111

# Conclusions 1

The main issues with policy seem to be:

- Recognising and addressing significant cumulative effects;
- Planning for the protection and recovery of populations of Priority Species;
- Setting measurable targets;
- Identifying indicators to enable progress to be monitored

# What Significant Cumulative Effects are Likely to Arise from Local Plan Policies?

- Priority Habitats
- Ecological Networks
- Populations of Priority Species

Where can you find strategic biodiversity targets?



# Is the Strategic Biodiversity Planning that LPAs are doing Meeting the Biodiversity Net Gain Principles?

## *Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles<sup>1</sup> Achieved?* (Only applicable to a Biodiversity delivery plan)

**Strategies reviewed:** Durham, Tyne and Wear and Northumberland; Guildford; Southampton, Norfolk, TBH, Essex Minerals, Warwick, Stroud

Principle	Yes	Partial	No
Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy	11111111		1
Avoid losing Biodiversity that cannot be offset	11	11	1111
Inclusive and Equitable	1	111	111
Address Risks	11	1	111
Measurable Net Gain contribution	11	11	1111
Best outcomes for biodiversity	1	11	111
Additionality	111	1	11
Net gain legacy (addressing cumulative effects)	11	11	11
Optimise sustainability	111	11	1
Transparency	111	1	11
<b>General good practice requirement</b>			
Are targets SMART? (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound)	11		1111

# Conclusions 2

Concerns about some of the current examples of strategic biodiversity planning are:

- Setting out clearly which features cannot be 'off-set';
- Recognising the inherent risks in mitigation plans;
- Setting SMART targets;
- Identifying appropriate indicators of progress against those targets;
- Delivering measures locally;
- Engaging local stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions.



What precautions are required to ensure that GI actually delivers measures to avoid, mitigate or compensate and/or biodiversity gain?

# Big Questions

- Is it reasonable to aim to secure net gain in perpetuity?
- Who should be trying to ensure that LPAs meet their strategic biodiversity planning obligations?
- Would further interrogations of the current approaches in Local Plans be profitable?
- If so, are we asking the right questions?
- Will the emerging 25 Year Environment Plan promote strategic biodiversity planning?

Please send any examples of good LPA  
strategic biodiversity planning to:

[karencolebourn@epr.uk.com](mailto:karencolebourn@epr.uk.com)

