

INCOMING EMAIL

From: planningcomments
 To: Sarah Smith
 Date: 08/03/2021 10:13:08
 Subject: FW: 5/2020/3022 Burston Garden Centre

Attachments:

- (1) image321277.png(341 B)
- (2) image361113.png(292 B)
- (3) image198530.png(490 B)
- (4) image424118.jpg(26 B)

From: Matt Dodds [mailto:Matt.Dodds@hmwt.org]
Sent: 10 February 2021 15:27
To: planningcomments <planningcomments@stalbans.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 5/2020/3022 Burston Garden Centre

In addition to the comments below, measures should be definitively proposed to protect the Ancient Woodland that borders the development. Govt guidance states that this buffer should be a minimum of 15m
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences#ancient-woodland> This must be made clear in the landscape plans.

Matt Dodds
Planning & Biodiversity Manager

☎ 01727 858901 x236
 ☎ 07585 441980
 ☎ hertswildlifetrust.org.uk



Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust is the leading voice for wildlife conservation in Hertfordshire and neighbouring areas. With over 40 nature reserves spanning 1,900 acres, from beautiful woodlands and wetlands to rare patches of heath and orchard, we take practical action every day to help wildlife flourish. You can help us to protect your local wildlife today. Become a member and join more than 20,000 others in Hertfordshire and Middlesex who say wildlife matters to them!

The Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust Limited (Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust), a registered charity in England and Wales (239863). A company incorporated and registered in England and Wales (company number 816710). Registered address Grebe House, St. Michael's Street, St. Albans, Hertfordshire, AL3 4SN.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender. This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: Matt Dodds
Sent: 10 February 2021 15:11
To: 'planningcomments@stalbans.gov.uk' <planningcomments@stalbans.gov.uk>
Subject: 5/2020/3022 Burston Garden Centre

Dear Planning

Please see comments below from HMWT on this application. If you have any questions please get in touch.

Objection: This application does not demonstrate a 'measurable' net gain to biodiversity.

This development must demonstrate that it can deliver a 'measurable' net gain in biodiversity in accordance with NPPF, BS 42020. At present it contains no objective, quantified assessment of net ecological impact and so should be refused until a calculation which utilises the DEFRA biodiversity metric has been submitted and approved. The following additional information is required:

Net gain to biodiversity (habitats) should be adequately and objectively demonstrated by application of the DEFRA biodiversity metric.

NPPF states:

170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value
- d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity

174. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

- b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing 'measurable' net gains for biodiversity.

175. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure 'measurable' net gains for biodiversity.

The object of an ecological report submitted in support of a planning application should be to demonstrate how the proposals are capable of being consistent with NPPF and local planning policy. Therefore the ecological report should state, what is there, how it will be affected by the proposal and how any negative impacts can be avoided, mitigated or compensated in order to achieve 'measurable' net gain to biodiversity. Subjective assessments of net impact (as in this case) are not sufficient, not 'measurable' and therefore not consistent with policy.

In order to prove net gain to biodiversity, the ecological report must include a 'measurable' calculation of the current ecological value of the site and what will be provided following the development. BS 42020 states:

'8.1 Making decisions based on adequate information

The decision-maker should undertake a thorough analysis of the applicant's ecological report as part of its wider determination of the application. In reaching a decision, the decision-maker should take the following into account:

- h) Whether there is a clear indication of likely significant losses and gains for biodiversity.'

The most objective way of assessing net gain to biodiversity in a habitat context is the application of the Defra biodiversity metric. This metric assesses ecological value pre and post development on a habitat basis, has been upheld by the planning inspectorate as an appropriate mechanism for achieving the ecological aims of NPPF, and its use is advocated in govt guidance e.g. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment>

In order to meaningfully and measurably accord with planning policy to achieve net gain to biodiversity, the applicant will need to use this metric. The development must show a net positive ecological unit score of 10% to demonstrate compliance with policy. Habitat mitigation can be provided on or offsite. This will give some legitimacy to statements claiming that net gain can be achieved.

If the development results in less than 10% net gain, a biodiversity offset must be proposed and endorsed by a legitimate biodiversity offset broker or provider with full establishment, management and monitoring regimes.

Once the extent of the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are established by the metric, they should be definitively proposed, so that they can form the basis of a condition. BS 42020 states:

'6.6.2 An ecological report should avoid language that suggests that recommended actions "may" or "might" or "could" be carried out by the applicant/developer (e.g. when describing proposed mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures). Instead, the report should be written such that it is clear and unambiguous as to

whether a recommended course of action is necessary and is to be followed or implemented by the applicant.'

A clear indication of all ecological measures that will be delivered by the development must be provided. This could be conditioned as part of the decision by adapting a condition from BS 42020. However, until a Defra metric assessment has been conducted, the character and extent of onsite provision will not be known.

Best wishes

Matt