

Submitted to Consultation on Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations and Implementation
Submitted on 2022-04-05 17:42:17

Confidentiality and your response

1 Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

If you answered 'Yes' to this question, please state clearly what information you would like to be kept as confidential and explain your reasons for confidentiality:

2 What is your name?

Name:
Caroline George

3 What is your email address?

Email:
caroline.george@londoncouncils.gov.uk

4 What is your organisation?

Organisation:
London Environment Directors' Network (LEDNet)

5 Which option best describes the sector you work in or otherwise represent?

Professional body or association

If you answered 'Other', please specify:

Introduction

Background

Why are we consulting?

The context for biodiversity net gain

Overview of the proposed biodiversity net gain processes

Part 1: Defining the scope of the BNG requirement for Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Part 1.1: Exemptions

1.1.1: Developments impacting habitat below a minimum size 'de minimis' threshold for biodiversity net gain

6 Do you agree with our proposal to exempt development which falls below a de minimis threshold from the biodiversity net gain requirement?

Yes, and the minimum threshold should be 5 meters squared

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

The thresholds should be low in order to minimise the loss or downgrading of habitat. Even a small site can have important habitat that should be protected and improved.

This is particularly important in urban areas, where mosaics of public green spaces, private gardens, linear 'fringe' habitats and green/blue infrastructure can add up to form large networks of critical habitat, and provide important co-benefits for local communities, health, wellbeing and climate resilience. In a city context, (re)development of numerous small sites could result in hectares of habitat loss overall, and edge nature out of large areas of (sub)urban life.

5m/5m2 would provide a reasonable de minimis exemption while preventing 'death by a thousand cuts' to wildlife networks in cities and suburbs. It would also be in line with existing de minimis exemptions, such as planning permission for paving over gardens (which, where the practice is widespread,

is one key way in which greenery and nature networks are lost in urban environments).

Yes, and the minimum threshold should be 5 meters

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See above.

1.1.2: Householder applications

7 Do you agree with our proposal to exempt householder applications from the biodiversity net gain requirement?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Anything that exceeds the de minimus thresholds should be included.

Some homes have important areas of habitat that are lost where buildings are enlarged or converted, or gardens paved over for parking. As mentioned in question 6 above, this practical has especially detrimental effects for wildlife and green networks in urban areas such as London. This is already a key challenge for retaining green networks in (sub)urban environments, and if BNG could help prevent this kind of incremental loss of green networks it would be an important step in halting and reversing local biodiversity loss.

1.1.3: Change of use applications

8 Do you agree with our proposal to exempt change of use applications from the biodiversity net gain requirement?

Other (please tell us more)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, in general. However, where the LPA determines that a change of use application would have an important impact on biodiversity then BNG should apply.

1.1.4: Creation of biodiversity gain sites

9 Do you think developments which are undertaken exclusively for mandatory biodiversity gains should be exempt from the mandatory net gain requirement?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

It would be perverse to allow mandatory biodiversity projects to deliver no BNG, if anything the requirement should be significantly higher than the 10% minimum requirement for other applications. Projects undertaken for other environmental objectives should also be subject to BNG.

1.1.5: Self-builds and custom housebuilding

10 Do you think self-builds and custom housebuilding developments should be exempt from the mandatory net gain requirement?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Anything that exceeds the de minimus thresholds should be included.

Although historically the origins in the self-build movement were partly driven by sustainability considerations, this is no longer universally true, and there is no reason to assume that self-builds are implicitly more sustainable than any other development type. Self-builds should be held to the same sustainability and biodiversity standards of other development types.

Where self-build sites are small, this will be covered elsewhere in proposals through exemptions or the small sites metric.

1.1.6: Brownfield sites

11 Do you agree with our proposal not to exempt brownfield sites, based on the rationale set out above?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

We agree that brownfield sites should be included for the reasons given.

1.1.7: Temporary permissions

12 Do you agree with our proposal not to exempt temporary applications from the biodiversity net gain requirement?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

1.1.8: Developments for which permitted development rights are not applicable due to their location in conservation areas, areas of outstanding natural beauty or national parks

13 Do you agree with our proposal not to exempt developments which would be permitted development but are not on account of their location in conservation areas, such as in areas of outstanding natural beauty or national parks?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

1.1.9: General question on exemptions

14 Are there any further development types which have not been considered above or in the previous net gain consultation, but which should be exempt from the biodiversity net gain requirement or be subject to a modified requirement?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 1.2: Development within statutory designated sites for nature

15 Do you agree with our proposal not to exempt development within statutory designated sites for nature conservation from the biodiversity net gain requirement?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes. BNG is explicitly in addition to existing policy and legal requirements.

Part 1.3: Irreplaceable habitat

16 Do you agree with the stated proposals for development (or component parts of a development on irreplaceable habitats), specifically:

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

It makes no sense to talk of BNG for irreplaceable habitats. The important point is that the requirements of the NPPF - that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats should be refused (unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists) - is applied effectively and enforced robustly for all types of development, including national infrastructure.

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

This would essentially be a statement of biodiversity net loss, but again the important point is that such applications should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional circumstances.

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

It seems rather fanciful to anticipate development applications that will result in enhancements to irreplaceable habitats, other than environmental projects where this is the explicit purpose of the development.

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, as a last resort. The application should be refused in all but the most exceptional circumstances.

Part 2: Applying the biodiversity gain objective to different types of development

Part 2.1: Phased development and development subject to subsequent applications

17 Do you agree with our proposed approach that applications for outline planning permission or permissions which have the effect of permitting development in phases should be subject to a condition which requires approval of a biodiversity gain plan prior to commencement of each phase?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

There should be a requirement to frontload BNG onto the early phases of development, for the reasons set out. Planning approval for subsequent phases should be conditional on the full implementation of BNG in the early phases.

This will require robust accountability mechanisms to ensure habitat is created and maintained, and proper powers and full resourcing for local monitoring and enforcement. Secondary legislation is likely to be needed to put this in place.

18 Do you agree with the proposals for how phased development, variation applications and minerals permissions would be treated?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 2.2: Small sites

19 Do you agree that a small sites metric might help to reduce any time and cost burdens introduced by the biodiversity gain condition?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

20 Do you think a slightly extended transition period for small sites beyond the general 2-year period would be appropriate and helpful?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

For clarity and the best possible biodiversity outcomes, it would be best to have a single transition period and commencement date, supported by funding, expertise and clarity for local authorities to support implementation.

21 Are there any additional process simplifications (beyond a small sites metric and a slightly extended transition period) that you feel would be helpful in reducing the burden for developers of small sites?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 2.3: Nationally significant infrastructure projects

2.3.1: Proposal 1 - Scope, percentage, and targeted exemptions

22 Are any targeted exemptions (other than that for irreplaceable habitat), reduced biodiversity net gain objectives, or other modified requirements necessary for the application of the biodiversity net gain requirement to NSIPs?

No

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

2.3.2: Proposal 2 - Setting the requirement and transition arrangements through 'biodiversity gain statements'

23 Do you agree that the above approach is appropriate for setting out the biodiversity net gain requirement for NSIPs?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

24 Do you consider that the November 2025 is an appropriate date from which NSIPs accepted for examination will be subject to the biodiversity net gain requirement?

No, it should be sooner (please provide any supporting evidence or justification)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

We do not consider it necessary to delay the implementation of mandatory BNG to NSIPs for two years after implementation by LPAs.

25 Do you agree that a project's acceptance for examination is a suitable threshold upon which to set transition arrangements?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

2.3.3: Proposal 3 - NSIP off-site gains and a 'portfolio approach'

26 Would you be supportive of an approach which facilitates delivery of biodiversity net gain using existing landholdings by requiring a lighter-touch registration process, whilst maintaining transparency?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

2.3.4: Proposal 4 - Process and demonstrating biodiversity net gains

27 Do you consider that this broad 'biodiversity gain plan' approach would work in relation to NSIPs?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

28 Should there be a distinction made for NSIPs between on-site habitats (which are subject to the biodiversity net gain percentage) and those habitats within the development boundary which are included solely for environmental mitigation (which could be treated as off-site enhancement areas without their own gain objective)?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

29 Is there any NSIP-specific information that the Examining Authority, or the relevant Secretary of State, would need to see in a biodiversity gain plan to determine the adequacy of an applicant's plans to deliver net gain (beyond that sought in the draft biodiversity gain plan template at Annex B)?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

2.3.5: Proposal 5 - Maintenance period for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project developments

30 Do you think that 30 years is an appropriate minimum duration for securing off-site biodiversity gains allocated to NSIPs?

No, it should be longer

2.3.6: Proposal 6 - Compulsory acquisition

31 Are further powers or other measures needed to enable, or manage the impacts of, compulsory acquisition for net gain?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

2.3.7: Proposal 7 - Marine infrastructure

32 Is any guidance or other support required to ensure that schemes which straddle onshore and offshore regimes are able to deliver biodiversity net gain effectively?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 3: How the mandatory BNG requirement will work for Town and Country Planning Act 1990 development

Part 3.1: Biodiversity gain plan

33 Do you agree with the proposed:

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

We are not sure about the distinction between BNG information and a BNG plan – as the latter includes and builds on the former, it seems reasonable to require developers to submit a BNG plan with their planning application. The plan should be clear about when and how its actions will be delivered, and how this will be monitored and reported to the LPA.

The application should not be consented until the plan has been submitted and seen to be of an acceptable standard, based on appropriate, relevant expertise and local biodiversity information. It is essential that LPAs, and other supporting departments of the local authority such as green space / biodiversity teams, are given the resources and tools to assess this.

The LPA should in turn set out what enforcement action will be taken in the event that the BNG plan is not implemented in full. It is essential that local authorities are equipped with appropriate powers, resources and expertise to support them in monitoring, evaluating and enforcing these, including nationwide investment in relevant skills and long-term funding for the new burden this represents.

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See above.

34 We will continue to work with external stakeholders and industry on the form and content of the template. Do you agree with the proposed information to be included in a biodiversity gain plan as shown in the draft template?

Other (please tell us more)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

At a high level, yes, but it needs more detail on the specific actions planned to protect/enhance/create habitats and timescales for these.

Part 3.2: Off-site biodiversity gains

35 Do you agree that further guidance is needed to support decision-making about what constitutes appropriate off-site biodiversity gains for a given development?

Yes (please state what in particular would help most)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, clear guidance is needed in order to avoid differences of opinion between developers, LPAs, and local environmental authorities such as the environment or greenspace directorates tasked with creating and delivering nature recovery and green infrastructure strategies (which we hope the policy framework and delivery/resourcing mechanisms will support us to link up closely to our planning colleagues' work on BNG at a local level).

We agree that the guidance and the metric should encourage early and on-site BNG wherever possible, and that where it is delivered off-site, local options should be preferred. Developers must demonstrate that they have adequately considered the on-site and local off-site options before looking further afield. We agree that the metric should incentivise any off-site BNG to be as early and as local as possible.

It is particularly important that guidance and requirements are sufficiently clear and robust to support on-site or local delivery in areas with high land value, development pressures and competing priorities. In London in particular, there is a risk that BNG, affordable housing needs, accessible greenspace and other considerations are played off against each other, and it is important that developers and local authorities are supported in delivering all these agendas while maintaining viability. In particular, it is important that we do not end up with a system whereby developers usually resort to biodiversity off-sets in cheaper areas of the country, leading to depleted biodiversity in the capital and increasing disconnection between its residents and nature.

To avoid this, LPAs and developers will need support via:

- Very clear guidance and robust requirements to allow BNG, alongside other priorities, to be factored into developers' economic approaches from the outset (e.g. via land prices)

- Appropriate guidance on what is considered appropriate off-site delivery for a given development
- Ongoing investment in local authority capacity, capability, systems and skills to support robust local decision-making and leadership on these questions - not just in planning departments but also in biodiversity / green space services

On the last point – it is important that properly qualified ecologists are involved in choosing and registering offsite BNG habitats, and that ecological professionals in local government, industry and allied sectors are appropriately trained in BNG design, metrics and habitat condition assessments.

It is also critical that policy frameworks and local authority resourcing models recognise the role that will be played not just by planning departments, but by other local authority functions (notably environment, biodiversity and greenspaces) if we are to deliver successfully and maximise benefits for nature.

36 How should the UK Government encourage or enable developers and landowners to secure biodiversity gain sites for longer than the minimum 30-year period?

How should the UK Government encourage or enable developers and landowners to secure biodiversity gain sites for longer than the minimum 30-year period?:

A key consideration will be the development of funding models that can support management and maintenance over longer periods. Funding for ongoing management and maintenance of any habitat or greenspace is a substantial challenge, compared to securing investment for initial creation. This should be addressed through investment in financially innovative and sustainable approaches e.g. further NEIRF funding.

Conservation covenants provide another potential lever; however, for this to meaningfully support longer-term biodiversity gains, they will need to be supported through:

- Clarity on roles and responsibilities for covenant monitoring and enforcement, and rectification of breaches
- Relevant powers and authority for the key actors involved in supporting and enforcing covenants
- Proper resourcing for on-site monitoring by competent ecologists from the relevant authority or covenant holder (not the landowner), to support genuine evaluation and enforcement of covenant requirements

Finally, this should be supported by a policy framework that explicitly supports and encourages local authorities, LPAs and other partners/actors in the field, to align BNG and biodiversity gain sites to long-term nature recovery strategies.

Part 3.3: The market for biodiversity units

37 Do you agree with our proposals for who can supply biodiversity units and the circumstances in which they may do so?

Other (please tell us more)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

We agree with much of what is set out in the consultation document. The market should be regulated in a way that incentivises suppliers to sell their units as locally as possible, so that it is cheaper for local development site to buy the units and the cost for other developers increases with distance. The calculation of the units should reflect the extent to which biodiversity has been improved on the site, so the greater the measured improvement the more units it should generate.

However, in order to answer yes with confidence, we would need to know more about who would be eligible to register to sell biodiversity units, and what competency and skills training would be required to demonstrate organisational or landowner capacity to create and manage habitats. This would be an important lever in ensuring quality habitat, alongside proper investment in monitoring, evaluation and enforcement.

38 Do you agree that developers which are able to exceed the biodiversity gain objective for a given development should be allowed to use or sell the excess biodiversity units as off-site gains for another development, provided there is genuine additionality?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

This would appear to create an incentive for developers to over-estimate the biodiversity gains they will deliver. We are therefore against this practice as the economic drivers and incentives do not support positive outcomes for nature.

If such a practice is to be allowed, it is essential that robust frameworks, powers and resourcing are provided for local monitoring and enforcement, and that the market is regulated in order to incentivise early and local use of the 'excess' units.

39 Do you agree with the proposed scope of the UK Government's role in facilitating the market, as set out above?

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

It is not clear who will regulate the market – set rules and guidance, provide support and oversight, and intervene to correct any conflicts of interest or market failure.

Furthermore, while we do not disagree in principle with the government's proposal not to get involved in credit pricing, we believe government should

establish a transparent record of pricing of biodiversity units to support oversight, and allow for intervention if the market fails to provide proper cost recovery for habitat creation and management, to avoid large-scale funding gaps in the sector.

Part 3.4: Habitat banking

40 Are the proposals outlined here sufficient to enable and encourage habitat banking?

No (please specify what else could be done and why it is needed)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

There should be a requirement for habitats to be protected and improved in line with priorities set out in Local Nature Recovery Strategies. A simple before and after metric is not sufficient here, as sites will vary in importance for nature recovery and improved biodiversity.

41 Do you agree with our proposal that to be eligible to supply biodiversity units for mandatory biodiversity net gain, habitat must be created or enhanced on or after a specified date, proposed to be 30 January 2020?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Overall, yes as we agree with the rationale that we do not want to penalise early actors from the environmental sector who have started delivering genuine biodiversity gains in anticipation of this new funding mechanism.

However, it will be important to have evidence of the condition and/or distinctiveness of the habitat, to show that a genuine gain has been made. This must be supported a clear policy framework setting out roles and responsibilities for assessing and enforcing this, supported by adequate resourcing, skills training and powers for the relevant actors.

42 Should there be a time limit on how long biodiversity units can be banked before they are allocated to a development? What would you consider to be an appropriate time limit?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 3.5: The biodiversity gain site register

3.5.1: Proposal 1 - The criteria and process for registration

43 Do you agree that the eligibility criteria for adding sites to the biodiversity gain site register are sufficient?

No (please explain which additional criteria should be included or which existing criteria should be excluded, and your reasons for this)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

There should also be a minimum threshold for level of enhancements made.

Furthermore, as noted above (question 32), the criteria should include more information about how an assessment will be made as to whether "a specified person or body that is considered fit and proper to undertake the enhancement works". Safeguards are needed to ensure that landowners and managers (or their partners/advisors) have proper competency and experience in habitat creation and management, as well as training and understanding of BNG frameworks.

44 Do you agree that the register operator should determine an application within a maximum of 28 days unless otherwise agreed between both parties?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

3.5.2: Proposal 2 - Information that will be required by and recorded in the register

45 Do you agree that this list of information requirements will be sufficient to demonstrate that a biodiversity gain site is legitimate and meets the eligibility criteria?

No (please explain which additional information should be included or which existing information should be excluded, and your reasons for this)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

The list should also include the provision of reliable, robust information on the baseline condition, in order to assessment the level of enhancements made. This may be implied but should be an explicitly stated requirement, and ideally a minimum threshold should be set for the level of enhancements.

Furthermore, alongside details of who will be responsible for management and maintenance, we would suggest inclusion of outline costings within the habitat management plan. This would support delivery, monitoring and enforcement of long-term maintenance.

46 Do you agree that the UK Government should require a habitat management plan, or outline plan, for habitat enhancement to be included on the register?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

3.5.3: Proposal 3 - Application fees and penalties for false and misleading information

47 Do you agree that the UK Government should allow the register operator to:

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes overall, although the level of the fee for individual applicants should also reflect the value of the biodiversity credits being created, that is, a small project should pay less than a large project.

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, and these should be significant enough and based on strong enough monitoring / checks to make a genuine difference to the economic decision-making of developers and other actors.

There will likely be a need for the register operator to work with local actors (particularly local authorities and their key environmental partners) to support proportionate monitoring and checks if a penalty system is to be meaningful; this will require relevant resources and expertise at a local level.

3.5.4: Proposal 4 - Appeals against rejection of a biodiversity gain site application or non-determination of an application by the register operator

48 Do you agree with our proposal to allow applicants to appeal a decision by the register operator where the applicant believes that the registration criteria have not been appropriately applied?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 3.6: Additionality

3.6.1: Proposal 1 - Additionality with respect to wider environmental planning policy and legislation

49 Do you agree with our proposals for additionality with respect to:

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

BNG is intended to be in addition to existing legal and policy requirements, so only those additional enhancements that are not required for other reasons should count. This answer also applies to questions 49b-49e.

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See 49a above.

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See 49a above.

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See 49a above.

No (please explain why not)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

See 49a above.

3.6.2: Proposal 2 - Enhancements in statutory protected sites for nature conservation

50 Do you think that A) the non-designated features or areas of statutory protected sites and/or B) local wildlife sites and local nature reserves, should be eligible for enhancement through biodiversity net gain?

Yes, both A and B should be eligible

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

The principle set out above – that only those enhancements not required for other reasons – should apply.

51 Do you agree that the enhancement of habitats, including designated features, within statutory protected sites should be allowed in the coastal, intertidal and marine environment as defined above?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

3.6.3: Proposal 3 - Stacking of payments for environmental services

52 Do you agree with our proposed approach to combining payments for biodiversity units with other payments for environmental services from the same parcel of land?

Yes

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, as above – the BNG payments must be for distinct and additional enhancements, but where this is clearly the case we would support this kind of blended funded model, to support a multiple benefits approach to environmental land management.

Part 3.7: Statutory biodiversity credits

3.7.1: Proposal 1 - Use of statutory biodiversity credits

3.7.2: Proposal 2 - Credit price and sales

53 Are these proposals for statutory biodiversity credits sufficient to:

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

54 Do you think there are any alternatives to our preferred approach to credit sales, such as those outlined above, which could be more effective at supporting the market while also providing a last resort option for developers?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

55 Do the principles for how we will set, and review credit price cover the relevant considerations?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

3.7.3: Proposal 3 - Credit investment

56 Do you agree with the proposed principles for credit investment?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Part 3.8: Reporting, evaluation, and monitoring

3.8.1: At a project level

57 Do the above project-level management, monitoring, enforcement, and reporting proposals seem sufficient, achievable, and not overly burdensome on practitioners, developers, or planning authorities?

No, not sufficient

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

There should be independent monitoring of the BNG that was specified as part of the planning consent, it should not be left to developers and landowners to 'mark their own homework'. This is essential to ensuring quality habitat creation and management, for both on and off site provision.

Monitoring will be best done at a local level, by the LPA and register operator (or delegated to an approved assessor). However this will require relevant, robust enforcement processes, and also authorities will need to be resourced to (a) establish new local processes and systems for monitoring and enforcement (b) invest in relevant skills and biodiversity expertise and (c) fund ongoing delivery and hands-on monitoring. The last point could perhaps be charged for on a cost recovery basis.

58 Do you think earned recognition has potential to help focus enforcement and scrutiny of biodiversity net gain assessments, reporting and monitoring?

Do not know

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Further details needed.

3.8.2: At a policy level

59 Do the above proposals for policy-level reporting, evaluation and enforcement seem sufficient and achievable?

Yes, but not sufficient

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

We welcome the government's intention to continue monitoring, reviewing and amending BNG policy and implementation over time. The system is unlikely to be perfect first time and we are particularly supportive of the intention to continue to review management and maintenance requirements, credit pricing and gain thresholds.
However we would also like to see:

- External professional and academic scrutiny of the degree of success of the BNG policy, law and implementation. There could be a role for the Office Of Environmental Protection in assessing the effectiveness of the law and advising on how to strengthen it where necessary.

- Information on how local authorities and other key stakeholders will be engaged in ongoing reviews and policy developments, as key partners in implementation

- A requirement for Biodiversity Reports and monitoring data to link across to LNRs and other coherent environmental strategies, to support quality, joined-up outcomes

- An impact assessment reviewing whether and how the policy framework has impacted on delivery of other developer requirements, e.g. provision of green infrastructure/accessible greenspace or affordable housing; and exploration of whether changes to policy clarity or delivery mechanisms might be required to prevent this (without downgrading BNG requirements)

60 Considering the data requirements set out above and in greater detail in Annex C:

Yes (please describe the data and explain the reasons for your view)

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Yes, LPAs should explain how BNG enhancements across their area have contributed to the delivery of the LNRs.

Project monitoring and biodiversity reports should also be used to inform residents and other local stakeholders, about the success or otherwise of BNG enhancements by significant landowners and developers that play a key role in enhancing biodiversity across the local area. This information should then be used as a relevant matter in determining future applications (for example, where a developer has consistently failed to deliver BNG enhancements to agreed standards and timescales, this should be taken into account when determining any future applications by that developer).

No

Please provide any explanation for your answer here:

Annex A: Other policies and objectives which interact with biodiversity net gain

Annex B: Biodiversity gain plan template (working draft)

Annex C: Reporting requirements

Glossary

Consultee feedback on the online survey

61 Overall, how satisfied are you with our online consultation tool?

Satisfied

Please give us any comments you have on the tool, including suggestions on how we could improve it. :

The interface is user friendly and quick to use.

However, in practice consultation responses are usually prepared offline (e.g. via word) to allow for drafting and collaboration with colleagues, and then copied and pasted.

It is therefore useful that you provide a PDF, but the question numbers did not match those on the form. Had that been fixed I would have been very satisfied overall.