

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

Meeting 2 Processes and Decision Making

03 March 2021

Attendees at Annex A

Introduction and Welcome

- Cara Davidson welcomed the group and thanked everyone for their time. The focus of the session would be on processes and decision making, building on discussions from the previous working group meeting and the broad policy options identified in the [NatureScot report](#).
- Fiona Simpson gave a broad overview of the spatial planning context. She touched on three significant changes arising from planning reform including that;
 - 1) National Planning Framework 4 (NPF4) will be different to its predecessor, it will have development plan status and help reduce repetition in Local Development Plans (LDPs);
 - 2) We will introduce new regional spatial strategies.
 - 3) LDPs will be different, through wider buy in/alignment with local outcome improvement plans. Evidence report and gatecheck – upfront evidence, more spatial / less policy – to give a clear picture of how the area should change.
- Paul Sizeland gave a presentation on Securing Positive Effects for Biodiversity through the wider land-use framework, including Forestry and Woodland strategies, Regional Land Use partnerships, the Climate Change Plan, Land Use Strategy 3, river basin management plans, and local /regional strategies and plans e.g. Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) and Agri environment schemes and existing designations.
- Cara Davidson concluded the introduction and directed everyone towards their group discussions.

Group Discussion 1. Understanding the national, regional and local ecological context

Group Chairs: Stuart Mearns and Gillian Dick

How can planning best align with wider policy, procedures, and processes to deliver for biodiversity? Is alignment already happening, if not – why not?

- Busy and complex landscape. A point that can be confusing for non ‘experts’.
- 3rd Land Use Strategy to be published later this month – will ‘paint the picture’ set out vision at a national level. A view was expressed that the strategy could be clearer on the role of the planning system.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Point made emphasising the importance of aligning the [Scottish Biodiversity Strategy Post-2020](#) with planning.
- Role for Open Space Strategies. Can see national policy flowing down to the local level.
- Key themes across the piece – on addressing climate change, and on biodiversity, strong points of convergence (across sectors), the question is, what can planning do to deliver? View that planning has a role in giving a spatial articulation to these frameworks. It needs to focus on delivery.
- Good examples out there of collaboration and sharing of data, e.g. [Peatland ACTION Project](#), and in the use of satellite imagery.
- Need for NPF4 to align with wider framework – risk that it could lose clarity. [Planning policy] needs to be relied on by decision-makers and must be clear. Can clear themes be used to set clear policy?
- Point made that planning doesn't 'control' wider land-use activities – some things are out of the scope of NPF4/the planning system.
- Collective desire for a plan-led system, don't want speculative applications/appeals driving the system.
- View on need to move away from planning as a 'control' to focus on delivery. Need to capture positivity.
- Discussion on the role of LBAPs – why are these not required? PA sees lots of applications referring to the LBAP, strong role in helping to deliver positive effects for biodiversity. View from others that mixed picture across the country on LBAPs. Opportunity for LBAP 'light', focused on delivery, to drive locally rich results.
- Solutions to barriers to alignment – clarity of policy and expectations; relevant use of data; role of LBAPs.
- View on the barrier around control of land – constraining factor where need to offset.
- View that offsetting can be difficult to deliver through planning alone – the planning system doesn't manage the planting of trees for example.
- Take a Place-based approach. Do no harm. Focus on priorities - areas where planning can make the decision. Take expertise/direction of travel from other plans/strategies.
- Integrated approach to support biodiversity benefits/ solutions across sectors. Remove duplication of effort in achieving benefits for biodiversity, e.g. Flood risk management plans.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- National spatial element to inform LBAPs and make them more user-friendly.
- Resource NatureScot to deliver advice in LBAP development.
- Focus on place is right but need to define better, so there is a common understanding.
- The planning system needs to get rid of red lines.
- Resourcing in LAs is an issue.
- Using an evidence base to inform LDP preparation - linked in with new gate check processes and make the best use of local/ regional knowledge.
- Developers will comply with what's required of them. They will build costs in at the start. There is room for more ambition in what we expect of developers in regard to biodiversity benefit. The current control of woodland removal policy doesn't necessarily lend itself to biodiversity gains - too forestry focused - have to replace like with like - can be cheapest and quickest growing woodland. Also, impacts on communities - visual impacts - need to build in benefits for communities. A whole range of other considerations informs these decisions as well.
- Lack of engagement - We need to get better at engaging each other early in the process and have good relationships with partners so we can influence good places and also have input when decisions are outwith the planning system, e.g. forestry.
- LBAPs need to be clearer and accessible by non-specialists. Alignment is there at the highest level strategies but translating into delivery is unclear.
- Developers will look at spaces in terms of a specific site - if we want to encourage biodiversity benefit, we need to be clear about our expectations & how developers can deliver outwith site boundaries and the expectation for quality places that will cost.

What does 'success' look like....at national / regional / local level? How will we know when we get there?

- View that solution is to improve collaboration across sectors, e.g. with Forestry. Need clarity of scope on what can be done through NPF4, then strong cooperation between sectors. View that planning has a role in sign-posting / directing where collaboration should take place.
- Funding – can't all come from the public sector. Mitigation/enhancement can't always be onsite. Need to direct developers to local opportunities [for offsetting]. Point that we need clarity from the outset of what expectations are at the national level on what 'slice' of [developer contributions] should go to biodiversity.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- View that developer contributions have been difficult to achieve (for biodiversity) in the past.
- Comment on the future role of the Infrastructure levy.
- View that the history of policies is driven by analysis of need, we need flexibility to say what can be delivered for the local environment.
- View that we need to deliver biodiversity through place-focused investment. Need to avoid silos/piecemeal investment. How can we slot into the Place Principle?
- Point that skills and expertise (within PAs) needs to be kept in mind. View that PAs need to understand viability, we need to avoid developers being 'held to ransom' / permission becoming conditional on developer contribution.
- Locally a clear and accurate picture of what we have on the ground & a clear plan for how and where the opportunities are for development to support PEFB.
- A clear recognition in regional and national plans that improvement is required, [not just do no harm] and an approach supported by ongoing site/ place stewardship.
- Success - where national outcomes need to be updated where we have achieved them, e.g. outcome on access to greenspace not necessary any more it's already embedded.
- Success - where people talk about Scotland the way they talk about the Malmo approach.
- View that we should get on with it now and not wait for NPF4.
- Success – where we have developer buy-in, e.g. coming forward with biodiversity benefit proactively considered/designed into developments.
- Success - that biodiversity is viewed as 'business as usual'
- National success - where Scotland's Natural Capital is secure and increasing and is central to any definition of Scotland's success.
- Regional success - where high quality, multifunctional green networks are in place as a key part of regional land use; cared for and used. High quality attractive green places with access to wildlife and natural settings as a standard: less strategies and more joined-up thinking.
- Success – where developer discussions are happening at an early stage and building in biodiversity gains at the beginning.
- Co-production and co-design - bringing communities with us.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Spatial information is available to inform decision making.
- Our open space strategy now has a quality matrix based on multifunctionality
- Quality - We are looking for solutions that are ecologically functional and coherent - but also that are multi-functional and attractive/meaningful to non-specialists (developers, residents, planners).

Plenary Part 2

- Stuart Mearns gave a presentation on policy and strategy regarding land-use in the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park and discussed case studies of positive effects being delivered in practice.
- Gillian Dick gave a presentation on Glasgow City Council's use of data mapping for planning and the advantages it presents.
- Cara Davidson concluded the second part of the plenary and directed everyone to re-join their discussion groups.

Group Discussion 2. Towards a national planning policy

Group Chairs: Julie Dewar & Emma Hay

Should policy requirements for PEFB vary for different types or scales of application? In what way?

- View that a 'blended approach' [of NatureScot options] is needed.
- View that there are gains to be made for small-scale development, collectively these are numerous in scale.
- View that requirements must be evidenced, reasonable and deliverable. Don't want to see an increase in appeals. Simple requirements, e.g. planting should be of native species. We need to be bold. Further view on the need for balance, taking account of the drive for productive species, e.g. conifers in forestry planting.
- Could have the scale of application based on curtilage for example, rather than [the hierarchy of development/national/major/local].
- Easier to simplify as we go down in scale, could be a simple checklist to integrate (requirements) into new developments. Question on how you deal with regional variation, i.e. take account of what's appropriate in different regions. Point that has to link back to local information/evidence base/LBAP.
- Some PAs have been invited to sign-up to the [Edinburgh Declaration](#) - giving a greater focus (on biodiversity) within authorities.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Developer view that the biggest challenge is not in understanding policy but rather in giving investors confidence to go ahead. Need strong policy from the outset, so it doesn't get 'negotiated out'/national ambition comes through from the top. Need acceptance in the same way need for [contributions for] affordable housing is accepted. Also, have to strike a balance/look at viability.
- View that scale [of PEfB] should be driven by the potential opportunities for nature rather than the scale of the development, underpinned by EIA and SEA.
- View that universal obligations need to be driven by local/regional need.
- View that should be top-down policy but further fleshed out at the local level.
- View that developers should be working out the biodiversity value of land from the outset.
- NPF/RSS/LDPs as providing opportunities for dialogue. A blended approach to policy can be used, with LDPs picking up specifics.
- Partnerships across the country, e.g. Tweed Valley providing the opportunity to offset.
- Measurement shouldn't just be quantitative - e.g. it should be about quality and usability of open space.
- Some sort of Land Bank with a clear strategic vision for it. It must be a simple obligation on developers.
- Like for like offsetting doesn't work - needs to be adaptable - qualitative element is needed.
- Biodiversity doesn't always need space. Menu of options, e.g. with open space per unit requirement - that gives you a baseline to work on quality.
- Opportunity mapping - where the opportunities are, so there's a menu of asks.
- View that 'Building with Nature' kite mark is an expensive approach.
- Give greater weight to biodiversity in obligations - needs careful design—clear statement of intent.
- With Large scale development- we need to drive developer behaviour to do more, not replacing like with like - but making sure we are getting the best biodiversity outcomes - e.g. managing visual impacts with a tree line - these need to be quality trees that benefit that ecosystem and the community - place.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

What universal obligations, if any, should apply (e.g. requiring the use of native species in landscaping, swift bricks or bat bricks etc. in new housing)?

- View on the role of [BNG principles](#). Point that these are already in place / being used, as is DEFRA metric. Noting England is introducing new legislation. [A Scottish solution] needs to be workable in Scotland.
- View that, in a plan-led system, there's a required understanding of what's to happen, either qualitatively or quantitatively. It comes back to what does the LBAP say about what is needed 'here'. Need a level playing field/means of establishing what is the 'burden' and how does that translate into 'price'/developer contribution? Can we achieve a balance in integrating nature into all of development?
- View that we need to be clear on what we mean by positive effects? This could just mean something 'good', but we need to be clear we are talking about an enhancement.
- Point made that what is being described is very close to the UK Forestry standard requirements – sets out expectations for protecting what is already onsite and of value, but also expectations for enhancement. This is left to owners to design into the plan / how to take this forward. Works well in forestry context.
- Point made that we know what is already happening is not enough – ref to recent [WWF report on biodiversity](#).
- Point that we need to know if we're making a difference, we need monitoring and enforcement. Need to ensure delivery in perpetuity.
- Reporting [by PAs] already happening – report every three years but need to do better at linking to planning.
- Point made that it's not development per se driving biodiversity decline, but the role of wider land use practice. Point made that monitoring this has not been what we would want it to be, but looking at how to improve.
- Can still have policy exceptions to a universal obligation - need to be able to justify it.
- General agreement on the need for an obligation that is simple - provides flexibility - gives developers certainty however;
 - Need to avoid tick box green spaces.
 - offsetting has to be done sensitively and on a place-based approach that brings communities with us. You can't offset the loss of something really good - for benefit in 50 years - we need to be cautious.
 - Needs to be supported by guidance, e.g. what does biodiversity look like on a football pitch & flexible so you can allow community aspiration and developer/ case by case planning.
 - Should provide multifunctional solutions.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Menu of options - for local authorities where options are for developers to achieve biodiversity gains - planners at Stirling with SEPA - one planet prosperity - directing planners to deliver - ask how we can deliver.
- Obligation should set direction and allow for flexibility at the local level.
- Need to address rural as well as central belt issues.

Do you have any comments on the role of offsetting or on any of the other options set out?

- High-level net-gain principle without a metric.
- Offsetting good but has challenges.
- Start at community demand end.
- Can't offset 'good' with 'future good' for biodiversity - different to climate.
- Help developers meet other obligations through what they do for biodiversity.
- Greater Manchester mapping of ecosystem-based opportunities. A huge amount of work to map those opportunities. The Scottish equivalent is Glasgow 'connecting nature' - using Euro money to do the opportunity mapping.

Group Discussion 3. Nature Scot Report – key findings

Group Facilitators: Paul Sizeland & Simon Brookes

- I. *Realising a new ambition. - Is a step change required?*
 - Agree that a step change is required/we need to be ambitious and clear in our asks and why we are asking for something.
 - Need for resourcing to match ambition.
 - Need multifunctional solutions.
- II. *Building on what works. - Do we understand what is good and bad practice - do we have enough knowledge?*
 - In terms of biodiversity need, we know some areas require specific interventions, whereas others have areas of great flexibility.
 - Collectively yes, individually no - Expertise is out there but not always in authorities - we know things are good in principle - but not technical detail.
 - It would help to have greater input from NatureScot at a local-regional level.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Tend to load requirements onto developers to give us information - not sure that's fair.
 - We don't always have enough of an understanding of each other, e.g. planning need to front-load evidence - and statutory agencies come in later and object - we need to collaborate earlier in the process.
 - The planning system probably is flexible enough to do what we need to do - but not sure it's clear enough of what the ask is, e.g. those developing the plan or making decisions on it. There is a bit of a gap still - concern about case studies and picking up good practice without a really in-depth understanding of what, why & how. Some areas don't identify with case studies, e.g. rural/urban. - we need to be careful where we import things from.
- III. *Establishing commitment for biodiversity enhancement through development. – is this an appropriate approach?*
- Agreement from the participants.
 - Point made that consideration needs to be made regarding resourcing and if it is realistic for a given site.
 - Point made that using a more qualitative as well as quantitative approach helps change 'nice to haves' into 'must haves' and helps communicate to a wider audience who may not be as familiar with ecological considerations.
 - Point made that if we don't go for enhancement rather than no detriment, we won't solve the biodiversity crisis.
 - Point made that data which looks at the state of biodiversity in local areas likely already exists which could be used to monitor quality.
 - View made that a national metric would be beneficial for establishing a baseline that could inform local solutions for delivering positive gains for biodiversity.
 - Concern expressed about resources required at a local government level if too much responsibility put on them for the process.
 - Point made of potential difficulties arising when it is unclear if/how a development is affecting the environment.
 - Point made that developers know that houses in well-designed leafy neighbourhoods sell well.
 - Agree, not just mitigation - but positive impact - and proportionate to the scale of development - we all want to do more than do no harm.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

- Proportionate to the scale of development - yes, planning conditions have six tests that have to be applied and need to be legally robust in terms of applying tests.
 - Challenge when we don't know what we have or what we are asking for.
 - Whilst we are looking practice elsewhere - how can you provide net gain - over and above - with new obligations.
 - Enhancement - needs to be at least - the minimum - others might be willing to go beyond for CSR reasons - offsetting, e.g. water framework directions.
- IV. *Option H. Delivering change for the long term through an inclusive approach – What wider actions are required to support the culture that recognises biodiversity as part of a development?*
- Embedding biodiversity in everything we do and focussing on the delivery element.
 - View that there needs to be investment in biodiversity in planning authorities, fees to cover more costs.
 - There should be an increased focus on quality rather than speed.
 - Point made that it's important to engage with users of developments to try and achieve a long-lasting outcome.
 - Point made that COVID-19 has increased people's awareness of the importance of greenspaces and biodiversity.

Plenary Part 3

- Cara Davidson summarised the recurring themes, including; importance of upfront certainty for developers, the collective ambition amongst the group to do much better on delivery and securing long-term management of measures, as well as the role of monitoring and enforcement, skills and resourcing, focus on the quality of outcomes, and the opportunities of collaboration between multiple groups and public engagement.
- Cara Davidson set out the next steps, including a third meeting of the working group meeting to convene during the summer which colleagues would be in contact to arrange. Cara thanked everyone for attending, particularly the guest speakers and group chairs and concluded the meeting.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

Chat log from NPF4 Securing Positive Effects for Biodiversity Working Group - Meeting 2

[10:17] Link to NatureScot options report securing-positive-effects-for-biodiversity.pdf (transformingplanning.scot)

[10:19] For the groups awareness the regional land use partnership pilot areas were launched in February of this year - Rural and Environment Working together to maximise the potential of our land. - Rural and Environment (blogs.gov.scot) (2 liked) Working together to maximise the potential of our land. - Rural and Environment Regional Land Use Partnerships are being piloted to help develop Scotland's approach to land use in support of our green recovery and transition to net-zero. The Partnerships will help national and...blogs.gov.scot[10:22 AM] Keith McWhinnie

I can also confirm that Scotland third Land Use Strategy will be published this month - The aim of the document is is to make land use more understandable and accessible to everyone, supporting a shift in the way we think about land, to promote more inclusive conversations around how we use land and who should be involved in those decisions. It moves away from the sector by sector approach (of the last two strategies) towards an overarching holistic picture of what sustainable land use in Scotland could look like.

[11:03] place based approach with a nature based frame / lens so in layman's terms do no harm to social cohesion, health & wellbeing, environment, economy and biodiversity by your action or projects. So if you are going to do harm ask yourself why you are doing it and how you can adapt or mitigate.

[11:05] Lots of funding for project development and implementation but really difficult to get funding for stewardship - long term sustainability and maintenance of any projects. We go for an all or nothing with community ownership. We should collaborate, co-produce and co-share stewardship responsibilities

[11:06] its all about the same place and space so all data / evidence information should be geo linked to that space or place. So you don't necessarily need to have access to the expert (1 liked)

[11:26] Stuart - as part of the planning negotiations is there a maintenance requirement on that site. i.e. it must be maintained for X numbers of years after completion.

[11:30] For the tree planting and in turn woodland management we are covering this in a Section 75 Agreement. Other conditions cover other aspects

[11:31] thanks Stuart

[11:32] the application's reference number is 2020/0555/DET if you want to look up on our portal

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

Chat log from NPF4 Securing Positive Effects for Biodiversity Working Group - Meeting 2 – Breakout Group CD

[10:32] Agree with what Paul is saying , in terms of alignment, at the SG level all strategies are being prepared with recognition to the national outcomes in the other NPF (National Performance Framework) as a guiding star [National Performance Framework | National Performance Framework](#) , (based on UN sustainable devt goals)

[10:37] There is a busy landscape as has been mentioned. Bringing all of this into the NPF is probably desirable given the need to bring positive effects through spatial planning. However, there is a risk that NPF4 could become a document with focus on too many things. It has a new function now, and decision makers have to be able to rely on this document for clear policy and guidance.

[10:38] A barrier is the lack of take up of the very comprehensive and numerous advice and guidance notes produced by specialists (usually NGO's) for habitats and species is low. These notes are often dispersed and hard to access.

[10:38] Agree, a clear policy objective would be the best way to align plans - e.g. net zero for the climate change plan is clear; bet zero and really net gain should be the clear policy objective

[10:38] which is complementary to the climate change plan

[10:39] i.e. net gain for biodiversity

[10:40] That clarity will help set expectations for communities, councils, land owners, agents, developers about what is to come forward through the plan process. It helps us all plan ahead.

[10:54] I agree with Richard about directing finance to the right areas locally where offsets are needed especially at the outset/site selection stage

[10:54] so could this then take us to some sort of local partnership plan or requirement that there is then a need to show how a development can work in the local area for additional mitigation etc.

[10:55] A known (fixed/proportionate?) biodiversity "burden" on land subject to planning proposals.

[10:56] is there also an opportunity for developers to open up applications from local land owners with the carrot of funding actions.

[10:59] A known biodiversity baseline would do this

[10:59] Biodiversity net gain could level the playing field

[10:59] shouldn't onsite integrated approaches to securing benefits for biodiversity ought be a presumption as far as possible.

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

[11:55] Hannah is there a link to these docs?

[11:58] Thanks!

[11:59] <https://cieem.net/i-am/current-projects/biodiversity-net-gain/> Biodiversity Net Gain | CIEEM The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management promotes the highest standards of practice for the benefit of nature and society

[12:00] how the principles have been taken and applied corporately by a developer: <https://www.ssen-transmission.co.uk/media/3723/our-approach-to-implementing-biodiversity-net-gain.pdf>

[12:03] Thanks Paul

[12:05] also CIEEM's own guidance: <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-in-Scotland-CIEEM-Scotland-Policy-Group.pdf>

[12:08] With all of the policies we put in place nationally, regionally etc, what measure do we have to quantify the positive effects that we will have in total? What is developments' proportionate contribution?

[12:08] yes that would be key

[12:09] [RTPI | More effective way to measure impact of planning published by RTPI](#)
More effective way to measure impact of planning published by RTPI
An innovative way to better measure and demonstrate the value of planning and how it helps create sustainable, successful places has been published by the RTPI.

[12:09] To Julies point

[12:10] Agree with Hannah on resourcing issues

[12:10] just to second Charles point - development or just human activity as a risk to any habitat work in the longer term.

[12:11] absolutely - need to consider the other pressures on the environment - wider land use practices/ pesticide use/ soil deterioration other pollution and climate change, etc

[12:12] Role for Improvement Coordinator role here?

[12:12] BNG approach would allow a standard method for monitoring from land purchase through to year 30 of management...

[12:13] [securing-positive-effects-for-biodiversity.pdf \(transformingplanning.scot\)](#)

[12:14] yes

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

[12:20] re the simple metric: If just based on area, what measures will be set to ensure habitats of biodiversity value are created and how is it ensured that the habitats provided are appropriate to the location? i.e. if losing 1Ha, and required to provide 1.1ha – need to ensure methodology established so can't lose 1ha of high value habitat and replace with 1.1ha of low value habitat – also how does this account for the time take for the habitat to establish and the loss of biodiversity in the intervening period?

[12:22] re complex metric which is (according to the report) but isn't (according to the workshop) being considered: Thoughts on the benefits of the DEFRA metric – very well tested, whilst there are still glitches Version 3.0 should help iron these out and the Metric for small scale developments in being produced. Time factor in using this should be considered, guidance, training already established, and the BS standard considers metric use. Given the timescales for developing an alternative approach there is an argument for considering the use of the DEFRA metric as would allow it to be rolled out quickly. It would be good to know therefore if it is meant that this has already been ruled out

[12:22] Would that methodology mean that if I have a 10 acre site, I could build on 4.5 acres only? Daft laddie question...?!

[12:25] it would mean providing 11ha if you lost 10ha

[12:26] I agree Hannah, I think we need the metric. Not sure whether the gain is 10% or 1%, it seems arbitrary.

[12:26] there is work being done by CIEEM on the %

[12:26] Yes - invest in expertise. there is a need to have the people who can articulate what is required/ what the opportunities are - influencing and delivering the outcomes.

[12:27] which i believe is more evidence based - will see if i can find out more

[12:28] 20 minute nieghbourhoods!

[12:30]Thanks All, we will need to rejoin plenary at 12:30

Chat log from NPF4 Securing Positive Effects for Biodiversity Working Group - Meeting 2 – Breakout Group MB

[10:50] One definite barrier is how to get "best practice" such as Scot refers to in Malmo into standard practice

[10:58] National - Scotland's Natural Capital is secure and increasing and is central to any definition of Scotland's success | Regional - high quality, multi-functional green networks in place as a key part of regional land use ; cared for and used | High quality attractive green places with access to wildlife and natural settings as a standard

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

[11:34] [securing-positive-effects-for-biodiversity.pdf \(transformingplanning.scot\)](#)

[11:38] Sorry, I don't have the report and haven't seen it - probably a function of the way I had to join this meeting due to our recent cyber attack, with files having to be relayed through a colleague. I'm just going to have to listen in for now.

[11:39] <https://www.transformingplanning.scot/media/2131/securing-positive-effects-for-biodiversity.pdf>

[11:39] Our open space strategy now has a quality matrix based on multifunctionality

[11:39] OK, have now seen the report at the link. Thanks Hannah.

[11:39] Guidance on Open space stuff and play assessment coming from Scot Gov

[11:42] HI Emma - just to flag that the third discussion will start from 12:10 and Simon Brooks will be taking us through - although I think we may have lost him

[11:42] ok, thanks Hannah

[11:42] Note that Nature scot are suggesting Building with Nature. This is an expensive option that would see councils paying an english wildlife trust to rubber stamp our work. WE have the expertise here and a planning system that has tools to deal with the issues in a way that the english planning system doesn't

[11:44] Place based approach

[11:44] Do no harm

[11:44] Climate adaptability

[11:48] Quality is an interesting concept when we are talking about biodiversity. We are looking for solutions that are ecologically functional and coherent - but also that are multi-functional and attractive/meaningful to non-specialists (developers, residents, planners).

[11:50] Opportunity mapping allows you to sweat the assets. If we can identify where the biodiversity ask is we can then align that with private sector desire to carbon offset; come up with nature based solutions to flood alleviation that can reduce costs. Double up on work so the work that tenants brewery are doing in glasgow where they were producing a large amount of heat that they wanted to store to reuse. they are next to a park. We give them permission to dig up the park to bury there heat storage (batteries) then they create a better more biodiverse park. win win

[11:51] SEPA have a pilot called LENS working with Nestle to try to link the biodiversity delivery needs of companies to the biodiversity delivery requirements of areas and communities

[11:51] Totally agree Gillian

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

[11:53] Stewardship is also a good word that it's not about "others" doing this - it's about all of us and the resources and funding need to be in to ensure that the legacy we are creating in places is sustainable.

[11:53] I agree with Deryck that there's an element of horses for courses in terms of which of the options apply (and which would apply at the different scales at which development takes place). Sustainable drainage is probably one such example, where we might look at a menu of different options at house level that would have varying contributions to improving biodiversity (green roof, rain garden, etc) but might require a more quantitative standards approach for 'regional SUDS' at the scale of the large development or several developments in an area, to ensure that it has sufficient capacity. But underlying all of this, as Deryck says, is the need for 'obligation'.

[11:53] Also the issue of post-development monitoring with compliance, to ensure obligations have been met.

[11:54] Need to get the right things in the right place at the right time. A lot of green space in development is on the land that is left over. Should design the open space first and then design the buildings into the space left over but acknowledge that there are opportunities for open space on roofs, walls, balconys, courtyards et.

[11:55] I agree with that Gillian - as proposed by Jan Gehl too!

[11:56] Ah! We've hit the Jan Gehl part of the discussion.

[11:57] It always comes round to Jan Gehl!

[11:58] I'm taking you back to Sir Patrick Geddes in Edinburgh right place for the right folk at the right time written into the Mumbai plan in 1908 I think

[11:59] or you can throw in Jane Jacobs who said to paraphrase if you don't like a place why would you fight for it?

[12:00] Start from do no harm for offsetting - NBS approach place based

[12:01] Exactly

[12:02] It's about sweating the asset to be more effective and efficient. The biggest land managers are the local authorities who manage development, manage policy and strategies and actually own large bits of land and buildings

[12:03] Planning framework also needs to link to Adaptation Scotland / sniffer adaptation benchmarking as this will give us another lever.

[12:05] sustainability and climate emergency stuff sometimes not sitting with planning service - we had to move quickly to deal with GCC climate emergency implementation plan actions to tie to Dev plan and OSS as the energy and Env health officers leading didn't know what they didn't know

NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP MINUTES

[12:05] Also conscious of the need not to stifle innovative (even visionary?) approaches through being too prescriptive.

[12:24] I don't need as a Planner to understand Biodiversity technically. I need to know the right questions to ask the data. This will identify data gaps, duplication of effort and misunderstanding

[12:24] Sounds like we need to understand the best way to use opportunity mapping to present where there is flexibility in what biodiversity interventions are helpful for delivering better habitat integration and where very specific interventions are required. (1 liked)

[12:26] Also need to have the professional ecologists to go to with questions about the data

[12:27] Need to know the baseline in order to have the evidence to ask for an action

[12:30] Aberdeenshire got caught out with a legal challenge when the developer contribution wasn't near enough to a site. National policy needs to close this loop hole

[12:31] We have taken on flood alleviation for GCC but in East ren - but GCC had to pay for it with grants - couldn't get developers to pay

[12:31] Scott can you just confirm what you mean by CSR?

[12:31] it is broadly similar to affordable housing in that sense, the need for affordable housing isn't created by a development but we have made it an obligation for developers to help meet local need

[12:32] I agree with David - if the developer becomes a partner in a larger partnership that is looking at the wider area - we have potential for a blended approach to delivering biodiversity improvements

[12:34] Thanks All - Yes, please feel free to add any further comments here

[12:34] Many barriers come down to control over and ownership of land and we can't condition some enhancements that developers would ne willing to do, speaking from experience around wind farms. Locally I've seen housing developments, supermarkets etc spring up around the river near me over years and yet no improvements made to biodiversity around the river, an opportunity lost really, as ultimately these developments have had negative effects on the river (fly tipping etc) and yet is used as a local resource due to the walking path beside it

**NPF4 SECURING POSITIVE EFFECTS FOR BIODIVERSITY WORKING GROUP
MINUTES**

**Annex A
Working Group Attendees**

Organisation	Representative
Green Action Trust (Formerly CSGN)	Deryck Irving
Homes for Scotland	Richard Holland
Loch Lomond & Trossachs National Park Authority	Stuart Mearns
Nature Scot	Paul Sizeland
Nature Scot	Simon Brooks
Planning Authority Edinburgh	Julie Dewar
Planning Authority Fife	Scott Simpson
Planning Authority Glasgow	Gillian Dick
Planning Authority Midlothian	Emma Hay
Royal Town Planning Institute	Robbie Calvert
Scottish Environment LINK	Charles Nathan
Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Scot Mathieson
Scottish Forestry	Colin Edwards
Scottish Land Commission	Kathie Pollard
Scottish Renewables	Stephanie Conesa
SG: Biodiversity team	Matthew Bird
SG: Energy Consents	Alan Brogan
SG: Head of Land Use Strategy team	Keith McWhinnie
SG: Planning	Cara Davidson
SG: Planning	David McGonigal
SG: Planning	Hannah Eamer
SG: Planning - Architecture	Kristen Anderson
SG: Regeneration	David Cowan
The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management	Hannah Williams