

Biodiversity and the Natural Environment – monitoring framework

NE1 - protecting and enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment in the district

- Support - 10
- Neither support of object - 1
- Object - 5

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way strategic policy NE1 - protecting and enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment in the district, will be monitored? | | |
|--|---|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | <p>I robust monitoring regime is needed - this business-as-usual monitoring approach is no longer acceptable in the face of the climate and biodiversity crises.</p> <p>The Plan requires a local state of nature report to enable nature recovery. This is required by the Environment Act to develop Local Nature Recovery Strategies. Planning applications must show net zero impacts on these strategies and contribution enhancements whenever possible. This needs to be monitored.</p> | <p>Comments welcomed and noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | <p>This requirement can be assisted with optimal offsetting from developers with 'biodiversity credits' for 30 years if they meet the standards in an offsetting and Nature-based solutions. For this an SPDs is needed or as part of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Offsetting always being the last option in achieving carbon net zero and only for the most significant nature recovery sites.</p> <p>Monitoring should capture the aspects</p> <p>For the Climate and Biodiversity crises the achievement of the BNG</p> | |

Recommended response: no change

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>standard is a low bar achievement and WCC must go further with higher levels of BNG to contribute to mitigation an adaptation needs. A Nature-based solutions SPD and policy is needed to enhance these aspects with robust a monitoring regime.</p> <p>The regulation BNG is low bar given the twin environmental crises and additionality is needed using Nature-based solutions.</p> <p>Plus, the Plan requires a local state of nature report to enable nature recovery. The Environment Act requires this report to underpin the development of the Local Nature Recovery Strategies. Planning applications ideally should quantify the net zero impacts on these strategies and the contributions of these biodiversity (carbon sequestration) enhancements whenever possible. Monitoring progress on this is an important dimension for place making and environmental protection. This is not mentioned in this Local Plan?</p> | |
| <p>ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5 Littleton and Harestock Parish Council</p> | <p>The Local Plan is seen by WCC as a key document to deliver sustainable development and support its ambitions to achieve a carbon zero district. The Local Plan will be subject to regular reviews between now and 2039 and understanding both the effectiveness of the polices and how successful (or otherwise) they are, will inform those reviews. How the monitoring of policies will be undertaken is set out in chapter at the end of the document. The focus appears to be limited to monitoring decision of planning applications and appeals. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council considers that a more comprehensive approach to monitoring should be set out which would assess the outcomes and the effectiveness of the full range of the Plan’s policies and the decisions arising from them.</p> <p>Note: This comment applies to all monitoring activities.</p> | <p>Comments welcomed and noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N889-8 | <p>In addition to this monitoring as stated above I would like to see commitment to using the Building With Nature protocol. This ensures that nature is put at the heart of decision making which will support wildlife, retain biodiversity and better benefit people. The protocol has systems that allow robust monitoring.</p> | <p>Comments welcomed and noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2 | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure biodiversity gains</p> <p>There need to be more agencies involved</p> <p>The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets specifically for biodiversity The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team Recommended response: No change</p> |
| <p>BHLF- KSAR- N86F-K Natural England Link here</p> | <p>The full Framework includes recommended standards for the quality and quantity of multifunctional green space including the production of GI Strategies, updated access to natural green space standards (ANGSt), tree canopy cover, and good design principles. Of particular interest to Winchester City Council would be the recommended standard on Urban Greening Factor (UGF). This standard sets a minimum target for achieving urban greening on development sites, which could be particularly beneficial on brownfield sites where lower existing biodiversity features may result in minimal GI being created</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>As useful as this framework would be to our monitoring scheme, the monitoring that is undertaken at present is conducted by HCC through HBIC, and the resources needed to capture the addition UGF and GI data would go beyond the capacity within the council.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>on sites through Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, and ensures urban greening benefits are achieved on site, rather than off-site provision. It provides clarity on what is 'good' quality provision of GI on development sites. Incorporation of UGF into the GI policy would also link with and assist monitoring of other proposed policies such as NE6 Sustainable Urban Drainage, NE11 Open Space Provision for New Development, D5 Masterplan and D6 Impact of Overheating (e.g. provision of green roofs). UGF can be tailored to local needs to encourage increase in a certain type of urban greening feature. It can be applied across the authority, to specific types or areas of development (such as brownfield sites, or Winchester Town and South Hampshire Urban Areas), or target areas with low provision of urban greening features.</p> | <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
|--|---|---|

NE2 - major commercial, educational and MOD establishment in the countryside /NE6 - flooding and flood risk/ NE7 - settlement gaps/ NE9 - landscape character /NE10 - protecting open areas /NE12 - equestrian development / NE13 - leisure and recreation in the countryside / NE14 - rural character

- Support - 8
- Neither support of object - 2
- Object - 4

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policies NE2 - major commercial, wducational and MOD establishment in the countryside /NE6 - flooding and flood risk/ NE7 - settlement gaps/ NE9 - landscape character /NE10 - protecting open areas /NE12 - equestrian development / NE13 - leisure and recreation in the countryside / NE14 - rural character, will be monitored? | | |
|---|--|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | Flood prevention measures can be applied/designed into the environment without recourse to engineered SUDS measure through application Nature-based solutions. This should be encouraged, and data captured to show delivery of both approaches for virtuous circle feedback for LP and policy improvements. | Comments welcomed and noted Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | Policies need to seek protection of all existing mature trees and not just ancient and veteran trees for Land character and climate and biodiversity purposes. This needs a strict monitoring regime. | |
| | Quantitative understanding and monitoring of size settlement gaps is needed. This approach is not apparent here? | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>A settlement gap review is currently underway and a review of the criteria and each settlement gap will be included within this. This is not something that will be or should be in the annual monitoring report.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| <p>ANON-KSAR-NKDW-5 Littleton and Harestock Parish Council</p> | <p>The Local Plan is seen by WCC as a key document to deliver sustainable development and support its ambitions to achieve a carbon zero district. The Local Plan will be subject to regular reviews between now and 2039 and understanding both the effectiveness of the policies and how successful (or otherwise) they are, will inform those reviews. How the monitoring of policies will be undertaken is set out in chapter at the end of the document. The focus appears to be limited to monitoring decision of planning applications and appeals. Littleton and Harestock Parish Council considers that a more comprehensive approach to monitoring should be set out which would assess the outcomes and the effectiveness of the full range of the Plan's policies and the decisions arising from them.</p> <p>Note: This comment applies to all monitoring activities.</p> | <p>Comments welcomed and noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p>ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2</p> | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure the vision and objectives in these specific policies are being met There need to be more agencies involved The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team Recommended response: No change</p> |
|-------------------------|---|--|

NE3 – open space, sport & recreation

- Support - 8
- Neither support of object - 1
- Object - 5

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way strategic policy NE3 – open space, sport & recreation, will be monitored? | | |
|---|--|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | Agree if there is a much stronger requirement for community growing spaces to be included in all new development along with a monitoring regime. The onus should be on the developer to demonstrate if and why this is not achievable. | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | <p>These objectives are supported with the following additions:</p> <p>A monitoring regime for an objective to understand why new open spaces, when in proximity to new build, do not include a design for district heating, i.e., GSHP or similar. This monitoring can be linked to the Carbon Neutrality policy and the energy hierarchy.</p> <p>A much stronger requirement for community growing spaces can also to be include in all new developments. The onus should be on the developer to demonstrate if and why this is not achievable. This needs to be monitored and recorded.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. This is not under the remit of the AMR, this is for planning applications and policy wording, not suggesting how we monitor these. Open spaces is decided at planning application stage and designs for district heating could be monitored but is something to be decided and implemented at planning application stage.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p>ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2</p> | <p>The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|-------------------------|---|--|

NE4 - green and blue infrastructure

- Support - 9
- Neither support of object - 0
- Object - 3

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE4 - green and blue infrastructure, will be monitored? | | |
|---|---|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | <p>It is not just the CIL/S106 process that needs monitoring.</p> <p>GI and G/B infrastructure can be complemented by the Environment Act requirement to develop Local Nature Recovery Strategies. A baseline and monitoring of delivery/enhancement in this respect is needed.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>ANON- KSAR- N8V5-2</p> | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure the vision and objectives in this specific policy is being met There need to be more agencies involved The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|

NE5 – biodiversity

- Support - 9
- Neither support of object - 1
- Object - 2

| No I do not agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE5 – biodiversity, will be monitored? | | |
|--|--|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | <p>Nature recovery is as crucial to our wellbeing as the elimination of carbon emissions and adaptation to changed climate. Therefore, best practise Nature-based solutions must be applied in the built and natural environment in any new development which goes further than the low bar BNG.</p> <p>The BNG policy in the Local Plan will need to avoid biodiversity loss in the first place, to completely avoid impacts on irreplaceable habitats and protected and unprotected wildlife sites such as ancient woodlands, to properly value biodiversity including in neglected areas such as scrub, to avoid downgrading mature habitats by replacing them with new species-poor habitats.</p> <p>Sites for BNG offsetting should have the potential to buffer or expand existing habitats. For example, connecting woodland blocks, buffering ancient woodland and species rich grassland creation.</p> <p>A monitoring regime is required for this.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>A monitoring regime will be in place shortly. The methods for monitoring BNG are still in the early stages of being developed and implemented. When these processes are in place we will be monitoring BNG in the Annual Monitoring Report produced to monitor our Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is not always possible to completely avoid biodiversity loss due to the lack of suitable brownfield land for development. BNG ensures that any biodiversity loss is recovered with an additional 10% on site or on another site if this is not possible.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| <p>ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2</p> | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure the vision and objectives in these specific policies are being met There need to be more agencies involved Natural England is a Government body - need an outside opinion too eg Hampshire Wildlife Trust. The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|-------------------------|---|--|

NE8 - South Downs National Park

- Support - 10
- Neither support of object - 0
- Object - 3

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE8 - South Downs National Park, will be monitored? | | |
|---|---|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | As stated earlier. WCC needs to monitor the number of applications for changes in land practises to further creative use of best and most versatile agricultural and other land which does not hinder land production or impact on climate and biodiversity issues. The aim should be to support changes to regulations whether NPA or otherwise. For example, if an opportunity to use the most versatile agricultural land is made with benefits to carbon net zero and biodiversity then this should be allowed. DNP/WCC need to capture this data and work on changes to planning | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>A monitoring regime will be in place shortly. The methods for monitoring BNG are still in the early stages of being developed and implemented. When these processes are in place we will be monitoring BNG in the Annual Monitoring Report produced to monitor our Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is not always possible to completely avoid biodiversity loss due to the lack of suitable brownfield land for development. BNG ensures that any biodiversity loss is recovered with an additional 10% on site or on another site if this is not possible.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | Continuing blind acceptance of current legislation without a challenge to the guidance in planning for a “strong presumption” against solar farms on the best and most versatile (BMV) land is unacceptable, unethical in the face of the environment, energy and food crises. | |
| | Crop and /or livestock production failing to use land and light twice for maximum net zero contributions inc. for biodiversity enhancement plus new green businesses and economy benefits is a missed opportunity for the two crises. Land production can be enhanced with economic benefits for land users with this dual approach with twin income streams benefits for agriculture land managers. | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>Solar farms have the potential to introduce a net gain in biodiversity for agricultural land where might not be possible in the face of current legislation/regulations. For example, Agrivoltaic schemes combine land production with solar energy generation which avoids the use of greenfield sites for solar use and more opportunities for nature improvements.</p> | |
| <p>ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2</p> | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure the vision and objectives in this specific policies are being met There need to be more agencies involved The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | than the AMR or the Planning Policy team Recommended response: No change |
|--|--|--|

NE11 - open space provision for new developments

- Support - 9
- Neither support of object - 2
- Object - 3

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE11 - open space provision for new developments, will be monitored? | | |
|---|--|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | Needs smarter monitoring targets. For example, meeting a requirement for allotments/ community growing spaces to be included in residential developments of 10 or more dwellings. | Comments noted This is a policy requirement and will be met and calculated at the planning application stage Recommended response: no change |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | Needs smarter monitoring targets as suggested at NE3. | Comments noted Recommended response: no change |
| ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2 | The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met? | Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|--|--|---|

NE12 - Equestrian Development

- Support - 6
- Neither support of object - 6
- Object - 1

| No – I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE12 - Equestrian Development, will be monitored? | | |
|---|--|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2 | The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met? | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains. This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|--|--|--|

NE15 - Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands

- Support - 11
- Neither support of object - 1
- Object - 4

| Yes I agree Do you agree with the way policy NE15 - Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands, will be monitored? | | |
|--|---|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-N8Q5-W | <p>The Woodland Trust supports robust monitoring for this important policy.</p> <p>In addition to the measures suggested, we recommend adding the following, to monitor the quantity as well as the quality of trees and woodland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hectares of ancient woodland, to track habitat preservation or loss (Data source: Ancient Woodland Inventory/Defra Magic Maps) - Hectares of woodland and/or percentage of woodland canopy cover (Data source: Defra Magic Maps/Forestry Commission data) - Increase or loss in the number of ancient, veteran or notable trees recorded (Data source: Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory). | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>A monitoring regime will be in place shortly. The methods for monitoring BNG are still in the early stages of being developed and implemented. When these processes are in place we will be monitoring BNG in the Annual Monitoring Report produced to monitor our Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is not always possible to completely avoid biodiversity loss due to the lack of suitable brownfield land for development. BNG ensures that any biodiversity loss is recovered with an additional 10% on site or on another site if this is not possible.</p> <p>Being able to monitor the quality of trees and woodland is unfortunately not</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | something the Council has the resources to undertake. Recommended response: no change |
|--|--|---|

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE15 - Special Trees, Important Hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands, will be monitored? | | |
|--|---|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | <p>Monitoring the protection of existing mature trees is needed and not just ancient and veteran trees.</p> <p>Ideally, this should inc. a baseline assessment of fauna and flora with ecosystem benefits - air quality, biodiversity and carbon sequestration capacity etc.</p> <p>This will then demonstrate rigour in support of mitigation and adaptation measures for the net zero carbon emissions and biodiversity crisis.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>A monitoring regime will be in place shortly. The methods for monitoring BNG are still in the early stages of being developed and implemented. When these processes are in place we will be monitoring BNG in the Annual Monitoring Report produced to monitor our Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is not always possible to completely avoid biodiversity loss due to the lack of suitable brownfield land for development. BNG ensures that any biodiversity loss is recovered with an additional 10% on site or on another site if this is not possible.</p> <p>Being able to monitor the quality of trees and woodland is unfortunately not</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>something the Council has the resources to undertake.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | <p>In view of the Climate and Biodiversity crises, mature trees need to be included in this monitoring. A new Policy beyond TPOs will be needed for this .</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>This is not within the Local Plan's remit and the AMR is produced to monitor Local Plan policies. The level of detail and the resources to monitor this is not something that the council would be able to do. The AMR uses data collected by HCC under HBIC data and therefore is not collected by the Council.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2 | <p>If it hasn't been done already, there should be an audit of all the special trees, important hedgerows and Ancient Woodlands in the district to act as a baseline against which to monitor</p> <p>There need to be more indicators to measure whether the vision and objectives in this specific policy are being met</p> <p>There need to be more 'specialist' agencies involved</p> <p>The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met.</p> <p>need proactive measurable targets to monitor improvements not just measure losses.</p> <p>The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators.</p> <p>A strong sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable.</p> <p>The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team.</p> <p>Being able to monitor the quality of trees and woodland is unfortunately not something the Council has the resources to undertake.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|--|--|--|

NE16 - nutrient neutrality, water quality effect on the special protection areas (SPA's), special areas of conservation (SAC's) and ramsar sites of The Solent and The River Itchen

- Support - 8
- Neither support of object - 1
- Object - 3

No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way policy NE16 - nutrient neutrality, water quality effect on the special protection areas (SPA's), special areas of conservation (SAC's) and ramsar sites of The Solent and The River Itchen, will be monitored?

| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
|-------------------|--|--|
| ANON-KSAR-NKZ5-S | <p>Clarity on the governance/regulating/monitoring mechanisms to ensure the allocating of land for mitigation is robust and not open to abuse.</p> <p>How will land set/activity aside for nutrient neutrality be checked/monitored?</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>A monitoring regime will be in place shortly. The methods for monitoring BNG are still in the early stages of being developed and implemented. When these processes are in place we will be monitoring BNG in the Annual Monitoring Report produced to monitor our Local Plan policies.</p> <p>It is not always possible to completely avoid biodiversity loss due to the lack of suitable brownfield land for development. BNG ensures that any biodiversity loss is recovered with an additional 10% on site or on another site if this is not possible.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
| ANON-KSAR-NK9M-G | <p>I would like to see the Environment Agency and other water quality monitoring organisations consulted.</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Monitoring water quality is a task that our council lacks the resources for. While we're open to collaboration with the Environment Agency, we cannot require them to share their monitoring data, and their methods might differ from ours, potentially complicating alignment with our Annual Monitoring Report. Moreover, numerous factors influencing water quality are beyond our direct control, making it challenging to</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>ascertain the effectiveness of policies solely through water quality monitoring across the entire district. Therefore, while valuable, water quality monitoring may not always provide definitive insights into policy effectiveness.</p> <p>Recommended response: no change</p> |
| <p>ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2</p> | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure the vision and objectives in these specific policies are being met There need to be more agencies involved not just Natural England but also a specialist outside agency The AMR report currently focusses too narrowly on numbers of developments and does not really show whether the vision and objectives are being met. need proactive measurable targets to monitor improvements not just measure losses The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators. A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team Recommended response: No change |
|--|--|--|

| Not answered - Do you agree with the way policy NE16 - nutrient neutrality, water quality effect on the special protection areas (SPA's), special areas of conservation (SAC's) and ramsar sites of The Solent and The River Itchen, will be monitored? | | |
|--|--|--|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-N819-1 | <p>A clear governance/regulating/monitoring mechanism is needed to ensure the allocating of land for nutrient neutrality mitigation/offsetting is robust and not open to abuse.</p> <p>How will land /activity set aside for nutrient neutrality be checked/monitored?</p> | <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy,</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|--|--|--|

NE17 - rivers, watercourses and their settings, will be monitored

- Support - 7
- Neither support of object - 4
- Object - 2

| No I don't agree - Do you agree with the way strategic policy NE17 - rivers, watercourses and their settings, will be monitored? | | |
|---|--|---|
| Respondent number | Comment | Officer comment |
| ANON-KSAR-N8V5-2 | <p>There need to be more indicators to measure if the vision and objectives in this specific policy are being met</p> <p>There need to be more specialist agencies involved</p> <p>The AMR report needs improving - look at Doncaster councils version which uses a traffic light system and over 90 indicators.</p> <p>A sanctions policy is needed. What happens if the vision and objectives are not met?</p> | <p>Comments noted and examples of good practice is welcomed</p> <p>Although the Authorities Monitoring Report does use planning applications and appeals, this makes up for a small portion of all the data used in the report. Data and information is also used and analysed from Hampshire County Council for housing completions and commitments including</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>affordable, market, house type and location of dwelling in relation to policy, Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and Economy data such as business class losses and gains</p> <p>This would be required during the planning application process and not in the monitoring of the development or policy. The monitoring of policies must be quantifiable and achievable and the data for the AMR needs to be attainable. The monitoring of the policies does not involve a sanction policy, this is under the remit of planning enforcement rather than the AMR or the Planning Policy team</p> <p>Recommended response: No change</p> |
|--|--|---|