From: Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan [dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com]
Sent: 03 October 2012 15:30
To: 'Tom Tew'; 'Heslop, Anna'; 'Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH'
Cc: 'Bexs Benmayor'; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; stoddart, carly; pullin, mark; hall, martin; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; 'Hanna, Sean (NE)'; dave.burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; 'Debbie Salmon'; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; andrew.dodd@rspb.org.uk; acbh@btinternet.com
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

I am sure everyone would like to move on, and quickly, but we cannot forget the nature of the process we are in:

1) The Inspector wants a technical panel to explore whether a consensus can be reached on the prospects for offsetting to achieve a solution for the impact of development on the nightingale population at Lodge Hill. If no consensus can be reached, that is just as relevant to her deliberations as if we had all left Gun Wharf last week speaking with the same voice.
2) Hence I would be very concerned about anyone choosing to present their own recollection of a 'broad consensus' as representative (even if I might understand their frustration). For the record, I too took extensive and pretty good notes on the day, but I would not suggest they were representative without getting assent from the rest of the attendees, and I wouldn't dream of putting them into the public domain without doing so.

At the end of the day, the Inspector was not there, but it falls to her, not any one of us, to make a decision that one way or the other will have significant ramifications for the LH nightingales. Therefore it is what is committed to paper now that is actually more important than the 'within these four walls' discussion we had last week, convivial, fascinating and productive though it was. If we cannot reach an on-paper consensus, on key points, that fact either needs to be recorded in the note, or we need to present only the things that can be agreed, and then move on. If even this is going to prove too big an obstacle, perhaps we should only agree 'next steps' action points. Today's emergence of apparently polarised views on what was agreed last week may be frustrating for those charged with managing this process, but that is no justification for short-cuts.

Dominic

From: tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk [mailto:tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Tom Tew
Sent: 03 October 2012 14:52
To: Heslop, Anna; Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan; Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH
Cc: Bexs Benmayor; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; hall, martin; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; Hanna, Sean (NE); dave.burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; Debbie Salmon; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; andrew.dodd@rspb.org.uk; acbh@btinternet.com
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Hi everyone

Oh dear - arguing over exactly who said exactly what was exactly what I was trying to avoid....

That is why I repeatedly reminded everyone during the workshop of the 'solution-seeking-consensual approach' - which you all, on the day, responded magnificently to - and why we specifically operated on a 'non-attributable' basis with the notes of the meeting seeking to record only headline points.

These notes do not prejudice anyone's position, they are not in any way quasi-legal and they do not supplant any part of the planning process - we are technical experts working together to see if there are possible solutions.

At several stages in the meeting we did reach a broad consensus (which is not to say every single person agreed with every single word, nor that anyone was 'signing up' to anything) and I took some time to clarify what we had or hadn't agreed on; if there is now direct disagreement from participants on their recollection of events then I will, for the record, note that disagreement and fall back on the notes that Bexs and I took to present *my* recollection.

In short, I will of course do my very best to reflect and record everyone's comments because of course we need an accurate reflection of the meeting but, please, can we not spend weeks and months arguing over meeting notes?

best wishes to all
Tom

Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop
Date: Wed, 3 Oct 2012 14:10:19 +0100
From: Anna.Heslop@rspb.org.uk
To: dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com; elizabeth.mason@cbre.com; tomtew@environmentbank.com
CC: rbenmayor@environmentbank.com; andy.jarrett@medway.gov.uk; catherine.smith@medway.gov.uk; brian.mccutcheon@medway.gov.uk; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; martin.hall@gtgkm.org.uk; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; Dave.Burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; debbie.salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; andrew.dodd@rspb.org.uk; acbh@btinternet.com

Hi Tom,

I'm afraid I would have to disagree with DIO and Land Sec's recollection in places, as it differs quite markedly from our own. In particular:

5.1 The RSPB's recollection is that "all" conditions should be met.

5.4 and the proposed new 5.5: The RSPB is quite certain that local Kent experts (by which I assume we mean Andrew Henderson, Owen Sweeney and Dominic Woodfield) did not make any statements about national numbers. Perhaps Dominic and Owen could confirm their recollection. The RSPB is certain that the meeting heard that there has probably been a slight decline in numbers in Kent. The BTO report makes quite clear (and again, the RSPB has no recollection of any statement to the contrary during the meeting) that there has been a marked decline in the national population.

5.6 – Comment AAU7 – The RSPB has no recollection of this comment being made.

6.2 and 7.2 The RSPB does not recall that the principle of a temporal lag was agreed, nor that there was general consensus that temporary impacts were less important than long term impacts.

7, action point 3 – The RSPB recalls that the purpose of the survey was to assess likely areas to be used by nightingales and was not limited to "semi natural and hard standing" areas, although it was to include these as they may form part of the home range of nightingales.

8, new proposed action point – The RSPB does not understand this point, but also doesn't recall it being listed as an action from the meeting.

Sorry to add to the work that must be involved in resolving all of our comments, but I do think it's important to start the process off by being clear about the conclusions we understood had been reached.

Many thanks

Anna

From: Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan [mailto:dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com]
Sent: 03 October 2012 12:01
To: 'Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH'; 'Tom Tew'
Cc: 'Bexs Benmayor'; 'jarrett, andy'; 'smith, catherine'; 'mccutcheon, brian'; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; 'hall, martin'; Heslop, Anna; Dawes, Samantha; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; Burges, Dave; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; debbie.salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; Dodd, Andrew; 'Andrew Henderson'
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Hi Tom

Sorry to be a bore – but Liz's comments on behalf of DIO and Land Securities appear to attempt to speak for the BTO in a few places. Putting aside what the document itself says at point 2 about comments not being attributable, would it not be more appropriate and representative to ask Rob/Chris to offer their own observations/recollections/opinions on these points (e.g. through being given the opportunity to review the document along with the rest of those who attended - I note they are not on the cc list)?

Dominic

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH [mailto:elizabeth.mason@cbre.com]
Sent: 03 October 2012 11:29
To: 'Tom Tew'
Cc: Bexs Benmayor; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; hall, martin; Heslop, Anna; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; dave.burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; debbie.salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; Dodd, Andrew; Andrew Henderson; dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Dear Tom,

Please find attached the comments made on behalf of DIO and Land Securities to the draft summary notes.

Kind regards,

Liz

Liz Mason | Director
Planning
CBRE Ltd
Henrietta House | Henrietta Place | London | W1G 0NB
DDI +44 20 7182 2136 | F +44 20 7182 2001 | M +44 7947 317986
elizabeth.mason@cbre.com | www.cbre.co.uk | www.cbreplanning.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk [mailto:tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Tom Tew
Sent: 27 September 2012 09:56
To: jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; hall, martin; Heslop, Anna; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; dave.burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; debbie.salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; greg.hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com
Cc: Bexs Benmayor; Tom Tew
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Dear all

Please find attached a draft version of the summary notes of the technical workshop held in Chatham earlier this week - the final version will be in the public domain.

You will see that we have tried, as promised, to distil the discussions and consensus into some plain-English conclusions, without attributing specific points to individuals or organisations; you will note also that I have tried to capture the many uncertainties. I would be grateful if you could look through these and let me know of any inaccuracies or omissions - if I could receive comments by next Wednesday (3 Oct) I can then issue a final version by 5 Oct.

My thanks again to all attendees for their uniformly constructive contributions to a very difficult set of technical questions

with best wishes
Tom

Dr T E Tew FRSA FBS MIEEM
Chief Executive
The Environment Bank

Subject: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop
Date: Fri, 7 Sep 2012 17:10:10 +0100
From: andy.jarrett@medway.gov.uk
To: catherine.smith@medway.gov.uk; brian.mccutcheon@medway.gov.uk; andy.jarrett@medway.gov.uk; carly.stoddart@medway.gov.uk; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; martin.hall@gtgkm.org.uk; Anna.Heslop@rspb.org.uk; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; Sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; Dave.Burges@rspb.org.uk; Rob.Cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; Debbie.Salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; Greg.Hitchcock@kentwildlife.org.uk; elizabeth.mason@cbre.com; Stephen.Neal@landsecurities.com
CC: ttew@environmentbank.com

Dear All

I refer to Catherine Smith's recent email confirming the date of the Technical Workshop as the morning of the 25th September 2012 I can now forward a number of reports which will help to inform the meeting. Please find the following documents attached:

1. Technical workshop to assess the ability of biodiversity offsetting to compensate for nightingale habitat loss at Lodge Hill, Kent. 25 September 2012. - Environment Bank Ltd.;
2. Independent assessment of the potential for Biodiversity Offsetting to compensate for nightingale habitat loss at Lodge Hill, Kent 20.7.2012. - Environment Bank Ltd.;
3. A study to identify mitigation opportunities for breeding Nightingales in Medway, Part One: Identifying suitable and deliverable sites locally on the Hoo Peninsula, Medway Date: 23rd July 2012 greening the Gateway Kent and Medway;

Following my call for Case Studies I gather that a number of you have contacted the same people about work they have undertaken. I am advised that this is causing some concern and a duplication in effort. I suggest that it might be better if you can forward to me readily available documentation and where known contacts for the studies. I will then suggest to Tom that he or Rob Fuller of the BTO contact the appropriate people directly. I hope that is acceptable to everybody.

Kind Regards

Andy

Andy Jarrett BA (Hons)TP MRTPI
Lodge Hill Planning and Project Manager

Development, Economy and Transport
Medway Council
Civic Headquarters
Gun Wharf
Dock Road
Chatham
Kent ME4 4TR

Tel: 01227 832418
Mob: 07789318096
Email: andy.jarrett@medway.gov.uk

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. This email has been scanned for viruses and all reasonable precautions have been taken to ensure that none are present. Medway Council cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments. Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender and not necessarily those of Medway Council unless explicitly stated. Please be aware that emails sent to or received from Medway Council may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

CBRE Limited, Registered Office: St Martin's Court, 10 Paternoster Row, London, EC4M 7HP, registered in England and Wales No. 3536032. Regulated by the RICS and an appointed representative of CBRE Indirect Investment Services Limited which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority. This communication is from CBRE Limited or one of its associated/subsidiary companies. This communication contains information which is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately. Any use of its contents is strictly prohibited and you must not copy, send or disclose it, or rely on its contents in any way whatsoever. Reasonable care has been taken to ensure that this communication (and any attachments or hyperlinks contained within it) is free from computer viruses. No responsibility is accepted by CBRE Limited or its associated/subsidiary companies and the recipient should carry out any appropriate virus checks.