From: Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan [dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com]
Sent: 02 October 2012 10:17
To: 'Tom Tew'; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; stoddart, carly; pullin, mark; hall, martin; 'Heslop, Anna'; samantha.dawes@rspb.org.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; acbh@btinternet.com
Cc: 'Bexs Benmayor'
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Thanks Tom, for your swift answer.

You do put my mind at rest a great deal – I can certainly see the value in a 'twin track' approach, although if the metric based system were to arrive at a lower compensation burden than that suggested by the experts, I repeat the point that the intrinsic importance of the LH nightingale population would surely have to militate against using this particular situation to test the theory.

Best regards

Dominic

From: tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk [mailto:tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Tom Tew
Sent: 02 October 2012 10:10
To: dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com; osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; 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; 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; acbh@btinternet.com
Cc: Bexs Benmayor; Tom Tew
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Many thanks Dominic for replying so promptly.

With regards to your specific point below - which is well made and understood, I would repeat my comments at the meeting:

The offsetting metric is simply a tool that allows transparent accountability to the assessment of habitat compensation schemes. We are not using Lodge Hill as a proving ground for a method, we are conducting two analyses in parallel to see if one challenges, or supports, the other. We are not insisting it is used, we are offering it as an optional tool to the Planning Authority.

And I would caution against anyone opposing the use of metrics in principle, if they are doing so based on the assumption that their use will necessarily suggest less compensatory habitat than the expert view based on numbers of pairs.

We will certainly keep all workshop participants fully informed
best wishes
Tom

From: dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com
To: osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk; tomtew@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; anna.heslop@rspb.org.uk;

samantha.dawes@rspb.org.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; acbh@btinternet.com
CC: rbenmayor@environmentbank.com; tomtew@environmentbank.com
Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop
Date: Tue, 2 Oct 2012 09:54:04 +0100

Hi Tom

Following on from Owen's response below (thanks for cc-ing me in Owen) herewith attached my thoughts and comments on the draft summary (tracked changes and comment boxes).

As a general and additional point, I repeat the concern I raised at the meeting about the appropriateness of trying to shoehorn this habitat compensation issue into the fledgling offsetting framework. I know this is EBL's raison d'etre, but by your own admission, offsetting as an approach is no further along the road than 'trial' and 'pilot' stage. Furthermore, no metrics for species have yet been devised. Lodge Hill may, through trial and error, allow us to arrive at a metric for nightingale, but I do have to question the appropriateness of using a nationally important population of a declining species as a proving ground – if nothing else this would appear to fly in the face of the precautionary principle. You may think the charge of trying to make the problem fit the solution is unfair, but I do think the insistence on applying the metric based system to arrive at an area calculation, when we have a fairly clear steer from the leading scientific lights in the field, does suggest the temptation is there.

Obviously, I would like to be kept informed and involved with the process going forward.

Best regards

Dominic Woodfield MIEEM CEnv
Director

Bioscan (UK) Ltd
The Old Parlour
Little Baldon Farm
Oxford
OX44 9PU

T: +44 (0)1865 341321
F: +44 (0)1865 343674
www.bioscanuk.com

This email (and any attachment) is confidential and is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must not copy, distribute, take any action in reliance on it or disclose it to anyone. Any confidentiality is not waived or lost by reason of mistaken delivery. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the sender immediately by using the e-mail address or telephone +44 (0) 1865 341321 and permanently delete the original and any copy or print out of this e-mail. Whilst we try to ensure that messages and attachments are virus-free, we cannot accept responsibility where this is not the case. No responsibility is accepted by Bioscan (UK) Ltd for personal e-mails or those unconnected with our business.

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Owen Sweeney [mailto:osweeney@blueyonder.co.uk]

Sent: 01 October 2012 21:24
To: Tom Tew; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; stoddart, carly; mark.pullin@medway.gov.uk; hall, martin; Heslop, Anna; Dawes, Samantha; sean.hanna@naturalengland.org.uk; Dave.Burges@rspb.org.uk; rob.cameron@naturalengland.org.uk; debbie.salmon@kentwildlife.org.uk; Greg Hitchcock; elizabeth.mason@cbre.com; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com; Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan; Andrew Henderson
Cc: Bexs Benmayor; Tom Tew
Subject: Re: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Dear Tom

Thank you for your draft summary. I have the following comments:-

Section 4, para.2 Would prefer ".....the factors affecting the success or otherwise of biodiversity offsetting for nightingales." since we are wrestling with both possibilities in this work.

Section 5, para.1 I take your "....could work...." to mean theoretically possible since the same caveats and uncertainties at Section 7.1 below should obtain here too. See also my last para below.

Section 6, para. 1 As above, I take your "....could work...." to mean theoretically possible since the same caveats and uncertainties at Section 7.1 below should apply here too. See also my last para below.
Section 6, para. 1 I thought the opinion trend was that ideally the offset sites should be within the Medway Council boundary rather than the whole of Kent.

Section 7, para. 1 In attempting to get to the sense of our discussions, this wording seems too optimistic as far as prospects are concerned given the many unknowns and uncertainties we covered. And the quantum involved at this particular site. (There must be a practical difference between compensating for a couple or so pairs and then trying to replace 70/80 singing males.)
Section 7, para.2 I have serious problems with this. First, I do not recall a clear view that temporary lag could confidently be mitigated for. On the latter part of this para, I thought the understanding was that any temporary loss of habitat was not acceptable to deliver permanent net gain, not least because this was far from guaranteed. In addition, it was stressed in the Development Brief and elsewhere that new habitat had to be in place and functioning before existing habitat (used by nightingales) was destroyed.

Before last week's meeting began, I mentioned to Brian McCutcheon that I was uneasy about the proposed "funnel" structure for the discussions, since it was my opinion that the three stages were closely inter-related. It was interesting that early on someone else queried the approach, and I think suggested it was upside-down? I suggest the caveats and uncertainties about compensating for this species apply to all stages, hence my comments above.

Best wishes

Owen Sweeney for Medway Countryside Forum

> ----- Original Message -----
> **From:** Tom Tew
> **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 ; elizabeth.mason@cbre.com ; stephen.neal@landsecurities.com
> **Cc:** Bexs Benmayor ; Tom Tew
> **Sent:** Thursday, September 27, 2012 9:55 AM
> **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.