From: Dominic Work [dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com]
Sent: 11 October 2012 09:16
To: Tom Tew
Cc: Heslop, Anna; Mason, Elizabeth @ London HH; Bexs Benmayor; jarrett, andy; smith, catherine; mccutcheon, brian; stoddart, carly; pullin, mark; hall, martin; <samantha.dawes@rspb.org.uk>; Owen Sweeney; 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 don't recall any consensus on "temporary loss can be mitigated". The duration of temporary loss might be able to be reduced (eg by employment of mulching technique) but that is a very different statement.

If you are determined to keep the wording as is, I would request that you record that there was not consensus on the statement "can be mitigated". I remind you that you have previously said that recording dissent is part of the process.

Cheers

Dominic

Sent from my iPhone

On 11 Oct 2012, at 09:00, Tom Tew <tomtew@environmentbank.com> wrote:

> Thanks Dominic
>
> But the words you want deleting - "temporary loss can be mitigated with different habitat management techniques" - summarise a significant part of the discussion, were agreed to be true, and are important for third parties to know.
>
> So on this point I'll leave the record as it stands with a clear sense (helpfully highlighted by this email thread) that temporary loss can be mitigated but not, under the current schedule, avoided and that this is a critical point for stakeholders.
>
> best
> Tom
>
> ---
>
> Date: Wed, 10 Oct 2012 20:43:42 +0100
> Subject: Re: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop
> From: dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com
> To: tomtew@environmentbank.com
> CC: anna.heslop@rspb.org.uk; elizabeth.mason@cbre.com; 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

You've usefully highlighted the problem with your "...." in your quoted passage below. The text you have removed from the quote is what makes that sentence opaque and potentially misleading, as it appears to suggest the temporary loss agreed by all can be mitigated, the implication being that it can be wholly mitigated.

Solution: if you were to go ahead and remove the '....' text permanently, so that the sentence ran in the abbreviated form you usefully give below, my elephant and cupboard problem would be solved....

Dominic

Sent from my iPhone

On 10 October 2012 17:21, Tom Tew <tomtew@environmentbank.com> wrote:

> Hi Dominic - thanks
>
> I'm struggling to understand your serious problem re elephantine skeletons....
>
> What element of "there was a consensus that temporary loss was unavoidable within the timescales for delivery being imposed by the planning system" (your words) isn't captured by the words in the note "Temporary loss .... cannot be avoided under the schedules currently proposed".
>
> Grateful for guidance.
> best
> Tom
>
> ---
>
> From: dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com
> To: tomtew@environmentbank.com; anna.heslop@rspb.org.uk; elizabeth.mason@cbre.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
>
> Subject: RE: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop
> Date: Tue, 9 Oct 2012 14:23:05 +0100
>
> Hi Tom
>
> Thanks for circulating this revised draft.

I have attached a copy with a very few residual, but important, notes. I have a serious problem with the apparent determination to ignore the 'elephant in the room' of timescales (actually, you referred to it as the 'skeleton in the cupboard' at the meeting). The note really does need to reflect that there was a consensus that temporary loss was unavoidable within the timescales for delivery being imposed by the planning system. However unpalatable that may be, it is a point of fact.

I'll have a quick look at the habitat criteria and condition paper now.

Best regards

Dominic

From: tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk [mailto:tom.tew@hotmail.co.uk] **On Behalf Of** Tom Tew
Sent: 08 October 2012 15:16
To: Dominic Woodfield - Bioscan; Heslop, Anna; 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: Lodge Hill: Technical Workshop

Hi everyone

With apologies for the slight delay - please find attached a revised draft of the Lodge Hill technical workshop notes. A few comments:

1. Your emails and notes were all extremely helpful - you will see that I have incorporated many of them - thank you.
2. There was clear disagreement over the use of the word 'all' in the phrase 'all offset site conditions required by nightingales' in section 5 - some remembered it, some definitely didn't. I have decided for the notes to exclude it because, as you will see from the attachment, we are coming up with lots and lots of potential criteria for assessing habitat quality for nightingales and perhaps no site will meet 'all'. We might need to debate whether there are some 'key' conditions that we do think must be met (see 3 below). In any case, the question I think I asked at the workshop - 'will it work if all conditions are met?' is different and much less helpful to the question I should have asked - 'do all conditions need to be met for it to work?'. Sorry for that.
3. I have amended the text on the local experts' views on nightingale populations - this was badly worded in the notes.

4. There has been a mini-row over what was said about the geographical location of the receptor sites - 'close to Lodge Hill', 'within Kent', 'within Medway', or 'not to be constrained by administrative boundaries'. As I recall the discussion, there was the (usual and legitimate) difference of views between national and local perspectives and no consensus was reached - I have left the wording that (to my mind) sets preferred options for local delivery but does not preclude a wider search.
5. I have clarified the position on temporary habitat loss - the notes here were plain wrong, and I am grateful for comments - my apologies again. I hope the revised wording captures the actual discussion. Again, there is a further important debate on whether temporary loss is ever acceptable, and under what circumstances - but we did not go far down that route in the workshop.

I hope this version is OK for everyone - I certainly don't want to encourage more editing (!) but if there remain bits of this that you find completely untrue or unacceptable then do get back to me.

Secondly, the BTO are revising the main report, taking on board the workshop comments, but are still waiting for figure-reproduction permissions - so that should follow next week and will be sent to all.

As will a short paper on the 'criteria for site selection' which is noted in the minutes and which everyone wished to comment on - I would be grateful if you could get comments to me within one week of receiving the paper (i.e. if receive on 15th, then comments by 22nd). In that paper we will try to structure a quick questionnaire to help you explore both which criteria are key (or necessary) and also what level of certainty we have in our assessment.

Finally, please find attached a draft paper that EBL & BTO have written on habitat condition criteria to help inform our assessment of the Lodge Hill site. We didn't promise to forward this round but if you are able to spare the time we would welcome any comments on this paper either asap (next day or two) before we visit Lodge Hill, or indeed thereafter to inform our post-visit analysis.

Thanking you again for all your contributions,

best wishes to all
Tom

PS Catherine - I am not at all certain this email list covers all workshop attendees - would you be so kind as to check for me and forward it on to anyone I have missed? Thanks.

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

--

Dominic Woodfield CEnv MIEEM
Director

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

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