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The Wildlife Trusts

Dr Sue Young
Head of Land Use Planning and Ecological Networks
Our principal petitioning points

• For HS2 Phase 1, an independent Ecology Review Group (ERG) has been established to consider annual monitoring outputs and advise the nominated undertaker if these appear to show that ecological habitat creation measures are not likely to achieve their objectives including making recommendations for remedial measures.

We request that HS2 should establish an adequately resourced publicly accountable and independent Ecology Review Group for Phase 2a.

• Resolved. As assurance has been given to Staffordshire County Council that the Promoter will extend the Phase 1 ERG to cover P2a.
Our principal petitioning points

• The Environmental Statement (ES) is incomplete and an inaccurate assessment of the likely impacts. If the ES is inadequate, it has repercussions for the mitigation and compensation measures.

We request that further survey work and impact assessment in relation to habitats and species along the route should be undertaken as a matter of urgency and where significant impacts are identified, adequate mitigation and compensation is provided.

• To be covered by Staffordshire Wildlife Trust and Cheshire Wildlife Trust in their petitions (who appear next)
Our principal petitioning points

• We believe the Bill will not achieve that stated aim of ‘no net loss’ of biodiversity. An incomplete Environmental Statement cannot present an accurate assessment of the likely impacts on biodiversity. This means that proposals for mitigation and compensation of these impacts will be insufficient.

• We request that the Bill adequately secures adequate mitigation and compensation measures both financially and in perpetuity, to achieve no net loss, using the modified Defra biodiversity metric to determine the amount of mitigation required.

• For Phase 1, we received an assurance that, should the calculations show a net loss of biodiversity, the Nominated Undertaker will provide additional mitigation required to reach no net loss.

• We requested a similar assurance for Phase 2a but this has not been received.
Our principal petitioning points

• We believe that the aim of the Bill should be to result in a ‘net gain’ for biodiversity (rather than the aim of ‘no net loss’).

We request a clause is added to the Bill requiring net gain for biodiversity to be secured in perpetuity through the works, mitigation and compensation, including habitat creation or improvement and that appropriate funding is allocated.

• Not resolved and the focus of our Select Committee appearance
CIRIA, CIEEM, IEMA Net gain principles

Define net gain as:

*Development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before, and an approach where developers work with local governments, wildlife groups, landowners and other stakeholders in order to support their priorities for nature conservation.*

From “The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature” HM government 2011
Natural Environment White Paper

• States that the Government:

“expects the planning system to deliver the homes, business, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs, while protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment.” (Para 2.33)

and that:

“Our leadership must stretch beyond its headline commitments – extending, for example, to the way we promote and conserve biodiversity on our estate and the standards we set for construction projects” (Para 3.44)

From “The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature” HM government 2011
Net gain for biodiversity

The recently published 25 Year Environment Plan: A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment included a policy commitment to “embed an ‘environmental net gain’ principle for development, including housing and infrastructure” with an action to “making sure that existing requirements for net gain for biodiversity in national planning policy are strengthened”.

The Plan also included a policy commitment to “Develop a Nature Recovery Network to protect and restore wildlife” and re-affirmed the Government’s commitment to “connecting habitats into larger corridors for wildlife”.

From “A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment” HM government 2018
Para 168:

**Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:**

d) Minimising impacts and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures
Net gain for biodiversity

In April 2014, in their report on HS2 and the Environment, the Environmental Audit Committee recommended that

“12. On HS2 the Government should aim higher than simply striving for no net biodiversity loss”

and that

“as it further develops its processes and metrics for biodiversity offsetting (para 23), it should seek to weight these to be more likely to produce biodiversity gains and take explicitly account of local communities’ well-being (para 44)”.

From “HS2 and the Environment” House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee, 2014
Net gain for biodiversity

Natural England conducted a review of HS2 Ltd’s approach to assessing the ‘no net loss’ calculation. Their recommendations included:

“for Phase 2 the metric should be applied for the purpose of meeting a net gain objective in order to fully accord with national policy, rather than simply aiming to achieve NNL” (para 26, pg 8)

and that

“Phase 2 is an opportunity for innovative and existing biodiversity projects to be realised under a net gain approach” (para 10.35, page 53).
Net gain for biodiversity

The House of Lords’ Select Committee on the High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands – Bill Special Report of Session 2016-2017 (Dec 2016) included the recommendation that “There is no doubt that a lot to be learned from experience on this project that can be used to improve the metric, and perhaps have the more ambitious aim of some net gain on future phases of HS2” (Para 293, pg 73).
CIRIA, CIEEM, IEMA
Net gain principles

1. Apply the mitigation hierarchy
2. Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset elsewhere
3. Be inclusive and equitable
4. Address risk
5. Make a measurable Net Gain contribution
6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity
7. Be additional
8. Create a Net Gain legacy
9. Optimise sustainability
10. Be transparent

From “The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature” HM government 2011
Achieving net gain

A greener vision for HS2
Ideas for large-scale nature restoration along the proposed route

Towards A Wilder Britain
Creating a Nature Recovery Network to bring back wildlife to every neighbourhood

A report for the Westminster Government by The Wildlife Trusts
Contributing to nature’s recovery

Example of where habitat creation could contribute to ecological linkage and nature’s recovery
Summary of Our requests

• We request that further survey work and impact assessment in relation to habitats and species along the route is undertaken as a matter of urgency and where significant impacts are identified, adequate mitigation and compensation is provided.

• We request an assurance for Phase 2a that, should the calculations show a net loss of biodiversity, the Nominated Undertaker will provide additional mitigation required to reach no net loss.

• We request a clause is added to the Bill requiring net gain for biodiversity to be secured in perpetuity through the works, mitigation and compensation, including habitat creation or improvement and that appropriate funding is allocated.