





Background

Producing biodiversity reports that meet required professional standards reduces the risks of delay with associated planning applications through the planning process.

In our experience the quality and adequacy of biodiversity reports submitted to local planning authorities to support planning applications is — across the whole of the UK - extremely varied and inconsistent. Where reports are inadequate, this can lead to failure to achieve desired outcomes for biodiversity conservation as well as running the risk of delays, increased costs and uncertainty for applicants over whether planning consent will be granted. In the worst case, a planning consent that is granted based upon inadequate information may be open to legal challenge.

Purpose

The purpose of this form is to ensure a competent review of the biodiversity information provided to support a planning application by the applicant has been undertaken. The form is designed to encourage those responsible for providing biodiversity reports to ensure they follow good professional practice and are fit for their intended purpose, i.e. is in accordance with Clauses 6 and 8.1 of BS42020:2013 and therefore adequate to enable determination by the relevant competent authority. This is based on the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) Checklist available on the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) website https://cieem.net/resource/ecological-impact-assessment-ecia-checklist/

Use

This form shall be used for all full and outline applications where there are likely to be implications for biodiversity. Consequently, the form shall be used for all types of development, whether the proposed development is listed on Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations or not. In line with the Validation Checklist, biodiversity information would be submitted in the form of either a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal or an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) Report (in accordance with CIEEM guidelines; see Endnote vii).

The Local Planning Authority will only accept biodiversity information in the form of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEA) Report where all 3 of the following apply:

- 1. No further surveys* beyond those that are complete and reported fully in the PEA Report are required;
- *A PEA Report will normally be based on a desk study and extended Phase 1 habitat survey (or equivalent), but may also include the results of Phase 2 surveys.
- 2. And either:
- a. The report provides an adequate assessment of biodiversity impacts; or
- b. The report is able to conclude robustly that there would be no significant residual biodiversity impacts.
- 3. And the report provides adequate information about the biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures proposed; and these are capable of being secured through a planning condition, obligation and/or protected species licence.







The terms 'Ecological Impact Assessment' (EcIA), 'EcIA Report', 'Preliminary Ecological Appraisal' (PEA), 'PEA Report', 'Extended Phase 1 habitat survey' and 'Phase 2 surveys' are defined by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) in the 'Guide to Ecological Surveys and Their Purpose' (December 2017), available at https://cieem.net/resource/guide-to-ecological-surveys-and-their-purpose/

How to complete this form

Part A of this form provides general background information and a signed declaration. It should be completed by the Ecologist representing the Applicant.

Part B of this form is a declaration that should be completed by the Applicant to demonstrate that they have read and understood the content of the biodiversity report and also agree to any recommendations that have implications for the proposed development, i.e. implementation of necessary biodiversity mitigation measures.

Part C should be completed by the Ecologist representing the Applicant (it is expected that, in most cases, this will be the lead author of the biodiversity report). Part C shall act as a checklist of the issues which should be addressed in the biodiversity report. The Ecologist should confirm that the information requested has been provided in the report and provide the appropriate paragraph reference numbers to allow the Local Planning Authority to quickly confirm that each criterion has been met.

Where the Ecologist finds that they cannot justifiably answer 'Yes' or 'Not applicable', or where they cannot cross-refer to a paragraph of the report which demonstrates that they have complied with a given criterion, they should revisit the work undertaken and revise the report accordingly, prior to its submission.

Part D of the form is to be completed by the Local Planning Authority's 'nominated person with biodiversity expertise' (i.e. a qualified ecologist or a planner with responsibility/expertise for biodiversity matters) during the Local Planning Authority's determination of the planning application.







PART A – GENERAL INFORMATION AND ECOLOGIST'S DECLARATION						
Name of Applicant: Mark	Harris	Site Name: Smerrill Farm, Kemble				
Site Location (Post Code/	Grid Reference): GL7 6BW					
	•	on of detched 2 bedroom annex and altera	ations to cottag			
	•		J			
For instance: Conversion o	f stone huilt aaricultural harn w	ithslate tiles and exposed roof timbers greater	r than 20cm thick			
		arn owls, and other breeding birds such as swo				
Details of Biodiversity Rep						
•	Ecological Appraisal Smerrill	Name and Qualifications of Lead Author: Phil	Quinn MCIEEM			
Farm, Kemble						
Date: 1.11.23 R	eference Number: PRARP-					
	0231101-V001-Smerrill					
F	arm					
Type of Biodiversity Repo	rt Submitted with the Planning	Application (see Sections 3 and 4 in Purpose a	bove)			
	pact Assessment (EcIA)	P. P. C.	Y□ N⊠			
<u> </u>	logical Appraisal Report (PEAR		Y⊠ N□			
Summary and Recommen						
-	-	e affected and mitigation required.				
Click or tap here to enter	text.					
Is a Protected Species Lice	ence from Natural England req	uired?	Y□ N⊠			
If so, what species and wh	nich type of licence?					
Click or tap here to enter text.						
Ara planning conditions re	autrad to cocure proposed m	itigation?	V NM			
If so, what for?	equired to secure proposed m	itigation?	Y□ N⊠			
Click or tap here to enter	text.					
· 						
Ecologist's Professional Declaration (lead author or person responsible for final QA of the report).						
Are full details of professional memberships, qualifications and experience for <u>all</u> staff involved in the preparation of this biodiversity report, provided in the EclA / PEAR? Y⊠ N□						
blodiversity report, provi	aca in the Edit / TEAM.	10				
I hereby confirm that the information provided in this form is accurate and is a true record of the work undertaken.						
Name of Ecologist:	Signe					
Philip Quinn	P. Qu	iinn 03.1	11.23			
Qualifications and Experience of the above Ecologist (if different from Lead Author identified above):						
-	Click or tap here to enter text.					

PART B - APPLICANT'S DECLARATION

I hereby confirm that I have read and understand the findings, implications and recommendations for impact avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement set out in the report referred to in Part A above. I understand that the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures set out in the report may be secured through a licence from the appropriate statutory conservation body and/or through condition(s) or obligations imposed by the Local Planning Authority, or other decision making authority.

Name of Applicant (or Agent): Signed: M Harris Date: 2.11.23

Mark Harris













PAR	PART C – BIODIVERSITY REPORT FORM (checklist)					
	Che	ecklist to ensure decisions are based on adequate information in accordance with Clauses 6.2 and 8.1 of BS42020:2013	Y, N, N/A?	Report Ref para no.(s)		
	1.	Where pre-app advice has been received from the LPA and/or an NGO and/or statutory	□Yes	Click or tap		
		body (e.g. NE DAS), it has been fully accounted for in the report.	□No	here to		
ddı			⊠ N/A	enter text.		
Pre-app	2.	The scope, structure and content of the report is in accordance with published good	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
Δ.		practice ^{ii, iii} and iv.	□No	here to		
			□ N/A	enter text.		
	3.	Adequate ^v and up-to-date ^{vi} :	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
		a. Desk study has been undertaken ^{vii} ;	□No	here to		
		b. Phase 1 habitat survey has been undertaken ⁷ ; and	□ N/A	enter text.		
		c. Phase 2 surveys have been undertaken (where necessary) viii.				
ats	4.	All statutory and non-statutory sites likely to be significantly affected are clearly and	□Yes	Click or tap		
bita		correctly identified.	□No	here to		
Ha			⊠ N/A	enter text.		
es &	5.	All protected or priority species and priority habitats ix likely to be significantly affected are	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
oeci		clearly and correctly identified, and adequate surveys have been undertaken to inform the	□No	here to		
s, S		baseline.	□ N/A	enter text.		
Surveys, Species & Habitats	6.	Any invasive non-native plant species present are clearly and correctly identified.	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
Sur			□No	here to		
			□ N/A	enter text.		
	7.	Where a separate preliminary ecological appraisal (phase 1) report states that Phase 2	⊠ Yes □ No	Click or tap		
		surveys are required, these have been undertaken in full and results submitted with the		here to		
		application (or lack of such surveys is justified).	□ N/A	enter text.		
	8.	The assessment is based on clearly defined development proposals along with relevant	□Yes	Click or tap		
		drawings/plans (and any plans used are the same version number as those submitted with	□No	here to		
cts	_	the application); OR	□ N/A	enter text.		
Effe	9.	The biodiversity effects are considered to be not significant at any geographical scale	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
S: 8		irrespective of the detailed development proposals, and the assessment is based on a worst-case-scenario.	□No	here to		
Impacts & Effects		worst case sections.	□ N/A	enter text.		
<u>E</u>	10.	The report describes and assesses all likely significant biodiversity effects (including	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
	cumulative effects) clearly stating the geographical scale of significance (where relevant).		□No	here to		
			□ N/A	enter text.		
	11.	The mitigation hierarchy has been clearly followed*.	⊠ Yes	Click or tap		
			□No	here to		
			□ N/A	enter text.		
int	12.	The report:	⊠ Yes	Click or tap		
Enhancement		a. Clearly identifies the proposed mitigation and compensation measures, and explains	□No	here to		
anc		how these will adequately address all likely significant adverse effects;	□ N/A	enter text.		
핍		b. Includes, where necessary, proposals for post-construction monitoring; andc. Recommends how proposed measures may be secured through planning				
ø		conditions/obligations and/or necessary licences.				
atio	13.	A summary table of proposed mitigation and compensation measures has been provided.	□Yes	Click or tap		
ens			□No	here to		
mu			⊠ N/A	enter text.		
Mitigation, Compensation &	14.	The need for any mitigation licences identified in relation to protected species is clearly	□Yes	Click or tap		
tion		identified.	□No	here to		
tiga			⊠ N/A	enter text.		
Ξ	15.	A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been provided where required	⊠Yes	Click or tap		
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	□No	here to		
			□ N/A	enter text.		







	16. Limitations ^{xi} of the biodiversity surveys and assessments have been correctly identified and the implications explained.		⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Click or tap here to
od Practice	-	ning issues (e.g. site vegetation clearance or roof removal) that may elyaffect the proposed timing of development have been identified.	Yes □ No □ N/A	enter text. Click or tap here to enter text.
Competence / Good Practice	methods and guide	veys and mitigation measures accord with published good practice lines OR deviation from such guidelines is made clear and fully plications for subsequent conclusions and recommendations made rtxii.	⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A	Click or tap here to enter text.
S	19. All ecologists and surveyors hold appropriate species licences (where relevant) and/or have all necessary competencies to carry out the work undertaken.			Click or tap here to enter text.
legislation and pol		dentifies where the proposed development complies with relevant cy, highlighting any possible non-compliant issues, and highlighting reaconclusion cannot be drawn as it requires an assessment of non-(such as socio-economic ones).	☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A	Click or tap here to enter text.
Conclusions	21. The report provides a clear summary of losses and gains for biodiversity and a justifies conclusion of overall net gain for biodiversity			Click or tap here to enter text.
	22. Justifiable conclusions based on sound professional judgement have been drawn as to the significance of effects on any designated site, protected or priority habitat/species or other biodiversity feature, and a justified scale of significance has been stated.			Click or tap here to enter text.
PAF	RT D – CONCLUSIONS C	OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY'S REVIEW OF THE BIC	DIVERS	SITY REPORT
The dete	scope, structure and cont ermination of the plannin	ent of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to infog application.		Yes □ No
The dete	scope, structure and cont ermination of the plannin	ent of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to infog application. If the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. If necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from Click or tap here to enter text.	rm the	□ Yes □ No
The deto	scope, structure and contermination of the planning the table below to identitinue on a separate sheet	ent of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to infog application. If the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. If necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from	rm the	□ Yes □ No
The deta Use Con Plan 1.	scope, structure and contermination of the planning the table below to identifying on a separate sheet and the sheet aring Recommendation Approval (no biodiversity	ent of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to infog application. If y the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. If necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from Click or tap here to enter text. Where adequacy of information provided dictates what recommendated in the commendate of the commendate o	om Section tion can licence	□ Yes □ No on C be made below.
The determination of the deter	scope, structure and contermination of the planning the table below to identitinue on a separate sheet aning Recommendation Approval (no biodiversity issues) Approval (conditional with no likely delays to	ent of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to infog application. If y the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. If necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from Click or tap here to enter text. Where adequacy of information provided dictates what recommendated and the provided dictates what recommendated are provided dictates are provided di	m Section tion can licence ation, etc	□ Yes □ No on C be made below. c. (i.e. no pre- ity issues







5.	Deferral (pending submission of further essential information)	inadequate	ther information must be submitted prior to determination dication cannot yet be conditioned		
6.	Refusal – insufficient information, inadequate biodiversity report	 □ Biodiversity report very poor and provides inad determination of the application □ Not capable of being conditioned to secure neces 	•		
7.	Refusal – other biodiversity reasons for refusal	 Biodiversity report is sufficient, but there are obiodiversity (e.g. objection in principle to the property) 			
Do		in the binding of the part of the last plant	orio - Arvah ania.		
		wing the biodiversity report on behalf of the Local Plan			
tex	me: Click or tap here to er t.	Role: Click or tap here to enter tex	τ.		
Qualifications and Experience: Click or tap here to enter text.					
Sig	nature: Click or tap here t	enter text.	Date: Click or tap here to enter text.		







ENDNOTES

- ⁱ Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service
- "CIEEM (2017) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing.
- "CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment.
- iv BS42020:2013 Biodiversity Code of Conduct for Planning and Development.
- ^v Adequate ecological information is defined as being Appropriate (i.e. the right type of surveys for the site and the receptors likely to be found) and Sufficient (i.e. there is sufficient effort in view of the time, size, complexity etc of the site to ensure all likely receptors are adequately accounted for such as abundance and distribution) (refer to BS42020:2013 Clause 6.2).
- vi BS42020:2013 states up-to-date normally means not more than 2/3 years although this may be longer if environmental conditions and features have remained the same and there has been minimal change on site. NOTE: CIEEM currently producing guidance on this
- vii Based on the approach described in Section 2 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- viii See Section 3, Box 4 and Appendix 5 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- ix See Section 1 Box 1 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- x In accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (England; 2018).
- xi An explicit understanding of any limitations for the ecological work should be provided in accordance with Clause 6.7 of BS42020:2013 (including limitations associated with: survey methods, adequacy of equipment, reference to relevant desk top data, interpretation and analysis of results, competency of all ecological surveyors and personnel undertaking the impact assessment and design of mitigation).
- xii Deviation from standard methods and guidance must be reported in accordance with BS42020:2013 (Clauses 4.4, 6.3.6 to 6.3.9 and 6.7) (see also Endnote 9 below). NOTE: CIEEM has a published list of relevant guidance on its website can this be referred to?
- xiii In accordance with CIEEM's Guidelines on Ecological Impact Assessment (2018).
- xiv Further information on how to provide robust justification for any deviation in methods used from those published in good practice guidance is provided in CIEEM (2016) *Pragmatism, Proportionality and Professional Judgement*. In Practice. Issue 91; page 57.