





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: Mr | J Bevan | Site Name: Dene Hollow, Lydney | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 40 | | | |
| | e/Grid Reference): SO64004 | | | | |
| Brief Description of Pro | posed Development: Demolitio | n of existing garage and construction of ne | w dwe | elling | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | - | n with slate tiles and exposed roof timbers grea | | | |
| Biodiversity features li | kely to be affected include bats, | barn owls, and other breeding birds such as sw | allows | • | |
| Details of Biodiversity F | Report | | | | |
| Report title: PEA of De | ene Hollow, Lydney | Name and Qualifications of Lead Author: A | Ashley | Butler MSc | |
| • | . , . | Applied ecology, CIEEM, Natural Resou | - | | |
| | | bat license (SO93356/1), Natural Englar | nd (NE |) class 17 bat | |
| Date: 22/4/24 | Reference Number: 24_010 | survey license (Number 2023-11805-CL17-BAT), Associate | | | |
| | | under Mr Steve Wadley's bat license - N | | | |
| | | class 19 & 20 bat survey license (Number | | | |
| | | CLS) and Natural Resources Wales (NRV | N) bat | license | |
| | | (SO85928/1) | | | |
| Type of Biodiversity Re | port Submitted with the Planning | Application (see Sections 3 and 4 in Purpose at | oove) | | |
| | I Impact Assessment (EcIA) | , representation (see sections s una 1 m mapose un | Υ□ | N⊠ | |
| - | Ecological Appraisal Report (PEA | AR) | Y⊠ | N□ | |
| Summary and Recomm | | | | | |
| | | e affected and mitigation required. | | | |
| Click or tap here to e | enter text. | | | | |
| Is a Protected Species I | Licence from Natural England red | nuired? | Y□ | N⊠ | |
| | which type of licence? | quireu: | | NZ | |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Are planning conditions required to secure proposed mitigation? Y□ N⊠ | | | | | |
| If so, what for? | | | | | |
| Click or tap here to e | nter 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 all staff involved in the preparation of this | | | | | |
| biodiversity report, pro | ovided in the EcIA / PEAR? | Y⊠ | $N\square$ | | |
| ,, , ,, ,, ,, | , | | | | |
| | | orm is accurate and is a true record of the work | | taken. | |
| Name of Ecologist: Ashley Butler | | g ned: Butler | Date: 22/4/ | /24 | |
| Ashicy Dutiel | Α. | Dutie. | / - / | - 7 | |
| 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):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Signed: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.







| PAR | ГС- | - BIODIVERSITY REPORT FORM (checklist) | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|---------------|
| | Checklist to ensure decisions are based on adequate information in accordance with Clauses | | | Report Ref |
| | 4 | 6.2 and 8.1 of BS42020:2013 | N/A? | para no.(s) |
| Pre-app | 1. | Where pre-app advice has been received from the LPA and/or an NGO and/or statutory | □Yes □No | Click or tap |
| | | body (e.g. NE DAS) ⁱ , it has been fully accounted for in the report. | | here to |
| | | | ⊠N/A | enter text. |
| | 2. | The scope, structure and content of the report is in accordance with published good | ⊠Yes | Click or tap |
| | | practice ^{ii, iii} and iv. | □No □N/A | here to |
| | | | | 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. |
| | 4 | c. Phase 2 surveys have been undertaken (where necessary) ^{viii} . | ⊠v | Clial, an tan |
| ats | 4. | All statutory and non-statutory sites likely to be significantly affected are clearly and | ⊠Yes □No | Click or tap |
| abit | | correctly identified. | | here to |
| ⊗ T | | | □N/A | enter text. |
| ies | 5. | All protected or priority species and priority habitats ^{ix} likely to be significantly affected are | ⊠Yes □No □N/A | Click or tap |
| bec | | clearly and correctly identified, and adequate surveys have been undertaken to inform the | | here to |
| Surveys, Species & Habitats | | baseline. | | enter text. |
| rve | 6. | Any invasive non-native plant species present are clearly and correctly identified. | □Yes | Click or tap |
| Su | | | □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 □N/A | here to |
| cts | _ | the application); OR The biodiversity effects are considered to be not significant at any geographical scale irrespective of the detailed development proposals, and the assessment is based on a worst-case-scenario. | | enter text. |
| Effe | 9. | | | Click or tap |
| 8 | | | | here to |
| Impacts & Effects | | worst-case-scenario. | □N/A | enter text. |
| <u>m</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 ^x . | ⊠Yes | Click or tap |
| | | | □No | here to |
| | | | □N/A | enter text. |
| nt | 12. | The report: | ⊠Yes | Click or tap |
| me | | a. Clearly identifies the proposed mitigation and compensation measures, and explains | □No | here to |
| Enhancement | | how these will adequately address all likely significant adverse effects; | □N/A | enter text. |
| nha | | b. Includes, where necessary, proposals for post-construction monitoring; and | | |
| | | c. Recommends how proposed measures may be secured through planning | | |
| ion | | conditions/obligations and/or necessary licences. | | |
| ısat | 13. | A summary table of proposed mitigation and compensation measures has been provided. | ⊠Yes □No | Click or tap |
| per | | | □N/A | here to |
| Mitigation, Compensation $\&$ | | | | enter text. |
|) , (C | 14. | The need for any mitigation licences identified in relation to protected species is clearly | □Yes | Click or tap |
| şatic | | identified. | □No ⊠N/A | here to |
| Λitig | | | | enter text. |
| _ | 15. | A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been provided where required | □Yes | Click or tap |
| | | | □No ⊠N/A | here to |
| | | | △ IN/ A | enter text. |
| | | | | |







| a) | 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 enter text. | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| ood Practice | 17. All relevant key timing issues (e.g. site vegetation clearance or roof removal) that may constrain or adversely affect the proposed timing of development have been identified. | | ⊠Yes □No □N/A | Click or tap here to enter text. | | |
| Competence / Good Practice | 18. All biodiversity surveys and mitigation measures accord with published good practice methods and guidelines OR deviation from such guidelines is made clear and fully justified, and the implications for subsequent conclusions and recommendations made explicit in the report ^{xii} . | | ⊠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. | | |
| SI | 20. The report clearly identifies where the proposed development complies with relevant legislation and policy, highlighting any possible non-compliant issues, and highlighting circumstances where a conclusion cannot be drawn as it requires an assessment of non-biodiversity issues (such as socio-economic ones). | | | 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. | | |
| | the significance of e | ns ^{xiii} based on sound professional judgement ^{xiv} have been drawn as to ffects on any designated site, protected or priority habitat/species or ature, and a justified scale of significance has been stated. | ⊠Yes □No □N/A | Click or tap here to enter text. | | |
| The scope, structure and content of the biodiversity report submitted is fit and adequate to inform the determination of the planning application. Use the table below to identify the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. | | | | | | |
| dete | rmination of the planning | application. | ne | □Yes □No | | |
| Use to | rmination of the planning | the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from SClick or tap here to enter text. | Section C | : | | |
| Use to Control Plant | rmination of the planning the table below to identify inue on a separate sheet if | the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from S | Section C | : | | |
| Use in Continuation Plant | rmination of the planning the table below to identify inue on a separate sheet if ning Recommendation Approval (no biodiversity | the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from Strick or tap here to enter text. Where adequacy of information provided dictates what recommendate. — No outstanding ecological issues | Section C tion can I | be made below. | | |
| Use to Continue Plant | rmination of the planning the table below to identify inue on a separate sheet if ning Recommendation Approval (no biodiversity issues) Approval (conditional with no likely delays to | the implications for the grant or refusal of planning consent. necessary. Comments – including reference to any corresponding criteria from Strick or tap here to enter text. Where adequacy of information provided dictates what recommendate No outstanding ecological issues And no requirement for any conditions/obligations or EPS licer Biodiversity report follows good practice Conditions are required to secure implementation of mitigatio commencement conditions) | Section C tion can I nce n, etc. (i. | e. no pre- | | |







| 5. | Deferral (pending submission of further essential information) | □ Biodiversity report currently does not meet good practice requirements and is inadequate □ Further information must be submitted prior to determination □ Application cannot yet be conditioned □ Potential substantial delays and/or costs inevitable | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 6. | Refusal – insufficient information, inadequate biodiversity report | □ Biodiversity report very poor and provides inadequated determination of the application □ Not capable of being conditioned to secure necessary | | | |
| 7. | Refusal – other biodiversity reasons for refusal | \Box Biodiversity report is sufficient, but there are other reasons for refusal based on biodiversity (e.g. objection in principle to the proposal) | | | |
| | | | at the | | |
| | | ng the biodiversity report on behalf of the Local Planning Au | ithority | | |
| tex | me: Click or tap here to en t. | er Role: Click or tap here to enter text. | | | |
| Qualifications and Experience: Click or tap here to enter text. | | | | | |
| Sig | nature: Click or tap here to | 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.
- iii 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.