M10.02



Home Builders Federation

Matter 10

FAREHAM LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Matter 10 – Natural Environment

Policy NE2 Biodiversity Net Gain

Are the requirements of the policy sufficiently clear in relation to:

- i) <u>the ability for developments to buy 'credits' where net gain on site is not</u> <u>achievable?</u>
- ii) <u>ii) That compensation can include new habitat or restoring/enhancing existing habitats?</u>

The necessary guidance from Government on how the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will be delivered is still to be published. This will provide the necessary clarity on both measuring the level of next gain to be delivered and how these can be addressed both on and offsite. For this reason, we would suggest that the Council recognise the two-year transitionary period between the Environment Act achieving royal ascent and the mandatory 10% BNG coming into force. This will ensure that the necessary guidance is in place to support both developers and LPAs in meeting this latest requirement. However, whilst guidance is not yet in place it is clear that the offsite mitigation and offsetting through the purchase of credits will play an important role in ensuring BNG is delivered and should be recognised within the policy.

How has viability been addressed?

The Council set out in the addendum to the Viability Assessment (VIA003) that an allowance of £500 per unit has been included to take account of the costs of delivering net gain and that with regard to Greenfield sites was below the estimates set out in the Government's impact assessment. However, what is not clear from the addendum is whether any consideration has been given to the loss of developable area that may result from the implementation of BNG on site. This will depend significantly on the nature of the site being developed and the number of biodiversity credits that need to be delivered to ensure the 10% minimum is achieved. In such circumstances it is possible that to maintain the developable area but deliver net gains offsite or through offsetting, however this will be the more expensive option that would need to be considered in the viability assessment.

What consideration has there been of environmental off setting on a local and/or sub regional basis?

For council

Home Builders Federation HBF House, 27 Broadwall, London SE1 9PL Tel: 0207 960 1600 Email: <u>info@hbf.co.uk</u> Website: <u>www.hbf.co.uk</u> Twitter: @HomeBuildersFed

Policy NE8 Air Quality

Are the requirements of the policy clearly articulated and would they be effective? Is it clear what is expected in terms of good practice and principles of design in part b) of the policy?

With regard to the requirements for Electric Vehicle Charging Points we would recommend that the Council delete the requirement in this policy and defer to the standard that are to be set out in Building Regulations later this year. Such an approach would avoid any conflict between the local policy and the national standard.

Is it clear to decision makers, developers and the local community where areas of poor local air quality are located?

No comment

What is the justification for land within the Welborne Plan being excluded for the requirement to provide EV charging facilities?

No comment

What is the justification requiring fast rather than rapid charge points? Have the viability implications been considered?

See above.

What is the justification for the policy requiring major development to contribute to the delivery of green infrastructure? Does this duplicate Policy NE9?

No comment

Have any Clear Air Zones been designated in the borough? If not, what is the justification for their inclusion in the policy?

No comment

Mark Behrendt MRTPI Planning Manager – Local Plans SE and E