



What does amendment 130 do and why should you vote for it?

Elevator pitch:

In its current form, the Bill introduces a generic approach to addressing the impacts of development on nature. This simply doesn't work for many impacts of development, like those on most protected species - like bats!

If Amendment 130 stays in, it means 'EDPs' are limited to 'tried and tested' areas where you can deal with issues like nutrients and water at a bigger, strategic level and EDPs could not be applied to protected species and habitats.

Amendment 130 provides a constructive way to ensure a win for development while safeguarding nature by tackling the larger environmental challenges faced by developers.

Longer form explanation of Part 3

At the moment, where a development might impact a legally protected site or species, developers must identify potential impacts and address these for each development. It means that the impact on wildlife and wild places is identified and measured, with actions taken by developers to avoid and reduce the impact.

The Planning and Infrastructure Bill, currently going through Parliament introduces a new way to assess and address these environmental impacts.

The Bill would mean that Natural England can create 'Environmental Delivery Plans', which will both assess and identify measures to address environmental impacts of development in an area. Each EDP would cover a single type of environmental impact and a specific geographic area. Developers would be able to meet legal requirements relating to the environmental impact covered by a relevant EDP by paying a 'Nature Restoration Levy'. This Levy would be spent on projects that aim to mitigate or compensate for the predicted damage.

This approach could work for some environmental impacts of development: these impacts are often diffuse with impacts on protected wildlife and wild places felt away from the development itself and development is just one source of the problem. It is also possible to develop ways to calculate the extent of these types of impact without detailed site surveys.



For example, efforts to address water pollution can be coordinated effectively across a catchment with action to reduce pollution from farming addressing any increase in pollution from new housebuilding. Examples in HIWWT, Dorset and Durham have already shown how a strategic mitigation approach can deliver more for wildlife.

However, for some issues, this simply doesn't work:

- **Species.** For many species, without a site level survey, the potential impact of development cannot be ascertained, or there simply isn't the data to establish this at a larger level.
- **Habitats:** an EDP can be a poor substitute for on-site protection of protected habitats. For some types of impact on habitat, you cannot simply 'offset' impacts somewhere else. This is, of course, particularly the case for irreplaceable habitats.

If amendment 130 stays in, EDPs will be limited to types of development impact where we know a strategic approach can deliver a win for nature (and a win for development).