Basingstoke and Deane

Green Infrastructure Strategy for Basingstoke and Deane (2018 to 2029)

Appendices A-E and G

Appendix A

Stakeholder Consultation

Green Infrastructure Strategy for Basingstoke and Deane (2017 to 2032)

Basingstoke GI Strategy - Notes from Stakeholder Workshop (30th May '17)

One half day facilitated workshop was held on 30th May 2017 during the early development of the GI Strategy at the council offices in Basingstoke. The purpose of the workshop was to develop a broad understanding of green infrastructure issues, existing activity, priorities and actions for the GI strategy.

Attendees included BDBC officers, BDBC councillors and Natural Basingstoke (Third sector group). The first part of the workshop involved a presentation by the consultants covering:

- Introduction to GI; and
- GI and Health and Wellbeing.

The second part of the workshop divided attendees into two discussion groups;

- Group 1 - Focusing on Basingstoke town
- Group 2 – Focusing on the wider borough

The questions for the discussion groups and comments from those groups are noted below.

Group 1 - Focusing on Basingstoke town

Attendees

Paul Johnston
Colin Rowland
Gordon Wade
Catherine Daly
Frank Wright
All above BDBC

Marcus Sangster - TEP
Marion Wolstencroft – Natural Basingstoke

Basingstoke GI Strategy – 'All things to all people'

Who will the audience be?

- Need to engage with economic development (Di Haywood), sports development? and health & wellbeing team
- Over 55's Forum (700 members)
- Chamber of Commerce
- Business Network
- Ideally need links with schools but curriculums tend be full and so it is difficult to engage. (Schools are run by Hants County Council, although there are some academies). Alternatively could make contact with local Forest Schools (are there any?), youth groups, scouts and guides in the Borough.
- 'everyone is a stakeholder' – there are a small number of experts but the potential impacts are massive. In consultation, many would put quality green space at the top of their priorities.

Other relates matters discussed:

- Mention was made of the BCBC Community Investment Framework adopted in 2016
- How grab attention of different community groups ?
- Consider that 100 languages spoke in the Borough
- There is Directory of Voluntary Groups and their sites
- Natural Basingstoke includes some activity in Overton ….urban & suburban activity
- No active natural environment group in Tadley
- Lack of publically accessible GI in some of the larger settlements (ex. Basingstoke) … although surrounded by countryside … this is privately owned & not available for football or picnic
- How will the GI Strategy interact with the BDBC Landscape & Biodiversity Strategy (2014) and the Landscape & Biodiversity SPD (2008)

How can we set the GI Strategy apart from other documents? (How can we make it stand out?)

- Consensus that the document should be concise and visual
- One attendee suggested an innovative approach with a document appealing to the 5 senses (sight, smell, touch, hearing, taste)
- Online engagement with the strategy through a Forum or Facebook page
- Live document that can be updated regularly

The top green infrastructure benefits

1. Quality of Place: this can be described using each of the three pillars of sustainability – biodiversity, economics, and community and personal benefits. Creating and maintaining quality of place requires management and investment over time.

Sense of place, which is related, is also important. Members are keenly interested in conserving and enhancing green space.

2. Health was identified as the second most important benefit, though with little discussion. (Perhaps because it had been covered in the preceding talk).

3. Economic investment: this has two dimensions a) to generate and sustain local employment within the area and b) to attract and retain employed people working in good quality, sustainable jobs wherever their employment is based.

There is an opportunity to involve businesses in the green infrastructure strategy. The council is interested in a mixed economy of retailing, manufacturing and services as well as residential and commercial development within the borough.

4. Climate change: four dimensions were identified:

- education – where green and natural spaces can be used for both informal and formal education about climate change and the environment,
- adaptation and resilience – this applies not only to the components of the green spaces (the plant and other species) but also to the town as an environment for human beings; so, cooling, shade and the other benefits of green space in an urban setting,
- the human environment – as above.
- “Blue" infrastructure is also part of the green infrastructure plan and is important not only for wildlife but also for its contribution to human needs – access and recreation, flood management, water has a utility.

5. Recreation and amenity: this perhaps is a composite theme that links to health, quality of place, sense of place and general well-being. There are also ethical considerations where poor areas tend to have less green space available to them. Benefits are greatest when green space is accessible for recreation, formal or informal, and we must not overlook the benefits for children’s play.

6. Quality of life: another composite benefit. In respect of the town the group had in mind well-designed attractive urban landscape that engenders a sense of safety and is accessed by a diverse range of people and interests. CABE’s Building For Life guidance has been adopted by the council’s urban design team.

Key themes

1. Design: we discussed four separate aspects:

- Maintaining connection between green spaces and avoiding green oases that have little access and, because of their small size, little value for wildlife.
- Maintaining quality of space.
- Ensuring that green spaces make a positive contribution to the broader environment.
- Well-designed spaces contribute to sense of place and engender a sense of communal ownership of a locality.

2. Values: where possible the economic value of green spaces should be articulated – attracting industry and attracting people. Intangible values should not be overlooked; they include the contribution that green space can make to social capital and broader quality of life and, of course, the "ecosystem services" they support.

3. Sustainability: the discussion under this heading was to do with public awareness and engagement with public open space and also the need for institutions – public and private – to respect the natural environment and the contribution it makes to quality of life.

4. Economic development: there was a recognition among the group that development can be very positive, generating resources for the whole community. Whilst the Basingstoke might seem to be well endowed with the green space, given its access to nearby areas of designated countryside, within the town green space is a limited resource and is an important factor in attracting businesses and people to the town. So there must be a balance between conserving and enhancing the green environment within the borough and providing space for future development.

5. Public open space: this discussion was closely linked to the preceding one on design; it was to do with a sense that informal open space is important to the town and its people.

6. Monitoring: the group felt that it was important to "know how we are doing"; this requires the gathering of information and feedback systems so that improvements and innovations can be made. Monitoring comes after objective setting, so it is important that the town understands what it wants from its green spaces. We discussed the idea of SMART objectives (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely). We also touched upon the idea of using technology of different types to assist with monitoring.

Current activities and possibilities

1. Tree strategy: the council has a tree strategy with a budget and a work plan.
1. Possible action: develop management plans with operational and long-term perspectives that set out a vision for the future of green spaces and how that vision might be achieved. A possible tool to assist in this could be I-Tree, that could reach across all land ownerships, not just council land.

2. Addressing connectivity: Basingstoke and Deane, together with its neighbouring councils, have a common approach to green corridors. Could "urban" green space and transport corridors be linked more strongly?

3. Managing Hampshire's grass: Basingstoke manages grassed areas on behalf of the county council. Could there be a survey to further understand the biodiversity value of these verges and other open spaces? A biodiversity officer has been employed by the maintenance team, this idea is relevant to the council's Living Landscapes strategy.

4. Basingstoke's parks as an economic resource: assuming that green infrastructure attracts business, could Basingstoke attract more inward investment based on improvement to its parks and linkages between them?

5. Building on current capabilities: as well as managing grassed areas on behalf of the county council Basingstoke also is involved in management of trees and woodlands on its own grounds and for the county. Could the council make more use of the skills and capabilities that it uses to undertake this work? Should there be it at linkage into the council strategies and concerns over design and quality of place? For example, could some of the resources used to manage the highways green landscapes be used to establish specimen trees? (In respect of street trees; we also discussed the problems that arise when trees are inappropriately located, either in terms of management or sometimes creating a nuisance to neighbours. How can you minimise aggravation and increase the benefits from street trees?)

The council's skills and capabilities mean that it might take on work for other public-sector land, for example housing association trees and green space.

6. Products from greenspace management: could the arisings from woodland management, and other greenspace management, be treated as products? For example as biofuels for commercial boilers?

Things we are proud of

1. Management plans: green space management plans, for example the War Memorial Park, covering multiple uses and functions of the green space. The council would like to maintain these and continue to roll them out. There is an opportunity to use digital technology using proprietary software that would make the planning more accessible and efficient.

2. Environmental renewal schemes (ERS) : these are especially relevant to the older parts of town. They been underway for 12 years. Members like them so the council intends to continue with the existing plans and roll out new ones. A good example is the Top of the Town scheme, where a number of stakeholders contribute.

3. Corporate environmental improvement projects: these are one off schemes where there is an environmental team presence from the inception, in the planning and execution of new development and regeneration. (It might be worth asking Paul for an example as a case study to include in the strategy)

Further notes from workshop:

Introduction – plenary
Paul introduced the review of the green infrastructure strategy, discussing the process and timescales. Draft approval is expected in autumn 2017 with a wider consultation at the end of the year prior to approval early in 2018.
Community planning
June Balcombe said that the community planning team find that people are becoming interested as they can see potential personal benefits being delivered through the green infrastructure strategy.
In respect of community plans, the process of community planning is described on the website; the purpose is to give the community as stronger voice as possible. The council has recently developed a Community Investment Framework, which is on the Borough website.

Participation so far
The economics voice has so far been missing from the review – the council economics team and representatives of bodies such as the chamber of commerce could be invited.
The community planning team has access to a range of interest groups. (June agreed to provide a list of groups and organisations who are using green space for social purposes; e.g. walking for health, numerous events, buggy push. She asked that any request for information should be channelled through Paul)
Education, in the broadest sense, is also missing – such as Scouts and guides, youth groups. This might be a good way of involving young people.

Group 2 – focussing on the main settlements (ex. Basingstoke) & wider Borough

Attendees:

Chris Slack – Biodiversity
Dave Perkins – Parks & Open Spaces
Margaret McGrath - Parks & Open Spaces
June Balcombe – Community Development
Greg Chapman – Development Management
All above BDBC

Paul Beevers – Natural Basingstoke
Tim Johns – TEP

1. With reference to the GI 'refresher' presentation …. What would be the top 6 GI benefits? (5 mins) … highlighted in red (we highlighted 8 !)

- Health & wellbeing
- Quality of place
- Economic growth & investment
- Tourism (impact on economy, need to market Basingstoke & Deane's rural area more)
- Land & biodiversity (to include habitats, species & connectivity)
- Recreation & leisure
- Land & property values
- Labour productivity
- Products from the land
- Climate change adaptation & mitigation
- Flood alleviation & management (River Loddon & Test)

Other matters discussed:

- 2050 Vision for Basingstoke … 'town to double in size'
- Evidence of developers not 'handing over' open spaces in their development to the local authority; residents required to pay a fee to a management company (risk of these going out of business);

2. The suggested themes for the Basingstoke GI Strategy are:

- Landscape
- Heritage & sense of place
- Biodiversity … needs to include nature protection & enhancement (species viability, sustainability etc.)
- Water resources
- Urban tree resource
- Woodlands habitats
- Access & recreation
- Health & well-being
- Local awareness
- Monitoring and Funding

Are there any gaps or omissions? (5 mins)

Yes, there needs to be an economic element also open space & community

Other matters discussed:

- Need to appreciate intrinsic value of biodiversity as well as human interaction with nature
- 850 species across the Boro' … need to consider viability & sustainability of habitats and populations
- Housing & open spaces in Basingstoke town … date from the 1960s … needs regenerating … is GI in the best space to serve people & nature? … possible not

3. Could you suggest some actions or projects arising from up to 6 themes? (see examples below) (allow 5 mins average per theme, plus time for themes not in initial 6)

- Landscape (quality & quantity) – landscape character, amenity green space, accessible natural green space, play areas, allotments
- Heritage & sense of place – event spaces & festivals, landscape art & public realm, transport corridors & gateways
- Biodiversity – habitats for pollinators, arable fringes, diversifying parks and schoolgrounds, SINCS
  Restoring priority species
  List of priority species in the County ..restore these through habitat management
  Consider reintroduction of species?

- Water resources – flood management, water storage
  Deficit of ponds & open water .. due to chalk geology
  Flood issues with River Loddon in Basingstoke … water table rose
  Flooding in Buckskin
- Urban tree resource – civic & street trees, meeting the Forestry Commission's tree canopy target of 20% (current canopy is 15%) … where is tree cover more limited?
  Linking woodlands …
- Woodlands – ancient woodland, woodland management
- Access & recreation – access to types of GI, public rights of way, cycle routes,
  BDBC Park Strategy (date ??) made clearer reference to parks
  Natural England's standards on accessibility to natural green space have been dropped (not always realistic in an urban area)
  2013 GI Strategy was a snapshot in time …. Assessment of current provision has not been updated
  Park & nature reserve network to Basingstoke perimeter
- Health & well-being – long active lives, metal health, paths to recovery
  Engagement, public participation, increasing use, action
  What data do we have … what don't we have
  Community Plan & Neighbourhood plans … need to link to GI Strategy
  3 levels of action for GI in Community Plans (i) communities self-help (ii) communities active with some support (iii) golden threads

- Local awareness – are people aware of the GI resource & the benefits it brings?
- Monitoring and Funding - how monitor improvements? Funding sources
  Need to undertake user surveys in parks …… monitoring to be computerised

Stakeholder Workshop – 5th July '17

One half day facilitated workshop was held on 5th July 2017 mid-way through the development of the GI Strategy at the council offices in Basingstoke. The purpose of the workshop was to develop a broad understanding of the green infrastructure issues, existing activity and opportunities and subsequently develop a set of strategic priorities and actions for the GI strategy.

Attendees included BDBC officers, BDBC councillors, officers from Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council, representation from Hampshire Hospitals NHS, Natural England, Hampshire Wildlife Trust and Natural Basingstoke (Third sector group).

The first part of the workshop involved a presentation by the consultants covering:

- Introduction to GI ;
- Summary of stakeholder workshop held on 30th May '17;
- GI and Biodiversity;
- GI and Natural Capital; and
- GI and Health and Wellbeing.

The second part of the workshop divided attendees into three topic based discussion groups:

- Health and wellbeing;
- Biodiversity; and
- Natural Capital.

The questions for the discussion groups and comments from those groups are noted below.

Health and Wellbeing Discussion Group

Attendees:

Margaret McGrath	BDBC – Natural Environment Team
Sue Rayden	BDBC – Community Investment Team Leader
David Perkins	BDBC – Parks and Street Scene Manager
Claire Penny	Winchester City Council – Principal Landscape Architect
Paul Bond	Hampshire Hospitals NHS – Associate Director Estates
Cllr Sean Keating	BDBC – Councillor (Ward Member for South Ham)
Tim Johns	TEP

Questions for discussion:

- *Examples of good practice in the Boro' and wider county ….*
- *In our context, what are some of the barriers to the use of green space?*
- *How can planners, public health & GI practitioners collaborate better?*
- *What type of GI would be most effective in meeting the goals for health and wellbeing?*
- *Parks protection motion – what makes parks valued by communities?*
- *Have you submitted or plan to submit any bids for GI, and if so from which funding sources?*
- *What would help you to deliver GI? What resources do you need and what holds you back?*

Notes from the discussion:

Health Walks / Buggy Walks – Villages, Town

Young people's activities in parks – Health Team

- Timing is an issue
- Primary school age

Outdoor gyms

- Promotion & facilitated sessions
- Link to G.Ps
- Promote network / connections

Supported exercise to increase participation.

Signage for routes with timed routes – and online

Promotion of what we have would be low cost along with link to health professionals in the clinical commissioning group (CCG) could help promote through S.Ps

Guided walks, planned & times routes.

Trail between green spaces and/or play areas promoted in schools with awards (example from Winchester landscape team).

Walking apps to show where the links are.

Reference to Health & Wellbeing strategy & community investment framework.

The road network forms a barrier to East/West and North/South routes are a barrier.

Community Buildings strategy 15 mins to walk to school routes

- Work with HCC school travel plan.

Park Run – encourage expansion of 'Park Run' to other venues, due to impact on path infrastructure in Memorial Park

Hospital – connections to green infrastructure for exercise.

Parks Motion – Value of sites

- In community plans value of green spaces in always top of list.
- Survey in parks & green spaces provides data on customer satisfaction per parks & management. Plan Parks.
- TEP Circulate survey for feedback from team on each site.

"Love Basingstoke" opportunity to promote G.S. and health & wellbeing benefits.

- Need large parks that provide a range of experiences & connect to countryside
- Also need local, walkable spaces especially for children to access independently.
- Allotments & community gardens linked to community centres e.g. Kempshott managed by community association.

❖ Health and wellbeing partnership board. – need to get representation of S.I.
❖ Mapping opportunities that exist already across partners & do joint promotion.

Biodiversity Discussion Group

Attendees:

Chris Slack BDBC – Natural Environment Team

Gordon Wade BDBC – Grounds Maintenance Manager

Frank Wright BDBC – Natural Environment Team

Liane Green BDBC – Natural Environment Team

Julia Nethercott BDBC – Natural Environment Team

Cllr Keith Watts BDBC – Councillor (Ward Member for Whitchurch)

Marion Wolstencroft Natural Basingstoke

Ken MacKenzie Natural Basingstoke

Becky Aziz Natural England (Lead Advisor)

Trevor Codlin Hampshire Wildlife Trust

Andy Nyul TEP

Questions for discussion:

- *Identify 'hot spots' for key species and habitats and designated sites (utilising land mapping information and data from the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre - HBIC);*
- *Consider strategic green corridors in adjacent authorities' GI Strategies/studies and where cross-border links would be appropriate*
- *Define and map the locations of existing important wildlife corridors for key species and habitats and identify corridors where opportunities exist to further link, expand and buffer key habitats and designated sites and/or enhance the movement, migration and expansion of populations of key species within the landscape; -*
- *Derive a set of robust criteria on which to define wildlife opportunity corridor boundaries;*
- *How ensure monitoring of progress with implementing wildlife opportunity corridors.*

Notes from the discussion:

Greywell Tunnel – largest wintering natterer's population in the UK.

Basingstoke – Large populations of great crested newts.

The above just highlighter some of the area's most important features.

Designated site and stepping stones habitat.

Disconnect between strategic land & detailed approach– Evidence base?

Too much emphasis on EU designated species.

- Needs increase in evidence base & increase in detail mapping.
- Strategic – detail and evidence – networks – projects.

I believe this revolved around the discussion that the focus of the planning system and the type of data collected was too focused on those species that receive legislative protection.

Needs more engagement of land owners on borough level.

Much of the land within which GI networks could be established is in private ownership. Therefor limited progress will be made unless farmers and other landowners are engaged.

GCN – secure funding from developers for large scale approach.

There was some discussion regarding Natural England's new approach to great crested newt licencing and mitigation. NE are moving away from requiring developers to provide all mitigation within the site and diverting funding into mitigation at wider scale to ensure favourable conservation status is maintained. Could some of this funding/mitigation be aimed at developing GI?

Hedgerow Networks

An acknowledgement that much of the remaining GI and habitat linkages within the agricultural habitats revolves around the hedgerow network.

Volunteer scheme with wildlife trust on private landscapes.

Another point relating to engagement with private landowners. Landowners are more likely to engage if projects don't come with financial implications. There's possibly scope for projects on private land using a voluntary workforce.

Make better use of GIS information and disciplines

- Sharing Data
- Collection of Data
- Scale of Data (accuracy)

Exchange of data with HBIC + updating of data.

Mapping of key species data.

BPA's large scale.

Questions around the quality of and access to data. Need to make sure that the data is updated regularly. Also need agreements on the free sharing of data. Often data is collected by an organisation/department but not made available to others. This benefits no one.

AONB influence on farming community bringing in landowners – connective stewardship funding etc.

Regional community

Enbourne-Heathland along WB boards – stepping stones in this area.

HLF Bid for upwaters of river test. – Funding.

LEPS? Funding to LNP based projects. Needs drawing?

Woodland corridor between North Wessex Downs AONB and South Downs National Park.

SE Basingstoke – Private ownership

MCC & borough – large area

Destination Park idea – historic, biodiversity, cultural.

Green connections around Basingstoke

SE Link, northern woodland arc.

Strategic gaps between villages and Basingstoke opportunities for habitat expansion.

Basingstoke – horizon 2050 blue sky thinking for Basingstoke in 2050 – wildlife area on boundaries by then.

CIL instigation for public impact on biodiversity – is GI up the list, not guaranteed bidding process.

Perhaps Chris can provide more insight into some of the above local areas identified as having potential for incorporation into a GI strategy, or existing schemes that might play a role?

Offsetting – Trumpet junction 16st SINC – 94K. only example not in local plan.

Matrix – habitat based 25 year management plans.

The potential for the use of biodiversity offsetting to secure funding to develop GI projects was discussed. Again this comes back to using the planning system to gain maximum benefit. Perhaps the results of pilot schemes could be evaluated and a similar scheme implemented by Basingstoke?

Qualifying loss & gain.

5 miles project along Basingstoke canal lack of link.

Habitat targets – monitoring???

Enforcement difficult at the moment. Resource into monitoring simple and achievable efforts.

The difficulty in monitoring the success of measures set out in various conservation initiatives was discussed. As was the difficulty in monitoring whether the requirements of planning conditions are delivered. If there's no resource available for monitoring and enforcement then it's hard to establish whether there's any benefit/progress.

Partnership working establishing wildlife areas.

Biodiversity protocol – sign of impacts and compensation.

SANG's – accessible natural green space

Natural Capital Approach Group

Attendees:

Paul Johnston BDBC – Natural Environment Team

Ed Rehill BDBC – Forward Planning

Daniel Garnier BDBC – Economic Development Manager

Jonathan Langham BDBC – Basing View Team

Jody Slater Hampshire County Council – Planning and Urban Design Team

Francis Hesketh TEP

Questions for discussion:

- *Any questions or comments on the Natural Capital approach ?*
- *How could the Natural Capital approach help with the protection of GI under the Parks Protection Motion ?*
- *How could the Natural Capital approach be used as a tool in the Basingstoke context ?*
- *Any parks and open spaces that already deliver well in terms of Natural Capital*

Does it chime in Basingstoke? Any comments on the natural capital indicators?

- Recreational day visits
- Pollutants
- Carbon sequestration

Natural capital – arguments + discussion about what they could be used for.

Smart City – Collection of data

- How much open space reduces levels of pollutants. Carbon sequeshation

Could look at variety of uses of an area gives (more uses – higher value). Could use this in relation to measuring the MFGS value of an area. Creating a metric to use.

Whitehill / Bordon – GI approach

Could a tailored “natural capital” approach work as part of development brief process.

Whole estate plans could be used in rural areas to demonstrate how GI contributes to management.

Could natural capital approach help with protection and promotion of GI in Basingstoke?

- Parks protection motion
- Wider rural areas?

Could possibly help in valuing.

Local green spaces, approach, could help.

From a business perspective – GI has a low profile but there are opportunities eg access that could be tapped into.

Impacts of development on AONB. Value of GI to tourism.

Any parks + open spaces that already deliver natural capital?

Any projects that could significantly uplift natural capital?

Advocating the economic value of GI

- How?
- Who to?
- GI Entrepreneurs

Appendix B – Legal and Policy Document Extracts

Green Infrastructure has a number of legal and policy drivers and forms of protection. These range from European to local level and include Government, planning and council priorities. This section provides a summary of these, outlining their relevance to GI. The section has been separated into the following sub-sections, which cover:

- European Legislation/Regulation
- National Legislation/Regulation
- National Policies
- Local Policies

Some aspects of GI have previously been adopted as separate policies within Basingstoke and Deane, such as the Strategy for Basingstoke Parks. As Green Infrastructure encompasses a wide range of themes, these 'precursor' policies have been summarised as a means to linking to, informing and providing a context to the GI Strategy.

European Legislation/Regulation

The scope of European legislation that has an impact on Green Infrastructure is wide ranging, including the EU Birds and Habitats Directives, the Water Framework Directive as well as a number of less directly related areas of legislation.

The EU Birds and Habitats Directives, transposed into UK legislation by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) provide protection to Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPA), part of a network of 'European sites' known as Natura 2000. While there are no European sites currently within the Borough of Basingstoke and Deane, there is potential pressure from development on a set of European sites known as the Thames Basin Heaths SPA in adjacent districts, to the north-east of the borough. The need to address these statutory requirements has led to the preparation of a delivery plan setting out provisions for offsetting potential development pressures on sensitive heathland sites from public access by making suitable alternative natural green space (SANGs) available. Given the proximity of the Thames Basin Heaths, if additional residential development is anticipated within 5km of the SPA, there could be a requirement for SANGs provision within the borough, which offers opportunities to integrate such requirements into a wider GI network.

The EU Water Framework Directive was transposed into UK legislation by The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003 with a target for all inland and coastal waters to meet 'good ecological status' by 2027. River Basin Management Plans have been developed for all 11 river basin districts in England and Wales, with the Thames River Basin District and the South East River Basin District affecting the borough. These plans set out the status of water bodies and the actions that are needed to meet European obligations and all public bodies have a duty to have regard for these management plans and any supplementary plans in the exercise of their functions. GI plans have an important role to play in helping to meet these challenges.

National Legislation and Regulation

The **Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981** (as amended) is the principle mechanism for the legislative protection of wildlife in the United Kingdom. This legislation is the means by which the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats and the European Union Directives on the Conservation of Wild Birds and Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora are implemented in the United Kingdom.

The **Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000** provides for public access on foot to certain types of land, to modernise the public rights of way system, to strengthen nature conservation legislation, and to facilitate better management of AONBs.

The **Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006** creates an overarching duty for local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity in exercising its functions. The conservation of biodiversity is defined as including the restoration and enhancement of habitats and is therefore of relevance in considering the development of the borough GI resource.

The **Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010** (as amended) as well as transposing EU legislation into UK law (as outlined above), are also relevant to GI in that they require policies to be included in spatial development plans that encourage the management of features of the landscape, which are of major importance for wild flora and fauna.

The **Equalities Act 2010** requires the public sector to actively promote equality in exercising its functions. This duty is an important consideration in the design of new GI, for instance play equipment, footpath surfacing and location and nature of access points in council parks and green spaces. It is also an important consideration in reviewing and improving the quality and accessibility of existing GI.

In addition to the above, there are numerous other policies and guidelines which support the concepts of Green Infrastructure. These include the Climate Change Act (2008), Flood Water Management Act (2010), Play Strategy for England (2008) and The Case for Trees (2010).

National Policy and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018) directs local authorities to make every effort to allocate land for development where it is of low environmental value. It also requires efforts to promote healthy communities, meet the challenge of climate change and flooding and conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment through the planning process. The following NPPF policies influence the objectives and outcomes of this study:

Strategic Policies

Paragraph 20: Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, and make sufficient provision for;

> *d) conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation.*

Promoting healthy communities

Health, wellbeing and the provision of open space facilities is addressed in section 8. Paragraph 91. outlines the need to provide places which:

b) are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion – for example through the use of clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas; and

c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.

Section 8 also illustrates the importance of Open Space and Recreation, in Paragraph 96 (part): Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.

The need to provide a sufficient quantity, range of types and proximity of open spaces for sport and recreation is detailed in para 96, which states:

Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate.

Paragraph 98 (part): *Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way network including National Trails.*

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Paragraph 149: *Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures.*

Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Paragraph 170 outlines how the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment. This can be achieved by:

> *a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
> *b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*
> *c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;*
> *d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;*
> *e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and*
> *f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.*

Many of these objectives are typically those that can be delivered in a co-ordinated and appropriate manner by a Green Infrastructure Strategy. This strategic approach is also supported by the NPPF in paragraph 171, where it states that local planning authorities should:

- *take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure*

Paragraph 174: *To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:*

a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and

b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Para 185: Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.

Biodiversity 2020

Biodiversity 2020 is the biodiversity strategy for England and sets the strategic direction for biodiversity policy for the next decade. The strategy builds on the Natural Environment White Paper, which highlighted the need to properly value nature, following the strong economic arguments for safeguarding and enhancing the natural environment presented in the UK National Ecosystem Assessment. The biodiversity strategy sets out a series of outcomes for 2020 (the following of which are relevant to this GI Strategy):

Outcome 1 – Habitats and ecosystems on land (including freshwater environments)
By 2020 we will have put in place measures so that biodiversity is maintained and enhanced, further degradation has been halted and where possible, restoration is underway, helping deliver more resilient and coherent ecological networks, healthy and well-functioning ecosystems, which deliver multiple benefits for wildlife and people, including:

- ***1A.** Better wildlife habitats with 90% of priority habitats in favourable or recovering condition and at least 50% of SSSIs in favourable condition, while maintaining at least 95% in favourable or recovering condition.*

- ***1B.** More, bigger and less fragmented areas for wildlife, with no net loss of priority habitat and an increase in the overall extent of priority habitats by at least 200,000 ha.*

- ***1C.** By 2020, at least 17% of land and inland water, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, conserved through effective, integrated and joined up approaches to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystem services including through management of our existing systems of protected areas and the establishment of nature improvement areas.*

- ***1D.** Restoring at least 15% of degraded ecosystems as a contribution to climate change mitigation and adaptation.*

Outcome 3 – Species
By 2020, we will see an overall improvement in the status of our wildlife and will have prevented further human-induced extinctions of known threatened species.

Outcome 4 – People
By 2020, significantly more people will be engaged in biodiversity issues, aware of its value and taking positive action.

Draft Climate Change Strategy (2017)
This Climate Change Strategy replaces the strategy published in 2008, and has been updated to take into account the many changes that have been introduced since that time. Appendix Three details council activity directly resulting from this strategy up to 2016. The strategy has taken into account comments with key stakeholders during early 2017.

This strategy sets out clearly how the council will work towards the delivery of the council's vision and the Council Plan in respect of climate change. This is a guide for current and future actions for the council and partners, setting out relevant targets and demonstrating integration with other relevant council policy.

The Paris Agreement was ratified by the UK in November 2016. It recognises that local authorities have a role in addressing climate change and invites us to: reduce emissions; build resilience and promote cooperation.

One of the actions in pledge 3 makes explicit and implicit reference to green infrastructure.

The council will prepare and plan for the impacts of climate change in its own services and with residents, community groups, businesses and partners.

Actions for the council include:

- *Ensure that all new development is built and designed to be resilient to climate change and incorporate features to minimize its impacts. This includes the use of Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), high standards of water efficiency and appropriate landscape planting;*
- *Ensure that green infrastructure is protected and enhanced, to enable habitats and species to adapt to climate change and maximise other benefits, such as the management of surface water run-off; and*
- *Ensure the provision of appropriate open space, including allotments as a part of new development to provide opportunities for residents to grow their own produce.*

Existing Corporate policies and strategies covering specific elements or issues in relation to GI

There are some existing policies and strategies which cover different aspects of GI provision and management. These have been summarised as a means to linking to and informing the GI Strategy.

Living Landscapes (2014)
'Living Landscapes' is the council's natural environment strategy and sets out how the council proposes to focus its resources to help meet its obligations and commitments to the conservation of the natural environment. The strategy works alongside the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and provides a range of objectives which include:

- Influencing management of green spaces to enhance biodiversity;
- creation of new habitats to expand and link isolated areas of key habitats; and
- working with local communities to increase opportunities for nature conservation volunteering.

Many of the Living Landscapes objectives will deliver green infrastructure benefits and will contribute to the delivery of the GI Strategy. Living Landscapes also includes a number of detailed actions that relate to biodiversity conservation in the wider countryside, including non-accessible farmland; borough wide habitat and species recording; assessment of biodiversity impacts at all stages of the land-use planning system; and raising awareness of wildlife and nature conservation generally. Given the detailed and wide ranging nature of Living Landscapes, it is considered appropriate that it continues as a separate strategy delivered in parallel to the GI Strategy.

Tree Strategy (2014)
The tree strategy sets out the council's approach on the protection of trees on private land and on development sites, the management of the Council's own tree stock and the provision of advice.

The high level aims of the strategy are for the tree resource to be:

- Resilient to climate change and disease by being diverse in terms of both species and age;
- Accessible to residents with sufficient tree planting in streets and parks and with easy access to well managed woodlands;
- Maximising ecological, recreational and landscape opportunities;
- Respectful of surroundings, including neighbouring residents and is maintained in a safe and healthy condition; and
- Managed with community engagement.

The strategy sets out in detail, the council's approach to a number of situations, ranging from general approaches to woodland management to specific situations such as how the council will deal with dangerous trees, removing ivy from and stump grinding. The document is complimentary to the GI strategy.

North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2014-19
This document is the statutory management plan for the nationally designated and protected landscape of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which extends across 80 square miles of the borough. The management plan is required under the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000 and it makes a number of references to GI. It makes explicit reference to the NPPF (2012) and GI (paragraph 114).

At Chapter 8.4 Additional Guidance, the management plan advises those responsible for preparing planning applications of the possibility of overcoming a planning objection to a development proposal by imposing a condition on the planning permission or by entering into a planning obligation (Section 106). The AONB will seek additional Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rates or Section 106 contributions from new development where appropriate. Local authority Partners should include these in their CIL Charging Schedules. Financial contributions should be raised to:
• *specifically support identified landscape, ecological, community, Green Infrastructure and environmental projects.*

Under the issues section of the management plan, GI is also specifically referred to in respect of the lack of resources for maintaining biodiversity and securing enhancements on the existing green infrastructure network, including road verges. In respect of development, GI (including new or enhanced biodiversity assets) should be incorporated within the area of all “major developments”, both within and near the AONB.

Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for Basingstoke and Deane (2015)
In April ‘13 responsibility for public health moved from NHS to local authorities. Hampshire County Council has the responsibility for public health & preparing the joint strategic needs assessment for Basingstoke and Deane which covers the following issues:

- Demography – how is our population changing?
- Starting Well – the health and life chances of our children
- Staying Well – the health of our adult population
- Ageing Well – the health of our older population

There is no explicit mention of GI or green space but significant references to healthy and active lifestyles that impact on health generally and specifically on starting well, managing obesity (lifestyle rather than burning calories), mental health and ageing well. In the context of the GI strategy, green space provides places where people can be active and attractive green space provides a continuing incentive to maintain levels of outdoor activity.

Appendix C – Biodiversity

This appendix provides further information in respect of the GI Strategy's Chapter 4.0 Providing Strategic GI and the review and update to the GI Strategy (2013). Information is arranged under the following headings:

- Accessible Natural Green Space
- Targets for areas with biodiversity potential
- Hampshire Ecological Network
- Biodiversity priority areas (BPAs)
- Objectives for the Ecological Network and BPAs
- Basingstoke green corridors
- Biodiversity targets

Accessible Natural Green Space
In terms of accessible areas of biodiversity value in urban areas, the most appropriate GI type to assess against is 'Accessible Natural Green Space'. This GI type can include areas of natural or semi –natural habitats (either naturally occurring or man-made) such as woodland, grassland, river corridors, etc. Chapter 4.5 Green Space Standards includes an assessment in relation to the distance thresholds for this GI type and there is, perhaps not surprisingly, a significant deficit in Basingstoke, as well as in Overton.

Priority urban green spaces in the borough, including accessible natural green space, parks, and amenity green space, will be subject to a programme of management plan preparation (see table 8). All of these sites have been subject to HBIC habitat surveys (principally botanical). Additional biodiversity assessments for the purposes of management planning will be undertaken where necessary and a programme of ecological monitoring established.

A number of other GI resources can also contribute to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment within the borough's urban areas including residential gardens, allotments, street trees and green corridors such as hedgerows, railway embankments, road verges, belts of buffer vegetation and urban river valleys.

The wildlife that depends upon these small and isolated islands of habitat is vulnerable to environmental change and disease as a result of their restricted environment and the constraints on population expansion and genetic exchange. Initiatives will need to look beyond just protecting the most pristine sites and individual endangered species, and move towards a more integrated approach, working to link sites, buffer sites, restore areas of habitat and allow wildlife to move more easily through the landscape. This can only be achieved if efforts are coordinated across a number of agencies and with many differing stakeholders, including landowners.
The provision of new green spaces and the enhancement of existing green spaces should be undertaken in a way that improves the protection of and enhances existing sites of high biodiversity value, for instance through the careful design and location, by expanding and/or buffering existing sites or providing linkages or stepping stones for species. The careful design of new green space can help to reduce recreational pressure on sites of high biodiversity value by providing alternative recreational resources.

Targets for areas with biodiversity potential
Biodiversity Improvements to GI can be targeted at a larger landscape scale as well as smaller local sites.

At the larger landscape scale, opportunities for improvement exist across the borough. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOA's) were identified within the South-East Biodiversity Strategy which covered vast tracts of land that often cross administrative boundaries. More recently habitat network mapping has been undertaken by the Hampshire Local Nature Partnership which looks at connectivity across the whole county through habitat type and designation. This refines the broad brush approach of the BOAs in that statutory and non-statutory nature conservation sites are identified along with the possible interlinking habitats which form connective corridors between them.

In order to focus attention to achieve results in the highest priority areas, the GI Strategy proposes two Biodiversity Priority Areas (BPA's) which are smaller discrete areas within the BOA's, where the

type of land uses, ownerships and potential funding streams provide most opportunity for improvements.

Hampshire Ecological Network
Further to chapter 4.3 of the GI Strategy, the bullet points below confirm the areas considered to be part of the network opportunities:

- All areas that are not buildings or roads
- All areas that have a habitat suitability index of more than 5 out of 9 and are more than 0.25ha
- All HBIC Broad Habitat types classified as woodland/scrub, or neutral grassland and calcareous grassland that are not improved
- All HBIC Broad Habitat type improved grasslands, neutral garasslands or arable which are covered by 80% floodzone and could therefore support wet grassland habitats.

Hedgerows
Linear features such as hedgerows that link up habitat patches have a conservation value in their own right and should be protected. HBIC maintains a GIS layer of digitised hedgerows which are shown as are linear features not polygons, representing hedgerow habitat up to 5m wide. These hedgerows can be overlain on to the main ecological network sites to show the full interconnectivity of habitats within the landscape.

The networking opportunities identified within the mapping does not preclude development or land use but can be used to inform proposals to obtain a net gain for biodiversity as part of the planning process in order to:

- promote the restoration and re-creation of priority habitats including increasing the size of existing wildlife sites,
- enhance connections between sites, either through physical corridors or through 'stepping stones'
- enable the protection and recovery of priority species populations

Biodiversity priority areas (BPAs)
Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) provide an important focus for multi-agency effort across the southeast of England for influencing countryside management in ways that are beneficial to biodiversity conservation. However, improvements in these areas are always likely to be opportunistic, reliant on incentives such as agricultural subsidies and subject to competing economic drivers over land use and the nature of its management. If significant improvements in local biodiversity are to be achieved, there is a need for the council, working with other landowners and organisations who have the ability to effect land use change, to directly create and restore habitat, particularly where this can create more wildlife friendly links and buffers between and around existing important sites. To this end, two Biodiversity Priority Areas (BPAs) have been identified as part of this strategy.

The BPAs are based on the borough's two main river corridors and have been chosen because these represent cohesive linear geographic areas that contain interrelated habitats, linked by the ecological function of the rivers, both of which are of major importance for biodiversity in their own right and in need of better management. Concerted effort to improve the management of existing high value habitats, restore degraded habitats that once had high value and to create new habitats in the place of those that have been completely lost, will complement activities within the BOAs, creating two major linear corridors across the borough from which many species will be able to spread out to take advantage of any habitat improvements within the BOAs. Likewise, improvements to land management within the BOAs, particularly catchment-related issues such as nutrient run-off from farmland, will aid biodiversity improvements within the BPAs. Therefore, the two approaches will reinforce one another.

Delivery of Ecological Network and BPA Objectives
The key means to deliver the objectives within each of the Biodiversity Priority Areas are

- **Management of council owned land**
  Much of the land in the upper reaches of the River Loddon BPA (including Millfield, Eastrop Park, Glebe Gardens and Victory Park) is under the ownership of the council which would help with the coordination and implementation of projects to improve the biodiversity within

this area. Similarly within the River Test BPA the council owns land at Daniel's Park, an area of grassland which borders the river.

- **Planning policy**
  The council will ensure that new development within the borough assists in the delivery of GI through specific local planning policy. Larger developments will be expected to include provision for GI, including habitat improvements which provide a net gain for biodiversity.
- **Partnership Working**
  The council will continue to work in partnership with other organisations and agencies to help conserve and enhance biodiversity within the borough. For instance, the council is working with the Environment Agency to implement parts of the Loddon Catchment Implementation Plan.
- **Community Groups**
  The council will continue to support local community conservation groups that carry out practical conservation work on public land.

Basingstoke green corridors

Within Basingstoke town itself there are a great number of opportunities to increase biodiversity and the connections between urban wildlife sites (see Appendix G - Figure 5.9) These mainly follow the main arterial roads within the town where there is a lot of opportunity for increasing wildlife interest on the wide verges which are present. There is also opportunity for increasing biodiversity interest within formal parks and within school grounds through habitat creation. This will add to the amenity and visual appeal of areas as well as providing an educational resource. Several methods are available for action on this front and these include:

- Reduction and targeting of mowing and clearance regimes
- Improvement of road side verges through reseeding with suitable native plant communities
- Creation of new habitats on council owned parks
- Creation of new habitats within school grounds and possible other open space opportunities such as cemeteries or allotments
- Increased management of planted woodland thickets

Biodiversity targets

In order to set meaningful and reasonable goals for achieving biodiversity improvements, habitat targets on a landscape scale have been developed for the restoration, creation and maintenance of key habitat types over the period of the strategy (to 2029) to help meet the Ecological Network and BPA objectives and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity. The habitat targets have been divided into two types;

- **specific targets** where known mechanisms have been identified to help deliver the targets within each of the BPAs or the wider borough, and
- **aspirational targets** where no current mechanism to deliver the targets has been identified but where targets will be pursued should opportunities arise.

Table D.1 presents the specific habitat targets. Each of the targets shown is associated with the council's own land holdings, that of key partners or where habitat restoration/creation habitats projects have already secured the necessary funding. It also includes all statutory designated sites (SSSIs) within the Borough where it can be assumed habitats will be maintained.

Targets for land owned or managed by the council which have current management plans, or where management plans are to be developed, are included in the table. Any land outside the council's ownership includes all Hampshire County Council owned countryside sites, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust reserves, land owned or leased by the Forestry Commission and all statutory designated wildlife sites within the Borough. The table does not contain all areas of key habitats within private land ownership, which may be managed for their biodiversity interests (except where these have been designated as SSSIs).

The majority of habitat types that have been identified to be maintained carry some sort of site designation. These areas will already support the key habitat types and are likely to be in a favourable condition. As a result no timescales are associated with these habitat targets. However, it may be that these areas could be further enhanced. Areas for restoration will be existing habitats that could be

restored to an acceptable quality through positive management, whilst areas for creation are new areas of particular habitat types.

No timescales have been given to create or restore new areas of habitat on land owned or managed by the council as these can only be derived through the green space management plans which are to be developed (see Table 6.1 in Strategy document). The green space management plans will set out specific aims for habitat creation and/or restoration with timescales which will include the areas given in Table D.1 where these occur.

The timescales can only be derived when it is known exactly what work will be required to create each habitat type on each of the relevant sites, the resources available over the course of each management plan, and when a system of monitoring is developed which can be used to assess when the desired habitat types have been achieved. Timescales for habitat creation and restoration targets outside the council's ownership or management are not given, as these are currently unknown and fall outside the council's control in terms of when they will be achieved.

Table D.1. Habitat Targets (as at 2017) within the Biodiversity Protection Areas and wider Borough up till 2029			
	Land owned and/or managed by BDBC		
Habitat type	Existing areas to be maintained (ha)	New areas to be created or restored (ha)	Change in BDBC areas since 2013
Terrestrial Great Crested Newt habitat *(includes scrub and grassland specifically managed for GCNs)*	6.27	*	0%
Heathland *(includes areas of acid grassland, bog and some woodland)*	195.61	3.18	0%
Native woodland *(includes ancient semi-natural woodland and wet woodland)*	52.56	16.30	0%
Orchard	1.50	0.28	0%
Ponds and other open water *(includes lakes and canals)*	3.07	0.92	0%
River Loddon	266m	1045 m	+25%
River Test HIWWT Projects on Bourne Rivulet Sediment passways Watercress and Winterbourne HLF Keeping Rivers Cool			
Species rich grassland *(includes many habitat types such as chalk grassland, neutral grassland and floodplain grazing marsh)*	16.17	40.91	0%
Fen	unknown at present	1.29	unknown

Table D.2. Habitat Targets (as at 2017) within the Biodiversity Protection Areas and wider Borough up till 2029					
	Land outside BDBC ownership/management				
Habitat type	Existing areas to be maintained (ha)	New areas to be created or restored (ha)	Change in land outside BDBC ownership since 2013	Total areas in Borough where known (ha/m)	Change in total area totals since 2013
Terrestrial Great Crested Newt habitat *(includes scrub and grassland specifically managed for GCNs)*	unknown	unknown	unknown	6.27	0%
Heathland *(includes areas of acid grassland, bog and some woodland)*	208.57	unknown	0%	407.36	0%
Native woodland *(includes ancient semi-natural woodland and wet woodland)*	592.09	4.67	0%	665.63	0%
Orchard	unknown	unknown	unknown	1.78	0%
Ponds and other open water *(includes lakes and canals)*	18.16	unknown	0%	22.15	0%
River Loddon	unknown	unknown	unknown	1311 m	+25%
River Test HIWWT Projects on Bourne Rivulet Sediment passways Watercress and Winterbourne HLF Keeping Rivers Cool	unknown	unknown	unknown		
Species rich grassland *(includes many habitat types such as chalk grassland, neutral grassland and floodplain grazing marsh)*	171.04	4.45	0%	232.57	0%
Fen	1.86	unknown	0%	3.15	+69%

Appendix D – Green Space Standards

This appendix should be read in conjunction with Chapter 4.5 - 4.8 (Green Space Standards, Quantity, Accessibility and Quality) of the GI Strategy.

Explanation of differences between MFGS figures in the GI Strategy 2013 and figures calculated for the GI Strategy Review 2017

The figures contained in the current GI Strategy figs. 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been taken from the Leisure and Recreation Needs Assessment 2008 (LRNA):

- The LRNA states that these figures are based on the Council's Open Space Audit carried out in 1998 which included all green spaces over 1000sq.m.
- The figures are the LRNA figures excluding school sites and playing fields and including Amenity Green Spaces, Accessible Natural Green Spaces and Parks and Gardens.
- N.B. As the Open Space Audit does not include sizes for all the green spaces or quantity figures per person by ward it is unclear how the figures in the LRNA were calculated.

The revised figures include only MFGS which meets the Green Space Standard for multi-functional green space contained in the GI Strategy 2013. For example the minimum size for MFGS contained in the Green Space Standards is 2000sq.m. with no dimension less than 15m (as opposed to 1000sq.m. and no minimum dimension in the Open Space Audit 1998)

The revised figures include all MFGS within a ward. In the Rural Area where the ward may include several small settlements the LRNA figures included only green spaces within the 7 main settlement boundaries rather than the whole ward. For example, there are sites of MFGS outside the settlement boundary of Kingsclere which were not included in the LRNA figures but have been included in the revised figures because they are within the ward.

The LRNA figures are based on population forecast figures in 2008, whereas the revised figures are based on population forecast figures for 2017.

Some ward boundaries changed in 2008 affecting the quantity of MFGS and the population, for example the GI Strategy has a figure for Pamber, Baughurst and Tadley North/South ward. This ward has now been split up into three separate wards.

Some wards have gained additional MFGS as a result of housing development since 2008.

Below is a summary by ward of the GI Strategy quantity figure and the revised quantity figure with suggested explanation for the differences in the right hand column:

Ward	GI Strategy 2013 MFGS quantity figure sq.m. per person	Revised MFGS quantity figure sq.m. per person	Likely explanation for difference
Brighton Hill North	99	18	Population increase by 300 since 2011. Boundary changes in 2008. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously. The previous figure still seems particularly high and consideration should be given to it having been an error.
Brighton Hill South	31	43	Boundary changes in 2008. Population down 176 since 2011.
Brookvale/Kings Furlong	14	8.5	Population increase of 75 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously. Boundary change in 2008.
Buckskin	28	18.2	Population down by 100 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously. Boundary change in 2008.
Chineham	72	63	Population increase of 843 since 2011.
Eastrop	109	65	Population increase of 400 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously. Boundary change in 2008.
Grove	57	38	Population increase of 350 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously.
Hatch Warren and Beggarwood	47	58	Addition of Beggarwood Park. Population decrease of 450 since 2011
Kempshott	79	72	Population increase of 40 since 2011. Boundary change in 2008.

Nordon	44	22	Population increase of 572 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously.
Popley East	55	42	Population increase of 850 since 2011 Additional open space as part of housing development off set by additional residents. Boundary change in 2008
Popley West	68	41	Population increase of 1000 since 2011 Additional open space as part of housing development off set by additional residents. Boundary change 2008
Rooksdown	36	23	Population increase of 2,000 since 2011 Additional open space as part of housing development off set by additional residents. Boundary change in 2008
South Ham	44	16	Population reduction of 400 since 2011. Large number of spaces between 1000 and 2000 sq.m. which would have been counted previously Boundary change 2008
Winklebury	88	28	Population decreased by 400 since 2011 Boundary change in 2008 Number of open spaces included in calculation for LRNA is 12 and for revised figure is 18 and still revised figure is less. Even if all school sites, allotments and playing fields are included in the calculation this would only result in 49 sq.m. per person. The previous figure still seems particularly high and consideration should be given to it having been an error.
Basing	160	119	Population decrease of 160 since 2011. Substitute Common no longer included as it is not

			generally accessible other than along footpaths
Baughurst and Tadley North		28	Population increase of 180 since 2011 Boundary change in 2008
Burghclere, Highclere and St Mary Bourne		560	Not included in previous calculations
Bramley and Sherfield	31	54	Non population change since 2011 Boundary change 2008 Additional MFGS outside the settlement boundary but within the ward has been included.
East Woodhay		230	Not included in previous calculations
Kingsclere	5	153	Population increase of 60 since 2011. Additional MFGS outside the settlement boundary but within the ward has been included. Even if only MFGS within the settlement boundary were included the original figure appears to be too low and consideration should be given to it having been an error.
Oakley and North Waltham	25	38	Population down 50 since 2011 MFGS outside the Oakley settlement boundary has been added.
Overton and Laverstoke	12	21	Population up 50 since 2011 MFGS outside Overton settlement boundary at Laverstoke included.
Pamber and Silchester		796	Population decrease by 260 since 2011. Boundary change in 2008. Now including commons.
Sherborne St John		454	Not included in previous calculation.
Tadley Central		13	Population down 50 since 2011 Boundary change in 2008.
Tadley South		72	Population down 20 since 2011 Boundary change in 2008.
Whitchurch	31	36	Population up 100 since 2011 Addition of new open space such as Daniel Park

Revised deficit and surplus table based on the revised quantity figures

Colour key:
Green = meets or exceeds the standards
Orange = doesn't meet the standards but within 10 sq.m. per person
Red = doesn't meet the standard by more than 10 sq.m. per person

m2 per person per ward		
	2017	
RURAL Ward	**MFGS**	**Play**
Basing	118.99	0.78
Baughurst & Tadley North	27.83	0.56
Burghclere, Highclere & St Mary Bourne	560.47	0.79
Bramley & Sherfield	53.81	1.03
East Woodhay	229.98	0.26
Kingsclere	153.45	1.07
Oakley & North Waltham	37.58	1.41
Overton, Laverstoke & Steventon	20.95	1.79
Pamber & Silchester	795.65	0.71
Sherborne St John	454.43	0.75
Tadley Central	13.19	0.73
Tadley South	71.72	0.63
Upton Grey & The Candovers	42.55	0.9
Whitchurch	35.99	0.64
URBAN Ward	**MFGS**	**Play**
Brighton Hill North	18.37	0.38
Brighton Hill South	43.33	0.69
Brookvale & Kings Furlong	8.49	0.71
Buckskin	18.2	0.72
Chineham	63.46	1.04
Eastrop	64.81	0.63
Grove	38.24	0.47
Hatch Warren & Beggarwood	57.81	0.84
Kempshott	72.53	0.36
Norden	22.44	0.64
Popley East	42.44	1.25
Popley West	41.41	1.66
Rooksdown	22.96	0.39
South Ham	15.84	0.22
Winklebury	28.33	0.75

The above figures have been calculated as follows:
Adding up all GI which meets the requirements for MFGS set out in the Green Space Standards within each ward, dividing by the population forecast numbers for each ward for 2017.
The types of GI included in the calculation are those which meet the definition of MFGS contained in the Green Space Standards and therefore it does not include:

- playing fields and formal sports pitches,
- allotments,
- churchyards and cemeteries,
- road verges
- wildlife sites and buffers/green corridors which do not allow free access for informal recreation
- any site less than 0.2ha (2,000sq.m.)

Appendix E – Funding

Funding of Green Infrastructure improvements will come from a number of sources, both internally and externally.

As with other aspects of infrastructure provision, the funding for the GI needed to accommodate future housing growth will come from developer contributions. However, it is unrealistic to expect this to cover all of the funding required for GI improvements.

Because of the multifunctional nature of GI, funding could be sought from a much wider range of potential funding streams than conventional open space provision, including those related to climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, community projects, and rural development.

Internal funding opportunities

It should be noted that internal funding streams are subject to periodic change, and the availability, scope and level of funding for each of these may change through the lifetime of the strategy.

Section 106 Funding
As part of planning obligations for developments and Section 106 legal agreements, funding for improvements to existing open space and play provision is secured by the council in relation to developments in the borough. This funding provides an excellent opportunity to provide for and improve green infrastructure. The requirements of section 106 agreements generally mean that improvements need to be provided in specific wards and parishes.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
The Community Infrastructure Levy is a levy that local authorities can choose to charge on new developments in their area. The money can be used to support development by funding infrastructure that the council, local community and neighbourhoods want. Any CIL charge must relate to development and must not duplicate funding obtained through S106 funding.

CIL may provide opportunities for developers to fund improvements to urban parks and green spaces where their development may create indirect impacts on those green spaces, for instance through increased recreational pressures. CIL may also provide opportunities for developers to fund project based biodiversity improvements, across the borough, by compensating for impacts that cannot be mitigated or compensated for within development sites and therefore beyond the scope for S106 funding.

Local Infrastructure Fund
LIF funding will support projects that improve existing, or establish new, facilities for community, sport, education or public amenity use. Schemes will ensure facilities are safe, accessible, fit for purpose; addressing gaps in local level community provision or increasing community involvement. Below are the LIF's main priorities, but applications will be considered on a case by case basis:

- Health and safety requirements (such as roof repairs, sports-related play surfaces, boiler/heating system replacement, re-wiring, dry rot)
- Improvements to accessibility (such as ramps, accessible toilets, parking, highway, transport, foot and cycle path, lighting projects)
- Modernisation (e.g. kitchen/toilet/pitch/play park/flooring refurbishments), where there is evidence the existing condition is affecting use
- Extensions, new buildings or facilities to meet increased demand or proven deficits (e.g. cemetery provision, skate parks, youth buildings) or feasibility studies to determine viability

Environmental Renewal Scheme programme
The overall aim of the council's Environmental Renewal Schemes (ERS) programme is to improve the quality of the external environment by addressing a number of issues. The following have a direct link to Green Infrastructure and improvements to open spaces;

- enhancing amenity by renewing boundary treatments and street furniture, planting, including the removal of dereliction etc

- reduction in crime and the fear of crime by improved lighting, dealing with inappropriate planting; and

- improving access by providing new paths along 'desire lines' and removal of inappropriate steps etc

The nature of this programme seeks to address issues in areas in greatest need of regeneration, typically the parts of the borough that were built in the 1960's and 1970's. Where these areas coincide with GI priority areas, opportunities will be taken to make connections and enhance the GI network.

Green Spaces Improvement budget
The council's Green Spaces Improvements budget can provide resources for implementing generally small, discrete improvements to parks and open spaces within the borough. It is intended to produce a planned programme of works identified as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, which can be funded by this budget.

External funding opportunities

Heritage Lottery Fund
The Heritage Lottery Fund runs two funding programmes of value to GI:
'*Parks for People'* provides £100,000 to £5million for the restoration of historic parks, gardens and cemeteries, making sure their history is understood and explained, and that the local community has a say in their future.

The 'Landscape Partnerships' programme is for schemes led by partnerships of local, regional and national interests which aim to conserve areas of distinctive landscape character throughout the UK. Grants from £100,000 to £3 million can be applied for.

Landfill Communities Fund
Tax on landfill waste was introduced in 1996 as a means to reduce the amount of land-filled waste and to promote a shift to more environmentally sustainable methods of waste management. The scheme enables operators of landfill sites to contribute money to carry out projects that meet environmental objects contained in the Landfill Tax Regulations. These projects generally need to be within a certain distance of a landfill site, rather than located within a specific district/borough.

The Government see the LCF as a way for Landfill Operators and environmental bodies to work in partnership to create significant environmental benefits and jobs and to undertake projects which improve the lives of communities living near landfill sites.
Funding is provided for the following areas of work:

- **The provision, maintenance or improvement of a public park or other general public amenity** (To facilitate the protection of the environment by the provision, maintenance or improvement of a public park or amenity. The site where the work takes place must be open and accessible to the general public).

- **The conservation of a specific species or a specific habitat where it naturally occurs** (For the conservation of identified species or habitats. The costs of the work undertaken must be directly related to the identified species or habitat and the place where it naturally occurs).

Agri-environment Funding

The most relevant agri-environment scheme for the provision of funding towards GI improvements is Countryside Stewardship, administered by Natural England, Countryside Stewardship provides funding to farmers and other land managers in England to deliver effective environmental management on their land. This could include permissive rights of way, habitat and species improvements, and school visits to farms. Habitat improvements on farms can contribute to creating and improving links between other elements of the GI network.

Other funding sources

Other funding sources need to be kept under review and pursued as opportunities arise but might include:

- Commercial sponsorship
- Local fund raising campaigns (as used successfully by the Wildlife Trusts to acquire new nature reserves)
- Social Action Fund
- Work in Kind – volunteers, corporate working days

Equally critical to the capital investment required to enhance the existing GI resource will be the resources required for ongoing management. There is no point in investing heavily in new GI assets if it is not going to be practical to maintain them. In addition to existing borough council maintenance budgets (including money collected through commuted sums from developers), potential sources of revenue for ongoing management include:

- Events and other activities for which an admission fee can be charged
- Countryside stewardship schemes
- Private management charges on communal GI
- Commercial sponsorship
- Work in kind – volunteers, corporate working days

It will be necessary to explore the widest range of options for delivery including: shared services with other local authorities, contracting out specialist types of management (where this is more cost effective), full engagement and enablement of the voluntary sector, and partnerships with a range of other organisations, including the private sector. Different models of governance and management will also be investigated to assess their appropriateness in a borough context, including community trusts and parks trusts.

Appendix G – Plans, Programmes and Projects Relevant to GI

Plans, Programmes and Projects	Lead Organisation	Relevance to GI
Biodiversity 2020	UK Government	Sets out UK approach to biodiversity management post BAP process overall objective is to halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people.
Water for Life & Livelihoods: River Basin Management Plan - Thames River Basin District	Environment Agency	Includes actions to address the pressures affecting this river basin, including the Loddon catchment.
Loddon Catchment Implementation Plan	Environment Agency	Plan builds on the Thames River Basin Management Plan and presents a prioritised programme of actions to achieve Good Ecological Status (GES) or in the case of heavily modified waterbodies, Good Ecological Potential (GEP) for the Loddon catchment.
North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan	NWD AONB management team on behalf of constituent local authorities.	Seeks to influence management within this designated area in order to conserve its distinctive landscape character.
Countryside Access Plan 2015-2025	Hampshire County Council Countryside Service	The statutory RoWIP is the county's framework for the maintenance and improvement of the Hampshire rights of way network.
Sustainable Community Strategy 2011	Basingstoke Area Strategic Partnership (BASP)	Describes headline priorities for the local community.
East Hampshire District GI Strategy 2013-2028	East Hampshire District	Provides a description of the integrated green infrastructure framework in East Hampshire and actions being taken to protect, enhance and expand that infrastructure
Hart District GI Strategy 2017	Hart District	Provides a description of the integrated green infrastructure framework in Hart and actions being taken to protect, enhance and expand that infrastructure
Council Plan 2016-2020	BDBC	Provides commitment to continue to meet our obligations and commitments to the conservation of the natural environment, including habitat protection and restoration by working with our partners and the community.
Climate Change Strategy 2014	BDBC	Provides council's strategy for tackling the effects of climate change. Some of the objectives of which fall within green infrastructure.
Living Landscapes 2014	BDBC	Sets out council priorities for protecting the natural environment in the borough, including green infrastructure strategy development.

Landscape Character Assessment (2001)	BDBC	Seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive sense of place and character of the borough's landscapes through guidance related to a series of landscape character areas.
Community Woodland Plan (2009)	BDBC	Sets out opportunities for creating new community woodlands within Basingstoke.
Tree Strategy 2014	BDBC	Relates to the council's roles in managing its own trees and influencing the management of privately owned trees and woodlands, including those on development sites.
Green Space Management Plans	BDBC	A programme of management plans is being established for council-owned green spaces, in association with community conservation groups.
Biodiversity Assessment for the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Feb 2010)	BDBC	An assessment of thirteen potential future development areas around Basingstoke Town which provides guidance on the biodiversity implications of accommodating development in these locations.
Biodiversity Assessment for the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Additional Sites)) (Aug 2010 and 2012)	BDBC	An assessment of an additional 14 sites, picking up those greenfield sites identified in the borough's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as worthy of further consideration through the LDF (category 1 sites).
Sports & Recreation Strategy (2010)	BDBC	Will provide an approved framework to effectively manage the allocation of resources to priorities in the sport and recreation infrastructure. It will also support the Local Development Framework.
Water Cycle Study (Phase 1) (2007) Water Cycle Study (Phase 2) (2009)	Steering group comprising: BDBC, The Environment Agency, Hampshire County Council, Thames Water, Southern Water, Natural England & South East Water	Informs the Local Plan to ensure that housing allocations and their phasing does not prejudice protection of the borough's water resources, including rivers.
Basingstoke and Deane Living Landscapes Project	Hampshire & Isle of White Wildlife Trust and BDBC	Tries to engage landowners in land management beneficial for ecology through supplying flexible HWT managed volunteer teams able to undertake management work throughout the borough.
Wildlife Trust Living Landscapes Projects: Enborne, Upper Test Valley, Greater Pamber and Loddon and Lyde Headwaters.	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Describes the capacity for habitat restoration and enhancement in each of the areas and sets out a programme of advisory activity to help deliver a vision of landscape-scale habitat improvements.
The Loddon Catchment Biodiversity Strategy	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Sets targets for biodiversity conservation within the River Loddon catchment.
Pamber Forest SLA	Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	Describes management procedures and policy for Pamber Forest SSSI/LNR

Community Plans and Neighbourhood Plans	BDBC and Local communities	Outline people's vision for their community and the actions that will lead to that vision being achieved.
Treescape Appraisals	BDBC	Profiles community tree resources and provides the basis for identifying area-specific policies for tree planting, protection and tree management.
Hampshire Local Nature Partnership	Wide partnership made up of representatives from the health, social, economic and biodiversity sectors	High level priorities include creating bigger, more joined up places for nature and reconnecting people and nature whilst improving the health of both.
Parish Wildlife Map Toolkit	Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust with assistance from BDBC	Tool kit to help local parishes prepare parish wildlife maps which identify key habitats and species within a parish, town or village boundary. The maps can be linked to parish plans or village design statements and/or help to identify ways to protect and enhance biodiversity locally.