



Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment

Land at The Hyde

The Ecology Partnership, Thorncroft Manor, Thorncroft Drive, Leatherhead, Surrey KT22 8JB

T +44 (0) 1372 364133 **E** info@ecologypartnership.com **W** ecologypartnership.com

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 3

2.0 STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC 5

3.0 CONCLUSIONS 11

LIABILITIES:

Whilst every effort has been made to guarantee the accuracy of this report, it should be noted that living animals and plants are capable of migration/establishing and whilst such species may not have been located during the survey duration, their presence may be found on a site at a later date.

This report provides a snap shot of the species that were present at the time of the survey only and does not consider seasonal variation. Furthermore, where access is limited or the site supports habitats which are densely vegetated only dominant species maybe recorded.

The recommendations contained within this document are based on a reasonable timeframe between the completion of the survey and the commencement of any works. If there is any delay between the commencement of works that may conflict with timeframes laid out within this document, or have the potential to allow the ingress of protected species, a suitably qualified ecologist should be consulted.

It is the duty of care of the landowner/developer to act responsibly and comply with current environmental legislation if protected species are suspected or found prior to or during works.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Ecology Partnership was commissioned by Richardson Architects to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) feasibility assessment for the outline application for the development to the land at The Hyde, Rusper Road, Crawley, RH11 0LN, hereafter referred to as the 'site' (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Site application boundary (red line).

1.2 The assessment is based on the Proposed Site Plan produced by Richardson Architecture Limited (773-04-P12) (see Figure 2 below).

2.0 Statutory Biodiversity Metric

- 2.1 BNG principles are aimed to support both the aspired green infrastructural proposals set to define the created landscape and support biodiversity and habitat enhancement. BNG principles are set within the Environment Bill (2021).
- 2.2 In order to determine the on-site habitat baseline, habitats were mapped and subject to a condition assessment on the 26th June 2025, by Alexia Tamblyn MA (Oxon) MSc CECOL CEnv MCIEEM FRGS.
- 2.3 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric is used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial habitats within the application area. This metric underpins the Environment Bill's provisions for mandatory biodiversity net-gain in England.
- 2.4 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric uses habitat as a proxy for wider biodiversity with different habitat types scoring different values according to their relative biodiversity value and dependent on the condition and location of the habitat, to calculate 'biodiversity units'.

On-Site Habitat Baseline

- 2.5 The habitats currently present on site have been identified and assessed. These are shown in Figure 3 and in Tables 1 and 2, overleaf. A full condition assessment is presented in Appendix 1.
- 2.6 The proposals are for the development of 6 houses within the red line boundary. These are located on the existing tennis court and in the garden area. The house currently present will be retained. There will be a new access and the existing access will be retained. The pond will remain.



Figure 3: Baseline habitats

Table 1. On-site habitat breakdown – Pre-Development

Habitat	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Units lost	Comments
Developed land; sealed surface	0.085	V.Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Buildings, hardstanding, tennis court, access road
Introduced shrub	0.004	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	
Introduced shrub	0.021	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.04	
Vegetated garden	0.253	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	0.51	0.00	0.00	0.51	
Other woodland; mixed	0.131	Medium	Poor	Low	0.52	0.043	0.00	0.35	
Urban tree	0.086	Medium	Moderate	Low	0.68	0.069	0.00	0.13	3 Medium + 1 Large moderate (2 medium + 1 large retained)
Urban tree	0.053	Medium	Good	Low	0.63	0.053	0.00	0.00	1 Large + 1 Medium good (1 Large retained)
Total area (excluding trees)	0.49	Total units/area			2.40	0.17	0.00	1.04	

Table 2. On-site hedgerow habitat breakdown – Pre-Development

Habitat	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Total units	Length retained	Units lost	Comments
Native hedgerow	0.049	Medium	Moderate	Low	0.20	0.049	0.00	
Total length	0.049	Total units/length			0.20	0.049	0.00	

On-Site Habitat Creation

- 2.7 The proposals include 7 new units and some associated buildings and hardstanding. The pond is being retained, with areas of woodland also retained. Some scattered and individual trees are also to be lost, including a good condition hornbeam located adjacent to the pond. In addition a large moderate condition tree, T6, Leyland cypress and medium sized moderate condition golden locust, will also be removed.
- 2.8 The proposed habitat areas are detailed in Tables 3 and 4 and Figure 4 below.

Table 4. On-site habitat breakdown – Post-Development Creation

Habitat	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Target Condition	Strategic significance	Years to target condition	Difficulty	Total habitat units	Comments
Developed land; sealed surface	0.215	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0	Low	0.00	
Introduced shrub	0.004	Low	Condition assessment N/A	Low	1	Low	0.01	
Vegetated garden	0.231	Low	Condition assessment N/A	Low	1	Low	0.45	
Total area	0.45	Total units					0.45	

Table 5. On-site hedgerow habitat breakdown – Post-Development Creation

Habitat	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Years to target condition	Difficulty	Total habitat units	Comments
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.031	Medium	Poor	Low	5	Low	0.12	Newly planted hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.031	Medium	Poor	Low	5	Low	0.12	Newly planted hedgerow
Total length	0.06	Total units					0.24	

2.9 The final results are shown in table 5 below.

Table 5. Final results

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change <small>(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Habitat units			-0.58
	Hedgerow units			0.24
	Watercourse units			0.00
Total net % change <small>(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Habitat units			-24.38%
	Hedgerow units			122.10%
	Watercourse units			0.00%
Trading rules satisfied?		No - Check Trading Summaries ▲		
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	2.40	2.64	0.82
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.20	0.22	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

Total net gain achieved is less than target set A

No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓

No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

2.10 The calculations confirm that the development has the potential to result in a **-24.38% net loss** in habitat units and a **+122.10 % net gain** in hedgerow units, based on the current proposal and all trading rules have been satisfied.

2.11 A total of 0.82 habitat units will be required to be purchased to ensure the development achieves 10% net gain. No off setting requirement for hedgerows is needed.

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 The baseline value of the site is **2.40 area units** and **0.2 hedgerow units**.

3.2 Post-development the proposed value of the site is currently predicted to be **1.81 habitat units and 0.44 hedgerow units**, equating to a change of **-24.38%** and **+122.10%** respectively.

3.3 Off setting through the purchase of 0.82 habitat units will be required in order to achieve 10% net gain. This can be secured by condition.

The Ecology Partnership

Thorncroft Manor

Thorncroft Drive

Leatherhead

KT22 8JB

Tel: 01372 364 133

www.ecologypartnership.com

Approved: Alexia Tamblyn MA (Oxon) MSc CEcol CEnv CIEEM FRGS

Date: 07/10/2025

Updated: 03/02/2026