



Biodiversity Net Gain Feasibility Assessment

Steyping Cricket Club, Steyping

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	METHODOLOGY.....	4
3.0	DEFRA METRIC	4
4.0	POST-DEVELOPMENT PLANTING SCHEMES ..ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.	
5.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	10
	APPENDIX 1: HABITAT BASELINE CONDITION ASSESSMENTS.....	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 Steyping Cricket Club to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) feasibility assessment for the outline application for Steyping Cricket Club, Charlton Street, Steyping, West Sussex, BN44 3LE, hereafter referred to as the 'site' (Figure 1).
- 1.2 The site is characterised by buildings and hardstanding, including the current main clubhouse and changing rooms for the Steyping Cricket Club. Small sections of the associated cricket ground are also included within the red line boundary, the site totals c. 0.23ha. The site is situated to the west of Steyping (central grid reference: TQ 17512 11183). The immediate surrounding area consists of business use and residential properties, Steyping Police station lies to the south-east, residential dwellings and Charlton Street to the east, and the associated fields for the Cricket Club and Steyping Bowling Club to the west.
- 1.3 The red line boundary of the site and immediate surroundings are displayed in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: The red line boundary and immediate surroundings.

- 1.4 The proposals are to demolish the existing pavilion and replace it with a new and improved facility that meets the current requirements of both the social and sports provisions of Steyping Cricket Club. To optimise the facility, all buildings and storage structures are to be demolished to allow a better integration of spaces within the new building programme.

2.0 Methodology

- 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 12th February 2025. This work was undertaken by Matt Pendry BSc (Hons) MCIEEM, and Sophie Baker BSc (Hons) MSc

- 2.3 The creation of areas which would support potential net-gain areas are based on the following:

- Identification / classification of the on-site baseline habitats;
- Identification of habitats which are of high ecological value;
- Provision of habitat mapping;
- Identification of potential for ecological connectivity;
- Identification of areas which support landscape development;
- Linking biodiversity net gain areas, landscape features in order to identify opportunity areas which support the Nature Recovery Network aspirations;
- Recommendations for species rich, native planting.

3.0 DEFRA Metric

- 3.1 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.

- 3.2 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’.

Baseline Habitat Units

- 3.3 The habitats currently present on site have been identified and assessed. These are shown in Figure 3 and in Table 1, overleaf. A full condition assessment is presented in Appendix 1.



Figure 3: On-Site Habitat Baseline

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

Habitat	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Total habitat units	Area retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Units lost	Comments
Developed land; sealed surface	0.128	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0.00	0.071	0	0.00	Buildings and hardstanding.
Modified grassland	0.052	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0.10	0.022	0	0.06	Area of modified grassland of the associated cricket ground.
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.045	Low	Poor	Low	0.00	0.019	0	0.00	Gravel and astroturf areas.
Urban tree	0.057	Medium	Poor	Low	0.23	0.053		0.02	1 large retained (T13) 1 medium retained (T11) and one small lost (T9)
Total area (excluding trees)	0.23	<u>Total units/area</u>			<u>0.33</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.08</u>	

Illustrative Proposed Habitat Units

3.4 Assumptions have been made about the proposed habitats based on the illustrative masterplan. The habitats currently proposed on site have been divided into a number of habitat types. The proposed habitats have been detailed in Figure 4 below and broken down within Table 2.



Figure 4: Proposed habitat plan for site.

Table 2. 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	0.107	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0	Low	0.00	New buildings and hardstanding
Modified grassland	0.008	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0	Low	0.00	New areas of re-seeded grass
Total area (excl. trees)	0.12	<u>Total units</u>					0.02	

- 3.5 The results of the metric calculation based on the habitat input from the tables above are displayed in Figure 5 below.

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-0.06		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-18.24%		
	Hedgerow units	0.00%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	0.33	0.37	0.09
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

Figure 5: Illustrative masterplan BNG metric calculation headline results

- 3.6 The calculations confirm that the development has the potential to result in a **-18.24% net loss** in habitat units, based on the current proposal .
- 3.7 In order to achieve a +10% net-gain and satisfy the trading summary the following additional units will be needed:
- 0.02 units of individual trees
 - 0.07 units of any habitat
- 3.8 This could be achieved onsite through the planting of eight additional trees, however, the survival and maintenance of these trees would need to be secured through a Section 106 agreement for a period of at least 30 years. If not feasible, these units could be purchased from a local offsite provider.
- 3.9 The BNG strategy has been developed in order to adhere to good practice principles (CIEEM 2016), which references measures to review and support biodiversity initiatives during the design, building and maintenance of developments.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 Post-development the proposed value of the site is currently predicted to be an decrease of **0.06 area units**, equating to a change of **-18.24%**.
- 4.2 In order to achieve a +10% net-gain and satisfy the trading summary the following additional units will be needed 0.02 units of individual trees, and 0.07 units of any habitat
- 4.3 This is achievable through either planting an additional 8 native trees on site and securing their management for 30 years, or through the purchase of units from a local offsite provider.

Appendix 1: Habitat Baseline Condition Assessments

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)		
UKHab Habitat Type(s): Grassland - Modified grassland		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Modified Grassland
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m present, including at least 2 forbs (this may include those listed in Footnote 1). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition. Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m~ (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	X
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	X
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note – patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90% cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	✓
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	X
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens?).	✓
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	✓
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species? (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA*).	✓
Condition		Poor
Condition Assessment Result		
Good	Passes 6 or 7 of 7 criteria including essential criterion A	
Moderate	Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	
Poor	Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR 4-6 of criteria but failing criterion A	
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover. Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying the buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)		

Individual trees				
UKHab Habitat Type(s): Urban tree: Covers the following topographical formations most commonly found in urban areas1: Individual Trees (urban or rural): Young trees over 75mm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only): Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies must overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.				
Condition Assessment Criteria		T9	T11	T13
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Fail	Fail	Fail
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Pass	Pass	Pass
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)1.	Fail	Fail	Fail
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain > 75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Fail	Fail	Fail
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Fail	Fail	Fail
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Pass	Pass	Pass
Condition		Poor	Poor	Poor
Condition Assessment Result				
Good	Passes 5 or 6 criteria			
Moderate	Passes 3 or 4 criteria			
Poor	Passes 2 or fewer criteria			
Footnote 1 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from: Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk) and: Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)				
Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.				

The Ecology Partnership

Thorncroft Manor

Thorncroft Drive

Leatherhead

KT22 8JB

Tel: 01372 364 133

www.ecologypartnership.com

Approved: Matt Pendry BSc (Hons) MCIEEM

Issue Date: 18/03/2025

Amended 28/05/2026