

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Site Address:

Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL

Client:

Phil Rowe

Updated Assessment Date:

10th June 2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Horsham District Council. The proposal is described as:

Erection of a six-pitch settled gypsy accommodation site.

BNG assessment methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **[BNG Methodology and Legislation – 2025.](#)**

The results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit and BNG assessment may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Version Control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	14/05/2026
Reviewed	0.2	Emma Taylor BSc ((Hons) Consultant Ecologist	25/05/2026
Updated	0.3	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	26/05/2026
Proof	0.4	Emma Taylor BSc ((Hons) Consultant Ecologist	26/05/2026
Final	1.0	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	26/05/2026
Updated with proposed enhancements	2.0	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	10/06/2026
Metric and report updates to meet net gain	2.1	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	17/06/2026
Final	3.0	Rhianna Trim BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	26/06/2026

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

Arbtech cannot be held responsible for any project management failures, delays or unforeseen costs arising from failure to read and ensure understanding of the content with in, nor is Arbtech responsible for any adverse outcomes arising from failure to account for ecological advice given at any stage throughout the project collaboration.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Contents 2

Executive Summary..... 3

Site Location and Context 1

Introduction 3

Baseline 8

Post-Development 12

Change of Biodiversity Value 16

Results, Discussion, and Next Steps 17

Appendix 1: Location Plan 19

Appendix 2: Baseline Habitat Plan 20

Appendix 3: Post-Development Habitat Plan 22

Appendix 4: Proposed Development Plans 23

Appendix 5: Headline BNG Results 25

Appendix 6a: Baseline Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets 26

Appendix 6b: Post-Development Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets 34

Executive Summary

- ❖ The baseline habitat assessment has been completed as a desk-based interpretation of the available source material, including the Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Sylvatica Ecology Ltd., site photographs, habitat mapping, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan prepared by Challice Consulting Ltd., aerial imagery and the available proposed layout information. Arbtech Consulting Ltd. has not undertaken a dedicated BNG habitat condition survey of the site.
- ❖ The revised Biodiversity Net Gain scenario assessed within this report generates a biodiversity net gain for both area-based and linear habitats. The baseline on-site biodiversity value is **2.99 area-based habitat units** and **0.20 linear habitat units**. The assessed post-development biodiversity value is **3.44 area-based habitat units** and **0.40 linear habitat units**, resulting in an overall net change of **+0.46 area-based habitat units (+15.27%)** and **+0.19 linear habitat units (+96.08%)**.
- ❖ The revised Biodiversity Net Gain scenario exceeds the statutory requirement to achieve a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain for both area-based and linear habitats. No additional off-site biodiversity units or statutory biodiversity credits are required, provided the assessed on-site habitat creation and enhancement measures are delivered as shown within the post-development BNG plan.
- ❖ The main metric constraint relates to the loss of 1no. large rural ash tree, which triggered the individual tree trading rule requirement. This has been addressed through the inclusion of 37no. small rural trees within the retained open habitat areas. **The proposed trees must be planted outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas and must be capable of achieving moderate condition.**
- ❖ The retained open habitat has been mapped as other neutral grassland. However, this has been assessed as poor condition on a precautionary basis due to the high density of proposed tree planting within the grassland parcel and the associated constraints on long-term grassland establishment and management.
- ❖ The habitat creation and enhancement measures assessed within this report are not currently reflected within the submitted development drawings. The proposed site layout and/or landscape plans will therefore require updating to incorporate the assessed biodiversity enhancement measures, including reduced garden/fenced curtilage areas, 37no. small rural trees, other neutral grassland, retained northern boundary hedgerow, and new native hedgerow planting along the amended rear garden boundaries.
- ❖ The post-development proposals also include the retention of the northern boundary native hedgerow in good condition and the creation of 0.0917km of native hedgerow in poor condition. The created hedgerow is proposed along the amended rear garden boundaries to provide additional linear habitat, wildlife passage, refuge and foraging opportunities.
- ❖ A **Biodiversity Gain Plan** and **Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan** will be required to secure the detailed habitat creation, establishment, management, monitoring and remedial measures for a minimum period of 30 years. The proposed site layout and landscaping plans should be updated to reflect the BNG post-development plan and integrated with the final planning submission. If the final landscaping plans are not updated to reflect the BNG post-development plan, or if the number or location of proposed trees differs from that assessed within this report, the metric will require review and amendment prior to release.

Site Location and Context

A location map is provided in **Appendix 1**, A baseline habitat map is provided in **Appendix 2**, a post development habitat map in **Appendix 3**, a proposed development plan in **Appendix 4**, headline BNG results in **Appendix 5**, and condition assessments in **Appendix 6**.

The site is located at Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL, and is centred at National Grid Reference TQ 14696 35577. The site has an area of approximately 0.77 Ha.

The baseline habitats have been informed by the Preliminary Ecological Assessment (PEA) prepared by Sylvatica Ecology Ltd, dated November 2025, and the Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement prepared by Challice Consulting Ltd, dated January 2026. The PEA described the site at the time of survey as comprising a managed vineyard with rows of common grape vine (*Vitis vinifera*), areas of bare and compacted ground forming access routes, several small timber agricultural buildings, boundary scrub and broadleaved woodland edge, and a native species hedgerow. No invasive plant species were recorded.

The PEA habitat map identified the main habitats within the site as vineyard, scattered trees and scrub, ruderal vegetation, bare ground, buildings and native species hedgerow. The map also identified areas of potential ecological interest, including dormouse potential habitat along boundary vegetation, reptile potential habitat within the vineyard and margins, badger push-throughs, and moderate bat roost potential associated with the timber buildings. The habitat map lists approximate baseline habitat extents as follows: vineyard 0.5 Ha, scattered trees and scrub 0.039 Ha, ruderal vegetation 0.025 Ha, bare ground 0.005 Ha, buildings 0.009 Ha and native species hedgerow 22 m.

The arboricultural report described the site as comprising vineyard planting and associated buildings, accessed via an existing established vehicle access point from Marches Road. The tree survey recorded seven individual trees and five tree groups, comprising four A grade records, one B grade record, six C grade records and one U grade record. The proposed scheme provides for the retention and protection of all surveyed trees, with the exception of U Grade ash T2, which is recommended for removal irrespective of the development proposals.

The post-development habitats have been mapped based on the proposed layout information available at the time of writing. The proposed development plan used within this assessment was originally derived from a hand-drawn plan provided by the client, which was superimposed onto the Tree Protection Plan prepared by Challice Consulting Ltd., dated January 2026. The Tree Protection Plan shows the proposed six-pitch settled gypsy accommodation site, associated mobile homes/caravans, parking, turning area, existing hard surface, tree protective fencing and retained tree/tree group locations.

The post-development BNG scenario has subsequently been amended to reflect the habitat creation and enhancement measures required to achieve biodiversity net gain. This includes reduced garden/fenced curtilage areas, creation of other neutral grassland, planting of 37no. small rural trees, retention of the northern boundary native hedgerow, and creation of additional native hedgerow along the amended rear garden boundaries. These amendments are shown on the post-development habitat map and have been assessed within the statutory metric.

The post-development habitat areas are based on the best available proposed layout information and the BNG-specific post-development habitat plan prepared for this assessment. The final site layout and landscaping plans submitted to the Local Planning Authority should be updated to reflect the BNG post-development plan. If the final landscaping plans do not reflect the assessed habitat layout, including the number and location of proposed trees and hedgerows, the metric will require review and amendment prior to release.

The site is situated within a predominantly rural landscape to the east of Warnham. The surrounding landscape comprises a mosaic of arable land, pasture, hedgerows, mature trees, woodland blocks, tree belts and scattered rural dwellings. The PEA describes the surrounding landscape as comprising arable and pastoral farmland with well-defined field boundaries formed by hedgerows and mature trees. A large arable field is present to the north, with improved grassland fields and patches of semi-natural vegetation to the east and south. Residential properties with associated gardens are present to the southwest, forming a transition between the open countryside and developed land. Tree belts and hedgerows connect the site to broader areas of woodland to the southeast, providing habitat connectivity within the wider landscape.

The PEA identified a block of deciduous woodland immediately adjacent to the east of the site and an area of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland approximately 150m to the south. These features contribute to the ecological context of the site and provide connectivity with the site's boundary habitats, particularly the scrub, hedgerow and woodland-edge habitats

This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- ❖ Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL – v3 (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026);
- ❖ Hand-drawn Proposed Development Plan – Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL, provided by the client, undated;
- ❖ Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Arboricultural Method Statement – Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL (Challice Consulting Ltd., January 2026);
- ❖ Tree Protection Plan – Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL, drawing no. TPP-AR5924 (Challice Consulting Ltd., January 2026); and
- ❖ Preliminary Ecological Assessment – Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warnham, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 3SL (Sylvatica Ecology Ltd., November 2025).

BNG Informative		
Habitat Degradation Statement	Date reflected by BNG calculations	5 th November 2025
	The date reflected by the baseline BNG calculations is 5th November 2025, based on the PEA prepared by Sylvatica Ecology Ltd. The baseline biodiversity value of the site has been derived from the habitats recorded during the PEA field survey, supplemented by the PEA photographs and habitat mapping, the January 2026 arboricultural survey information, Google Earth aerial imagery and Google Street View imagery of the site boundaries.	
	A review of available aerial imagery, including Google Earth imagery dated 26th September 2018 and 14th May 2025, did not identify evidence that habitats within the red line boundary have been degraded since 30th January 2020. The baseline habitats and associated biodiversity value are therefore considered to reflect the habitats present at the time of the PEA survey.	
	It should be noted that dedicated BNG habitat condition assessments were not completed as part of the original PEA. Condition scores have therefore been derived from the available habitat descriptions, photographs, arboricultural information and aerial imagery. Where the available evidence supported a reduction in condition, this has been reflected within the condition assessment. Where no evidence was available to support a lower condition category, criteria have been assessed as passing or good condition, as appropriate, to avoid applying unsupported negative assumptions to the baseline.	
	A review of aerial imagery indicates apparent tree canopy removal outside the red line boundary to the north, exposing developed land beneath. This area is outside the provided red line boundary and has therefore not been included within the current BNG assessment. If this area falls within the wider site ownership boundary or is otherwise relevant to the planning application, the baseline may require review.	



Irreplaceable Habitat Statement	No irreplaceable habitats as listed under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024 are currently present, nor were present before 30th January 2020.
Metric Version & Publication Date	The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool first published 29th November 2023. This assessment has been completed using the statutory biodiversity metric current at the time of assessment, with reference to the latest available statutory metric tools and guidance.
BNG Target Uplift	+10%
National Character Area (NCA)	121 – Low Weald
Strategic Significance	At the time of writing, the West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is available in draft form, with consultation closed and publication anticipated following review and sign-off. As the LNRS has not yet been formally published, strategic significance has been assessed using the best available local policy and emerging nature recovery evidence, including: ❖ Draft West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Strategy and associated Local Habitat Map;

- ❖ Horsham District Local Plan 2023–2040 Regulation 19;
- ❖ Horsham District Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Planning Advice Note; and
- ❖ Relevant local biodiversity, green infrastructure and nature recovery priorities.

The draft West Sussex Local Habitat Map identifies Areas of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (APIB) and Areas that Could Become of Importance for Biodiversity (ACIB). The site is not located within a mapped APIB or ACIB; therefore, high strategic significance has not been applied to any baseline or post-development habitat.

Where a fully published LNRS and Local Habitat Map are available, baseline habitats outside mapped strategic biodiversity areas would typically be assigned low strategic significance. However, as the West Sussex LNRS remains in draft form at the time of assessment, medium strategic significance has been applied only where habitats clearly align with draft LNRS priorities and relevant local planning policy objectives, including priorities for woodland, trees, hedgerows, grassland, farmed landscapes and soils.

The following habitats have been assigned medium strategic significance on this basis. All other habitats have been assigned low strategic significance.

Habitat	Baseline / Post-Development	Justification
Woodland, scrub, boundary habitat and associated individual tree	Baseline and post-development	Medium strategic significance. The woodland-edge/boundary habitat and associated tree resource align with draft LNRS priorities for woodland, trees and habitat connectivity, and contribute to ecological connectivity along the site boundary. This is also supported by the Horsham District Local Plan 2023–2040 Regulation 19, which identifies woodland habitats and hedgerows as key features of the District's biodiversity network and expects development to maintain and enhance green infrastructure, ecological connectivity, trees and priority habitats. The site is not located within a mapped APIB or ACIB; therefore, high strategic significance has not been applied. T2 has been entered separately within the metric as an individual rural tree to reflect its removal, and the post-development tree planting has been entered separately to address the associated individual tree trading rule requirement.
Native hedgerow	Baseline and post-development	Medium strategic significance. The retained and created native hedgerows align with draft LNRS priorities for hedgerow enhancement, restoration and connectivity. This is also supported by the Horsham District Local Plan 2023–2040 Regulation 19, which identifies hedgerows in the Low Weald as providing important connectivity between fragmented habitats, and expects development proposals to

			retain and enhance existing trees and hedgerows where possible. The site is not located within a mapped APIB or ACIB; therefore, high strategic significance has not been applied.
	Vineyard / cropland	Baseline	Medium strategic significance. The baseline vineyard/cropland habitat aligns broadly with draft LNRS priorities for farmed landscapes and soils, particularly where retained or enhanced margins can support biodiversity. The Horsham District Local Plan also recognises that the District's rural environment and agricultural land contribute to ecosystem services, green infrastructure and the wider nature recovery network. The site is not located within a mapped APIB or ACIB; therefore, high strategic significance has not been applied. This habitat is not retained as vineyard/cropland within the assessed post-development scenario.
	Other neutral grassland	Post-development only	The proposed other neutral grassland contributes to habitat creation within the retained open areas of the site and aligns with wider local objectives for biodiversity enhancement, green infrastructure and nature recovery within rural landscapes. The habitat is assessed as poor condition on a precautionary basis due to the density of proposed tree planting and associated management constraints. The site is not located within a mapped APIB or ACIB; therefore, high strategic significance has not been applied.

Limitations

The baseline habitat condition assessments have been completed as a desk-based interpretation of the available source material, including the Preliminary Ecological Assessment, site photographs, habitat mapping, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan and aerial imagery, rather than from a dedicated BNG habitat condition survey undertaken by Arbtech Consulting Ltd.

Where the available information provides clear evidence that a lower condition category is met, this has been reflected within the relevant condition assessment. Where no such evidence is provided, the relevant criterion has been assessed using the highest condition category reasonably supported by the available information, in order to avoid applying unsupported negative assumptions to the baseline.

The condition assessments should therefore be read as a professional desk-based interpretation of the best available baseline information. Should further site-specific habitat condition data become available, or should a dedicated BNG condition assessment be undertaken, the baseline condition scores and associated BNG calculations may require review and amendment.

The classification of artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface is based on third-party habitat descriptions and photographs. If vegetation cover is later confirmed to exceed the 10% threshold, this habitat may require reclassification as sparsely vegetated urban land and associated condition assessment.

The post-development habitat classifications and condition scores are based on the v3 BNG post-development habitat plan prepared for this assessment. The final site layout and landscaping plans should be updated to reflect the BNG post-development plan, including the reduced garden/fenced curtilage areas, 37no. proposed individual rural trees, other neutral grassland, retained northern boundary hedgerow and created native hedgerow. If the final landscaping plans do not reflect the assessed BNG post-development plan, or if the number or location of proposed trees changes, the metric will require review and amendment.

The baseline habitat descriptions below are derived from the Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Sylvatica Ecology Ltd., supplemented only where necessary by the Arboricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Challice Consulting Ltd. Arbtech Consulting Ltd. has not undertaken a site walkover for this BNG assessment; therefore, the original PEA habitat descriptions have been used to inform habitat classification, condition assessment and baseline interpretation. The only exception is the separately recorded individual rural tree T2, which has been described using the arboricultural survey information, as this tree was not mapped separately within the PEA but is recommended for removal irrespective of the development proposals.

Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site				
Area-Based Habitats (A-1)				
Habitat	Area (ha)	Description derived from PEA and/or AIA	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
u1b5 - Buildings	0.0063	The site contained a small group of single-storey timber buildings of simple construction, likely used for storage or ancillary agricultural purposes. The structures were clad in dark-stained horizontal timber boards with flat or gently sloping felted roofs. Some sections showed signs of weathering and localised wear, with gaps between the timber cladding and roof edges providing limited crevice features of potential interest to small fauna such as bats or nesting birds. Windows were single-glazed with wooden frames, some partly obscured by surrounding vegetation. Doors and external fittings appeared functional but aged, with a mixture of boarded and glazed panels.	No biodiversity value. Condition assessment is not applicable.	Low Strategic Significance
u1c (510, 839) - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (bare ground, track)	0.0366	The site included areas of compacted gravel and bare ground forming an access track and small hardstanding area. The substrate was dominated by crushed stone with patches of sparse vegetation consisting of early colonising species such as annual meadowgrass (<i>Poa annua</i>), dandelion (<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>), and knotgrass (<i>Polygonum aviculare</i>). In more compacted areas, vegetation was minimal, while the track edges supported ruderal species including broad-leaved dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), common nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), and cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>). These areas showed signs of regular vehicle use and ground disturbance, providing limited ecological value but functioning as transitional habitat between developed and vegetated zones.	No biodiversity value. Condition assessment is not applicable.	Low Strategic Significance

		BNG interpretation note: As Arbtech Consulting Ltd. has not undertaken a site walkover, the percentage vegetation cover could not be directly verified against the <10% vegetation cover threshold for artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface. On the basis of the third-party habitat description and available photographs, including the description of compacted gravel/bare ground, sparse patchy vegetation, minimal vegetation in compacted areas and vegetation largely associated with track edges, the habitat has been interpreted as artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface. If further site-specific evidence indicates vegetation cover exceeds 10%, this habitat may require reclassification as sparsely vegetated urban land and associated condition assessment.		
c1d7 (127, 128, 516, 532) - Vineyards (sward type mosaic, tall or tussocky sward, active management, scattered grass)	0.5779	The main habitat comprised a managed vineyard planted with grapevines (<i>Vitis vinifera</i>) in regularly spaced rows. The ground layer between the vines supported a grassy sward dominated by perennial rye-grass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>), cock'sfoot (<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>), creeping buttercup (<i>Ranunculus repens</i>), and white clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>). Occasional ruderal species such as broad-leaved dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), common nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), and creeping thistle (<i>Cirsium arvense</i>) occurred along the margins, reflecting localised soil disturbance and nutrient enrichment.	Habitat condition is pre-determined as N/A , as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Supplement.	Medium Strategic Significance
w1g (10) - Other broadleaved woodland (scattered scrub)	0.1156	The vineyard was bordered by a well-developed woodland edge comprising mature broadleaved trees including oak <i>Quercus robur</i>, hazel (<i>Corylus avellana</i>), and field maple (<i>Acer campestre</i>). The understorey and shrub layer contained hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>), blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>), dogwood (<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>), bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) and holly (<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>). The herb layer included cow parsley (<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>), ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>), and common nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), creating a structurally diverse boundary that provided foraging and nesting opportunities for wildlife.	Moderate condition. Assessed using the woodland condition assessment sheet. The habitat achieved a total score of 32, which falls within the moderate condition category.	Medium Strategic Significance
u1f (81) - Sparsely vegetated urban land (Ruderal or ephemeral)	0.0359	The buildings were surrounded by narrow strips of bare or compacted ground, supporting occasional ruderal and shade-tolerant plants such as broadleaved dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), herb-Robert (<i>Geranium robertianum</i>), and ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>). Areas of ruderal vegetation were present around the timber buildings where ground disturbance and nutrient enrichment had occurred. These zones	Good condition. Assessed using the urban habitat condition assessment sheet, passing three of three criteria.	Low Strategic Significance

		supported a mix of tall, competitive and early-successional species typical of disturbed ground. Dominant plants included common nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), broad-leaved dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), creeping thistle (<i>Cirsium arvense</i>), and cow parsley (<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>), with locally frequent cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>), bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.), and hogweed (<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>).		
Rural tree - T2 (Ash)	1 large tree - equivalent area in Ha = 0.0366	1 x Rural tree, large ash tree The PEA did not map T2 as a separate individual tree habitat. However, one individual ash tree, T2, has been included separately within the baseline as a large rural tree because the AIA recommends its removal irrespective of the development proposals, and its loss therefore requires separate consideration within the metric. T2 is described within the AIA as a mature ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) with a stem diameter of 600mm, significant deadwood over 25mm diameter and dieback associated with ash dieback. The tree is assigned BS5837 category U and is recommended for removal for safety reasons within three months of the arboricultural survey. The tree has therefore been included in the baseline and removed within the post-development scenario to reflect the anticipated loss of this feature.	Good condition. Assessed using the individual trees condition assessment sheet, informed by the arboricultural assessment description of T2 as a mature native ash with significant deadwood and dieback. On this basis, and in line with the desk-based condition assessment approach applied within this BNG assessment, the tree passes six of six criteria.	Medium Strategic Significance

Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site**Linear-Based Habitats (B-1)**

Habitat	Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
h2a - Native hedgerow	0.0307	Native Species Hedge A section of boundary native species hedgerow was present to the north of the application site. Species recorded comprised hawthorn (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>), hazel (<i>Corylus avellana</i>) and blackthorn (<i>Prunus spinosa</i>).	Good condition. Assessed using the hedgerow condition assessment sheet. No condition criteria are evidenced as failing within the available source material; therefore, the hedgerow passes no more than two criteria overall and no more than one criterion within any functional group.	Medium Strategic Significance

Post-Development

The post-development habitat areas have been mapped using the proposed layout information available at the time of assessment. The proposed layout is based on the client-provided hand-drawn plan, superimposed onto the Tree Protection Plan prepared by Challice Consulting Ltd. As detailed scaled landscape proposals were not available at the time of writing, some post-development habitat classifications and condition scores have been applied on a precautionary basis.

The amended post-development scenario includes the creation of other neutral grassland, 37no. individual rural trees and native hedgerow planting within the retained open areas of the site. The original drawings fenced garden areas have been reduced in order to maximise the area available for individual tree planting and satisfy the metric trading rules associated with the loss of 1no. large rural tree.

Due to the number of proposed trees within the retained open habitat area, the proposed other neutral grassland has been assessed as poor condition. This reflects the likely constraints associated with establishing and maintaining a species-rich neutral grassland sward beneath and between a relatively high density of proposed tree planting, including shading, establishment pressure, future management access and potential physical disturbance.

The proposed BNG solution is dependent on the 37no. individual trees being deliverable, planted outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas, and secured through appropriate long-term management for a minimum period of 30 years. Should updated or finalised proposed plans become available, the post-development habitat areas, condition scores and associated BNG calculations may require review and amendment.

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site

Area-Based Habitats

Habitat		Area (ha)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained (A-1)	w1g - Other broadleaved woodland	0.1156	No direct impacts or material changes are proposed to the retained woodland-edge habitat. Proposed fencing is shown in proximity to the boundary vegetation; however, based on the information available, this is not expected to materially alter the extent, structure or function of the retained woodland-edge habitat.	Assumed Moderate condition retained. Assessed using the woodland condition assessment sheet within the baseline assessment. As the habitat is to be retained and no material change is proposed, the retained post-development habitat is assessed as remaining in moderate condition.	Medium Strategic Significance

Created (A-2)	u1b5 - Buildings	0.0396	The post-development layout includes six caravans/mobile homes located on hardstanding, in addition to the retained building already present within the south-eastern part of the site.	No biodiversity value. Condition assessment is not applicable.	Low Strategic Significance
	u1b - Developed land; sealed surface	0.0838	Additional sealed surfacing is proposed to provide parking and associated hardstanding for each accommodation plot. This includes parking areas adjoining the access track, replacing areas previously classified as artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface.	No biodiversity value. Condition assessment is not applicable.	Low Strategic Significance
	u1 (828) - Built up areas and gardens	0.1216	Small fenced garden plots are proposed around each of the six caravan/mobile home plots. These areas have been classified as built-up areas and gardens. The garden/fenced curtilage areas have been reduced within the amended post-development scenario to allow additional individual tree planting and native hedgerow creation within the retained open habitat areas. No habitat creation or enhancement has been assigned within the private garden/fenced curtilage areas, as these areas cannot be relied upon to deliver enhanced habitat condition for BNG purposes over the required 30-year period.	Habitat condition is pre-determined as N/A , as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Supplement.	Low Strategic Significance
	g3c - Other neutral grassland	0.4112	Other neutral grassland is proposed within the retained open space in the southern/central part of the site. The habitat should be created using an appropriate native neutral grassland/wildflower seed mix suitable for the local soil conditions. However, due to the number of proposed individual trees within this area, the grassland has been assessed as poor condition. This reflects the likely constraints associated with establishing and maintaining a diverse neutral grassland sward beneath and between the proposed tree planting, including shading, establishment pressure, management access and potential physical disturbance.	Assumed Poor condition. Assessed using the grassland medium/high/very high distinctiveness condition assessment sheet. Good condition has not been targeted at this stage due to the constraints associated with the proposed residential use of the site and the uncertainty regarding long-term grassland establishment and management.	Medium strategic significance.
	Individual trees - Rural trees	37no. small trees - equivalent area in ha = 0.1506	A total of 37no. individual trees are proposed within the retained open habitat areas. These trees must be planted outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas in order to be included separately within the metric as created individual trees. The proposed tree planting is required to address the metric trading rules associated with the loss of 1no. large rural tree and to achieve the required 10% biodiversity net gain. Proposed individual trees	Assumed Moderate condition. Assessed using the individual trees condition assessment sheet. Newly planted trees are not expected to provide mature ecological niches at	Medium strategic significance.

			should be native or locally appropriate species and should be planted with sufficient space to allow long-term canopy development. Trees should be protected from damage during establishment, should not be subject to regular intensive pruning and should be located where the canopy can oversail vegetated ground beneath. Suitable species may include oak, field maple, hornbeam, rowan, wild cherry, hazel, hawthorn or other locally appropriate native species.	establishment and are therefore assessed as moderate condition.	
--	--	--	---	---	--

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site

Linear-Based Habitats

Habitat		Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained (B-1)	h2a - Native hedgerow	0.0307	No direct impacts or material changes are proposed to the retained native hedgerow.	Good condition. Assessed using the hedgerow condition assessment sheet within the baseline assessment. As the hedgerow is to be retained and no material change is proposed, the retained post-development hedgerow is assessed as remaining in good condition.	Medium Strategic Significance
Created (B-2)	h2a - Native hedgerow	0.0917	Native hedgerow creation is proposed along the rear boundaries of the amended garden areas, including the southern/south-western garden boundaries and the northern rear garden boundaries. The garden areas have been reduced in the amended layout to accommodate additional individual tree planting and linear habitat creation. The proposed hedgerows should comprise a mixed native species composition and should be designed to provide boundary habitat, wildlife passage, refuge and foraging opportunities. Further detail will be required within the Biodiversity Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan to secure the proposed species mix, planting specification, establishment measures and long-term management for a minimum period of 30 years.	Assumed poor condition Assessed using the hedgerow condition assessment sheet. As these hedgerows are newly created and detailed planting/management proposals have not yet been provided, a precautionary poor condition has been applied.	Medium Strategic Significance

Change of Biodiversity Value

Biodiversity Units			
		Area-Based	Linear-Based
On-Site	Baseline	2.99 ❖ u1b5 – Buildings: 0 units, no biodiversity value. ❖ u1c – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface: 0 units, no biodiversity value. ❖ c1d7 – Vineyards: 1.27 units. ❖ w1g – Other broadleaved woodland, moderate condition: 1.02 units. ❖ u1f – Sparsely vegetated urban land, good condition: 0.22 units. ❖ Rural tree – 1 large tree, good condition: 0.48 units.	0.20 ❖ h2a – Native hedgerow, good condition: 0.20 units.
	Post-Development	3.44 ❖ Retained w1g – Other broadleaved woodland, moderate condition: 1.02 units. ❖ Created u1b5 – Buildings: 0 units, no biodiversity value. ❖ Created u1b – Developed land; sealed surface: 0 units, no biodiversity value. ❖ Created u1 – Built-up areas and gardens: 0.23 units. ❖ Created g3c other neutral grassland, poor condition: 1.68 units. ❖ Created rural tree – 37 small trees, moderate condition: 0.51 units.	0.40 ❖ Retained h2a – Native hedgerow, good condition: 0.20 units. ❖ Created h2a – Native hedgerow, poor condition: 0.19 units. ❖ u1e – Built linear feature/fence: 0 units, no biodiversity value.
Overall Net Change		+ 0.46 units (+15.27%)	+ 0.19 units (+96.08%)
Unit requirements for 10% gain target to be achieved		0.00 additional area-based units required to achieve 10% net gain.	0.00 additional linear-based units required to achieve 10% net gain.

Results, Discussion, and Next Steps

BNG Informative	
Results	The revised post-development scenario generates a biodiversity net gain for both area-based and linear habitats. The baseline on-site biodiversity value is 2.99 area-based habitat units and 0.20 linear-based habitat units. The assessed post-development biodiversity value is 3.44 area-based habitat units and 0.40 linear-based habitat units, resulting in an overall net change of +0.46 area-based habitat units (+15.27%) and +0.19 linear-based habitat units (+96.08%). The revised Biodiversity Net Gain scenario therefore achieves the statutory requirement to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain for both area-based and linear habitats. No additional area-based or linear-based biodiversity units are required to achieve the 10% gain target, provided the assessed on-site habitat creation and enhancement measures are delivered as shown within the post-development BNG plan. The relevant metric trading rules are also satisfied within the revised scenario. The principal constraint relates to the loss of 1no. large rural tree from the baseline. This has been addressed through the inclusion of 37no. proposed small rural trees within the retained open habitat areas of the site.
Discussion	The revised post-development scenario relies on the delivery of the habitat creation and enhancement measures shown on the BNG post-development habitat plan. These include the creation of other neutral grassland, 37no. small rural trees, retained other broadleaved woodland, retained native hedgerow and created native hedgerow. The proposed other neutral grassland has been assessed as poor condition on a precautionary basis. This reflects the high density of proposed tree planting within the grassland parcel and the associated constraints on establishing and maintaining a higher-condition grassland sward. The BNG uplift is therefore primarily delivered through the proposed tree planting, supported by retained boundary habitats and native hedgerow creation. The proposed 37no. small rural trees are required to address the trading rule associated with the loss of 1no. large rural tree. These trees must be planted outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas, provided with sufficient space for long-term canopy development, and secured through appropriate establishment, management and monitoring measures. The retained northern boundary native hedgerow is assessed as remaining in good condition post-development. The created native hedgerow has been assessed as poor condition on a precautionary basis and will require detailed planting, establishment and management measures to be secured through the Biodiversity Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

Recommendations and Next Steps	The proposed site layout and/or landscaping plans should be updated to reflect the BNG post-development habitat plan. This should include: ❖ Reduced garden/fenced curtilage areas; ❖ Creation of other neutral grassland within the retained open habitat area; ❖ Planting of 37no. small rural trees outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas; ❖ Retention and protection of the northern boundary native hedgerow; ❖ Creation of native hedgerow along the amended rear garden boundaries; and ❖ Retention and protection of the other broadleaved woodland/woodland-edge habitat. If the final landscape/layout plans do not reflect the BNG post-development plan, or if the number or location of proposed trees differs from that assessed within this report, the metric will require review and amendment prior to release.
Pre-Commencement	A Biodiversity Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan will be required to secure the detailed habitat creation, establishment, management, monitoring and remedial measures for a minimum period of 30 years. These documents should confirm the final habitat layout, tree planting locations, native hedgerow creation, grassland establishment specification, management prescriptions, monitoring schedule and remedial measures required to ensure the proposed BNG habitats are delivered and maintained.
BNG Mitigation Hierarchy	
Avoidance	Impacts to the retained boundary woodland-edge habitat and retained northern boundary native hedgerow have been avoided as far as practicable. These habitats are retained within the post-development scenario and continue to form the main boundary habitat resource within the site.
Minimisation	The revised post-development scenario reduces the mapped garden/fenced curtilage areas to allow additional habitat creation and individual tree planting within the retained open habitat areas. This reduces reliance on private garden habitat, which cannot be enhanced above garden habitat or relied upon to deliver separately recorded individual tree habitat within the metric.
Mitigation	The revised scenario includes on-site habitat creation and enhancement comprising other neutral grassland, 37no. small rural trees and native hedgerow creation. The proposed other neutral grassland has been assessed as poor condition due to the high density of proposed tree planting and associated management constraints. The proposed tree planting is required to address the trading rule associated with the loss of 1no. large rural tree.
Offset	Based on the revised metric, off-site biodiversity units or statutory biodiversity credits are not required, provided the proposed on-site habitat creation, tree planting and hedgerow creation are delivered as shown within the BNG post-development habitat plan and secured for the required 30-year period. If the final landscaping or layout differs from the BNG post-development plan, off-site units or statutory credits may be required to address any resulting deficit.

Appendix 1: Location Plan



Appendix 2: Baseline Habitat Plan



Appendix 3: Post-Development Habitat Plan



Appendix 4: Proposed Development Plans





Appendix 5: Headline BNG Results

Long Wells Vineyard, Marches Road, Warrington

Return to results menu

Headline Results

Scroll down for final results ▲

On-site baseline

Habitat units

2.99

Hedgerow units

0.20

Watercourse units

0.00

On-site post-intervention

(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)

Habitat units

3.44

Hedgerow units

0.40

Watercourse units

0.00

On-site net change

(units & percentage)

Habitat units

0.46

15.27%

Hedgerow units

0.19

96.08%

Watercourse units

0.00

0.00%

Off-site baseline

Habitat units

0.00

Hedgerow units

0.00

Watercourse units

0.00

Off-site post-intervention

(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)

Habitat units

0.00

Hedgerow units

0.00

Watercourse units

0.00

Off-site net change

(units & percentage)

Habitat units

0.00

0.00%

Hedgerow units

0.00

0.00%

Watercourse units

0.00

0.00%

Combined net unit change

(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)

Habitat units

0.46

Hedgerow units

0.19

Watercourse units

0.00

Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions

Habitat units

0.00

Hedgerow units

0.00

Watercourse units

0.00

FINAL RESULTS

Total net unit change

(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)

Habitat units

0.46

Hedgerow units

0.19

Watercourse units

0.00

Total net % change

(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)

Habitat units

15.27%

Hedgerow units

96.08%

Watercourse units

0.00%

Trading rules satisfied?

Yes ✓

Unit Type

Target

Baseline Units

Units Required

Unit Deficit

Habitat units

10.00%

2.99

3.29

0.00

Hedgerow units

10.00%

0.20

0.22

0.00

Watercourse units

10.00%

0.00

0.00

0.00

No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓

No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓

No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Appendix 6a: Baseline Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

Habitat type (Habitats in bold are Priority Habitats)	Condition sheet	Sheet number
Area habitats		
Urban – Buildings	N/A - Other	n/a
Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	N/A - Other	n/a
Cropland – Non-cereal crops	Condition assessment – N/A	n/a
Woodland and forest – Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland	24a
Urban – Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral	Urban	22a
Individual trees – Rural tree	Individual trees	9a
Linear habitats		
Hedgerows and lines of trees – native hedgerow	Hedgerow	8a

Other broadleaved woodland; assessed using 'Woodland' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria						
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
A	Age distribution of trees	Three age-classes present.	Two age-classes present.	One age-class present.	2	The AIA records the trees/groups largely as early mature or mature. Some variation is present, but three clear age classes are not evidenced.
B	Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland.	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland.	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland.	3	No significant browsing damage is described in the PEA, photographs or AIA.
C	Invasive plant species	No invasive species present in woodland.	Rhododendron <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> or cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> not present, other invasive species <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species >10% cover.	3	The PEA states that no invasive species were observed. No rhododendron, cherry laurel or other INNS are described.
D	Number of native tree species	Five or more native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species across woodland parcel.	3	The PEA/AIA collectively record oak, hazel, field maple, hawthorn, blackthorn, dogwood, holly, ash and hornbeam, providing more than five native woody species.
E	Cover of native tree and shrub species	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native.	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native.	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native.	3	The described canopy and shrub species are native, with no non-native woody dominance recorded.
F	Open space within woodland	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space. Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted.	21 - 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space. But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category.	3	The woodland parcel is less than 10ha, where 0-20% temporary open space can achieve good condition. The source material does not indicate that open space exceeds this threshold.
G	Woodland regeneration	All three classes present in woodland; trees 4 - 7 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth.	One or two classes only present in woodland.	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland.	3	The PEA describes a well-developed woodland edge with mature trees, an understorey/shrub layer and herb layer. The presence of hazel, hawthorn, blackthorn, dogwood,

Condition Assessment Criteria						
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
						bramble and holly indicates younger woody growth/regeneration.
H	Tree health	Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback.	11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low-risk pest or disease present.	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high-risk pest or disease present.	2	The AIA records ash dieback affecting T2 and ash within tree groups G3, G11 and G12. The wider tree stock is generally recorded as fair to good, with no evidence of >25% mortality or high-risk pest/disease across the parcel.
I	Vegetation and ground flora	Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community at ground layer present.	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community at ground layer present.	1	The PEA describes cow parsley, cleavers, ivy and common nettle within the woodland-edge herb layer. These species are typical of woodland-edge/nutrient-influenced conditions, but no ancient woodland flora specialists or recognisable woodland NVC ground-layer community are described.
J	Woodland vertical structure	Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland.	Two storeys across all survey plots.	One or less storey across all survey plots.	3	The PEA describes mature broadleaved trees, an understorey/shrub layer and a herb layer, indicating at least three vertical structural layers.
K	Veteran trees	Two or more veteran trees per hectare.	One veteran tree per hectare.	No veteran trees present in woodland.	1	No veteran trees or veteran features are identified within the PEA or AIA.
L	Amount of deadwood	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	3	The AIA records significant deadwood associated with T2, and the habitat comprises a mature woodland-edge/tree group habitat. The source material does not provide evidence that deadwood falls below the good-condition threshold.

Condition Assessment Criteria						
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
M	Woodland disturbance	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident.	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground.	More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground.	2	Common nettle and cleavers indicate some nutrient enrichment within the woodland-edge context. The PEA/AIA do not describe substantial ground damage, dumping, compaction, poaching or disturbance exceeding the poor-condition threshold.
Total Score (out of a possible 39)					32	
Condition Assessment Result					Condition Assessment Score	Result Achieved
Total score >32 (33 to 39)					Good (3)	Moderate
Total score 26 to 32					Moderate (2)	
Total score <26 (13 to 25)					Poor (1)	

Ruderals/Ephemeral assessed using the 'Urban' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed	Notes/Justification
Core Criteria - must be assessed for all urban habitat types :			
A	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.	Pass	The PEA describes the parcel as supporting a mix of tall, competitive and early-successional species typical of disturbed ground, including common nettle, broad-leaved dock, creeping thistle, cow parsley, cleavers, bramble and hogweed. On the basis of the available description, the parcel is considered to support sufficient variation in vegetation structure, with no single structural component understood to account for more than 80% of the habitat area.
B	The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year.	Pass	The parcel supports a range of ruderal and early-successional species, including creeping thistle, cow parsley, bramble and hogweed, which can provide nectar, pollen and structural resources for invertebrates at different times of year. Although the assemblage is typical of disturbed, nutrient-enriched ground and is not botanically diverse, the species present are considered to provide some wildlife benefit.
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area. Note – to achieve good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).	Pass	No invasive non-native plant species were recorded during the PEA.
Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No)			Yes
Number of criteria passed			3
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ✓
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 3 core criteria only:			
Passes all 3 core criteria AND Meets the requirements for good condition within criterion C		Good (3)	✓
Passes 2 of 3 core criteria OR Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for good condition within criterion C		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria		Poor (1)	

1 x Rural Tree assessed using 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Achieved	Notes/Justification
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Pass	Common ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) is a native broadleaved tree species.
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	This criterion is automatically passed for individual trees.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	Pass	The AIA records T2 as a mature ash.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Pass	The AIA records ash dieback but does not describe anthropogenic damage, vandalism, herbicide damage or a regular pruning regime. In the absence of evidence of anthropogenic adverse impacts, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
E	Natural Ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Pass	The AIA records significant deadwood over 25mm diameter and dieback associated with ash dieback. These features are likely to provide ecological niches for saproxylic invertebrates and other wildlife.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Pass	The available source material does not provide detailed information on canopy oversail above vegetation beneath T2. However, T2 is located within the wider boundary tree/scrub context, and no information is provided to indicate that the criterion is failed. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, and in line with the desk-based condition assessment approach applied within this BNG assessment, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
Number of criteria passed			6
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria		Good (3)	✓
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria		Poor (1)	

Native hedgerow; assessed using 'Hedgerow' habitat type condition sheet:

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings	Criteria (the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition')	Description	Criterion passed	Notes/Justification
A1. Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is > 1.5 m height).	Pass	The PEA does not provide a measured hedgerow height. However, the hedgerow is described as an established native species hedge rather than newly planted or recently coppiced. No evidence is provided to indicate that the average height is below 1.5m; therefore, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
A2. Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (e.g. blackthorn suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	Pass	The PEA does not provide a measured hedgerow width. No evidence is provided to indicate that the average width is below 1.5m; therefore, in the absence of evidence supporting a lower condition category, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
B1. Gap – hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).	Pass	The PEA does not describe significant basal gaps or a raised canopy base within the hedgerow. In the absence of evidence that gaps between the ground and base of canopy exceed the criterion threshold, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
B2. Gap – hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness', but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).	Pass	The PEA does not describe canopy gaps within the native species hedgerow. In the absence of evidence that canopy gaps make up more than 10% of the total length or that any canopy gap exceeds 5m, this criterion has been assessed as passing.

C1. Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: - measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and - is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedge. Undisturbed ground should be present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedge. This criterion recognises the value of the hedge base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.	Pass	The PEA does not describe cultivation, poaching, heavy trampling, compacted ground or other disturbance at the base of the hedgerow. In the absence of evidence that undisturbed ground with perennial vegetation is absent from at least one side of the hedge, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
C2. Undesirable perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground	The indicator species used are nettles (<i>Urtica</i> spp.), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and docks (<i>Rumex</i> spp.). Their presence, either singly or together, should not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Pass	The PEA does not describe nettles, cleavers or docks as dominating the hedgerow base or associated undisturbed ground. In the absence of evidence that undesirable perennial vegetation exceeds 20% cover, this criterion has been assessed as passing.
D1. Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and recently introduced species	Recently introduced species refer to plant that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives.	Pass	No invasive plant species were recorded during the PEA. No invasive non-native or recently introduced species are described in association with the hedgerow. This criterion has therefore been assessed as passing.
D2. Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (e.g. excessive hedge cutting).	Pass	The PEA does not describe damage to the hedgerow or associated undisturbed ground from human activities, pollution, rubble, excessive cutting or inappropriate management. In the absence of evidence of current damage affecting more than 10% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground, this criterion has been assessed as passing.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees

Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (score)
Good	No more than 2 failures in total AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group	3
Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g., fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and C2 = moderate condition)	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and B2 = poor condition)	1
Score achieved:	Good	

Appendix 6b: Post-Development Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

Habitat type (Habitats in bold are Priority Habitats)	Condition sheet	Sheet number
Area habitats		
Urban – Buildings	N/A - Other	n/a
Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	N/A - Other	n/a
Urban – Vegetated garden	Condition assessment – N/A	n/a
Woodland and forest – Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland	24a
Grassland – Other neutral grassland	Grassland (Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness)	6a
Individual trees – Rural tree	Individual trees	9b
Linear habitats		
Hedgerows and lines of trees – native hedgerow	Hedgerow	8b

The post-development woodland and native hedgerow are retained habitats and are not expected to be materially altered by the proposed development. The post-development condition assessments for these habitats therefore remain unchanged from the baseline assessment.

The post-development other neutral grassland condition assessment is provisional and is dependent on the finalised proposed layout, landscaping scheme and long-term management proposals, including grassland planting, seeding specification, establishment measures and management regime. The habitat has been assessed on a precautionary basis as poor condition due to the high density of proposed tree planting within the grassland parcel and the associated constraints on establishing and maintaining a higher-condition grassland sward. Finalised landscape proposals should be reviewed and the metric updated where necessary prior to finalisation.

Retained - Other broadleaved woodland; assessed using 'Woodland' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria						
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
A	Age distribution of trees	Three age-classes present.	Two age-classes present.	One age-class present.	2	Maintain existing age structure (mainly early mature/mature). Avoid unnecessary removal of younger growth to prevent further loss of diversity.
B	Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland.	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland.	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland.	3	No significant browsing currently. Monitor for grazing pressure and implement protection if required.
C	Invasive plant species	No invasive species present in woodland.	Rhododendron <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> or cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> not present, other invasive species <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species >10% cover.	3	Keep free of invasive species. Monitor and remove any colonisation promptly.
D	Number of native tree species	Five or more native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species across woodland parcel.	3	Maintain >5 native woody species. Avoid selective removal that reduces diversity; use native species for any planting.
E	Cover of native tree and shrub species	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native.	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native.	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native.	3	Retain >80% native canopy and shrub cover. Do not introduce non-native woody species.
F	Open space within woodland	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space. Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted.	21 - 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space. But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category.	3	Maintain current balance of canopy and open space. Prevent clearance, encroachment or garden expansion.
G	Woodland regeneration	All three classes present in woodland; trees 4 - 7 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings	One or two classes only present in woodland.	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland.	3	Retain natural regeneration. Avoid disturbance to seedlings/saplings; supplement with native planting if needed.

Condition Assessment Criteria						
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
		or advanced coppice regrowth.				
H	Tree health	Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback.	11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low-risk pest or disease present.	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high-risk pest or disease present.	2	Monitor tree health (incl. ash dieback). Limit works to essential safety or management. Replace lost trees where needed.
I	Vegetation and ground flora	Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community at ground layer present.	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community at ground layer present.	1	Ground flora currently poor. Prevent further degradation (e.g. dumping, enrichment, disturbance). No uplift assumed.
J	Woodland vertical structure	Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland.	Two storeys across all survey plots.	One or less storey across all survey plots.	3	Maintain multi-layered structure (canopy, shrub, herb). Avoid removal of understorey.
K	Veteran trees	Two or more veteran trees per hectare.	One veteran tree per hectare.	No veteran trees present in woodland.	1	No veteran trees present. Retain mature trees and allow development of veteran features where possible.
L	Amount of deadwood	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities.	3	Retain deadwood where safe. Only remove if necessary; keep material on site where possible.
M	Woodland disturbance	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident.	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground.	More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground.	2	Limit disturbance. Prevent dumping, enrichment, compaction and encroachment. Maintain protective buffer where possible.

Condition Assessment Criteria					
Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
Total Score (out of a possible 39)				32	
Condition Assessment Result				Condition Assessment Score	Result Achieved
Total score >32 (33 to 39)				Good (3)	Moderate
Total score 26 to 32				Moderate (2)	
Total score <26 (13 to 25)				Poor (1)	

Created other neutral grassland; assessed using 'Grasslands Medium/High/Very High Distinctiveness' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes/Justification
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relative to the specific habitat type. Note – this criterion is essential for achieving moderate or good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	Fail	Although an appropriate neutral grassland/wildflower seed mix is proposed, the high density of proposed individual tree planting within the grassland parcel is likely to constrain the establishment and long-term maintenance of a consistently species-rich neutral grassland sward. The habitat has therefore been assessed as failing this criterion on a precautionary basis.
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7cm and at least 20% is more than 7cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	Pass	The grassland should be managed to provide a varied sward height, including shorter and longer areas, where compatible with the proposed tree planting and site use.
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.	Fail	As detailed landscape and management proposals are not yet available, and given the likely establishment pressure associated with tree planting and residential use of the site, it cannot be confirmed that bare ground will remain between 1% and 5% across the parcel.
D	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.	Pass	The grassland should be managed to prevent scrub encroachment above 5% cover and bracken above 20% cover.
E	Combined cover of species indicative of sub-optimal condition and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.	Fail	Given the proposed residential use of the site, the proximity of the grassland to access routes, static caravans and garden areas, and the high density of proposed tree planting, it cannot be confirmed that physical damage and sub-optimal species cover will remain below 5% of the total area. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.

Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types			
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m² present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 2 and 4 cannot contribute towards this count). Note – this criterion is essential for achieving good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	Fail	Although a species-rich seed mix may be used, the density of proposed tree planting is likely to constrain long-term grassland establishment, shading and management. It cannot therefore be confirmed that the grassland will reliably support 10 or more vascular plant species per m ² in the long term.
Essential criterion for good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)			No
Number of criteria passed			2
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ✓
Non-acid grassland types (result out of 6 criteria)			
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F		Good (3)	
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A		Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F		Poor (1)	✓

37no. Created Rural Trees assessed using 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Achieved	Notes/Justification
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Pass	The proposed individual trees should comprise native or locally appropriate species. A minimum of 70% of proposed trees must be native species. Suitable species may include oak, field maple, hornbeam, rowan, wild cherry, hazel, hawthorn or other locally appropriate native species.
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	The proposed trees are entered into the metric as individual rural trees and therefore automatically pass this criterion.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	Fail	The trees are proposed as newly planted small trees and will not be mature at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Pass	The proposed trees should be protected during establishment and managed to avoid vandalism, herbicide damage, inappropriate pruning or other adverse impacts from human activity. Trees should not be subject to a regular intensive pruning regime and should be allowed to develop a natural canopy form.
E	Natural Ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Fail	As newly planted trees, the proposed trees are not expected to support mature ecological niches such as deadwood, cavities, loose bark or well-developed ivy at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Pass	The proposed trees should be planted within retained open habitat areas and outside private garden/fenced curtilage areas. They should be positioned so that the developing canopy oversails vegetated ground beneath, including the proposed other neutral grassland.
Number of criteria passed			4
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria		Good (3)	✓
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria		Moderate (2)	✓
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria		Poor (1)	

Retained - Native hedgerow; assessed using 'Hedgerow' habitat type condition sheet:

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings	Criteria (the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition')	Description	Criterion passed	Notes/Justification
A1. Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is > 1.5 m height).	Pass	The retained northern boundary hedgerow must be managed to maintain an average height of at least 1.5m along its length. Cutting should avoid reducing the hedgerow below this threshold. Management should retain a dense, established hedgerow structure and avoid excessive flailing or over-cutting.
A2. Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (e.g. blackthorn suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	Pass	The retained hedgerow must be managed to maintain an average width of at least 1.5m along its length. Management should avoid excessive side trimming that would reduce the hedgerow width below this threshold or result in a narrow, over-managed hedgerow structure.
B1. Gap – hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).	Pass	The hedgerow base must be maintained as dense and continuous, with the gap between the ground and the base of the canopy remaining below 0.5m for more than 90% of the hedgerow length. Any sections that become gappy at the base should be reinforced through native infill planting.
B2. Gap – hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness', but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).	Pass	Canopy continuity must be maintained, with gaps making up less than 10% of the total hedgerow length and no individual canopy gaps exceeding 5m. Any newly formed gaps should be infilled using appropriate native hedgerow species.

C1. Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: - measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and - is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedge. Undisturbed ground should be present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedge. This criterion recognises the value of the hedge base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.	Pass	A buffer of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation must be maintained along at least one side of the hedgerow for more than 90% of its length. This buffer should be at least 1m wide and should be protected from cultivation, regular trampling, vehicle tracking, storage, dumping, poaching or other damaging activities.
C2. Undesirable perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground	The indicator species used are nettles (<i>Urtica</i> spp.), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and docks (<i>Rumex</i> spp.). Their presence, either singly or together, should not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Pass	The hedgerow base and associated buffer should be managed to prevent dominance by nutrient-enrichment species such as nettles, cleavers and docks. These species should remain below 20% cover within the area of undisturbed ground. Management should avoid nutrient enrichment, dumping of arisings, compost, waste or other materials at the hedge base.
D1. Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and recently introduced species	Recently introduced species refer to plant that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives.	Pass	The retained hedgerow and associated ground flora must remain free from invasive non-native species and recently introduced species across more than 90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground. Monitoring should identify any invasive or inappropriate ornamental species, with removal undertaken where required.
D2. Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (e.g. excessive hedge cutting).	Pass	The hedgerow and associated undisturbed ground must remain free from damage caused by human activities across more than 90% of its length. The hedgerow should be protected from inappropriate cutting, pollution, rubble, storage of materials, garden waste, vehicle damage, fencing damage and other activities that could reduce its condition.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees

Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (score)
Good	No more than 2 failures in total AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group	3
Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g., fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and C2 = moderate condition)	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and B2 = poor condition)	1
Score achieved:	Good	

Created- Native hedgerow; assessed using 'Hedgerow' habitat type condition sheet:

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings	Criteria (the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition')	Description	Criterion passed	Notes/Justification
A1. Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is > 1.5 m height).	Fail	The hedgerow will be newly planted and is not expected to achieve an average height of >1.5m at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.
A2. Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (e.g. blackthorn suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	Fail	The hedgerow will be newly planted and is not expected to achieve an average width of >1.5m at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.
B1. Gap – hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).	Fail	As the hedgerow will be newly planted, a dense base cannot be confirmed at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.
B2. Gap – hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness', but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).	Fail	The hedgerow will be newly planted and canopy continuity cannot be confirmed at establishment. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.

C1. Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: - measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and - is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedge. Undisturbed ground should be present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedge. This criterion recognises the value of the hedge base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.	Fail	The proposed hedgerows are located along garden boundaries within a constrained residential layout. It cannot currently be confirmed that >1m of undisturbed ground with perennial vegetation will be provided for >90% of the hedgerow length.
C2. Undesirable perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground	The indicator species used are nettles (<i>Urtica</i> spp.), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and docks (<i>Rumex</i> spp.). Their presence, either singly or together, should not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Pass	The hedgerow planting and associated ground flora should be managed to prevent dominance by nutrient-enrichment species such as nettles, cleavers and docks.
D1. Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and recently introduced species	Recently introduced species refer to plant that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives.	Pass	The proposed hedgerow should comprise native species and should not include invasive non-native species.
D2. Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (e.g. excessive hedge cutting).	Fail	Due to the proposed location along residential garden boundaries, the hedgerow may be subject to pressure from garden use, access, maintenance or inappropriate management. This criterion has therefore been assessed as failing on a precautionary basis.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees

Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (score)
Good	No more than 2 failures in total AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group	3
Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g., fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and C2 = moderate condition)	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1, and B2 = poor condition)	1
Score achieved:	Poor	