



## **Biodiveristy Net Gain Report**

Land North of Warnham  
Lodge Farm

## Report Sign-Off and Status

| Item               | Detail                                                  |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Project            | Land North of Warnham Lodge Farm (Little Warnham Lodge) |
| Location           | Mayes Lane, Warnham, West Sussex, RH12 3SG              |
| Planning reference | DC/25/2100                                              |
| Report type        | Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment                        |
| Report reference   | RVS170726                                               |
| Version / date     | V.02 / 17 July 2026                                     |
| Client             | Robert and Vanessa Sharpe                               |
| Author             | RJ - BSc MSc MCIEEM CBiol MIFM                          |
| Technical reviewer | DM - MSc MCIEEM                                         |
| Status             | Final submission ready                                  |

## Declaration of Competence and Scope

This report has been prepared as ecological and Biodiversity Net Gain evidence in accordance with the CIEEM Code of Professional Conduct, BS 42020:2013 and the statutory Biodiversity Metric framework. It is not legal advice and does not address non-ecological grounds of appeal. The author remains responsible for confirming the factual evidence, final drawings and professional sign-off before submission.

## Executive Summary

This assessment has been comprehensively revised for use as planning appeal evidence for the proposed self-build dwelling and associated landscaping at Land North of Warnham Lodge Farm. It replaces the earlier V.01 baseline report as the controlling BNG assessment and should be read with the completed statutory metric, condition assessment schedule and landscape plan LAR2518-LAN-DRA-0901-P03.

The 3.5930 ha red line exceeds the 0.5 ha ceiling for the statutory self-build/custom-build exemption. The proposal has therefore been assessed as subject to the mandatory Biodiversity Gain Condition and has been designed to deliver at least 10% BNG on site.

The revised official metric baseline is 10.98 habitat units. The post-development value is 15.77 habitat units, giving a net increase of 4.79 units or 43.6%. The scheme also creates 2.86 hedgerow units from a zero baseline. No watercourse units or irreplaceable habitats are present within the red line.

| Unit module   | Baseline | Post-development | Net change        | Outcome                          |
|---------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Area habitats | 10.98 HU | 15.77 HU         | +4.79 HU (+43.6%) | Minimum 10% comfortably exceeded |
| Hedgerows     | 0.00 HeU | 2.86 HeU         | +2.86 HeU         | New species-rich native hedgerow |
| Watercourses  | 0.00 WU  | 0.00 WU          | 0.00 WU           | Not applicable                   |

The revised assessment corrects material issues in V.01, including the statutory distinctiveness of other broadleaved woodland, the condition of the removed entrance oak, classification of private garden land, tree-size assumptions for newly planted trees, use of official temporal and difficulty multipliers, and the inconsistency between the metric and the stated meadow area.

The scheme does not rely on all 84 proposed trees for compliance. A conservative minimum of 40 newly planted Small rural trees is credited, sufficient to replace the lost entrance oak within the individual-tree broad habitat. The remaining 44 trees are treated as additional, uncredited landscape enhancement. Credited trees must be mapped outside private gardens and hedgerows and secured within the 30-year BNG management area.

## Contents

|                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction and Purpose .....                    | 6  |
| 1.1 Commission .....                                 | 6  |
| 1.2 Development.....                                 | 6  |
| 1.3 Purpose and status of this report .....          | 6  |
| 1.4 Documents relied upon .....                      | 6  |
| 2. Appeal and Planning Context .....                 | 6  |
| 2.1 Application .....                                | 6  |
| 2.2 Mandatory BNG applies .....                      | 6  |
| 2.3 Appeal relevance .....                           | 6  |
| 2.4 Biodiversity Gain Plan timing .....              | 6  |
| 3. Statutory and Policy Framework .....              | 7  |
| 3.1 Statutory framework .....                        | 7  |
| 3.2 National planning policy .....                   | 7  |
| 3.3 Local planning policy .....                      | 7  |
| 3.4 Strategic significance .....                     | 7  |
| 3.5 Significant on-site enhancements .....           | 7  |
| 4. Methodology, Evidence and Limitations .....       | 8  |
| 4.1 Field survey and mapping .....                   | 8  |
| 4.2 Metric version.....                              | 8  |
| 4.3 Red-line reconciliation.....                     | 8  |
| 4.4 Earlier baseline date and oak removal .....      | 8  |
| 4.5 Private gardens and tree counting .....          | 8  |
| 4.6 Limitations and conservative assumptions .....   | 8  |
| 5. Baseline Habitats and Condition.....              | 9  |
| 5.1 Baseline overview .....                          | 9  |
| 5.2 Modified grassland .....                         | 9  |
| 5.3 Other broadleaved woodland .....                 | 9  |
| 5.4 Mixed scrub.....                                 | 9  |
| 5.5 Individual trees.....                            | 9  |
| 6. Post-development Habitat Strategy .....           | 10 |
| 6.1 Spatial strategy .....                           | 10 |
| 6.2 Credited and uncredited trees .....              | 10 |
| 6.3 Species-rich native hedgerow .....               | 10 |
| 6.4 Woodland-edge buffer.....                        | 10 |
| 6.5 Area reconciliation .....                        | 10 |
| 7. Statutory Biodiversity Metric Results .....       | 11 |
| 7.1 Area habitat calculation.....                    | 11 |
| 7.2 Hedgerow module.....                             | 11 |
| 7.3 Watercourse module .....                         | 11 |
| 7.4 Official workbook.....                           | 11 |
| 8. Trading Rules, BNG Hierarchy and Robustness ..... | 12 |
| 8.1 Trading rules .....                              | 12 |

|                                                         |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 8.2 BNG hierarchy .....                                 | 12 |
| 8.3 Sensitivity and headroom.....                       | 12 |
| 8.4 Key risks and controls.....                         | 12 |
| 9. Habitat Management and Monitoring Framework .....    | 13 |
| 9.1 Management principles .....                         | 13 |
| 9.2 Neutral grassland .....                             | 13 |
| 9.3 Scrub and ancient woodland buffer.....              | 13 |
| 9.4 Pond and SuDS .....                                 | 13 |
| 9.5 Species-rich hedgerow.....                          | 13 |
| 9.6 Trees.....                                          | 13 |
| 9.7 Monitoring programme.....                           | 13 |
| 9.8 Legal security.....                                 | 14 |
| 10. Submission Controls and Conclusions .....           | 15 |
| 10.2 Recommended appeal commitments / conditions.....   | 15 |
| 10.4 Conclusion .....                                   | 15 |
| References .....                                        | 16 |
| Appendix A - Proposed Landscape Plan .....              | 17 |
| Appendix B - Baseline UKHab Map.....                    | 18 |
| Appendix C - Condition Assessment Audit .....           | 19 |
| Appendix D - Metric Input and Calculation Schedule..... | 21 |

# 1. Introduction and Purpose

## 1.1 Commission

Leith Ecology Consulting Ltd. was commissioned by Mr R. Sharpe to assess Biodiversity Net Gain for the proposed development at Land North of Warnham Lodge Farm (Little Warnham Lodge), Mayes Lane, Warnham, West Sussex, RH12 3SG, centred approximately at OS NGR TQ 15421 35035.

## 1.2 Development

The proposal comprises one detached self-build dwelling with integrated garage, a stable block and equestrian paddock, access, tiered gardens, sustainable drainage and extensive landscape planting. The current red line is approximately 3.5930 ha.

- A detached dwelling over three floors with integrated garage.
- Stable block and retained/managed equestrian paddock.
- Private residential gardens, amenity lawn and ornamental planting.
- New vehicular access and hard landscape.
- Species-rich neutral grassland, native scrub and a woodland-edge buffer.
- A wildlife pond/SuDS basin, vegetated swales, native hedgerow and tree planting.

## 1.3 Purpose and status of this report

This report provides the pre-development baseline, post-development metric scenario, condition evidence, management framework and appeal-facing explanation of BNG deliverability. It is not itself the statutory Biodiversity Gain Plan. The formal Gain Plan may only be submitted after permission is granted and must be approved before development commences.

## 1.4 Documents relied upon

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and UKHab survey undertaken on 31 May 2025.
- Baseline UKHab map dated June 2025.
- Landscape plan LAR2518-LAN-DRA-0901-P03, dated 13 November 2025.
- The Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation tool, version 1.0.4.
- Official statutory metric condition assessment criteria and June 2026 User Guide.
- The earlier V.01 BNG report and supporting calculation schedules, audited and superseded by this report.

# 2. Appeal and Planning Context

## 2.1 Application

Planning application DC/25/2100 relates to the erection of a self-build dwelling with associated landscaping on land to the north of Warnham Lodge Farm. The published application notice identifies an effect on a Public Right of Way. This BNG report addresses the ecological and statutory metric position only; it should be integrated into the wider appeal statement and should not be presented as resolving unrelated planning matters.

## 2.2 Mandatory BNG applies

The self-build/custom-build exemption applies only where the development consists of no more than nine dwellings, is on a site no larger than 0.5 ha and consists exclusively of qualifying self-build/custom-build dwellings. Although the proposal is for one self-build dwelling, the current 3.5930 ha application red line exceeds the area limit. The report therefore proceeds on the precautionary and legally compliant basis that mandatory BNG applies.

## 2.3 Appeal relevance

At appeal stage the key BNG question is whether the scheme has a credible route to meet the statutory Biodiversity Gain Condition. The evidence demonstrates a substantial on-site surplus, compliance with the trading rules, a realistic 30-year management approach and no need for off-site units or statutory credits. This provides confidence that BNG can be secured through the deemed condition and any necessary planning obligation or conservation covenant for significant on-site enhancements.

## 2.4 Biodiversity Gain Plan timing

The formal Biodiversity Gain Plan is a post-permission, pre-commencement submission. The current appeal evidence appropriately provides the baseline metric and a detailed post-development scenario to demonstrate deliverability. A final Gain Plan should reproduce the approved metric and plans and specify the legal and management mechanisms.

## 3. Statutory and Policy Framework

### 3.1 Statutory framework

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, inserted by the Environment Act 2021, requires most planning permissions in England to achieve at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value. The gain is measured with the statutory biodiversity metric and must be delivered through on-site gains, registered off-site gains or statutory biodiversity credits, in that order of preference.

### 3.2 National planning policy

The current National Planning Policy Framework is the December 2024 Framework as amended in February 2025. It requires planning decisions to protect and enhance biodiversity, minimise impacts, provide net gains and support coherent ecological networks.

### 3.3 Local planning policy

The adopted Horsham District Planning Framework remains the operative development plan for this assessment. Relevant policies include environmental protection, natural environment and landscape character, strategic countryside protection, green infrastructure and biodiversity, and sustainable construction. Emerging policy may be a material consideration according to its stage and consistency with national policy but is not treated as adopted policy in this report.

### 3.4 Strategic significance

Horsham District Council guidance states that, until the West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Strategy is adopted, Medium strategic significance may be applied to priority habitats and to habitats with biodiversity value within additional or buffer areas identified by the Wilder Horsham District Nature Recovery Network, subject to justification in the metric comments. On this basis the boundary woodland, scrub, retained boundary trees, created woodland-edge scrub and new hedgerow are assigned Medium strategic significance. The intensively managed central grassland, garden, pond and other created grassland are conservatively assigned Low significance.

### 3.5 Significant on-site enhancements

Habitat creation or enhancement which makes a material contribution to the BNG outcome must be maintained for at least 30 years. The meadow, scrub/woodland-edge buffer, pond, credited trees and species-rich hedgerow are treated as significant on-site enhancements. Their boundaries must be shown on an approved plan and managed under a 30-year Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan.

## 4. Methodology, Evidence and Limitations

### 4.1 Field survey and mapping

The ecological baseline is based on the PEA and UKHab survey completed on 31 May 2025. Habitats were classified using UKHab and assessed against the statutory condition criteria. The survey timing was suitable for identifying the dominant habitat types and condition of the modified grassland, woodland, scrub and individual trees.

### 4.2 Metric version

The macro-enabled Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric version 1.0.4 has been populated. Official lookup values and automatic temporal and difficulty multipliers are used. No deviation under metric Rule 4 is proposed.

### 4.3 Red-line reconciliation

Ground-cover habitat parcels total exactly 3.5930 ha in both baseline and post-development scenarios. Individual-tree area-equivalents are additive and are not deducted from the habitat beneath. This follows the statutory metric method.

### 4.4 Earlier baseline date and oak removal

A Large mature pedunculate oak of approximately 80 cm DBH was recorded at the entrance during the 31 May 2025 survey and was subsequently removed. Because habitat degradation occurred after the survey, the oak is retained in the pre-development metric and entered as a complete loss. The May 2025 survey provides direct evidence of its pre-removal condition.

### 4.5 Private gardens and tree counting

The statutory User Guide requires created private residential garden land to be entered as Urban - Vegetated garden or Unvegetated garden. It does not permit separate gains for meadow, scrub, hedgerow or individual-tree habitats within private gardens. Accordingly, 0.7535 ha of amenity lawn, ornamental planting and residential garden is combined as Urban - Vegetated garden. Newly planted trees are entered as Small at the time of planting, not at their anticipated future size.

### 4.6 Limitations and conservative assumptions

- The metric uses a transparent grouped tree schedule: eight Small and four Medium retained boundary trees, plus one Large removed oak.
- Only 40 of the 84 proposed trees are credited. They must be identified outside private gardens and hedgerows on the final approved BNG plan.
- The SuDS grassland target depends on the final drainage design and seed specification. The scheme still exceeds 10% if the SuDS and pond units are excluded.
- The report and metric must be cross-checked against the final drawings so no habitat is double-counted.

## 5. Baseline Habitats and Condition

### 5.1 Baseline overview

The baseline comprises species-poor modified grassland, boundary other broadleaved woodland, a small parcel of mixed scrub and individual rural trees. There are no hedgerows or watercourses within the red line and no irreplaceable habitat within the metric baseline. Ancient woodland lies adjacent to the site and is an important off-site constraint.

| Ref    | Statutory habitat           | Extent               | Condition | Strategic significance | Baseline units |
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------|
| MG-01  | Modified grassland          | 3.2330 ha            | Poor      | Low                    | 6.466          |
| WB-01  | Other woodland; broadleaved | 0.3200 ha            | Moderate  | Medium                 | 2.816          |
| SC-01  | Mixed scrub                 | 0.0400 ha            | Moderate  | Medium                 | 0.352          |
| TR-B01 | 12 rural boundary trees     | 0.0980 ha equivalent | Moderate  | Medium                 | 0.862          |
| TR-O01 | Large entrance oak          | 0.0366 ha equivalent | Good      | Medium                 | 0.483          |
| TOTAL  |                             |                      |           |                        | 10.980 HU      |

### 5.2 Modified grassland

The central pasture is intensively managed, recently mown/grazed and species-poor. Four of seven low-distinctiveness grassland criteria may be passed, but the essential floristic criterion A is not achieved. The statutory condition is therefore Poor.

### 5.3 Other broadleaved woodland

Other woodland; broadleaved is Medium distinctiveness in the statutory metric, not High as stated in V.01. The woodland score is 27/39, giving Moderate condition. The woodland is retained in full and no enhancement units are claimed.

### 5.4 Mixed scrub

The existing mixed scrub passes three of five statutory criteria and is assigned Moderate condition. It is retained in full. The created woodland-edge scrub is treated as habitat creation rather than enhancement of this existing parcel.

### 5.5 Individual trees

The 12 retained boundary trees are grouped as eight Small and four Medium trees, producing an area-equivalent of 0.0980 ha. They pass four of six condition criteria and are Moderate. The removed entrance oak was a Large mature native tree with natural ecological niches and is conservatively assigned Good condition, producing 0.483 baseline units.

## 6. Post-development Habitat Strategy

### 6.1 Spatial strategy

Development is concentrated within low-distinctiveness modified grassland. The boundary woodland, mixed scrub and 12 boundary trees are retained. The landscape strategy creates a mosaic of meadow, native scrub, pond/SuDS features, species-rich hedgerow and trees, while the private residential curtilage is separately treated as vegetated garden.

| Ref      | Post-development habitat            | Extent        | Target condition | Strategic significance | Metric treatment    |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| WB-01    | Retained other broadleaved woodland | 0.3200 ha     | Moderate         | Medium                 | Retained            |
| SC-01    | Retained mixed scrub                | 0.0400 ha     | Moderate         | Medium                 | Retained            |
| MG-01    | Retained modified grassland paddock | 1.2978 ha     | Poor             | Low                    | Retained            |
| ONG-C01  | Other neutral grassland - good core | 0.1500 ha     | Good             | Low                    | Created             |
| ONG-C02  | Other neutral grassland meadow      | 0.3500 ha     | Moderate         | Low                    | Created             |
| VG-C01   | Private vegetated garden            | 0.7535 ha     | N/A              | Low                    | Created             |
| SC-C01   | Mixed scrub / woodland-edge buffer  | 0.4093 ha     | Moderate         | Medium                 | Created             |
| POND-C01 | Pond (non-priority habitat)         | 0.0200 ha     | Moderate         | Low                    | Created             |
| ONG-C03  | Other neutral grassland SuDS/swales | 0.0557 ha     | Moderate         | Low                    | Created             |
| DL-C01   | Developed land; sealed surface      | 0.1967 ha     | N/A              | Low                    | Created             |
| TR-B01   | 12 retained rural trees             | 0.0980 ha eq. | Moderate         | Medium                 | Retained            |
| TR-C01   | 40 credited new rural trees         | 0.1640 ha eq. | Moderate         | Low                    | Created Small trees |

### 6.2 Credited and uncredited trees

The landscape plan identifies 84 proposed trees. The statutory metric credits only a minimum of 40 trees, all as Small at planting. To remain valid, those 40 must be individually numbered and located outside private gardens and outside hedgerow habitat. The remaining 44 trees are retained as an additional design commitment but contribute no metric units. This materially reduces over-crediting risk.

### 6.3 Species-rich native hedgerow

A total of 0.388 km of new hedgerow is entered as Species-rich native hedgerow at Moderate target condition. The planting specification must contain at least five native woody species per 30 m. Credited sections must be outside private garden land, include a protected perennial margin and not be double-counted as scrub or individual-tree habitat.

### 6.4 Woodland-edge buffer

The 0.4093 ha native scrub and graded woodland-edge habitat forms part of the 15 m buffer to adjacent ancient woodland. It must remain free from residential garden encroachment, artificial lighting, storage, hard surfacing and adverse drainage changes. Its Medium strategic significance reflects its location and ecological corridor function.

### 6.5 Area reconciliation

The post-development ground-cover parcels sum to 3.5930 ha. Individual-tree equivalents are additive. The stated 1.90 ha meadow area in the earlier draft HMMP was inconsistent with the metric and has been corrected: the credited neutral grassland totals 0.5557 ha, comprising 0.1500 ha Good, 0.3500 ha Moderate and 0.0557 ha SuDS/swale grassland at Moderate target condition.

## 7. Statutory Biodiversity Metric Results

### 7.1 Area habitat calculation

| Habitat / intervention                     | Area or equivalent | Units     |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Retained modified grassland paddock        | 1.2978 ha          | 2.596     |
| Retained other broadleaved woodland        | 0.3200 ha          | 2.816     |
| Retained mixed scrub                       | 0.0400 ha          | 0.352     |
| Retained boundary trees                    | 0.0980 ha eq.      | 0.862     |
| Created other neutral grassland - Good     | 0.1500 ha          | 1.261     |
| Created other neutral grassland - Moderate | 0.3500 ha          | 2.343     |
| Created private vegetated garden           | 0.7535 ha          | 1.507     |
| Created mixed scrub / woodland edge        | 0.4093 ha          | 3.014     |
| Created pond                               | 0.0200 ha          | 0.144     |
| Created SuDS neutral grassland             | 0.0557 ha          | 0.373     |
| Developed land; sealed surface             | 0.1967 ha          | 0.000     |
| 40 created Small rural trees               | 0.1640 ha eq.      | 0.501     |
| POST-DEVELOPMENT TOTAL                     |                    | 15.769 HU |

| Measure                        | Result     |
|--------------------------------|------------|
| Baseline habitat units         | 10.9795 HU |
| 10% target                     | 12.0775 HU |
| Post-development habitat units | 15.7688 HU |
| Net change                     | +4.7893 HU |
| Percentage change              | +43.6%     |
| Surplus above 10% target       | +3.6913 HU |

### 7.2 Hedgerow module

There are no baseline hedgerows. Creation of 0.388 km of species-rich native hedgerow at Moderate condition and Medium strategic significance delivers approximately 2.857 hedgerow units. A percentage increase is not meaningful from a zero baseline; the outcome is a positive new linear habitat resource and no hedgerow loss.

### 7.3 Watercourse module

No watercourses occur within the red line. The watercourse module is therefore not applicable. Off-site drainage sensitivity remains a design and pollution-control consideration but does not generate statutory watercourse units.

### 7.4 Official workbook

The accompanying .xslm is the controlling calculation. It contains the detailed parcel references, user comments, retention/loss areas, target conditions, strategic-significance justifications, creation timing and no-delay assumptions. The workbook retains its original macro project and is configured for full recalculation on opening in Excel.

## 8. Trading Rules, BNG Hierarchy and Robustness

### 8.1 Trading rules

| Loss                                      | Trading requirement                          | Replacement / outcome                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Modified grassland (Low distinctiveness)  | Same distinctiveness or better               | Replaced by low and medium distinctiveness habitats; compliant.                       |
| Large rural tree (Medium distinctiveness) | Same broad habitat or higher distinctiveness | 0.483 tree units lost; 0.501 tree units created from 40 Small rural trees; compliant. |
| Woodland and scrub                        | No loss                                      | Retained in full; no replacement required.                                            |
| Hedgerow                                  | No baseline loss                             | 2.857 new hedgerow units created.                                                     |

### 8.2 BNG hierarchy

1. Avoid: development is focused on modified grassland; woodland, scrub and boundary trees are retained.
2. Mitigate: a 15 m ancient woodland buffer, root protection, pollution controls, sensitive lighting and drainage controls protect retained habitats.
3. Enhance/create on site: meadow, scrub, pond, SuDS grassland, hedgerow and credited trees are delivered within the site.
4. Off-site units: not required.
5. Statutory credits: not required.

### 8.3 Sensitivity and headroom

The result has substantial headroom and does not depend on the most uncertain small habitat parcels. If both the 0.0557 ha SuDS grassland and 0.0200 ha pond were removed from the calculation, the scheme would still deliver approximately 15.25 HU, equivalent to a gain of about 38.9%. If the 0.1500 ha Good grassland core were also conservatively downgraded to Moderate, the scheme would remain at approximately 15.00 HU or 36.6% gain. This demonstrates that the 10% objective is robust.

### 8.4 Key risks and controls

| Risk                           | Control required before/through approval                                                                              |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Private garden double-counting | Use Urban - Vegetated garden for the full 0.7535 ha private curtilage and do not claim other habitat gains within it. |
| Tree over-crediting            | Map and number the minimum 40 credited Small trees outside gardens/hedges; treat 44 additional trees as uncredited.   |
| Hedgerow classification        | Plant at least five native woody species per 30 m and protect a perennial margin.                                     |
| Habitat plan mismatch          | Issue a BNG parcel plan using the metric references and exact areas.                                                  |
| Oak degradation evidence       | Retain May 2025 survey evidence and record the felling date where available.                                          |
| Management failure             | Secure 30-year HMMP, monitoring, remedial triggers and responsible body.                                              |

## 9. Habitat Management and Monitoring Framework

### 9.1 Management principles

All significant on-site gains must be established, maintained and monitored for at least 30 years. The final HMMP should use the parcel references in this report and metric, identify the responsible party and funding mechanism, and specify measurable condition criteria, monitoring methods and remedial actions.

### 9.2 Neutral grassland

- Prepare low-fertility seedbeds and use a locally appropriate native neutral grassland mix.
- Do not apply fertiliser, routine herbicide or pesticide.
- Undertake an annual late-summer hay cut after flowering and seed set; remove arisings.
- Use additional spring cuts or aftermath grazing where required to control rank growth.
- Monitor quadrats, species richness, positive indicators, sward structure, bare ground and undesirable species.
- Overseed or plug-plant where the target condition trajectory is not achieved.

### 9.3 Scrub and ancient woodland buffer

- Plant a native mixed scrub assemblage with at least three native woody species and no single non-exempt species dominating more than 75%.
- Create a graded transition from tall grass/forbs to scattered scrub and denser scrub.
- Manage rotationally to maintain multiple age classes and sheltered edge habitat.
- Control invasive and suboptimal non-native species.
- Prohibit garden extension, storage, composting, lighting spill and drainage discharge into the 15 m buffer.

### 9.4 Pond and SuDS

- Create varied depths and shallow marginal profiles with clean inflows and a treatment train.
- Do not stock fish; remove any introduced ornamental fish.
- Allow or establish native marginal, emergent and submerged vegetation.
- Manage shading and vegetation rotationally, retaining refuge areas.
- Monitor turbidity, pollution, algae/duckweed, INNS, fish, water levels and plant cover.
- Ensure the final engineering design remains compatible with the metric habitat classification.

### 9.5 Species-rich hedgerow

- Plant at least five native woody species per 30 m, with local provenance where practicable.
- Use double-staggered planting and replace failures during establishment.
- Maintain at least a 1 m undisturbed perennial vegetation margin on one side, preferably wider.
- Avoid annual flailing; cut on a two- or three-year rotational cycle outside the main bird nesting period.
- Allow the hedge to develop height, width and continuity consistent with Moderate condition.

### 9.6 Trees

- Provide a numbered schedule for the 40 credited native rural trees and distinguish them from uncredited landscape trees.
- Protect with appropriate guards/stakes, mulch and watering during establishment.
- Replace failures in the following planting season so that the credited number is maintained.
- Retain vegetated ground beneath and avoid regular pruning that materially reduces canopy development.
- Monitor survival, health, canopy development and ecological niches.

### 9.7 Monitoring programme

| Period                  | Frequency             | Core outputs                                                                                                |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Years 1-5               | Annual                | Establishment checks, statutory condition trajectory, fixed-point photographs, failures and remedial works. |
| Years 7 and 10          | Two monitoring visits | Full condition assessment, management review and corrective programme.                                      |
| Years 15, 20, 25 and 30 | Five-yearly           | Full condition assessment and confirmation that target condition is maintained.                             |
| Any failure trigger     | Additional visit      | Implement and record corrective action; revise management as necessary.                                     |

## 9.8 Legal security

The significant on-site habitats should be secured for 30 years through an appropriate planning obligation, conservation covenant or other mechanism accepted by the decision maker. The legal plan should clearly exclude the private residential garden from the credited BNG management area and identify the party responsible for management, monitoring and reporting.

## 10. Submission Controls and Conclusions

### 10.2 Recommended appeal commitments / conditions

- The development shall deliver the BNG outcome shown in the approved statutory metric and BNG assessment.
- Before commencement, a Biodiversity Gain Plan and detailed 30-year HMMP shall be submitted and approved.
- A plan shall identify the significant on-site habitats, private residential curtilage and the 40 credited trees.
- The 0.388 km hedgerow shall be established as species-rich native hedgerow with at least five native woody species per 30 m.
- The 15 m ancient woodland buffer shall be protected from construction, lighting, storage, garden use and adverse drainage.
- Monitoring reports and remedial actions shall be submitted at the intervals specified in the approved HMMP.

### 10.4 Conclusion

The revised assessment provides a coherent and conservative statutory BNG case. It uses the official metric methodology, demonstrates compliance with the habitat trading rules and provides a credible 30-year delivery framework. The proposal achieves approximately 43.6% area-habitat net gain and creates approximately 2.86 hedgerow units entirely on site, without reliance on off-site units or statutory credits.

## References

- British Standards Institution (2013). BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity - Code of practice for planning and development.
- CIEEM (2019). Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys.
- CIEEM (2022). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland.
- CIEEM (2025). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 3rd edition.
- CIRIA, CIEEM and IEMA (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development.
- Defra (2026). Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide, updated June 2026.
- Defra (2025). Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments, updated July 2025.
- Defra (2026). Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation tool, version 1.0.4.
- HM Government (1990, as amended). Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Schedule 7A.
- HM Government (2021). Environment Act 2021.
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024/2025). National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024 as amended February 2025.
- Horsham District Council (2015). Horsham District Planning Framework.
- Horsham District Council (2026). Biodiversity Net Gain guidance and strategic significance approach, accessed 17 July 2026.
- Horsham District Council and Sussex Wildlife Trust (2021). Wilder Horsham District Nature Recovery Network Report.
- UK Habitat Classification Working Group (2024). UKHab v2.01.

## Appendix A - Proposed Landscape Plan

Landscape plan LAR2518-LAN-DRA-0901-P03 (13 November 2025). The plan is the design basis for the metric areas. A final BNG parcel overlay should identify the metric references, private curtilage boundary, credited hedgerow length and the minimum 40 credited trees.



Figure A1. Proposed landscape plan LAR2518-LAN-DRA-0901-P03.

## Appendix B - Baseline UKHab Map

The baseline UKHab map identifies the principal area habitats. It should be supplemented in the appeal bundle by a tree schedule or plan showing TR-B01 and TR-O01.



Leith Ecology Consulting Ltd.  
www.leithecology.co.uk  
01403 906938

### Appendix 1 – Habitat Map – UKHab



24

Figure B1. Baseline UKHab habitat map from the May 2025 PEA.

## Appendix C - Condition Assessment Audit

### C1. Modified grassland MG-01

| Criterion                                                             | Pass? | Evidence                                                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| A - 6-8 vascular species/m <sup>2</sup> including 2 forbs (essential) | No    | Species-poor modified pasture; essential threshold not met. |
| B - varied sward height                                               | No    | Consistently short grazed/mown sward.                       |
| C - scrub below 20%                                                   | Yes   | Open pasture; scrub mapped separately.                      |
| D - physical damage below 5%                                          | Yes   | No extensive poaching/machinery damage recorded.            |
| E - bare ground 1-10%                                                 | No    | Required bare-ground component not evidenced.               |
| F - bracken below 20%                                                 | Yes   | No material bracken.                                        |
| G - INNS absent                                                       | Yes   | No Schedule 9 invasive plants recorded.                     |
| RESULT                                                                | Poor  | Four criteria pass, but essential criterion A fails.        |

### C2. Woodland WB-01

| Indicator               | Score | Evidence basis                                     |
|-------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------|
| A Age distribution      | 2     | Two apparent classes; three not demonstrated.      |
| B Herbivore damage      | 2     | No severe widespread browsing; not quantified.     |
| C Invasive plants       | 3     | No listed INNS recorded.                           |
| D Native species number | 3     | Mixed native woody assemblage.                     |
| E Native cover          | 3     | Predominantly native canopy/understorey.           |
| F Open space            | 2     | Edge/open areas present; percentage not measured.  |
| G Regeneration          | 2     | Some regeneration; all classes not demonstrated.   |
| H Tree health           | 2     | No major mortality; no detailed health survey.     |
| I Ground flora          | 1     | Recognisable NVC community not demonstrated.       |
| J Vertical structure    | 3     | Canopy, shrub and ground layers.                   |
| K Veteran trees         | 1     | Threshold not demonstrated.                        |
| L Deadwood              | 1     | Formal plot threshold not demonstrated.            |
| M Disturbance           | 2     | Local edge effects; extensive damage not recorded. |
| TOTAL / RESULT          | 27    | Moderate (26-32).                                  |

### C3. Scrub SC-01

| Criterion                                  | Pass?    | Evidence                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| A - good native mixed example              | Yes      | Consistent with mixed native scrub.                 |
| B - all growth stages                      | Yes      | Range of unmanaged growth stages.                   |
| C - INNS absent and suboptimal species <5% | No       | Quantitative suboptimal threshold not demonstrated. |
| D - developed edge                         | Yes      | Transition to grassland/woodland edge.              |
| E - clearings/glades/rides                 | No       | Not demonstrated within small parcel.               |
| RESULT                                     | Moderate | Three criteria pass.                                |

### C4. Individual trees

| Criterion                                  | TR-B01 boundary trees | TR-O01 entrance oak |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| A Native                                   | Pass                  | Pass                |
| B Canopy continuity / individual auto-pass | Pass                  | Pass                |
| C Mature                                   | Fail                  | Pass                |
| D Health / pruning                         | Pass                  | Pass                |

| Criterion                     | TR-B01 boundary trees | TR-O01 entrance oak |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| E Ecological niches           | Fail                  | Pass                |
| F Canopy oversails vegetation | Pass                  | Pass                |
| Result                        | 4/6 - Moderate        | 6/6 - Good          |

## Appendix D - Metric Input and Calculation Schedule

### D1. Audit corrections made to V.01

| V.01 issue                                                                   | Correction in V.02                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Report presented representative multipliers and required later confirmation  | Official macro-enabled metric populated with statutory lookup tables and automatic recalculation. |
| Other broadleaved woodland recorded as High distinctiveness                  | Corrected to Medium distinctiveness.                                                              |
| Entrance oak recorded Moderate condition                                     | Corrected to Good using six individual-tree criteria.                                             |
| Private amenity lawn/garden entered as modified grassland                    | Combined with ornamental garden as Urban - Vegetated garden (0.7535 ha).                          |
| 84 trees credited using medium-size equivalent and minimal temporal discount | Only 40 credited, all Small at planting; official 27-year temporal multiplier applies.            |
| Tree location/curtilage controls unclear                                     | Credited trees required outside private gardens and hedgerows and within secured BNG land.        |
| Hedgerow described as native with four species per 30 m                      | Entered as species-rich native hedgerow; minimum five species per 30 m required.                  |
| HMMP stated approximately 1.90 ha neutral grassland                          | Corrected credited neutral grassland total to 0.5557 ha.                                          |
| LNRS described as approved                                                   | Corrected to current HDC interim strategic-significance approach pending LNRS adoption.           |
| Report title implied baseline only                                           | Reissued as full BNG Assessment and Appeal Evidence.                                              |

### D2. Calculation formula check

Baseline units are calculated as area × distinctiveness score × condition score × strategic-significance multiplier. Created units also apply the statutory time-to-target and difficulty multipliers. The detailed formulas remain in the official .xlsm workbook. Rounded figures in this report are for presentation; unrounded workbook values control.

| Headline                       | Unrounded value | Reported value |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Baseline habitat units         | 10.979520       | 10.98 HU       |
| Post-development habitat units | 15.768809       | 15.77 HU       |
| Net habitat-unit change        | 4.789289        | +4.79 HU       |
| Percentage change              | 43.6202%        | +43.6%         |
| Created hedgerow units         | 2.857268        | 2.86 HeU       |