



Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report

Land at West Hoathly Road

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

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

Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.0	DEFRA METRIC METHODOLOGY.....	4
3.0	DEFRA METRIC CALCULATIONS.....	5
4.0	CONCLUSIONS	11
	APPENDIX 1: CONDITION ASSESSMENTS	12
	<u>APPENDIX 2: RIVER CONDITION ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>17</u>

LIABILITIES:

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

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

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

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

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Ecology Partnership was commissioned by Devine Homes to undertake a Biodiversity Net-gain calculation for the proposed development at land at West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead, RH19 4RQ hereafter referred to as 'the site'.
- 1.2 The site is located east of West Hoathly Road in the town of East Grinstead, East Sussex (TQ 39244 36695). The site covers approximately 1.91ha and comprises woodland, sheep-grazed grassland and boundary hedgerows and treelines. The southern boundary is adjacent to further deciduous woodland. The surrounding area consists of grazed fields to the east and a playing field to the north.



Figure 1: Site red line boundary

- 1.3 An accompanying Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been prepared by The Ecology Partnership in support of the current planning application (The Ecology Partnership, 2025). This report should be read in conjunction with the PEA.

- 1.4 It is understood that the development will be residential, with 44 dwellings, gardens, road access and parking. Access will be through the western hedgerow to West Hoathly Road and woodland will be retained.

2.0 DEFRA Metric Methodology

- 2.1 BNG principles are aimed to support both the aspired green infrastructural proposals set to define the created landscape and support biodiversity and habitat enhancement. BNG principles are set within the Environment Bill (2021).
- 2.2 In order to determine the on-site habitat baseline, habitats were identified in accordance with UK Hab 2.0, mapped and subject to condition assessments on 5th November 2025, which included a River Condition Assessment (RCA) of the adjacent stream following the standard metric and RCA guidelines. This work was undertaken by Principal Ecologist Matthew Pendry BSc (Hons) MCIEEM, an experienced botanist who holds a Level 4 Field Identifications Skills Certificate (FISC) and is certified to carry out RCA surveys, and assistant ecologist Daniel Whitlock BSc (Hons).
- 2.3 The Statutory Metric is used to calculate biodiversity losses and gains for terrestrial habitats within the application area, and supersedes version 4.0 of the Defra metric. This metric underpins the Environment Act's provisions for mandatory biodiversity net-gain in England and defines 'measurable' net-gains.
- 2.4 The Biodiversity Metric uses habitat as a proxy for wider biodiversity with different habitat types scoring different values according to their relative biodiversity value. These are dependent on the condition and location of the habitat, in order to calculate '**biodiversity units**'.
- 2.5 The site has been assessed in terms of the condition assessment of the baseline during both the November 2025 assessment by The Ecology Partnership, and through review of present and historic satellite imagery, following the standard metric guidelines.
- 2.6 The accompanying PEA report provides a wider site appraisal, with species lists provided. As such, the PEA should be read in conjunction with this report.

- 2.7 A single unnamed watercourse to the east of the site was subject to a River Condition Assessment (RCA). In order to inform the assessment, a series of MoRPh5 surveys were undertaken along this water course to characterise each sub-reach. Each MoRPh5 comprises five contiguous modules. As the width of the water course was less than 5m, the minimum module length of 10m was used, and so each MoRPh5 totalled 50m per sub reach. MoRPh5 surveys are repeated so that a minimum of 20% of the length of river within the development red line boundary is surveyed and each sub-reach should be equally spaced and located to best capture variations along within the red line boundary. In this instance, the channel dissecting the redline measured *c.7m*, and so a single sub-reach was sufficient, with a 50m MoRPh5 survey carried out, incorporating the section within the redline and channel extending downstream to the north-east.
- 2.8 The MoRPh survey involves a detailed assessment of a number of features on the channel bed, banks, and immediate bank tops (to 10 m from the bank top edge). This includes morphological and hydraulic features, habitats, and presence and extent of non-native invasive plant species, land use pressures on the bank top and human interventions within the river channel. Data is gathered using the Cartographer App, and is automatically uploaded to the Cartographer Website (www.Cartographer.io). A series of positive and negative indicator scores are then generated ranging from -4 to 0 for negative indicators and 0 to +4 for positive indicators. The average of negative indicators are then subtracted from the average of positive indicators to generate the preliminary condition score. A desk study is undertaken within the Cartographer Website to determine the river type. The preliminary condition score is then compared against the river type to determine the river condition for the purposes of the statutory metric.

3.0 DEFRA Metric Calculations

- 3.1 The habitats currently present on site have been divided into a number of habitat types, each of which was subject to a condition assessment. The results from the metric are shown in Table 1, 2 and 3 overleaf, with the baseline habitat map shown in Figure 2. The proposed habitats are shown in Table 4, 5 and 6 as well as Figure 3.
- 3.2 The habitats currently present on site have been assessed as having a value of **7.83 habitat units**, **2.17 hedgerow units** and **0.07 watercourse units**.

Table 1. On-Site Habitat Baseline

Habitat	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Total habitat units	Area retained	Units lost	Comments
Modified grassland	1.676	Low	Poor	Low	3.35	0.00	3.35	Sheep-grazed field
Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	0.226	High	Good	Low	4.47	0.226	0.00	Broad-leaved woodland outside the ancient woodland extent
Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	0.004	High	Good	Low	0.00	0.004	0.00	Ancient woodland designation overlapping with site boundary
Total area (excluding trees)	1.91	Total units/area			7.83	0.23	3.35	

Table 2. On-site hedgerow baseline

Habitat	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Total units	Length retained	Units lost	Comments
Line of trees	0.121	Low	Moderate	Low	0.97	0.121	0.00	Lines of mature trees along SW and NE boundary
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.1504	Medium	Moderate	Low	1.2	0.139	0.09	Hedgerow along NW boundary
Total length	0.27	Total units/length			2.17	0.26	0.09	

Table 3. On-site watercourse habitat breakdown – Pre-Development

Habitat	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Extent of encroachment		Total units	Length retained	Units lost	Comments
					Water-course	Riparian				
Other rivers and streams	0.007	High	Fairly poor	Medium	None	None	0.07	0.007	0	Stream to the south-east



Figure 2: Habitats present on site pre development



Figure 3: Post development habitat map

Table 4: On-Site Habitat Creation

Habitat	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Target Condition	Strategic significance	Years to target condition	Difficulty	Total habitat units	Comments
Developed land: sealed surface	0.265	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	0	Low	0.00	Buildings
Developed land: sealed surface	0.469	V.Low	N/A – Other	Low	0	Low	0.00	Hardstanding
Modified grassland	0.076	Low	Poor	Low	1	Low	0.15	Informal open space in the north of the site
Mixed scrub	0.139	Medium	Moderate	Low	5	Low	0.93	New mixed native shrub planting along the south-eastern and south-western site boundaries
Other neutral grassland	0.109	Medium	Moderate	Low	5	Low	0.73	Flower-rich grassland areas in the eastern corner of the site around the SUDS and along north-west boundary
Other neutral grassland	0.204	Medium	Poor	Low	2	Low	0.76	Areas of flowering lawn on verges around the development, as well as areas of tussocky grassland along the edge of the scrub.
SUDS	0.015	Low	Moderate	Low	5	Low	0.04	SUDS basin seeded with wetland wildflowers.
Vegetated garden	0.396	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	1	Low	0.76	Private garden spaces
Urban tree	0.35	Medium	Poor	Low	10	Low	0.98	86 new trees
Introduced shrub	0.0063	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Low	1	Low	0.01	Small areas of ornamental planting
Total area	1.68	<u>Total units</u>					4.36	

Table 5. On-Site Hedgerow Creation

Habitat	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Years to target condition	Difficulty	Total habitat units	Comments
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.261	Medium	Poor	Low	1	Low	1.01	New species-rich native hedgerows planted throughout the site
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.311	V.Low	Poor	Low	1	Low	0.3	New ornamental hedgerows around front gardens
Total length	0.57	<u>Total units</u>					<u>1.31</u>	

On-Site Habitat Creation/management

- 3.3 The proposed development is largely centred on the existing grassland, whilst retaining most of the boundary habitats. The woodland in the south of the site and both treelines will be retained. Two small sections of the western native hedgerow will be lost to facilitate site access, though new species rich native hedgerow will be planted to offset this loss.
- 3.4 New areas of species-rich grassland will be established using a complete mixture, which includes slow-growing grasses such as [EM4](#). The SUDS basin will be seeded with a wetland seedmix such as [EM8](#).
- 3.5 The new scrub will be largely unmanaged, with partial coppicing every 5 years, to create a variety of heights and ages of vegetation, and bramble will be kept in check to prevent encroachment into the grassland.
- 3.6 Grassland on site will be cut 2-3 times a year, in the spring and autumn, avoiding the main flowering period of June/July. All cutting will be removed to prevent buildup of nutrients in the soil. Areas of flowering lawn and modified grassland will be cut more regularly to maintain a short sward, however, management can be relaxed on flowering lawn areas in June and July to encourage flowering.
- 3.7 The final results are shown in table 7 below.

Table 6. Final results

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	1.01		
	Hedgerow units	1.22		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	12.88%		
	Hedgerow units	56.02%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	7.83	8.61	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	2.17	2.39	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.07	0.08	0.01

- 3.8 The calculations confirm that the development has the potential to result in a net-gain of 1.01 habitat units (12.88%), a net gain of 1.22 hedgerow units (56.02%) and no change in watercourse units, based on the current proposal, with all trading rules satisfied.
- 3.9 There is a 0.01unit deficit in watercourse units to achieve +10% above the baseline, which is currently unchanged. This will need to be purchased from an offsite provider.
- 3.10 A detailed Habitat Management & Maintenance Plan will be developed at the detailed design stage to detail the long-term management of the proposed habitats to achieve the targeted habitat conditions, over a 30 year timespan.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 The ecological baseline value of habitats on site is **7.83 habitat units, 2.17 hedgerow units and 0.07 watercourse units**.
- 4.2 The proposals for the site would result in a **net-gain of 1.01 habitat units (+12.88%), a net gain of 1.22 hedgerow units (56.02%) and no change in watercourse units**. All trading rules have been satisfied.
- 4.3 In order to achieve a +10% net-gain in watercourse units an additional 0.01units would need to be purchased from an offsite provider.
- 4.4 A number of ecological enhancements have been outlined in the accompanying PEA, which promote opportunities for wildlife on site, albeit not measurable.

Appendix 1: Condition Assessments

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)		
UKHab Habitat Type(s): Grassland - Modified grassland		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Grassland 1
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs (this may include those listed in Footnote 1). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition. Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m ² (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	Fail (average of 4.1 species per m ² over 7 quadrats; see PEA)
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	Fail Uniform grazed sward
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note – patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90% cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Pass
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	Pass
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	Fail <1% bare ground
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Pass
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	Pass
Condition		Poor
Condition Assessment Result		
Good	Passes 6 or 7 of 7 criteria including essential criterion A	
Moderate	Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	
Poor	Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR 4-6 of criteria but failing criterion A	

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type			
Condition Assessment Criteria		South-west tree line	North-east tree line
A	More than 70% of trees are native species.	Fail <i>Largely hybrid poplar</i>	Pass
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	Pass	Pass
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Pass	Pass
D	There is an undisturbed naturally-vegetated strip of at least 6 m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice ²	Pass	Fail <i>Recreation ground to north</i>
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this. There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	Fail <i>Many trees in poor condition</i>	Fail <i>Ash die back prevalent</i>
Condition		Moderate	Moderate
Condition Assessment Result			
Good	Passes 5 of 5 criteria		
Moderate	Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria		
Poor	Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 5 criteria		

Condition Sheet: Hedgerows		
Condition Assessment Criteria		TL1 (north)
A	Height >1.5 m average along length	Pass
	Width >1.5 m average along length	Pass
B	Gap – hedge base Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Pass
	Gap – hedge canopy continuity Gaps make up <10% of total length and No canopy gaps >5 m	Pass
C	Undisturbed perennial vegetation >1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length (on one side of the hedge (at least))	Pass
	Undesirable species Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	Pass
D	Invasive species >90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ³) and recently introduced species.	Pass
	Current Damage >90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Pass
Condition		Good
Condition Assessment Result		
	Hedgerow without trees	
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 in any functional group.	
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 & C2 = Moderate condition).	
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 & B2 = Poor condition).	

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type					
UKHab Habitat Type(s): All woodlands (except wood pasture)					
Condition Assessment Criteria					
Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator W1
A	Age distribution of trees Footnote 1	Three age-classes ¹ present	Two age-classes ¹ present	One age-class ¹ present	3
B	Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage Footnote 2	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland ²	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland ²	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland ²	3
C	Invasive plant species Footnote 3	No invasive species ³ present in woodland	Rhododendron <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> or cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> not present, other invasive species ³ < 10% cover	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species ³ > 10% cover	3
D	Number of native tree species Footnote 4	Five or more native tree or shrub species ⁴ found across woodland parcel	Three to four native tree or shrub species ⁴ found across woodland parcel	None to two native tree or shrub species ⁴ across woodland parcel	3
E	Cover of native tree and shrub species Footnote 5	> 80% of canopy trees and > 80% of understory shrubs are native ⁵	50-80% of canopy trees and 50-80% of understory shrubs are native ⁵	< 50% of canopy trees and < 50% of understory shrubs are native ⁵	3
F	Open space within woodland Footnote 6 and 7	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space ⁶ . Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted ⁷	21- 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space ⁶	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space ⁶ . But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category ⁷ .	3
G	Woodland regeneration Footnote 8	All three classes present in woodland ⁸ ; trees 4-7cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth	One or two classes only present in woodland ⁸	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland ⁸	3
H	Tree health Footnote 9	Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback ⁹	11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low risk pest or disease present ⁹	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high risk pest or disease present ⁹	3

I	Vegetation and ground flora Footnote 10	Recognisable NVC plant community ¹⁰ at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community ¹⁰ present at ground layer present	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community ¹⁰ at ground layer present	2
J	Woodland vertical structure Footnote 11	Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland ¹¹	Two storeys across all survey plots ¹¹	One or less storey across all survey plots ¹¹	2
K	Veteran trees Footnote 12	Two or more veteran trees ¹² per hectare	One veteran tree ¹² per hectare	No veteran trees ¹² present in woodland	1
L	Amount of deadwood Footnote 13	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities ¹³ .	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities ¹³ .	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities ¹³ .	3
M	Woodland disturbance Footnote 14	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident ¹⁴	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and/or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground ¹⁴	More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and/or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground ¹⁴	3
Total score (out of a possible 39)					37 Good
Condition Assessment Score					
Good	Total score >32 (33 to 39)				
Moderate	Total score 26 to 32				
Poor	Total score <26 (13 to 25)				

Appendix 2: River Condition Assessment

Data collected in the field was analysed through the Cartographer App and a condition score applied to each criterion based on the results. Positive criteria are scored between 0 and 4 and negative criteria between 0 and -4. The total positive and negative scores were added together to provide the overall condition score. These are summarised in the Table 1 below:

RCA Results –

Code	Name	Baseline Score	Post development score	Change
B1	Bank top vegetation structure	3	3	-
B2	Bank top tree feature richness	3	3	-
B3	Bank top water related features	0	0	-
B4	Bank top non-native invasive species	0	0	-
B5	Bank top managed ground cover	0	0	-
C1	Bank face riparian vegetation structure	1	1	-
C2	Bank face tree feature richness	1	1	-
C3	Bank face natural bank profile extent	3	3	-
C4	Bank face natural bank profile richness	4	4	-
C5	Bank face natural bank material richness	2	2	-
C6	Bank face bare sediment extent	1	1	-
C7	Bank face artificial bank profile extent	0	0	-
C8	Bank face reinforcement extent	0	0	-
C9	Bank face reinforcement material severity	0	0	-
C10	Bank face non-native invasive species cover	0	0	-
D1	Channel margin aquatic vegetation extent	0	0	-
D2	Channel margin aquatic morphotype richness	0	0	-
D3	Channel margin physical feature extent	1	1	-
D4	Channel margin physical feature richness	1	1	-
D5	Channel margin artificial features	0	-1	-1
E1	Channel aquatic morphotype richness	0	0	-
E2	Channel bed tree feature richness	3	3	-
E3	Channel bed hydraulic features richness	1	1	-
E4	Channel bed natural features extent	0	0	-
E5	Channel bed natural features richness	0	0	-
E6	Channel bed materials richness	3	3	-
E7	Channel bed siltation	-4	-4	-
E8	Channel bed reinforcement extent	0	0	-
E9	Channel bed reinforcement severity	0	0	-
E10	Channel bed artificial features severity	0	0	-
E11	Channel bed non-native invasive species extent	0	0	-
E12	Channel bed filamentous algae extent	0	0	-
Positive Index Average		1.421	1.421	-
Negative Index Average		-0.308	-0.385	-0.077
Condition Score		1.113 <i>Moderate</i>	1.036 <i>Moderate</i>	

The average positive indicator score was **1.421** and average negative indicator score **-0.308**, with an overall preliminary condition score of **+1.113**, installation of a single outflow pipe from the SUDS system post development result in a post development preliminary condition score of **1.036**. Based on the river morphology and desktop data entered into Cartographer, the watercourse was assessed as being River Type K. Based on this river type, the final condition score is determined to be '**Moderate**' both before and after development, as shown in the table below.

River Type K Conditions scores

Preliminary Condition Score	Final Condition
>1.9	Good
>1.2	Fairly good
>0.2	Moderate
>-1.0	Fairly poor
<-1.0	Poor

However, due to the narrow width of the channel compared to the depth, as well as its artificially straightened nature, the watercourse is considered to be over deep. In line with river condition assessment guidance (Gurnell et al, 2024), the condition score should therefore be reduced by one level to fairly poor.

A single outflow pipe will be incorporated for discharge of water from the SUDS, however, there are no other changes post development as the watercourse is largely located offsite, with no changes to the bank top. The minimal changes post development are not sufficient to reduce the preliminary condition score below the next lowest threshold of 0.2.

The Ecology Partnership

Thorncroft Manor

Thorncroft Drive

Leatherhead

KT22 8JB

Tel: 01372 364 133

www.ecologypartnership.com

Approved: Matt Pendry BSc (Hons) MCIEEM

Date: 16/12/2025

Amended 06/01/2026