

ECOLOGY & BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN ASSESSMENT

9th January 2026

The Foal Barn, Wineham Lane,
Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9AN

On behalf of: Sarah Platt

Agent: Fowler Architecture and Planning

REPORT ISSUE SHEET:

Draft/final and Version no:	Final (all surveys completed) V 2.0
Previous report version(s) and date(s):	Ecology & Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Report – dated 06/08/2024
Client:	Sarah Platt
Agent/planner:	Fowler Architecture and Planning
Author(s):	Georgia Linter BSc (Hons) & Emily Parsons BSc (Hons)
Report approved for issue by:	Amy Parsons BSc (Hons) ACIEEM
Local Planning Authority:	Mid Sussex District Council
Planning application number (if known):	n/a

DISCLAIMER:

The copyright of this document remains with ABR Ecology Ltd (“ABR”). The contents of this document therefore must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of ABR.

ABR shall not be liable for the use of this report for purposes other than those for which the report was prepared and provided; and accept no responsibility for any documents or information supplied to ABR by others.

This document has been prepared in accordance with CIEEM’s Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (CIEEM, 2017) and Biodiversity Net Gain Report & Audit Templates (CIEEM, 2021).

This report may contain sensitive data pertaining to particularly vulnerable species. It is the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority to determine whether data and information contained within his report is made publicly available.

At the time of writing, standard methodologies have been used which are accepted by Natural England and other statutory bodies. No responsibility will be accepted where standard methodologies change and where Government, national bodies and industry subsequently modify standards.

This report has been produced using all reasonable skill and care, and a Quality Assurance (QA) review process has been conducted prior to issue of this report.

SURVEY DATA LIFESPAN AND VALIDITY:

Unless otherwise explicitly stated, survey data contained within this report is valid for 12-18 months from the survey date in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Advice note (CIEEM, 2019) due to the presence of and/or potential for mobile species to be present within the site. However, should the condition on-site change substantially during this 18-month period, and/or if the nature/extent of the development changes, then this report may not be valid, and a reassessment of the site may be required.

This report has been prepared to identify the presence of protected species and habitats within the site, where this falls within the scope of the agreed works.

Survey data has a limited lifespan for mitigation licence applications with Natural England. Update surveys may be required e.g. in the event a bat licence is required; survey data must be sought from the then current survey season (May to August).

The results of the surveys and this assessment are representative at the time of the surveys taking place.

	ABR Ecology Ltd		
	First Floor Office, 35 Black Moor Road, Verwood, Dorset, BH31 6AT		
	Tel:	01202 821325	Web: www.abrecology.com
	Lead ecologist email:	abrecology@gmail.com	
	Registered Limited company in England and Wales no:		11266688

Contents

Non-technical summary	3
1. Introduction	6
2. Methodology	8
3. Results	16
4. Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation results	22
6. References	34
Appendix A – Site location plan	36
Appendix B – Proposed plans.....	37
Appendix C – Relevant legislation and planning policy.....	39
Appendix D – Habitat maps and species lists.....	43
Appendix E – Photographs	47
Appendix F – Condition assessments	49
Appendix G – Biodiversity enhancement plan	60

Non-technical summary

- ◆ ABR Ecology Ltd were commissioned by Fowler Architecture and Planning on behalf of Sarah Platt to produce an Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment to inform a planning application for a sand school and barn at The Foal Barn, Wineham Lane, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9AN.
- ◆ This assessment is informed by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) including a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) of buildings and trees conducted on the 21st May 2024 by experienced Natural England class 2 licensed bat ecologist Phil Smith ACIEEM and assistant ecologist Georgia Linter.

Habitats and protected sites:

- ◆ Habitats onsite within the red line boundary include artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface (u1c 839), modified grassland (g4 103 106 128 502), ruderal (g4 81), a culvert (u1 851), a native hedgerow with trees – associated with a bank or ditch (h2a 11 50), a native hedgerow (h2a) and a native hedgerow with trees (h2a 50).

Statutory Biodiversity Metric results:

- ◆ The development is anticipated to achieve a percentage net gain of 12.92% in habitat units, 47.46% in hedgerow units and 998.35% in watercourse units. Further details are provided in Section 4 of this report.

Badgers:

- ◆ Badgers are not considered to be impacted by the proposals and no further action is recommended for this species.

Barn owls:

- ◆ Barn owls are not considered to be impacted by the proposals and no further action is recommended for this species.

Bats:

- ◆ The trees onsite were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats. All trees onsite were considered to hold ‘negligible potential’ for roosting bats due to a lack of

Potential Roost Features (PRFs) and or their smaller size. Further information is provided in Section 5 on what to do if a bat is unexpectedly discovered.

- ◆ There are bat records within 1km of the site. A 'bat-friendly' lighting strategy is detailed in Section 5 to ensure any additional lighting does not impede foraging and commuting bats which may be using the site.

Dormice:

- ◆ The hedgerows onsite provide limited habitat for dormice therefore, a precautionary works method statement for works affecting hedges is detailed in Section 5.

Great crested newts:

- ◆ The site provides limited habitat for great crested newts (GCN). No ponds were identified onsite; however, eight ponds were identified within 500m of the site. A pond is adjacent to the south of the site, and a previous Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment survey was undertaken on the 7th June 2019 and resulted in a score of 0.56 ('below average' for GCN); eDNA sampling was then conducted and was 'negative' for GCN. All other ponds were inaccessible. The site is within a 'Red Risk Zone' for GCN therefore, details regarding a District Level License (DLL) and a precautionary works method statement for site clearance is detailed in Section 5.

Nesting birds:

- ◆ No evidence of nesting birds was identified within the site, however, there is potential for nesting birds to be present within the hedgerows onsite. A mitigation and enhancement strategy for birds is detailed in Section 5.

Hedgehogs:

- ◆ Hedgehogs have been recorded within the local area and the site consists of suitable habitats for this species. It is considered likely that hedgehogs utilise the site; a mitigation strategy is detailed in Section 5.

Reptiles and common amphibians:

- ◆ There is potential for low numbers of reptiles and common amphibians within the hedges around the site boundaries. As a hedgerow will be removed, a method statement is provided in Section 5.

Biodiversity enhancements:

- ◆ To ensure the application is compliant with national and local planning policy, one bird nest box will be erected on the proposed barn. Further details are provided in Section 5.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 ABR Ecology Ltd were commissioned by Fowler Architecture and Planning on behalf of their client to produce an Ecology and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment to inform a planning application for a sand school and new barn at The Foal Barn, Wineham Lane, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9AN (central grid reference: TQ 23777 19449) (herein referred to as 'the site' / 'onsite').
- 1.2 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) including a Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) of trees was conducted on 21st May 2024 by experienced Natural England class 2 licensed bat ecologist Phil Smith ACIEEM and assistant ecologist Georgia Linter.
- 1.3 A site location plan is provided in Appendix A and proposed plans in Appendix B.

Site context

- 1.4 The site is situated within West Sussex and is approximately 1.693 hectares (ha) and comprises of horse paddocks. The site consists of grassland, gravel tracks and native hedgerows. The site is situated within a rural setting surrounded by arable and pastoral farmland. The Rive Adur is present 12m to the north. The site is considered to offer good opportunities for wildlife and is in an optimal location for biodiversity.

Purposes and aims of this assessment

- 1.5 This assessment primarily aims to determine the biodiversity value of the site and looks to identify the presence/likely absence of protected and vulnerable species onsite. This report also aims to evaluate whether there will be any potential development impacts on protected species and habitats and identifies whether mitigation and/or protected species licensing is required to ensure the development complies with legislation and national and local planning policy.
- 1.6 This assessment also estimates the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) anticipated to be generated by the current proposals for the site, as measured using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (GOV.UK 2025); and follows guidance set out within the Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development (Baker *et al.*, 2019) and BS 8683:2021 Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain - Specification (BSI, 2021).

1.7 The BNGA part of this assessment aims to:

- ◆ *Classify the habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, connectivity and strategic significance of habitats present prior to and post-development.*
- ◆ *Ensure that baseline habitat conditions are classified in a consistent and robust manner, and that classification is based on the best quality data available at the time of the assessment.*
- ◆ *Clearly identify data collection methods and any survey limitations.*
- ◆ *Calculate baseline (pre-development) and proposed (post-development) habitat units, watercourse and hedgerow units for onsite and offsite land where applicable based on the current development proposals.*
- ◆ *Proposed a BNG design with the aim of maximising BNG through habitat creation and enhancement; ensuring BNG is designed to support the known protected species within the site based on the wider ecological evaluation of the site.*
- ◆ *Aim to achieve a BNG onsite, with offsite BNG pursued where this is not possible.*

Relevant planning policy and legislation

1.8 Full details of relevant planning policy and legislation are provided in Appendix C of this report; the following policy and legislation in respect of biodiversity is applicable to this application:

- ◆ *The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 – Section 15*
- ◆ *The Environment Act 2021 – Schedules 7a and 14 Parts 1 and 2*
- ◆ *Annex II and IV of the EC Habitats and Species Directive 1992*
- ◆ *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019*
- ◆ *The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) – Section 1 and Schedules 5 and 9*
- ◆ *The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 – Sections 40 and 41*
- ◆ *The Mid Sussex District Plan (2014-2031) (Mid Sussex District Council, 2014) Policy 2.13 ‘A vision for Mid Sussex’*

1.9 **It is the responsibility of the applicant(s) to ensure that the proposed development proceeds in full compliance with legislation, national and local policy, and in accordance with all conditions of the obtained planning consent.**

2. Methodology

Desktop data search

- 2.1 Internationally protected sites including Ramsars, Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) were identified within a 7.5 kilometre (km) radius and nationally designated sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) were identified within a 2km radius of the site using the Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside website (MAGIC) (2024).
- 2.2 Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SXBRC) (2024) were contacted to provide records of any protected, vulnerable and notable species, locally designated sites such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and Local Geological Sites (LGSs) within a 1km radius of the application site.
- 2.3 A search was also conducted on MAGIC (2024) to identify the presence of nearby priority habitats, European Protected Species (EPS) licences and known great crested newt breeding ponds.
- 2.4 This information was used to evaluate the potential of the site for protected and vulnerable species, and to determine whether there is potential for development impacts on these species, surrounding habitats and protected sites.
- 2.5 To inform the BNG assessment, a desktop study was undertaken to determine strategic significance of habitats. This comprised a review of the following:
 - ◆ The Mid Sussex District Plan (2014-2031) Policy 2.13
 - ◆ Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) online database (accessed May 2024) to identify any statutory nature conservation designations.
 - ◆ Data search response from SXBRC (April 2024)

Botanical survey (UKHab)

- 2.6 A botanical survey of the site was conducted on 21st May 2024 by experienced botanist Phil Smith ACIEEM and assistant ecologist Georgia Linter.

- 2.7 Prior to the site visit, a geopackage was created in QGIS version 3.28.6-Firenze (QGIS.org, 2023) for export into Coreo (Coreo, 2024) for digital mapping and data collection in the field. A red line boundary for the site was created based on a georeferenced site plan (Site Location Plan provided in Appendix A), and relevant vector and raster layers added.
- 2.8 The survey involved a detailed flora survey of habitats, and each flora species was allocated an abundance in accordance with the DAFOR scale, using local (L) as a pre-fix where a species was restricted in distribution across the habitat:
- D – Dominant
 - A – Abundant
 - F – Frequent
 - O – Occasional
 - R – Rare
- 2.9 Habitats on site were classified and coded in accordance with the UKHab Classification System, using the UK Habitat Classification Definitions document Version 2.0 (UKHab Ltd, 2023¹) and UKHab Field Key Version 2.1 (UKHab Ltd, 2023²). Other features of ecological interest were identified using ‘target notes’.
- 2.10 All mapping was undertaken digitally within the Coreo app and the geopackage was then imported back into QGIS.

Statutory Biodiversity Metric

Pre and post-development habitat mapping

- 2.11 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric (GOV.UK, 2025) was conducted as a tool to determine a baseline and proposed biodiversity value for the site, this included both a percentage habitat net gain/loss and the overall change in habitat units post-development.
- 2.12 Pre and post-development habitat maps were digitised using the QGIS template associated with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Natural England, 2025¹). In accordance with the ‘Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide’ (Natural England, 2025²), and the proposed site plan (as shown in Appendix B) was georeferenced and the proposed habitats were overlain using this plan.

- 2.13 Information was then entered for each parcel including baseline/proposed habitat types, condition, strategic significance, parcel reference, retention category and spatial risk category using the QGIS template for both onsite and offsite maps, where appropriate.
- 2.14 The QGIS Import Tool (Natural England, 2025¹) was then used to prepare data for import into the Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation tool.
- 2.15 Trees were entered manually using the 'Urban Tree Helper' in the Main Menu of the Metric Tool to determine their equivalent size in hectares (ha).

Strategic significance

- 2.16 The criteria within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric was assessed by determining if habitat areas within the site occur within any strategic locations for biodiversity, form part of a designated site for nature conservation or are identified within local planning documents such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and Local Geological Sites (LGSs) within a SXBRC (2024).

Measurements of Habitat Areas

- 2.17 Baseline and proposed habitat areas were measured as distinct habitat parcels. Baseline habitat parcels were measured using habitat mapping and aerial photography overlain in QGIS and Coreo. Post-development habitat parcels were calculated by measuring the proposed plan (as shown in Appendix B).

Competency requirements

- 2.18 Phil Smith ACIEEM undertook the baseline survey assisted by assistant ecologist Georgia Linter; both ecologists have undertaken CIEEM certified training in the Biodiversity Metric 4.0 and UK Habs.

Protected species assessment

Badgers

- 2.19 A walkover was conducted during the site visit looking for potential evidence of badgers (*Meles meles*). Evidence of badgers can include the presence of setts (underground burrows), 'snuffle marks' (nose marks and scratches from badger

foraging within the earth), latrines (territorial marking sites), scats, hair, footprints and well-worn paths.

Barn owls and other nesting birds

- 2.20 A search was conducted for evidence of barn owl (*Tyto alba*) and other nesting birds within and around the buildings and vegetation during the site visit. Evidence of nesting birds can include the physical presence of chicks and/or adult birds, nesting material, eggs and/or egg casings, feathers, white splashing (droppings), and pellets (for barn owls).

Bats – Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW)

- 2.21 A Daytime Bat Walkover (DBW) survey was conducted to assess the site and record any habitats suitable for roosting bats. This included an inspection of trees for bat suitability as detailed below.

Ground level tree assessment (GLTA) – roosting bats in trees

- 2.22 A ground level tree assessment (GLTA) was conducted to identify Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) in any trees onsite. Timing and weather conditions for the GLTA survey are provided in the table below:

Survey date	Time of survey	Surveyor(s)	Equipment used	Weather conditions		
20/05/2024	11:00am	Phil Smith ACIEEM and Georgia Linter	High-powered torch and binoculars	Temp:	Okta cloud cover:	Beaufort wind force:
				14°C	7/8	2/12

- 2.23 The GLTA involved a detailed inspection of the exterior of the tree from the ground to look for features that bats could use for roosting. Trees with identified PRFS were categorized in accordance with the following guidelines (Collins, 2023):

Suitability	Description
PRF-I	PRF is only suitable for individual bats either due to size or lack of suitable surrounding habitats.
PRF-M	PRF is suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony.

- 2.24 A search was also conducted, where possible, for evidence of roosting bats, which can include:

- ◆ The presence of live or dead bats.
- ◆ Bat droppings (distinguished from rat/mouse droppings by their crumbly texture).
- ◆ Staining from oily fur around access points.
- ◆ The presence of invertebrate feeding remains (butterfly/moth wings and beetle casings).

2.25 The tree was identified as a 'confirmed' bat roost if evidence of roosting bats was recorded. To confirm the species of bat present, a sample of any bat droppings recorded was collected and sent to Swift Ecology Ltd for DNA analysis.

2.26 The inspection was carried out systematically and consistently around all parts of each tree (from all angles and close to the trunk and further away). PRFs that can be exploited by bats include the following:

PRFs formed by disease and decay	PRFs formed by damage	PRFs formed by association
Woodpecker holes Squirrel holes Knot holes Pruning cuts Tear outs Wounds Cankers Compression Forks Butt rots	Lightning strikes Hazard beams Subsidence cracks Shearing cracks Transverse snaps Welds Lifting bark Desiccation Fissures Frost cracks	Fluting Ivy

Dormice

2.27 An assessment was conducted to evaluate the suitability of the habitats on site for the dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*), a small, nocturnal mammal which occupies habitats such as hedgerows, scrub, woodland and treelines. The dormouse requires good habitat connectivity and suitable food resources providing fruit, nuts, nectar and/or insects throughout the year.

Great crested newts

2.28 The habitats on site were assessed for their potential to support the great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) (GCN). GCN occupy both aquatic and terrestrial habitats, spending most of their life cycle on land and a short period of the year for breeding and egg-laying. Suitable terrestrial habitats can include grassland, woodland,

hedgerows, scrub, and tall herb communities; and suitable overwintering (hibernation) sites can include piles of materials such as rubble/logs and at the base of buildings/stone walls.

- 2.29 GCN are known to travel up to 500 metres (m) from their breeding sites; for this reason, an aerial assessment was made prior to the site visit to determine if any waterbodies were present onsite and around the site (offsite). Any accessible waterbodies were assessed under the Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) (Oldham et al, 2000, 2008) to determine the suitability of the waterbody to support great crested newts.

Reptiles and common amphibians

- 2.30 An appraisal of the habitats on site was conducted to evaluate their suitability for common British reptiles, such as slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*), common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*), grass snake (*Natrix helvetica*) and adder (*Vipera berus*), and common amphibians such as common frog (*Rana temporaria*).
- 2.31 Suitable habitats for reptiles and amphibians include those with a varied structure, offering a range of niches for basking and foraging. Typical habitats include rough and unmanaged grassland with shorter margins, heathland, woodland, scrub and ruderal vegetation. Potential overwintering (hibernation) sites can include piles of materials such as rubble/logs, rockeries and at the base of buildings/stone walls.

Survey limitations and assumptions

PEA, PRA and GLTA surveys

- 2.32 Evidence of crevice-dwelling bats may have been missed due to the concealed nature of bat roosts. Binoculars were used to identify any potential bat droppings on the exterior features of the buildings and/or trees.
- 2.33 The GLTA can be constrained by canopy cover and by the angle of the surveyor and some PRFs may not be visible from ground level. Where PRFs are present at height, these cannot be inspected from ground level.
- 2.34 An aerial search for waterbodies is constrained by the accuracy of OS maps. Several websites were accessed to minimize the chances of missing waterbodies, however,

garden ponds within residential properties are often unmapped and it is possible that waterbodies have been missed as part of this assessment.

- 2.35 The site visit provides a ‘snapshot’ of the site and does not take into account seasonal variation. Species may have been overlooked due to the constraints of the season and time in which the survey was undertaken. A lack of evidence of a species does not confirm its absence from site, rather there was no indication of its presence at the time of survey.

Assumptions and limitations – Statutory Biodiversity Metric

- 2.36 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric relies on outputs of biodiversity unit calculations which are not absolute values or scientifically precise. Therefore, the Metric and its outputs should be informed by a qualitative assessment and the Metric’s results interpreted within caution.
- 2.37 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric does not change the legislation afforded to biodiversity; individual species and protected/irreplaceable habitats are outside of the scope of the Metric and are addressed separately within this assessment.
- 2.38 The accuracy of habitat area measurements is limited by the form of baseline data collection and resolution of the proposed site plan. QGIS and Coreo have been used to calculate habitat areas which have been aligned with Google Maps satellite imagery and the proposed site plan.
- 2.39 Habitat condition for newly created habitats was assigned on a precautionary approach and with consideration of biological and operational phase conditions (i.e. which may limit the degree to which ‘good’ condition is likely to be reached).

Data validity and survey data lifespan

- 2.40 The data within this report should not be seen as comprehensive. Data obtained from the data search (SXBRC, 2024) is unlikely to provide a complete record of species within the search area. It is possible that a species may occur within the vicinity of the site that has not been identified within the data search.
- 2.41 Survey data is considered valid for 18 months from the survey date in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)

Advice note (CIEEM, 2019) due to the presence of and/or potential for mobile species to be present within the site.

- 2.42 Survey data is only intended for the proposals outlined within this report. If any material changes to the site occur and/or if the nature and/or extent of the proposed development changes, an update visit to reassess the site will be required, and any conclusions provided herein may not be relied upon.

3. Results

Desktop data search

Internationally, nationally and regionally protected (statutory) sites

- 3.1 MAGIC (MAGIC, 2025) was used to identify any international statutory sites located within 7.5km of the application site and national/local sites within 2km of the site. No statutory sites were identified within 7.5km of the site and no national/local sites were identified within 2km.

Locally designated (non-statutory) sites

- 3.2 SXBRC (2024) were consulted to provide results of any locally designated sites within 1km of the site. No locally designated sites were identified within 1km of the site.

Priority habitats

- 3.3 The nearest area of priority habitat is ‘Traditional orchard’ situated approximately 100m north of the site (MAGIC, 2025). No impacts are anticipated upon this habitat.

Protected, rare and vulnerable species

- 3.4 SXBRC (2024) was consulted to provide any records of protected/vulnerable species of interest as presented in the table below:

Common name	Taxonomic name	Number of records	Latest record	Nearest record to site
Amphibians and reptiles				
Common frog	<i>Rana temporaria</i>	3	2011	403m northwest
Common toad	<i>Bufo bufo</i>	1	2011	945m southeast
Grass snake	<i>Natrix helvetica</i>	3	2017	658m northeast
Great crested newt	<i>Triturus cristatus</i>	2	2011	570m southeast
Palmate newt	<i>Lissotriton helveticus</i>	4	2015	575m southeast
Slow worm	<i>Anguis fragilis</i>	1	2019	765m southwest
Smooth newt	<i>Lissotriton vulgaris</i>	3	2011	575m southeast
Fish				
Brown/sea trout	<i>Salmo trutta</i>	4	2012	300m northwest
European eel	<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>	6	2015	300m northwest
Bats				
Brown long-eared bat	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	5	2019	100m south
Common pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	3	2019	100m south
Long-eared bat species	<i>Plecotus sp.</i>	1	2019	100m south
Myotis species	<i>Myotis sp.</i>	1	2019	100m south

Noctule	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	1	2019	100m south
Nyctalus species	<i>Nyctalus sp.</i>	1	2019	100m south
Pipistrelle species	<i>Pipistrellus sp.</i>	1	2003	600m southeast
Serotine	<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>	1	2001	970m northwest
Soprano pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	1	2019	100m south
Birds				
Barn owl	<i>Tyto alba</i>	25	2022	490m southeast
Cetti's warbler	<i>Cettia cetti</i>	4	2015	Within 1km
Hobby	<i>Falco subbuteo</i>	2	2010	Within 1km
Kingfisher	<i>Alcedo atthis</i>	2	1999	130m west
Red kite	<i>Milvus milvus</i>	4	2022	Within 1km
Woodlark	<i>Lullula arborea</i>	7	2016	Within 1km
Flora				
Bluebell	<i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i>	7	2019	680m southwest
Corn buttercup	<i>Ranunculus arvensis</i>	1	1994	950m southwest
Tubular water-dropwort	<i>Oenanthe fistulosa</i>	1	2014	940m southeast
Invertebrates				
Brown hairstreak	<i>Thecla betulae</i>	14	2017	500m northwest
Cinnabar	<i>Tyris jacobaeae</i>	1	2019	1km southwest
Grizzled skipper	<i>Pyrgus malvae</i>	1	2012	Within 1km
Purple emperor	<i>Apatura iris</i>	1	2014	Within 1km
Small heath	<i>Coenonympha pamphilus</i>	10	2019	575m west
Wall	<i>Lasiommata megera</i>	1	2013	Within 1km
White admiral	<i>Limenitis camilla</i>	1	2012	Within 1km
Other mammals				
European polecat	<i>Mustela putorius</i>	1	2015	910m northeast
West European hedgehog	<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>	2	2013	480m south

- 3.5 The above records will be used to inform the assessment of the site and to inform the enhancement potential of the site for protected species.

Botanical survey (UKHab)

Habitats recorded on site

- 3.6 The following habitats were recorded within the site redline boundary (habitat map with species lists for each habitat are provided in Appendix D and photographs provided in Appendix E of this report):

Habitat	Primary UKHab code	Description and UKHAB secondary code(s)	Location within site
Modified grassland	g4	Parcel BA-B1 comprises horse-grazed paddocks (103). The northern section is seasonally wet (502). Parcel BA-B2 comprises a field of tall tussocky sward (128) and parcels BA-B3 comprise mown grass verges (106).	North, west and south.
Ruderal	g4	Areas of ruderal (81) are present within the modified grassland.	To the east of the site.

Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	u1c	Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface is present in the form of a gravel track (839).	To the east and south of the site.
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	h2a	A native hedgerow with trees (11) and a bank (111) (H1) is present onsite. The hedgerow measures approximately 115m in length, 3m in width and 2m in height.	North boundary of BA-B1.
Native hedgerow	h2a	A native hedgerow is present (H2). The hedgerow measures approximately 31m in length 2m in height and 3m in width.	To the northeast of the site.
Native hedgerows with trees	h2a	A native hedgerow with trees (11) (H3) is present onsite. The hedgerow measures approximately 22m in length 1m in width and 2m in height.	Eastern boundary.
Culvert	u1	A culvert (851) approximately 7m in length is present on-site.	East.

Impacts of development on onsite habitats

- 3.7 The proposed development will involve the removal of sections of artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface, modified grassland, ruderal, and hedgerow H2 as part of the development. The proposed plan will include developed land; sealed surface, other neutral grassland and species-rich native hedgerows.
- 3.8 The results of the metric are provided in Section 4 of this report.

Protected species assessment

Badgers

- 3.9 There are no records for badgers within 1km of the site (SXBRC, 2024) and no evidence to suggest badgers are using the site was recorded during the site visit. Therefore, badgers are not considered to be impacted by the proposals and are not discussed further in this assessment.

Barn owls and other nesting birds

- 3.10 No evidence of barn owls was present onsite, and this species is not considered to be impacted by the proposals; barn owls are not discussed further in this assessment.
- 3.11 No evidence of nesting birds was identified within the site, however, there is potential for nesting birds to be present within the hedgerows. A mitigation and enhancement strategy for nesting birds is detailed in Section 5.

Bats – roosting bats in buildings/trees

Trees

- 3.12 The trees within the hedgerows onsite were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats; all trees were considered to hold ‘negligible’ potential for roosting bats due to a lack of Potential Roost Features (PRFs) and/or due to their smaller size. No further action is recommended in relation to roosting bats and trees; however, further information is provided in Section 5 regarding the validity of the survey.

Bats – commuting/foraging habitats and lighting

- 3.13 The hedgerows onsite are considered to provide potential habitat for commuting and foraging bats.
- 3.14 A number of bat records exist within the surrounding area (SXBRC 2024). General lighting reduction measures are detailed in Section 5 for any new proposed lighting.

Dormice

- 3.15 The hedgerows surrounding the boundary were assessed for their potential to support dormice. The hedgerows onsite connect to the wider landscape, however, there are no known dormouse records within 1km of the site (SXBRC, 2024) and the nearest European Protected Species (EPS) licence for dormice is approximately 7.3km northeast of the site (MAGIC, 2025). ‘H2’ will be removed as part of the works. Due to the low risk of dormice being present, a works method statement will be followed for the removal of the hedgerow areas as a precaution and is detailed in Section 5.

Great crested newts

- 3.16 The site holds some limited potential for terrestrial and hibernating great crested newts (GCN) around the fringes of the site within the hedgerows, however, the majority of the site is short-grazed grass. An aerial assessment revealed one pond onsite (MAGIC, 2025); however, no pond was recorded onsite at the time of the site survey. There are two records for GCN within 1km of the site with the closest situated 570m southeast (SXBRC, 2024) and the site appears to fall in a ‘Red Zone’ for GCN under the NatureSpace District Level Licence (DLL) scheme (NatureSpace, 2025).

3.17 The site does not feature any ponds within the red line boundary; however, aerial assessment revealed eight ponds within 500m of the site (MAGIC, 2025), including one within the wider site ownership immediately adjacent to the site in the south. All other ponds were on private land and were considered inaccessible. A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment survey was formerly undertaken on the accessible pond on the 7th June 2019 during a survey of land to the south (offsite), the results of which are presented below:

Variable	Ref: Pond (offsite to the south)
SI1 - Location	1
SI2 - Pond area	0.2
SI3 - Pond drying	0.9
SI4 - Water quality	0.33
SI4 - Shade	1
SI6 - Fowl	0.67
SI7 - Fish	0.67
SI8 - Ponds	1
SI9 – Terrestrial habitat	0.33
SI10 - Macrophytes	0.35
HSI SCORE =	0.56

3.18 The pond adjacent scored 0.56 and holds ‘below average’ suitability for great crested newts (Oldham et al. 2000, 2008). eDNA sampling for great crested newts was conducted on the pond on the 7th June 2019 as part of a former survey and the pond returned a ‘negative’ result for great crested newts.

3.19 As the site is located within a ‘Red Zone’ for GCN, the local area is considered to support populations of this species and there is potential for the site to be used by GCN. Due to the proximity to waterbodies, the site could have GCN commuting across the site and any GCN could be killed/injured during construction activities. Although the habitats are considered to be unsuitable for GCN, the risk of an offence occurring is considered to be high and a District Level Licence (DLL) will be required to cover the works. A suitable mitigation plan is provided in Section 5 of this report, including details of the DLL.

Hedgehogs

3.20 Two hedgehog records are present, with the closest approximately 480m south of the site (SXBRC, 2024). The site possesses suitable commuting and foraging habitat for hedgehogs in the hedgerows and adjacent grassland. It is therefore considered

likely that hedgehogs utilise the site; hedgehogs are a priority species due to their historical population decline (Wembridge, D. *et al*, 2022). Therefore, mitigation for hedgehogs is provided in Section 5 of this report.

Reptiles and common amphibians

- 3.21 The site features limited habitats for reptiles and amphibians as the majority of the site comprises artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface, and short-grazed grassland which lacks any protective cover for reptiles. The hedgerows and ruderal vegetation may hold potential for reptiles and common amphibians and therefore these species will be addressed during site clearance works as detailed in Section 5.

4. Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation results

DEFRA Biodiversity Metric calculation

- 4.1 A DEFRA Biodiversity Metric calculation (Natural England, 2025a) was undertaken to estimate the projected habitat gains / losses from the proposed development. A full copy of the Calculation Tool accompanies this report and must be read in conjunction with this report.

Baseline habitats

- 4.2 A baseline (existing) habitats plan is provided in Appendix E and photographs in Appendix D of this report. Habitat Condition Assessments are provided in Appendix F providing the habitat condition score for each habitat type and habitat parcel recorded on-site.

Relevant date for baseline of the site

- 4.3 The relevant date for the baseline of the site is taken to be the 21st May 2024; no site clearance is believed to have occurred on-site prior to the site visit.

Baseline habitats present on-site

- 4.4 Baseline habitats present within the site are listed in the table below:

Habitat type	Habitat parcel reference	Area (ha) / length (km)	Strategic significance	Habitat condition	Habitat units
<i>Area habitats</i>					
Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface	BA-A	0.1653	Not in local strategy	n/a	0
Modified grassland	BA-B1	0.9805	Not in local strategy	Moderate	3.92
	BA-B2	0.4	Not in local strategy	Poor	0.80
	BA-B3	0.078	Not in local strategy	Poor	0.16
Ruderal/ephemeral	BA-C	0.0432	Not in local strategy	Good	0.26
Total units =					5.14 units
<i>Hedgerow habitats</i>					
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	H1	0.212	Not in local strategy	Good	3.82

Habitat type	Habitat parcel reference	Area (ha) / length (km)	Strategic significance	Habitat condition	Habitat units
Native hedgerow	H2	0.031	Not in local strategy	Good	0.19
Native hedgerow with trees	H3	0.022	Not in local strategy	Moderate	0.18
Total units =					4.18 units
<i>Watercourse habitats</i>					
Culvert	BA-W1	0.007	Not in local strategy	Poor	0.01
Total units =					0.01

Proposed habitats

- 4.5 A proposed (post-development) habitats plan is provided in Appendix E and habitat condition assessment criteria is detailed in Appendix F; proposed on-site habitats are presented in the table below:

Habitat type			Habitat parcel reference	Area / length	Proposed Strategic significance	Proposed Habitat condition	Criteria targeted	Habitat units
<i>Area habitats</i>								
Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface			BA-A	0.1457	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	0
Modified grassland			BA-B1	0.7876	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	3.15
Modified grassland			BA-B3	0.078	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	0.16
Modified grassland in poor condition	To	Other neutral grassland in moderate condition	PR-D	0.4	Not in a local strategy	Moderate	Expected to pass criteria A-E. Through sowing of an appropriate seed mix, appropriate management practices and only planting native species.	2.48
Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface			PR-A	0.225	Not in local strategy	n/a	n/a	0

Habitat type	Habitat parcel reference	Area / length	Proposed Strategic significance	Proposed Habitat condition	Criteria targeted	Habitat units
Developed land; sealed surface	PR-B	0.0235	Not in local strategy	n/a	n/a	0
Modified grassland	PR-C	0.0073	Not in local strategy	Poor	Expected to pass criteria B-G through the existing management practices of retained BA-B1. Previously ruderal, expected to become modified grassland after the removal of H2.	0.01
Total units projected from retention =						3.31 units
Total units projected from enhancement =						2.48 units
Total units projected from creation =						0.01 units
Total units =						5.8 units
<i>Hedgerow habitats</i>						
Native hedgerow with trees	H1	0.209	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	3.76
Native hedgerow with trees	H3	0.022	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	0.18
Species rich native hedgerow with trees – associated with ditch	PR-H4	0.049	Not in local strategy	Moderate	Expected to pass criteria A1/A2, B1/B2, D1/D2 and E2 through appropriate management practices and planting only native species. PR-W2, to be created, will be the associated ditch.	0.55
Species rich native hedgerow	PR-H5	0.079	Not in local strategy	Moderate	Expected to pass criteria A1/A2,	0.53

Habitat type	Habitat parcel reference	Area / length	Proposed Strategic significance	Proposed Habitat condition	Criteria targeted	Habitat units
					B1/B2, D1/D2 through appropriate management practices and only planting native species.	
Species rich native hedgerow	PR-H6	0.171	Not in local strategy	Moderate	Expected to pass criteria A1/A2, B1/B2, D1/D2 through appropriate management practices and only planting native species.	1.14
Total units projected from retention =						3.94 units
Total units projected from creation =						2.22 units
Total units =						6.16 units
Watercourse habitats						
Culvert	BA-W1	0.007	Not in local strategy	Retained in current condition	Retained in current condition	0.01
Ditches	PR-W2	0.049	Not in local strategy	Poor	Expected to pass criteria E, G and H through appropriate management practices, creating the ditch away from a heavily shaded area and only planting native species. PR-H4, to be created, will be an associated hedgerow.	0.10
Total units projected from retention =						0.01
Total units projected from creation =						0.10
Total units =						0.11

Strategic significance

- 4.9 A search was undertaken on the West Sussex Local Habitat Map (West Sussex County Council, 2025) and West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Strategy Draft for Consultation (West Sussex County Council, 2025) to determine if any proposed habitats are in a strategic area for habitat creation.
- 4.10 None of the proposed habitats were considered to fall within the local strategy based on their location and/or habitat type. Therefore, all proposed habitats were assigned a low strategic significance (i.e. not in a local strategy).

Headline results

- 5.1 The headline results presenting the projected overall net loss/gain for the site is presented in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1: DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric headline results

FINAL RESULTS		
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.66
	Hedgerow units	1.98
	Watercourse units	0.10
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	12.92%
	Hedgerow units	47.46%
	Watercourse units	998.35%
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓	

Interpretation of results

- 5.2 Based upon the current proposals, there is anticipated to be an overall combined net unit change of +0.66 habitat units, +1.98 hedgerow units and +0.10 watercourse units; this is equivalent to a net % change of +12.92% in habitat units, +47.46% in hedgerow units and +998.35% in watercourse units post-development.
- 5.3 Therefore, a minimum 10% net gain is anticipated to be achievable as part of the development; it is considered that the development will be compliant with Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021 and relevant planning policy provided that the new habitats are implemented and maintained effectively.
- 5.4 As the proposed habitats/hedgerows/watercourse are very high and medium distinctiveness and contribute significantly to the site's biodiversity net gain uplift, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and a legal agreement will be

required to secure the long-term management of the habitats. A Biodiversity Gain Plan will also be required to discharge the Biodiversity Gain Condition; refer to Section 5 for further details.

5. Biodiversity mitigation and enhancement plan

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) – habitat gains/losses

- 5.1 Based upon the current proposals, there is anticipated to be an overall combined net unit change of +0.66 habitat units, +1.98 hedgerow units and +0.10 watercourse units; this is equivalent to a net % change of +12.92% in habitat units, +47.46% in hedgerow units and +998.35% in watercourse units post-development.

Requirements to discharge the biodiversity gain condition of planning permission

- 5.2 Based upon the proposed habitat interventions, the mandatory minimum 10% net gain requirement as required under the Environment Act 2021 is anticipated to be met.

Biodiversity Gains Plan, Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and legal agreement

- 5.3 A biodiversity gain condition will be applied to the planning consent, and a Biodiversity Gains Plan must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) by the applicant. The Biodiversity Gains Plan is a mechanism to ensure the post-development biodiversity value of the development's on-site habitat is accurate based on the approved plans and drawings; and any offsite biodiversity gains have been registered and allocated to the development; and/or biodiversity credits, if necessary, have been purchased.
- 5.4 A legal agreement will also be required, such as a Section 106 Agreement, and where there are 'significant' on-site gains (this includes habitats of 'medium' or higher distinctiveness), a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will also be required; the HMMP details how the on-site habitats will be created, managed and secured over a minimum 30-year period. The habitats will be subject to habitat monitoring over the 30-year period to ensure that the anticipated condition of the habitat is being met; monitoring reports will need to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA).
- 5.5 These documents must be supplied to the LPA to discharge the Biodiversity Gain Condition.

Bats

Roosting bats:

- 5.6 The PRA of the trees was undertaken, and all trees were considered to hold ‘negligible potential’ for roosting bats due to a lack of suitable bat roosting provisions and potential access points.
- 5.7 It must be noted that the PRA provides a ‘snapshot’ of the conditions at the time of survey and does not account for seasonal changes. It is always possible for bat species to ingress at any point in the future, and therefore it is recommended that if 18 months pass and no works have been undertaken, and/or if the condition of the trees changes, an update PRA is undertaken to assess whether the potential of the trees to support roosting bats has altered.
- 5.8 In the unlikely event bat(s) are encountered at any stage, work will cease and Natural England or a suitably qualified bat ecologist must be sought for advice by the applicant/landowner. The applicant must be aware of the severe penalties associated with bat crimes and their legal obligation to report this information.
- 5.9 In the event a bat is discovered, the nature of the advice will concern allowing the bat(s) to leave on their own accord or waiting for a licensed person to remove the bat(s). A bat licence may then be deemed necessary following the necessary survey work. **All contractors are explicitly forbidden from handling bats or interfering with bats in any way.**

Artificial lighting and bats:

- 5.10 The site likely supports commuting and foraging bats and the following luminaire specifications must be adhered to for any proposed new lighting around the site and is based on the ‘Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night’ Guidance Note BN08/23 (BCT & ILP, 2023):
- ◆ Preferably, no external light fixtures will be installed. If external lighting is required, this will be limited and only installed where required for safety purposes. No external luminaires will be installed where these will cast light spill onto surrounding vegetation such as mature trees.

- ◆ All luminaires will lack UV elements when manufactured. Metal halide, compact fluorescent sources will not be used.
- ◆ LED luminaires only will be used due to their sharp cut-off, lower intensity, good colour rendition and dimming capability.
- ◆ A warm white light source (2700Kelvin or lower) will be adopted to reduce blue light component.
- ◆ Light sources will feature peak wavelengths higher than 550nm to avoid the component of light most disturbing to bats (Stone, 2012).
- ◆ Column heights must be carefully considered to minimise light spill and glare visibility. This must be balanced with the potential for increased numbers of columns and upward light reflectance.
- ◆ Only luminaires with a negligible or zero Upward Light Ratio, and with good optical control, will be used.
- ◆ Luminaires must always be mounted horizontally, with no light output above 90° and/or no upward tilt.
- ◆ External security lighting will be set on motion sensors and set to a 1-minute timer.
- ◆ Any bollard lighting will not be installed within 5m of the hedgerows.
- ◆ Bollard or low-level downward-directional luminaires will not be installed. This is due to a considerable range of issues, such as unacceptable glare, poor illumination efficiency, unacceptable upward light output, and increased upward light scatter from surfaces.
- ◆ Only if all other options have been explored, accessories such as baffles, hoods or louvres can be used to reduce light spill and direct it only to where it is needed. However, due to the lensing and fine cut-off control of the beam inherent in modern LED luminaires, the effect of cowls and baffles is often far less than anticipated and must not be relied upon solely.

Vegetation clearance - dormice, GCN, reptiles and nesting birds

- 5.11 The site falls within a 'Red Risk Zone' for GCN (NatureSpace, 2025). An enquiry with NatureSpace will need to be made to determine if a District Level Licence (DLL) is obtainable for the site. The DLL will be sought prior to works commencing.
- 5.12 The following strategy will address planned works for clearance of vegetation on site, and any potential dormice, nesting birds, great crested newts (GCN) and reptiles within the application site.
- 5.13 The hedgerows on site are considered to provide potential habitat for dormice, however, the potential for dormice is considered to be low due to the small amount of hedge to be removed. There is also potential for nesting birds and GCN/reptiles to be present in the hedgerows on site. A works method statement will be followed and is considered appropriate due to the limited amount of sub-optimal habitat impacted upon:

Pre-construction phase:

- Supervision of the works will be undertaken by an experienced licensed worker which will be provided alongside a 'toolbox talk' on dormouse, GCN, reptiles and nesting birds ecology. The talk will inform the site contractors on when to stop at signs of hibernating dormice, what to do if a reptile/amphibian/dormouse/nesting bird is found and measures of best practice to reduce any harm to dormice, nesting birds, GCN and reptiles within the area.
- The licensed worker will undertake a pre-works survey of the area which will include a fingertip search of any holes in stems and careful checks of the stumps looking for dormice. If a dormouse is recorded at this stage works must stop and a licence must be sought from Natural England, following any required survey work.
- To prevent harm to any dormice within the local area, the hedgerows being impacted will be felled to 0.5m stumps/0.5m in height between the months of **November and February** (to also avoid the nesting bird season) when the low temperatures are at least 5°C. This will also ensure protection of any potential GCN/reptiles leaving the stumps/ground vegetation cover in-situ.

- As dormice/GCN/reptiles will be hibernating at ground level during the winter period, the trees will be felled to 0.5m stumps to ensure the dormice (and amphibians) have safe hibernation sites throughout the winter. To prevent harm to hibernating dormice and GCN/reptiles, this will be done by hand where possible with limbs being removed in sections and lowered to the ground rather than by machine which can kill any hibernating animals.
- Removal of the stumps of the hedgerow will only occur when GCN/reptiles are active and within ponds between months of **March-June**.
- If a GCN/dormouse is discovered at any stage, all works will cease immediately, and a licence will be sought following the relevant survey work.
- If an active bird's nest is encountered, works will cease immediately, and the nest will be left undisturbed. The ecologist will instate a minimum 5m works exclusion buffer zone marked out with red/white hazard tape and a second site visit by the ecologist to check the status of the nest will be required before works can continue in this area. Works may only continue when the nest is deemed to be unoccupied/no longer active by the ecologist.
- **A completion statement detailing the findings from the site clearance must be provided to the Local Planning Authority by the project ecologist following the works.**
- **If a bird's nest, dormouse and/or amphibian/reptile is encountered at any other unsupervised time, all works in the area must cease immediately the ecologist must be contacted immediately to provide further advice.**

Hedgehogs

5.14 Hedgehogs are considered likely to be using the site during the nocturnal hours and the following measures will be followed:

- ◆ To prevent hedgehogs from becoming entrapped, any trenches must have a ramp installed or must be covered over to prevent overnight entrapment.
- ◆ Any materials must be stockpiled off the ground on pallets to ensure hedgehogs do not take refuge within them.

- ◆ Additionally, if any new close-boarded fencing/boundaries are proposed as part of the development, a minimum of one specialised hedgehog ‘gravel board’ or 13cm x 13cm custom-made hole will be provided within every boundary to allow for the free movement of hedgehogs.

Biodiversity enhancement

- 5.15 To ensure the application is compliant with national and local planning policy, one ‘Vivara Pro Woodstone House Sparrow Nest Box’ (<https://www.nhbs.com/vivara-pro-woodstone-house-sparrow-nest-box>) will be installed on the new barn on the western elevation as close to the eaves as possible.

6. References

- Baker, J., Blyth, N., Edmonds, B., Girvan, M., Harwood, N., Hayns, S., Jenkins, O., Saponja, A., Small, M., and Wansbury, C. (2019). *Biodiversity Net Gain Good practice principles for development: A practical guide*. Accessed from: <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf>
- Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) and Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) (2023). *Bats and Artificial Lighting At Night' Guidance Note BN08/23*. Accessed from: <https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/>
- British Standards Institution (BSI) (2021). *BS 8683:2021 Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain – Specification*.
- CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2017). *Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (second edition)*. Accessed from: <https://cieem.net/resource/guidelines-for-ecological-report-writing/>
- CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2018). *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland*. Accessed from: <https://cieem.net/resource/guidelines-for-ecological-impact-assessment-ecia/>
- CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2019). *Advice Note On The Lifespan Of Ecological Reports & Surveys*. Accessed from: <https://cieem.net/resource/advice-note-on-the-lifespan-of-ecological-reports-and-surveys/>
- CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) (2021). *Biodiversity Net Gain Report & Audit Templates (Version 1)*. Accessed from: <https://cieem.net/resource/biodiversity-net-gain-report-and-audit-templates/>
- Collins, J (ed) (2023). *Bat Surveys for Professionals Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London. Accessed from: <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/09/bat-surveys-for--ecologists-good-practice-guidelines-4th-edition-launched>
- Coreo (2024). *Coreo application*.
- Department for Communities and Local Government (2005). *Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System*.
- Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (2024). *The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*.
- GOV.UK (2025) *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool – macro disabled*. Accessed from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>
- JNCC (The Joint Nature Conservation Committee) (2016). *UK BAP priority habitats*.
- JNCC (The Joint Nature Conservation Committee) (2016). *UK BAP priority terrestrial mammal species*.

MAGIC (2025). *Search for Priority Habitat Inventory habitats, EPS licences, GCN ponds and statutory sites around Wyndham Farm, Henfield.* Accessed from: <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

Mid Sussex District Council (2014). *Mid Sussex District Plan, Mid Sussex 2014-2036.*

Naturespace (2025). *GCN Risk Zones.* Accessed from: <https://naturespaceuk.com/>

Natural England (2025¹). *QGIS Template.* Accessed from: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720>

Natural England (2025²). *QGIS Template and QGIS Import Tool User Guide.* Accessed from: <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720>

Oldham, R.S., Brady, L.D., Sewell, D.L. & Baker J.M.R. (2008). *ARG UK Advice Note 5: Great Crested Newt Habitat Suitability Index.* Amphibian and Reptile Groups of the United Kingdom.

Oldham, R.S., Keeble, J., Swan, M.J.S. & Jeffcote, M. (2000). *Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (Triturus cristatus).* Herpetological Journal 10 (4), 143-155.

QGIS.org (2022). *QGIS Geographic Information System – Version 3.28.6-Firenze.* QGIS Association.

Stone, E.L., Jones, G., Harris, S. (2012). *Conserving energy at a cost to biodiversity? Impacts of LED lighting on bats.* Glob. Change Biol. 18, 2458–2465.

Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SXBRC) (2024), *1km Data search around Wyndham farm, Henfield.*

UKHab Ltd (2023¹). *UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0.* Accessed from: <http://www.ukhab.org/>


UKHab Ltd (2023²). *UK Habitat Classification Field Key.* Accessed from: <http://www.ukhab.org/>

Wembridge, D., Johnson, G., Al-Fulaij, N., & Langton, S. (2022). *The State of Britain's Hedgehogs 2022.* British Hedgehog Preservation Society (BHPS) and People's Trust for Endangered Species (PTES). Accessed from: <https://www.hedgehogstreet.org/about-our-hedgehog-street-campaign/stateof/>


West Sussex County Council (2025). *West Sussex Local Habitat Map.* Accessed from: https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/d51975866ca1413d927e74f701fdb8a0/page/Page?views=Map-Layers#data_s=id%3AdataSource_2-1995ceebaec-layer-84-1995ceea029-layer-82~dataSource_2-199582aad0a-layer-42-1995ce41cf3-layer-67%3A2


West Sussex County Council (2025). *West Sussex Local Nature Recovery Strategy.* Accessed from: <https://www.sussexnaturerecovery.org.uk/media/2025/12/Part%202%20LNR%20West%20Sussex.pdf>

Appendix A – Site location plan




Appendix B – Proposed plans






Plan
1:100



Roof Plan
1:100



South Elevation
1:100



West Elevation
1:100



North Elevation
1:100



East Elevation
1:100

revision	initials	date
C	File revised	20.03.20
B	Design	15.03.20
A	Design	22.03.20

Contractors, Sub-Contractors and Suppliers are to check all relevant dimensions and levels of site and buildings before commencing any shop drawings or building work.

This drawing is copyright and may not be reproduced in any part of form without the written consent of Fowler Architecture and Planning.

project
THE FOAL BARN

drawing
Stable Design

scale
1:100 @A1

drawn by
db

date
April '24

180506-501

drawing no.

C

rev

FOWLER

ARCHITECTURE & PLANNING

39 High Street

Pewsey

Wiltshire

SN9 5AF

tel (01672) 569444

fax (01672) 569488

enquiries@faap.co.uk



Appendix C – Relevant legislation and planning policy

Legislation and UK BAP priority habitats/species

Legislation

In England, all bats, dormice (*Muscardinus avellanarius*), otters (*Lutra lutra*), white-clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*) and great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*) are legally protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

A number of species are also listed under Annex II of the EC Habitats and Species Directive (1992), including barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*), Bechstein's bat (*Myotis bechsteinii*), greater horseshoe (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*), lesser horseshoe (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*), great crested newt, white-clawed crayfish and otter.

The above named species and adders (*Vipera berus*), slow worms (*Anguis fragilis*), grass snakes (*Natrix helvetica*), common lizards (*Zootoca vivipara*), common frog (*Rana temporaria*), palmate newt (*Lissotriton helveticus*), smooth newt (*Lissotriton vulgaris*), water voles (*Arvicola amphibius*) and several invertebrate species are also protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) (1981) (as amended). Schedule 9 of the WCA (1981) includes non-native, invasive species including (but not limited to) Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) and signal crayfish (*Pacifastacus leniusculus*). Badgers (*Meles meles*) are legally protected under The Protection of Badgers Act (1992).

All birds, their nests and eggs are protected under Section 1 of The WCA (1981) (as amended) and it is thus an offence, to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird; intentionally take, and damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built.

A number of sites designated for nature conservation are afforded legal protection due to being of European importance. These include Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) (protected under the EC Habitats and Species Directive (1992), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for birds (protected under the EC Birds Directive) and Ramsar (Ramsar Convention, 1975). Other protected sites include Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and Protected Road Verges which are designated under the WCA (1981) and strengthened by The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) (2006).

SPAs and SACs were previously included in the Natura 2000 sites and following amendments to the legislation, are now included under the 'National Site Network'. Ramsar sites do not form part of the 'National Site Network' however, are afforded the same protection. These changes allow the Government to continue commitment to the international commitments under the Bern Convention, the Oslo and Paris Conventions (OSPAR), Bonn and Ramsar Conventions.

Following a consultation in 2019, the Government announced that it would mandate Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for developments in England to reverse the widespread loss of biodiversity. The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 will be amended and the Environment Bill received Royal Assent on 9th November 2021; this legislation was enacted into law on the 12th February 2024.

Schedule 14 Parts 1 and 2 of The Environment Act 2021 concerns BNG as a condition of planning permission.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities, 2024) sets out requirements for the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), and this is supported within Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The Natural Environment PPG addresses principles targeting biodiversity conservation, including individual site and species protection through to supporting ecosystem services, and the use of Ecological Networks to support the national Nature Recovery Network. In particular, the PPG promotes the delivery of measurable BNG through the creation and enhancement of habitats alongside development.

UK BAP priority species and habitats

Several species and habitats are listed under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) (JNCC, 2016) as priority habitats/species due to their vulnerability or rarity as listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006) and Section 40 places a duty on all public authorities to conserve biodiversity. These are known as habitats / species of 'principal importance' under Section 41 of the NERC Act (2006).

These include several terrestrial and freshwater habitats, including some hedgerows and streams, and several species such as hedgehogs (*Erinaceus europaeus*), barbastelle, Bechstein's bat, both species of horseshoe bat, brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*), water voles, white-clawed crayfish and otter.

National and local planning policy

NPPF – The National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities, 2024) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. In the context of this report, Section 15 of NPPF is relevant and applicable, Section 15 states:

'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.'

New developments and projects are supported where plans promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue measurable net gains for biodiversity.

To ensure this application is compliant with Section 15 of NPPF, habitat enhancements will be required to demonstrate a biodiversity net gain as an outcome of the development.

Section 15 of NPPF also gives consideration to sites with potential to impact on irreplaceable habitats, and states:

'Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.'

To ensure this application is compliant with Section 15, this application should be accompanied by a suitable arboricultural report to assess the presence of potential ancient or veteran trees.

The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031

The Mid Sussex District Plan (2014-2031) (Mid Sussex District Council, 2014) Policy DP38 Biodiversity states the following:

'Biodiversity will be protected and enhanced by ensuring development:

- Contributes and takes opportunities to improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity and green infrastructure, so that there is a net gain in biodiversity, including through creating new designated sites and locally relevant habitats, and incorporating biodiversity features within developments; and*
- Protects existing biodiversity, so that there is no net loss of biodiversity. Appropriate measures should be taken to avoid and reduce disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Unavoidable damage to biodiversity must be*

offset through ecological enhancements and mitigation measures (or compensation measures in exceptional circumstances); and •

- Minimises habitat and species fragmentation and maximises opportunities to enhance and restore ecological corridors to connect natural habitats and increase coherence and resilience; and*
- Promotes the restoration, management and expansion of priority habitats in the District; and*
- Avoids damage to, protects and enhances the special characteristics of internationally designated Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation; nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and locally designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserves and Ancient Woodland or to other areas identified as being of nature conservation or geological interest, including wildlife corridors, aged or veteran trees, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, and Nature Improvement Areas.*

Designated sites will be given protection and appropriate weight according to their importance and the contribution they make to wider ecological networks.

Valued soils will be protected and enhanced, including the best and most versatile agricultural land, and development should not contribute to unacceptable levels of soil pollution.

Geodiversity will be protected by ensuring development prevents harm to geological conservation interests, and where possible, enhances such interests. Geological conservation interests include Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites’.

Appendix D – Habitat maps and species lists

Baseline habitat map



Project name:	The Foal Barn
Client:	Sarah Platt
Produced by:	EP
Scale:	1:1300 @A3
Date produced:	09/01/2026
Drawing no:	001-090126SP
Revision no:	00

Species lists for habitats:

Common name	Taxonomic name	DAFOR scale abundance
Native hedgerow with trees associated with a bank or ditch (H1) (h2a 11):		
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	Abundant
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.	Frequent
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Occasional
Cleavers	<i>Gallium aparine</i>	Rare
Common nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Frequent
Cow parsley	<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>	Occasional
Creeping thistle	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Rare
Curled dock	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Rare
Dog-rose	<i>Rosa canina</i>	Occasional
Field maple	<i>Acer campestre</i>	Occasional
Garlic mustard	<i>Alliaria petiolate</i>	Rare
Grey willow	<i>Salix cinerea</i>	Occasional
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Dominant
Hedge bindweed	<i>Calystegia sepium</i>	Occasional
Hemlock water-dropwort	<i>Oenanthe crocata</i>	Rare
Hogweed	<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>	Occasional
Lesser burdock	<i>Arctium minus</i>	Rare
Meadow buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	Rare
Rough meadow-grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Frequent
Spindle	<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	Rare
Native hedgerow (H2) (h2a):		
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	Abundant
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.	Frequent
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Occasional
Cleavers	<i>Gallium aparine</i>	Occasional
Common nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Frequent
Cow parsley	<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>	Occasional
Dog-rose	<i>Rosa canina</i>	Occasional
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	Dominant
Hedge bindweed	<i>Calystegia sepium</i>	Occasional
Hogweed	<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>	Occasional
Lesser burdock	<i>Arctium minus</i>	Rare
Meadow buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	Rare
Rough Meadow-grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Frequent
Spindle	<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>	Rare
Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	Occasional
Native hedgerow with trees (H3) (h2a 11):		
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>	Dominant
Cleavers	<i>Gallium aparine</i>	Occasional
Curled dock	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Occasional
Dog-rose	<i>Rosa canina</i>	Occasional
Dogwood	<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>	Occasional
Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	Occasional
Hedge bindweed	<i>Calystegia sepium</i>	Occasional
Hemlock water-dropwort	<i>Oenanthe crocata</i>	Occasional
Ivy	<i>Hedera helix</i>	Frequent
Ornamental bluebell	<i>Hyacinthoides</i> sp.	Frequent
Pedunculate oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>	Occasional
Modified grassland (BA-B1) (g4 103 502):		
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Frequent
Common fleabane	<i>Pulicaria dysenterica</i>	Rare
Common nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Locally occasional
Creeping bent	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>	Abundant
Creeping buttercup	<i>Ranunculus repens</i>	Frequent
Creeping thistle	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Locally frequent
Curled dock	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Rare
Daisy	<i>Bellis perennis</i>	Rare

Greater plantain	<i>Plantago major</i>	Rare
Herb-Robert	<i>Geranium robertianum</i>	Rare
Meadow buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	Locally occasional
Ribwort plantain	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	Occasional
Rough meadow-grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Occasional
Soft rush	<i>Juncus effusus</i>	Rare
Spear thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	Locally occasional
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>	Occasional
Wild parsnip	<i>Pastinaca sativa</i>	Rare
Yorkshire-fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	Dominant
Modified grassland (BA-B2) (g4 128):		
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Rare
Cock's-foot	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>	Occasional
Creeping buttercup	<i>Ranunculus repens</i>	Occasional
Dandelion species	<i>Taraxacum agg.</i>	Abundant
Hard rush	<i>Juncus inflexus</i>	Rare
Perennial rye-grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	Occasional
Rough meadow-grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Abundant
Soft rush	<i>Juncus effusus</i>	Occasional
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>	Occasional
Yorkshire-fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	Abundant
Modified grassland (BA-B3) (g4 106):		
Annual meadow-grass	<i>Poa annua</i>	Occasional
Creeping buttercup	<i>Ranunculus repens</i>	Occasional
Daisy	<i>Bellis perennis</i>	Occasional
Dandelion species	<i>Taraxacum agg.</i>	Occasional
Perennial rye-grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	Abundant
Ribwort plantain	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	Occasional
Ruderal (BA-C) (g4 81):		
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Occasional
Common nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	Occasional
Mugwort	<i>Artemisia vulgaris</i>	Rare
Rough meadow-grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	Occasional
Spear thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	Occasional
Wild parsnip	<i>Pastinaca sativa</i>	Dominant
Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	Occasional

Post-development habitat map



Appendix E – Photographs



Photo 1: Modified grassland in the centre of the site (BA-B1).



Photo 2: Modified grassland to the east of the site (BA-B1).



Photo 3: Area of ruderal (BA-C) to the east of the site.



Photo 4: Modified grassland to the east of the site (BA-B1).



Photo 5: Gravel track (BA-A) to the south of the area.



Photo 6: Northern area of modified grassland (BA-B2).



Photo 7: Native hedgerow with trees – associated with a bank ('H1').



Photo 9: Native hedgerow ('H2').



Photo 9: Native hedgerow with trees ('H3').



Photo 10: Pond present offsite to the south.

Appendix F – Condition assessments

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)					
UKHab Habitat Type:					
Grassland - Modified grassland					
UKHab – see UK Habitat Classification					
On-site or off-site / site name and location:	The Foal Barn, onsite	Survey date and surveyor name:		21 st May 2024 Phil Smith and Georgia Linter	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey):		-	
Limitations applicable) (if	-	Habitat parcel reference:			
		BA-B1	BA-B2	BA-B3	
		Grid reference:			
Condition Assessment Criteria		See map for grassland locations			Notes (such as justification)
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)			
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs (these 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.	Y	N	N	
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.	N	N	N	

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.	Y	Y	Y	
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.	N	Y	N	
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	N	Y	Y	
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Y	Y	Y	
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	Y	Y	Y	
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No):		Y	N	N	
Number of criteria passed:		4	5	4	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓			
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)				
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	✓			
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)		✓	✓	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score					
Footnotes:					
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> .					
Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.					
Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.					
Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).					

Condition Sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Types														
Habitat Type:														
Native hedgerow Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Native hedgerow with trees Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch Species-rich native hedgerow Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Species-rich native hedgerow with trees Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch														
UKhab – see UK Habitat Classification														
On-site or off-site / site name and location:		On-Site – The Foal Barn	Survey date and surveyor name:		21/05/2024 – Phil Smith ACIEEM & Georgia Linter									
			Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey):		-									
Condition Assessment Details:														
A series of ten attributes, representing key physical characteristics are used for this assessment. Each attribute is assigned to one of five functional groups (A – E) and the condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of attributes from these functional groups which pass or fail the 'favourable condition' criteria. This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook¹ and Favourable Conservation Status document². For further clarification please refer to the Hedgerow Survey Handbook. Best practice would be to record the species, age, spacing and other key information about all trees present along a hedgerow within the 'Habitat Description' box, as well as other key features of the hedgerow.														
Limitations (if applicable)		-	Habitat parcel reference:											
			H1	H2	H3									
			Grid reference:											
Hedgerow favourable condition attributes:			See map for hedge locations											
Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D and E)		Criteria - the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Criteria description	Criterion passed (Yes or No):										Notes (such as justification):
Core groups - applicable to all hedgerow types:														
A1.	Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of the shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and	Y	Y	Y								

		undisturbed ground.	does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.												
D1.	Invasive and neophyte 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.	Recently introduced species refer to plants that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives. For information on archaeophytes and neophytes see the JNCC website ⁴ , as well as the BSBI website ⁵ where the 'Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora' ⁶ contains an up-to-date list of the status of species. For information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website ⁷ .	Y	Y	Y									
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 (for example, excessive hedgerow cutting).	N	N	N									
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only:															
E1.	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young,	This criterion addresses if there are a range of age-classes or morphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide	Y		Y									

		mature, veteran and or ancient ⁸), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	opportunities for different species.											
E2.	Tree health	At least 95% of hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). 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.	This criterion identifies if the trees are subject to damage which compromises the survival and health of the individual specimens.	Y		N								

The hedgerow condition assessment generates a weighting (score) ranging from 1 - 3, which is used within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The scores for each are set out in the tables below:

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees:

Category:	Category requirements:	Metric score:	Score Achieved x/✓										
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 (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).	2											
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes; OR Fails both	1											

	attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).													
Condition categories for hedgerows with trees:														
Category:	Category requirements:	Metric score:	Score Achieved ×/✓											
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3	✓											
Moderate	No more than 5 failures in total; AND Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 and E1 = Moderate condition).	2			✓									
Poor	Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; OR Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1												
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score:														
Footnotes:														
Footnote 1 – DEFRA (2007) Hedgerow Survey Handbook. A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK. [online] Available on: layout (hedgelink.org.uk) Footnote 2 – STALEY, J.T. ET AL. (2020) Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows. [online] Available on: Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows - RP2943 (naturalengland.org.uk) Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Footnote 4 – CHEFFINGS, C. M. et al. (2005) The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain. Species Status 7: 1-116. [online] Available on: The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain (Species Status No. 7) JNCC Resource Hub Footnote 5 – BOTANICAL SOCIETY OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND (BSBI). Definitions: wild, native or alien? [online] Available on: Definitions: wild, native or alien? – Botanical Society of Britain & Ireland (bsbi.org) Footnote 6 – BSBI and Biological Records Centre (BRC) (2022) Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora. [online] Available on: Acknowledgements Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora (brc.ac.uk) Footnote 7 – GB NON-NATIVE SPECIES SECRETARIAT (GBNNS) (2022) Available on: Home » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org) Footnote 8 – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from: Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk) and Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)														


Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Types												
Habitat Types:												
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs Urban - Allotments Urban - Biodiverse green roof Urban - Bioswale Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards Urban - Facade-bound green wall Urban - Ground based green wall Urban - Intensive green roof Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land Urban - Rain garden Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS) Urban - Vacant or derelict land Urban - Bare ground"												
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats: ukhab – UK Habitat Classification												
On-site or off-site / site name and location:	On-site – The Foal Barn	Survey date and surveyor name:		21/05/2024 – Phil Smith ACIEEM & Georgia Linter								
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey):		-								
Limitations applicable (if -	-	Habitat parcel reference:										
		BA-C	BA-C									
		Grid reference:										
Condition Assessment Criteria		See map for urban habitat locations										Notes (such as justification)
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										
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.	Y	Y									
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.	Y	Y									
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ¹) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) ² cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area ³ . Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).	Y	Y									
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land only:												

D	The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS: - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i); Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.												
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for Bioswale and SuDS habitat types only:													
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife ⁴ .												
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Intensive green roofs only:													
F	The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Biodiverse green roofs only:													
G	The roof has a varied depth of 80 – 150 mm; at least 50% is at 150 mm and is planted and seeded with wildflowers and sedums or is pre-prepared with sedums and wildflowers. Note – to achieve Good condition some additional habitat, such as sand piles, stones, logs etc. are present.												
Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No):		Y	Y										
Number of criteria passed:		3	3										
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓											
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 3 core criteria only (all listed urban habitats except Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land, Bioswale, SuDS and Green roofs):													
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)												
Results for Green roofs and Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (requiring assessment of 4 criteria only - core criteria plus additional criterion specified for habitat type):													
Passes all 3 core criteria; AND Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND Passes additional criterion relevant to	Good (3)												

specific habitat type (D, F or G)																			
Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C	Moderate (2)																		
Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria	Poor (1)																		
Results for Bioswale or SuDS (requiring assessment of 5 criteria - core criteria plus additional criteria specified for habitat type):																			
Passes all 3 core criteria; AND Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E)	Good (3)																		
Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C	Moderate (2)																		
Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria	Poor (1)																		
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score:																			
Footnote 1 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Footnote 2 – Sources of information about detrimental non-native species can be found on the GB Non-native Species Secretariat (GBNNS) website: Home » NNS (nonnativespecies.org) and Natural England Access to Evidence page should also be checked for up-to-date information: Horizon-scanning for invasive non-native plants in Great Britain - NECR053 (naturalengland.org.uk) For criterion C – For green roof habitat types only – buddleia <i>Buddleja davidii</i> should be assessed alongside Schedule 9 species. This species impairs the health of the local ecosystem and reduces the biodiversity potential of the roof. It is also a sign that a roof has not been planted and seeded correctly in subsequent years. Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. Footnote 4 – Use professional judgement. Sources of information about non-native species that are not detrimental to native wildlife can be found on the GBNNS website: Alternative plants » NNS (nonnativespecies.org)																			

Appendix G – Biodiversity enhancement plan

1x 'Vivara Pro Woodstone House Sparrow Nest Box' will be installed on the new building on the western elevation as close to the eaves as possible.



West Elevation
1:100