



BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN REPORT
RESIDENTIAL APPLICATION
THE PRINCE ALBERT
COPTHORNE BANK
CRAWLEY
RH10 3QX

OCTOBER 2024
AMENDED MAY 2026

ON BEHALF OF WESTCOAST DEVELOPMENTS



The Old Squash Court,
Rempstone Hall,
Rempstone,
Corfe Castle,
Wareham,
Dorset,
BH20 5JQ
www.ecological-services.co.uk

Telephone: 01929 477115
E-mail: enquiries@ecological-services.co.uk

Authorisation

	Name	Date
Report prepared by:	RM	01.10.2024
Report checked by:	SH	02.10.2024
Report updated by:	RM	27.04.2026
Report checked and authorised by:	WD	06.05.2026

The contents of this report were correct at the time of the last survey visit. The report is provided for the sole use of the named client and is confidential.

All rights in this report are reserved. No part of it may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature, without our written permission. Its content and format are for the exclusive use of the addressee in dealing with this. It may not be sold, lent, hired out or divulged to any third party not directly involved in this situation without our written consent. It is company policy to share species records collected during our surveys with local biological records centres unless instructed otherwise by the client.

CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0	INTRODUCTION	2
3.0	LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT	3
4.0	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	5
5.0	BASELINE	7
6.0	BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT	9
7.0	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	11
8.0	CONCLUSION	14
9.0	REFERENCES	16
	APPENDIX I: Site Location Plan	17
	APPENDIX II: Proposed Site Plan	18
	APPENDIX III: Baseline habitats	19
	APPENDIX IV: Condition assessment sheets	20
	APPENDIX V: Proposed habitats	25

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This Biodiversity Net Gain Report, prepared by LC Ecological Services Limited, was undertaken to assess the potential to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain from the proposed development of two new dwellings, and associated infrastructure at The Prince Albert, Copthorne Bank, Crawley, RH10 3QX (Ordnance Survey grid reference (TQ 31292 39389)).
- 1.2 The purpose of this report is to identify the net percentage change in biodiversity value on-site post development and to establish whether a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain can be delivered in accordance with the mandatory national policy requirements.
- 1.3 The baseline site habitats include modified grassland with scattered trees, developed land, sealed surface, and other native hedgerow. The on-site baseline comprises 0.31 habitat units, and 0.20 hedgerow units, with zero watercourse units.
- 1.4 It is concluded from this assessment and the accompanying BNG metric calculation that the proposed development will result in an overall net loss in biodiversity value of -0.27 habitat units for the site which equates to -85.86%, and a net loss of 0.20 linear units, equating to a -100.00% loss. The trading metric for the site is not satisfied and biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved onsite.
- 1.5 Purchasing credits under a local scheme would require 0.30 A1 habitat units, and H 0.22 linear habitat credits would need to be purchased. Local schemes often offer more competitive pricing. Under the statutory scheme double the number of credits will be required. This would equate to a total requirement of 0.60 A1, and 0.45 H credits at a cost for purchasing these credits would be approximately £45,000.00 excluding VAT and legal fees. Alternately,
- 1.6 To ensure the habitats created on site reach their target condition, a Biodiversity Net Gain Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will need to be created and implemented. The proposed habitats and features created on site will need to be managed and maintained over a minimum 30-year aftercare period, in line with the mandatory requirements.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Project brief

- 2.1 This Biodiversity Net Gain Report, prepared by LC Ecological Services Limited, was undertaken to assess the potential to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain from the proposed development of two new dwellings, and associated infrastructure at The Prince Albert, Copthorne Bank, Crawley, RH10 3QX (Ordnance Survey grid reference TQ 31292 39389). This assessment is based on the site proposals as shown in appendix I. An ecological impact assessment for the site has also been undertaken and provides additional insight into the findings within this document (LCES, 2026).

Preparation of Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

- 2.2 This assessment was conducted using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (DEFRA, 2025).

Purpose of the report

- 2.3 The purpose of this report is to outline the following:
- To identify the net percentage change in biodiversity value on the site following the most recent design proposals.
 - To establish whether a minimum of 10% BNG can be delivered in accordance with the mandatory national planning policy.
 - To demonstrate that any biodiversity net gains can be obtained with reasonable and viable habitat creation which can be maintained on site or off-site in the long term.

3.0 LEGISLATION AND POLICY CONTEXT

Legislation

3.1 From 12th February 2024, delivery of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain became mandatory for most developments, through the Environment Act 2021. The Environment Act 2021 sets out a mandatory minimum Biodiversity Net Gain of 10% required for all Town & Country Planning Act (TCPA) projects. There is also a mandatory requirement for a minimum 30-year aftercare period in which the post-intervention habitats are managed, maintained and monitored. Small developments were required to achieve this net gain from 2nd April 2024. Current regulations and guidance have been included here for context (DLUHC, 2023):

- **The Environment Act 2021 (Commencement No.8 and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2024:** Establishes the official start date for the mandatory requirement of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for most types of new planning applications in England. It also outlines transitional provisions to ensure a smooth transition from the existing system to the new BNG requirement.
- **The Biodiversity Net Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024:** Specifies categories of development that are exempt from the BNG requirement, such as projects deemed to have minimal impact on biodiversity. This regulation aims to ensure that BNG is focused on developments that have a significant impact on the natural environment.
- **The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024:** Amends existing planning regulations to incorporate provisions related to BNG, including requirements for planning applications, Biodiversity Gain Plans, and phased developments. This regulation aims to streamline the delivery of BNG and ensure it is effectively integrated into the planning process.

National Planning Policy

3.2 Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) '*Conserving and enhancing the natural environment*' sets out the Government's planning policies relating to biodiversity, landscape and geological conservation. The relevant paragraphs within this chapter are from 187, 188 and 192 to 195.

Local Planning Policy

3.3 Relevant planning policies within the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (Dec 2015) include:

- ENV1: Green Infrastructure
- ENV2 –Biodiversity
- ENV3: Local green space

4.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Study Area

- 4.1 The application site is 0.251 hectares and located at central Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference TQ 31292 39389 (refer to appendix I).

Sources of information

- 4.2 The initial walkover survey of the site was undertaken by ecologist Rob McCalman in June 2024 and was updated in March 2026. The habitats present were classified according to the UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (UKHABS, 2023) methods and criteria for this assessment.
- 4.3 The habitat survey recorded the habitat types across the site with a record made of the botanical interest in each area. A condition assessment was then conducted using the data obtained from this survey.
- 4.4 The BNG Metric was completed by David Caplin BSc. (Hons.), MSc. David provides expertise in land management and Geographic Information Systems (GIS). He has run training courses for ecologists in the use of GIS in conservation. He has gained experience in BNG in the last year and a half, and is developing further experience with BNG, including new workflows and data accountability.
- 4.5 The following guidance was used:
- The UK Habitat Classification v2.0 (UKHab, 2023).
 - UK Biodiversity Action Plan, Priority Habitat Descriptions (JNCC, 2018)
 - The Statutory Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric). User Guide (Defra, 2024)
 - The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment methodology (Defra, 2024).
- 4.6 Habitats recorded on site were transposed into a digital map using QGIS coordinate referencing system OSGB 1936/ British National Grid.
- 4.7 Habitats recorded on site were measured using the derived areas (Ellisoidal – EPSG 7001) and all habitat areas are provided in hectares. Linear features were measured using the derived length (Ellisoidal – EPSG 7001) and the measurements provided in kilometres.

Limitations

- 4.8 Whilst every effort has been made to accurately map the habitats on site there may be discrepancies associated with the projected coordinate reference system. However, the National Grid transformation is considered to be the most accurate with an accuracy level of less than 1 metre.
- 4.9 The most recent botanical survey was undertaken in March 2026 during the sub-optimal botanical survey period, meaning some early flowering species could have been missed. Though floristic abundance may change within the growing season, it is not considered likely that notable species were under recorded, or the value of the present habitats were under recorded.
- 4.10 The condition assessment was undertaken based on the results of the botanical survey. The condition can only be determined on the day of the survey. Some of the criteria associated with the condition of the habitats could change such as sward height, physical damage, bare ground, and cover of undesirable species, and thus impacting the overall score if assessed at a different time of the year.

5.0 BASELINE

Habitats

- 5.1 The site comprised an area of unmanaged grassland, within the curtilage of The Prince Albert public house, and small section of adjoining pub garden. The area is primarily grassland, with areas of hardstanding and bare ground. The grassland within the pub garden is managed regularly to a short award, with the grassland within the fenced area unmanaged and overgrown. A native hedgerow is present on the southern boundary of the site.
- 5.2 The baseline habitats recorded on site are summarised in full below and a habitat map of the site is included in appendix II. The relevant habitat condition assessment sheets are included in appendix III.

Developed land, sealed surfaces (u1b5, u1b6)

- 5.3 This habitat includes various walkways and paving areas around the building.
- 5.4 Developed land, sealed surface is a **very low distinctiveness** habitat type, with no required condition assessment.

Modified grassland with scattered trees (g4)

- 5.5 Modified grassland covers the majority of the site area, and comprised two main areas, the pub garden, and a separate fenced section of garden. The grassland within the garden area was managed, and kept short, with some taller sward patches also present in obstructed areas and on the southern site boundary. The fenced garden section was un-managed and had a longer sward of vegetation, with elements of mixed scrub on the peripheries of the habitat. Species present included perennial rye-grass (*Lolium perenne*), Yorkshire-fog (*Holcus lanatus*), false-oat grass (*Arrhenatherum elatius*), and wall barley (*Hordium murinum*), with ribwort plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*), dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale* agg.), and white clover (*Trifolium repens*).
- 5.6 Modified grassland is a **low distinctiveness** habitat type in good and moderate condition. The condition assessment sheet is included in appendix III.

Other native hedgerow

- 5.7 A native hedgerow is present on the site's southern boundary with abundant amounts of bramble (*Rubus fruticosus*) and honeysuckle (*Lonicera sp.*), occasional amounts of hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), and rare amounts of holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), and dog rose (*Rosa canina*). The understory comprised a continuation of species found in the adjacent modified grassland however, occasional amounts of cleavers (*Galium aparine*) is also present.
- 5.8 Other native hedgerow is a **low distinctiveness** habitat type, with the example on-site in good condition.

Summary of baseline value

- 5.9 The overall baseline value of the habitats present within the site boundary is 0.06 habitat units, 0.20 linear hedgerow habitat units, and zero watercourse units. Table 1 below provides a summary breakdown of the baseline habitat values within the site boundary.

Table 1: Summary of baseline habitat values

Habitat types	Distinctiveness level	Condition scores	Area/Length (Ha/km)	Habitat value (Units)
Habitats				
Developed land, sealed surface	V.low	N/A	0.002	0.00
Modified grassland	Low	Moderate	0.0014	0.06
Modified grassland	Low	Good	0.043	0.26
Totals			0.06	0.31
Linear				
Other native hedgerow	Low	Good	0.034	0.20
Totals			0.034	0.20

6.0 BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT

- 6.1 As part of the BNG process there are ten good practice principles that help to achieve BNG if they are followed. Each principle is described below and how the project has addressed each principle.

Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy

- 6.2 The design of the development has tried to utilise the mitigation hierarchy by avoidance to any adverse impacts on habitats and species on site.
- 6.3 Species recorded on site are considered to be of low ecological value, and no priority habitats were recorded.
- 6.4 The development has not resulted in any adverse impacts by following the mitigation hierarchy.

Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere

- 6.5 Habitats which are considered 'irreplaceable' are those which would be technically difficult to recreate, replace, or restore once destroyed. Habitats such as ancient woodland and veteran trees are considered irreplaceable due to the time it takes to reach such condition. Irreplaceable habitat includes factors which contribute to the condition of that habitat including age, environmental context, achievability to recreate and its geographical position within the landscape.
- 6.6 The site does not support any habitats of principal importance.

Be inclusive and equitable

- 6.7 Discussions have been had and shared to demonstrate how the design can achieve a better outcome for BNG.

Address risks

- 6.8 All habitats have been calculated within the red line boundary, including habitats within the development footprint. No additional land for the construction phase and site compounds has been included within the calculator.

- 6.9 Habitats to be created will be done so by appointed contractors who have experience in habitat creation, with the guidance of the appointed ecologist.

Make a measurable Net Gain contribution

- 6.10 The proposed development has been measured against The Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The development has reduced its overall impact throughout the design of the scheme where possible.
- 6.11 The site, is currently intensively managed. Created habitats will be managed for people as well as biodiversity and will directly contribute towards nature conservation.

Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity

- 6.12 Planting of additional urban trees will promote biodiversity, create habitat for recorded species on site, and will directly contribute towards nature conservation.

Be additional

- 6.13 Areas assigned for mitigation will not be included within the assessment for biodiversity net gain as this would trigger a conflict with additionality. The development will include enhancement measures including bird boxes and bat boxes. These enhancement features are not measured as part of Biodiversity Net Gain.

Create a Net Gain legacy

- 6.14 Long-term benefit to biodiversity will be able to be monitored through habitat management.

Optimise sustainability

- 6.15 The landscaping plan for the development aims to be as sustainable as possible and providing net gain on site in an environment which will be managed by UHD.

Be transparent

- 6.16 Through the progression of the development the design team and client have all been made aware of the communications and outcomes of the BNG.

7.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1 The proposed development will result in the loss of areas of modified grassland on site, to facilitate the creation of two new dwellings, and associated infrastructure. The proposals aim to minimise the loss of biodiversity and achieve the best result in terms of Biodiversity Net Gain through the application of the mitigation hierarchy. Table 2 below provides a summary of the habitat losses through this proposal.

Table 2: Area and linear habitat units retained and lost.

Habitat type	Baseline area/length (ha /km)	Area/length retained (ha /km)	Area habitat lost in the application area (hectares)	Biodiversity Units lost
Habitats				
Developed land: sealed surface	0.002	0.00	0.00	0.00
Modified grassland (Moderate)	0.014	0.00	0.01	0.06
Modified grassland (Good)	0.043	0.00	0.04	0.26
Total	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.31
Linear hedgerow habitats				
Native hedgerow	0.034	0.00	0.03	0.20
Total	0.034	0.00	0.03	0.20

Please note the above information reflects the rounding undertaken within the metric. Within the current guidance, it states not to adjust for this rounding error in displaying the information.

Baseline retained habitats

7.2 All baseline habitats will be lost through these proposals. Overall, there will be a loss of 0.31 area habitat units, and 0.20 linear hedgerow units.

Proposed on-site habitat creation

7.3 The proposals for on-site habitat creation include developed land, sealed surface, and vegetated garden. These additions would deliver an area of 0.06

hectares, with a value of 0.04 biodiversity units. A plan showing the proposed post-intervention habitat layout for the site has been provided in appendix V.

- 7.4 **Overall, there will be a net loss in biodiversity value of -0.27 habitat units for the site which equates to -85.86%, and a net loss of 0.20 linear units, equating to a -100.00%. The trading metric for the site is not satisfied, and biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved onsite.**
- 7.5 The current proposals do not achieve the minimum 10% biodiversity net gain score required for both habitat and linear units on site.
- 7.6 Figure 1, below, shows the final BNG metric calculation results as the outcome of the proposals, demonstrating that the required mandatory net gain in biodiversity value for habitat and linear units has not been met.

Figure 1: Headline results from the statutory metric calculation

Headline Results		Return to results menu	
Scroll down for final results ⚠			
On-site baseline	Area habitat units	0.31	
	Hedgerow units	0.20	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site post-intervention (including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.04	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	-0.27	-85.86%
	Hedgerow units	-0.20	-100.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Off-site baseline			
Off-site post-intervention (including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	0.00	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%

On-site net gain is less than target set A
On-site net gain is less than target set A

Westcoast Developments

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, The Prince Albert, Crawley, RH10 3QX (Residential)

Combined net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-0.27		
	Hedgerow units	-0.20		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Area habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-0.27		
	Hedgerow units	-0.20		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-85.86%		Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲
	Hedgerow units	-100.00%		Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	0.31	0.35	0.30
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.20	0.22	0.22
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
No additional watercourse units required to meet target				

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 It is concluded from this assessment and the BNG metric calculation that the proposed development will have a deficit of **0.30 habitat units, which equates to a -85.86% decrease in value**, and a loss of **0.20 hedgerow units, which equates to a -100.00% loss in value. This demonstrates that the required mandatory net gain in biodiversity value for both habitat and linear units has not been reached. To achieve net gain, offsite credits will need to be purchased through offsite providers, or through the governments statutory scheme.**
- 8.2 The use of off-site credits will need to be undertaken in order to satisfy biodiversity net gain obligations for the application. These credits can be purchased from a third-party scheme or from the Government's statutory scheme.
- 8.3 Under the statutory scheme double the number of credits will be required. This would equate to a total requirement of 0.60 A1, and 0.45 H credits. The estimated cost for this credit purchase is given in diagram one below:

Diagram one: Cost of statutory credit purchase:

Estimated cost of statutory biodiversity credits		
£45,000 (excluding VAT)		
Tier	Credits	Estimated cost
A1	0.60	£25,200
A2	0.00	£0
A3	0.00	£0
A4	0.00	£0
A5	0.00	£0
H	0.45	£19,800
W	0.00	£0
Total estimated cost		£45,000

- 8.4 Alternately purchasing credits under a local scheme would require less credits approximately 0.30 area habitats, and 0.22 linear habitats credits

would need to be purchased. Local schemes often offer more competitive pricing.

9.0 REFERENCES

Butcher, B., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. & Treweek, J. (2020). *The UK Habitat Classification user Manual Version 1.1*. Available at <http://www.khab.org/>.

CIEEM (2022). *Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester, UK.

CIRA (2019). *Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principles for Developments*.

Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030 (Dec, 2025)

Department for Communities and Local Government (2024). *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). Statutory Metric (*Statutory Biodiversity Metric*). (February 2024).

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric -Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology*. (February 2024).

Ecological Impact Assessment, LC Ecological Services – PRINCECO (2024, 2026)

Lawton, J. (2010). *Making space for nature: A review of England's wildlife sites and ecological networks*. Defra.

Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) Website at <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

QGIS Development Team (2024). *QGIS Geographic Information System*. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project. <http://qgis.osgeo.org>.


Stace, C. (2019). *New Flora of the British Isles (Fourth edition)*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

The Statutory Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric). User Guide (Defra, 2024)

UKHab Ltd (2023). *UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0*. available at <https://www.ukhab.org>

APPENDIX I: Site Location Plan





APPENDIX III: Baseline habitats



APPENDIX IV: Condition assessment sheets

Habitat conditions during survey in 2026 matched the previous conditions calculated during 2024.

Modified Grassland

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Modified grassland			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	PRINCECO	Survey date and Surveyor name	R McCalman - 27.06.2024
Limitations (if applicable)	None	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Grid reference	TQ 31318 39404	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Habitat Description			
Area 1 - No brackets, Area 2 - Brackets			
ukhab - UK Habitat Classification			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
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.	Yes (Yes)	6-8 species per quadrat
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.	No (Yes)	Sward is varied, but area less than 20% (Sward very varied)
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.	Yes (No)	Scrub areas less than 20%, if ruderal/scrub area allowed to grow back then No (Scrub greater than 20%)
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.	Yes (Yes)	Grassland in mostly good condition, no signs of damage, but some slightly worn areas (Unmanaged areas)
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	Yes (No)	Areas of bare ground concentrated around seating benches and play equipment (Concrete foundations more than 10%)
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Yes (Yes)	No bracken present (No bracken)

G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ⁴ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	Yes (Yes)	No invasives noted (no invasives)
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			Yes
Number of criteria passed			
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x1✓	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)	Yes	
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	(Yes)	
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).			

Hedgerow

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				
Habitat Description				
Good condition (2 failures)				
ukhab - UK Habitat Classification				
On-site or off-site, site name and location	PRINCECO	Survey date and Surveyor name	R McCalman - 27.06.2024	
Limitations (if applicable)		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)		
Grid reference	TQ 31318 33404	Habitat parcel reference		
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 Handbook ¹ and Favourable Conservation Status document ² . 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.				
Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D, 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 pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is >1.5 m height).	Yes	
A2. Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (such as blackthorn <i>Prunus spinosa</i> suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they are >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	No	Less than 1.5 meterwe with average

B1.	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).	Yes	
B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).	Yes	
C1.	Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: · Measured from outer edge of hedgerow; and · Is present on one side of the hedgerow (at least).	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedgerow. Undisturbed ground is present for at least 30% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1 m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedgerow. This criterion recognises the value of the hedgerow base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.	No	Mowed up to hedgerow
C2.	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	The indicator species used are nettles <i>Urtica</i> spp., cleavers <i>Galium aparine</i> and docks <i>Rumex</i> spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Yes	Less than 20% coverage
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 .	Yes	
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).	Yes	Mostly intact
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, 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	This criterion addresses if there are a range of age-classes or morphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide 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.		
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
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 Does not fail both attributes 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 attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1
Score achieved:		3
Condition categories for hedgerows with trees		
Category	Category Requirements	Metric score
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
Score achieved:		
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score		
Footnotes		
Footnote 1 - DEFRA (2007) <i>Hedgerow Survey Handbook. A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.</i> [online] Available on: layout.hedgeline.org.uk Footnote 2 - STALEY, J.T. ET AL. (2020) <i>Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows.</i> [online] Available on: Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows - BP2343 (naturalengland.org.uk) Footnote 3 - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Footnote 4 - CHEFFINGS, C. M. et al. (2005) <i>The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain.</i> 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). <i>Definitions: wild, native or alien?</i> [online] Available on: Definitions: wild, native or alien? - Botanical Society of Britain & Ireland (bsbi.org) Footnote 6 - BSBI and Biological Records Centre (BRC) (2022) <i>Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora.</i> [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 » GBNNS (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)		

APPENDIX V: Proposed habitats

