



Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Hall Hunter Partnership (Farming)

Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	1	Oliver Bevilacqua, BSc (Hons), MSc, Consultant Ecologist	14/02/2024
Final	2	Oliver Bevilacqua, BSc (Hons), MSc, Consultant Ecologist	15/02/2024
Final	3	Oliver Bevilacqua, BSc (Hons), MSc, Consultant Ecologist	11/06/2024
Final	4	Oliver Bevilacqua, BSc (Hons), MSc, Consultant Ecologist	28/04/2025

Arbtech Consultant's Contact Details:

Oliver Bevilacqua
Consultant Ecologist

Tel: 07512327452 Email: oliverbevilacqua@arbtech.co.uk
<https://arbtech.co.uk>

Limitations and Copyright

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

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

Industry Guidelines and Standards

This report has been written with due consideration to:

- British Standard 42020 (2013). Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Version 1.1. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2020). Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Construction Industry Research and Information Association & Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principles for Development.

Proportionality

The work involved in preparing and implementing all ecological surveys, impact assessments and measures for avoidance, mitigation, compensation, and enhancement should be proportionate to the predicted degree of risk to biodiversity and to the nature and scale of the proposed development. Consequently, the decision-maker should only request supporting information and conservation measures that are relevant, necessary, and material to the application in question. Similarly, the decision-maker and their consultees should ensure that any comments and advice made over an application are also proportionate.

The desk studies and field surveys undertaken to provide a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) might in some cases be all that is necessary.

(BS 42020, 2013)

Executive Summary

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Hall Hunter Partnership (Farming) to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment at Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The assessment was required to inform a planning application for the erection of three detached two storey dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, and open space, following demolition of the existing dwellings on land at Dairy Cottage. (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”).

The baseline area-based habitat value of the site is 1.84 units.

The post development area-based habitat value of the site is 2.03 units.

This results in a net change in biodiversity of **10.32% (i.e. a net gain)**.

The baseline linear-based habitat value of the site is 0.79 units.

The post development linear-based habitat value of the site is 2.40 units.

This results in a net change in biodiversity of **77.73% (i.e. a net gain)**.

The current landscaping proposal generates a net gain of area-based habitat units (10.32%) and a net gain of linear-based habitat units (77.73%). As such, the proposed development is compliant with current legislation and current planning policies.

Contents

1.0 Introduction and Context6

1.1 Site Location, Geology and Landscape Context 6

1.2 BNG Informative..... 6

1.3 Scope of this Report 7

2.0 Methodology.....8

2.1 Baseline Biodiversity Value..... 8

2.2 Post Development Biodiversity Value..... 9

3.0 Results10

3.1 Baseline Habitats..... 10

3.2 Post Development Habitats 13

3.3 Change in Biodiversity Value of the Site..... 17

4.0 Recommendations to Deliver BNG18

4.1 Discussion..... 18

4.2 Post Development 18

5.0 Bibliography.....19

Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan..... 20

Appendix 2: Site Location Plan 21

Appendix 3: Baseline Habitat Plan 22

Appendix 4: Proposed Habitat Plan 23

Appendix 5a: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Baseline 24

Appendix 5b: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets – Proposed..... 26

1.0 Introduction and Context

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Hall Hunter Partnership (Farming) to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment at Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The assessment was required to inform a planning application for the erection of three detached two storey dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, and open space, following demolition of the existing dwellings on land at Dairy Cottage. (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”).

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

- Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric.
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment (PEA/PRA): Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2025).

1.1 Site Location, Geology and Landscape Context

The site is located at National Grid Reference SU82350 66706 and has an area of approximately 0.783ha comprising buildings, trees, hedgerows, and grassland. It is surrounded by solar panel farms to the north, agricultural field to the west, and residential dwellings to the south and Heathlands Road to the east. The wider landscape comprises pockets of woodland, solar panel farms and agricultural fields. A site location plan is provided in Appendix 2.

1.2 BNG Informative

BNG is a specific, measurable outcome of project activities that deliver demonstrable and quantifiable benefits to biodiversity compared to the baseline situation. In order to achieve BNG, a project must be able to demonstrate that it has followed all 10 of the Principles of Biodiversity Net Gain (as outlined in the *British Standard 8683:2021 Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain*).

The legalised Environment Act (2021) requires developments in England to demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity and sets a target of a minimum of +10% BNG for all developments. It also stipulates that a management plan with a minimum 30-year term, should be adopted to ensure biodiversity net gain can be delivered. The requirement for biodiversity net gain is also enshrined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2023). In addition, BNG is a requirement of Policy CP7 of the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework (adopted in 2010).

The Statutory Biodiversity Metric is now the widely accepted tool used to calculate BNG. It enables the calculation of habitat value pre- and post-development in order to determine the overall change in biodiversity value as a result of the proposed development. The Biodiversity Metric has separate BNG assessments for areas of habitat, hedgerows, and watercourses.

The biodiversity value of a site should be maximised. However, it may not always be possible to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain within a site and therefore the Statutory Biodiversity Metric can also account for offsite habitat creation, where land is available. Alternatively, developers can seek to provide an agreed financial contribution to an appropriate third party (such as the Local Authority, the UK Government, or another landowner) to deliver the required biodiversity net gain elsewhere on their behalf.

1.3 Scope of this Report

This report assesses the biodiversity value of the site pre-development and outlines the minimum biodiversity units required to achieve a +10% net gain.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Baseline Biodiversity Value

The baseline BNG Calculation was informed by a PEA and PRA (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2024). A baseline habitat plan is provided in Appendix 3.

Habitat Classification

The PEA classified the habitats on site according to UK Habitat Classification User Manual (UK Habitat Classification Working Group, 2023).

Habitat Area/Length

The area or length of each habitat was calculated using qGIS software. In calculating the area or length of each habitat, habitats which occur as two or more isolated parcels across the site were combined, where they were deemed to be of a similar composition and condition. Distinctions were made between habitats to be retained (i.e. left as found in baseline), enhanced (i.e. improved condition) or lost (i.e. destroyed by proposed development).

Areas of scattered trees were calculated using the Tree Helper tool within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. Class sizes for urban trees are set out in Table 14 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (Natural England, 2024).

Habitat Condition

Habitat condition was assessed using the relevant condition assessment sheets found in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (Natural England, 2024).

Strategic Significance

Strategic significance was assigned for each habitat based upon a review of the following:

- Ecological value
- Function within the landscape
- Any site or habitat allocations under the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework 2010

2.2 Post Development Biodiversity Value

The post development BNG Calculation was informed by '23011 - P301 (Proposed Site Plan)11042025' which is included in Appendix 1. A post development habitat plan is provided in Appendix 4.

Habitat Classification

Proposed habitats were translated to their equivalents in the UK Habitat Classification using The UK Habitat Classification Habitat Definitions Version 2.0 (The UK Habitat Classification Working Group, 2023) and the information provided within the '23011 - P301 (Proposed Site Plan)11042025'.

Habitat Area/Length

The area or length of each proposed habitat was calculated using qGIS software. In calculating the area or length of each habitat, habitats which occur as two or more isolated parcels across the site were combined, where they were deemed to be of similar composition and condition. Distinctions were made between habitats to be retained (i.e. left as found in baseline), enhanced (i.e. improved condition) or newly created.

Areas of scattered trees were calculated using the Tree Helper tool within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. Class sizes for urban trees are set out in Table 14 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (Natural England, 2023).

Habitat Condition

Target habitat condition for each proposed habitat was determined assessed using the Temporal Multipliers Tool and the Enhancement Temporal Multipliers Tool included in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric spreadsheet as well as the relevant condition assessment sheets found in the Draft Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (Natural England, 2023). This is based on the assumption that a 30-year management plan will be adopted for the site.

Strategic Significance

Strategic significance was assigned for each proposed habitat based upon a review of the following:

- ❖ Likely ecological value
- ❖ Function within the landscape
- ❖ Any site or habitat allocations under the Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework 2010.

3.0 Results

3.1 Baseline Habitats

Table 1 details the baseline habitats present within the site along with their area/length, condition, and strategic significance. A full condition assessment for each habitat (where relevant) is provided in Appendix 5a.

Table 1: Baseline Biodiversity Value

Type	Habitat	Area (ha) / Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Area Based	Bult up areas and gardens (u1) with vegetated garden (828) [G1]	0.4599ha	On the north-eastern side of the site, an area of the garden with a sward height of approximately 4-5cm. Species composition is moderate, comprising predominantly perennial ryegrass (D) and Yorkshire fog with herbs such as dandelion (A), dock (O), common daisy (O), buttercup (O) and nettle (R). The modified grassland was in poor condition based on the amount of disturbance, diversity of species and sward height diversity. There was a pile of cut logs/tree trunks piled up adjacent the eastern boundary (TN1). On the north-western section of the site, there are areas of the garden with a sward height of approximately 2-3cm. Species composition is low, comprising predominantly perennial ryegrass (D) and Yorkshire fog with herbs such as dandelion (A), moss (O) and primrose (R). The modified grassland was in poor condition based on the amount of disturbance, diversity of species and sward height. On the south-eastern section of the site, there are areas of the garden with a sward height of approximately 2-3cm. Species composition is low, comprising predominantly perennial ryegrass (D) and Yorkshire fog with herbs such as dandelion (A), moss (O) and primrose (R). The modified grassland was in poor condition based on the amount of disturbance, diversity of species and sward height.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).

	Scattered tree (u1 32)	0.0765ha	There is one extra large English oak tree present in the northeast corner of the site.	Good: passes 6 of 6 criteria. Assessed using the 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Developed land, sealed surface (u1b)	0.0168ha	An area of concrete hardstanding (approximately 150m ²) was located around the main dairy house (B1) to the south of the site.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (u1c)	0.2539ha	An area of gravel hardcore was located to the south of the site as well as an unsealed access track leading northeast.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Buildings (u1b5)	0.0518ha	There are 8 buildings on site. The buildings are comprised of brick-built residential dwellings, brick-built garage, temporary mobile homes, and a wooden shed.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).

Linear Based	Non-native and ornamental hedgerow (h2b)	0.114km	[Previously classified as 'other hedgerow (h2a)'] Sections (approximately 75m length x 2.5m height x 1m wide) of non-native ornamental hedgerow was present in the south of the site. Species of the hedgerow were completely dominated with leylandii cypress. The understorey composition was nettle (D), ivy (F) and bramble (O). The hedgerow was in good condition based on the amount of gapping, dimensions of the hedgerow, amount of damage and understorey species.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' Poor ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Line of trees (w1g 33)	0.075km	Several lines of trees divide and bound the site (LOT). Line of trees (LOT1) was present in the centre of northern part of the site. The species (immature) was dominated by conifer cypress densely packed together. There was no understorey for LOT1 due to management. The line of trees was in poor condition based on the amount of human disturbance, lack of understorey vegetation and tree maturity. This line of trees will be removed in the proposed development.	Poor: passes 1 of 5 criteria. Assessed using the 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Line of trees (w1g 33)	0.06km 0.069km	Line of trees (LOT2 and LOT3) was present along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. The species (mature) was dominated by oak trees. The understorey species composition included bramble (D), ivy (F) and nettle (O). The line of trees was in moderate condition based on the maturity of trees and the small amount of undisturbed vegetation (less than 6m). A small section will be removed for this development.	Moderate: passes 3 of 5 criteria. Assessed using the 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	Medium Strategic Significance The habitat is of medium strategic significance due to being part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone and containing mature native species with ecological features and niches present.

3.2 Post Development Habitats

Table 2 details the post development habitats present within the site along with their area/length, condition, and strategic significance. An assessment of the anticipated condition for each habitat (where relevant) is provided in Appendix 5b, which is based on the assumption that a 30-year management plan will be implemented for the site.

Table 2: Post Development Biodiversity Value

Habitat			Area (ha) / Length (km)	Description	Target Condition	Strategic Significance
Created	Area-Based	Modified grassland (g4)	0.2297ha	All proposed soft landscaping that will function as a public open space will be modified grassland.	<i>Poor: passes 3 of 6 criteria. Excluding essential criterion A. Assessed using the 'Grassland' habitat type condition sheet.</i>	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).

		Developed land, sealed surface (u1b)	0.0684ha 0.0966ha	The new dwellings to be constructed.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
		Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (u1c)	0.0182ha	The paths, driveways, and road leading onto site from Heathlands Road.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).

		Bult up areas and gardens (u1) with Scattered trees (32)	0.0611ha	15 native small-sized trees will be planted around the site. Only the trees planted in the communal access areas will count towards net gain.	Moderate: passes 4 of 6 criteria. Assessed using the 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Linear-Based	Native hedgerow (h2a5)	0.260km	Native hedgerows will be planted around the site to separate each new dwelling plot.	Moderate: fails 2 criteria in one functional group. Assessed using the 'Hedgerow' habitat type condition sheet.	Low Strategic Significance Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy and no evidence to suggest the habitat is of medium strategic significance (not part of a habitat corridor or steppingstone).
	Area-Based	Vegetated garden (u1 828)	0.2406ha	See Table 1.		

		Scattered trees (u1 32)	0.0765ha	See Table 1.
	Linear-Based	Line of trees (w1g 33)	0.06km [LOT 2] 0.069km [LOT 3]	See Table 1.

3.3 Change in Biodiversity Value of the Site

Area-Based Habitat Units

The baseline area-based habitat value of the site is 1.84 units, comprising of 0.92 units of vegetated gardens and 0.92 units of individual trees, and sealed/unsealed surfaces (no value).

The post development area-based habitat value of the site is 2.03 units, comprising the:

- ❖ creation of 0.64 units; comprising of 0.44 units of modified grassland and 0.19 units of individual trees.
- ❖ retention of 0.48 units of vegetated garden and 0.92 units of individual trees.

This results in a net change in biodiversity of **10.32% (i.e. a net gain)**.

Linear-Based Habitat Units

The baseline linear-based habitat value of the site is 0.79 units, comprising 0.11 units of non-native and ornamental hedgerow and 0.67 units of line of trees .

The post development linear-based habitat value of the site is 2.4 units, comprising the:

- ❖ creation of 0.87 units of native hedgerow.
- ❖ retention of 0.52 units of line of trees.

This results in a net change in biodiversity of **77.73% (i.e. a net gain)**.

4.0 Recommendations to Deliver BNG

4.1 Discussion

The current landscaping proposal generates a net gain of area-based habitat units (10.32%) and a net gain of linear-based habitat units (77.73%). As such, the proposed development is compliant with current legislation (Environment Act 2021) and current planning policies (National: National Planning Policy Framework, 2023; Local: Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework 2010).

All trading conditions have been satisfied.

Additional measures to increase net gain further include increasing tree planting, enhancing modified grassland areas into other neutral grassland in moderate/good condition, and/or creating areas of mixed scrub in moderate/good condition.


4.2 Post Development

A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Management Plan must be produced for the site. This should include recommendations for the implementation, management and monitoring of the site for at least 30 years.

5.0 Bibliography

- Arbtech Consulting Ltd. (2025). Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA): Dairy Cottage, Heathlands Road, Wokingham, RG40 3AN.
- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.
- CIEEM-CIRIA-IEMA (2019) Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principles for Development.
- DEFRA (2023). *Biodiversity Net Gain moves step closer with timetable set out*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/biodiversity-net-gain-moves-step-closer-with-timetable-set-out>
- Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey a technique for environmental audit.
http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/PDF/pub10_handbookforphase1habitatsurvey.pdf
- National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
- Natural England (2023). The Biodiversity Metric 4.0 (JP039: March 2023). <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720>
- Natural England (2023). The Biodiversity Metric 4.0 User Guide (JP039: March 2023). <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720>
- UK Habitat Classification Working Group (2023). UK Habitat Classification – Habitat Definitions V2.0.
- Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework, Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2010).
<https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/sites/wokingham/files/2023-06/Final%20adopted%20Core%20Strategy%20inc.%20cover.pdf>.

Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan



Appendix 2: Site Location Plan



Appendix 3: Baseline Habitat Plan



Appendix 4: Proposed Habitat Plan



Appendix 5a: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Baseline

Urban Trees; assessed using 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Achieved (Y/N)	Notes/Justification
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Y	T4 is an English oak.
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Y	T4 is an individual tree and thus automatically passes this criterion.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	Y	T4 is mature.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Y	Little to no evidence of adverse anthropogenic impacts.
E	Natural Ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Y	Extensive ivy and deadwood present.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Y	More than 20% of the tree canopy area has vegetation underneath.
Number of criteria passed			6
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/✓
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria		Good (3)	✓
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria		Poor (1)	

Line of trees (LOT1); assessed using 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	N	Dominated by cypress.
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	Y	Trees are densely packed together.
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy, or loose bark.	N	No ecological niches or features present.
D	There is an undisturbed naturally vegetated strip of at least 6 m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice.	N	Disturbed land is present along a significant portion of the line.
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	N	No features associated with healthy trees present, extensive, and regular management has taken place.
Number of criteria passed			1
Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	✓	

Line of trees (LOT2, LOT3); assessed using 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed	Notes (such as justification)

		(Yes or No)	
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	Y	Dominated by oak.
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	N	Gaps larger than 5m present.
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy, or loose bark.	Y	Due to maturity of the trees, several ecological niches and features are present, including dense ivy.
D	There is an undisturbed naturally vegetated strip of at least 6 m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice.	N	Some of the vegetation adjacent to the line has been affected by human activities.
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	Y	Little to no evidence of adverse impact on tree health.
Number of criteria passed			3
Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	✓	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		

Appendix 5b: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets – Proposed

Modified Grassland; assessed using 'Grasslands Low Distinctiveness' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria:	Condition Achieved (Y/N)	Notes/Justification
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

A	There must be 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² , including at least 2 forbs. NB - this criterion is essential for achieving moderate condition.	N	Fewer than 6 vascular plant species per m ² .
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	Regularly mown, uniform sward height present.
C	Some scattered scrub (including bramble) may be present, but scrub accounts for less than 20% of total grassland area. Note - patches of shrubs with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Y	No scattered scrub present (less than 20% coverage).
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	Physical damage present in more than 5% of total grassland area.
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens).	Y	Bare ground cover between 1% and 10%.
F	Cover of bracken less than 20%.	Y	No bracken observed (less than 20% coverage).
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981).	Y	Absence of invasive species.
Essential criterion 1 achieved (Y/N)			N
Number of criteria passed			3
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/✓	
Passes 6 or 7 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion 1	Good (3)		
Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion 1	Moderate (2)		
Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 7 criteria; OR 4, 5 or 6 of criteria but failing criterion 1	Poor (1)	✓	

Urban Trees; assessed using 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Achieved (Y/N)	Notes/Justification
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Y	All native trees to be planted.
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Y	All trees are individual trees and thus automatically pass this criterion.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	N	No mature trees on planted.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Y	Little to no evidence of adverse anthropogenic impacts; all trees will have retained >75% of their expected canopy.
E	Natural Ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	N	None will be present
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Y	More than 20% of the tree canopy area has vegetation underneath.
Number of criteria passed			4
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/✓	
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria	Moderate (2)	✓	
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria	Poor (1)		

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

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D & E)	Criteria (the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Description	Condition Achieved (Y/N)	Notes/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 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).	Y	Hedgerow averages 10m in height.
A2. Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (e.g. blackthorn suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	Y	Hedgerow averages 2m in width.
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).	Y	Gap between ground and base of canopy is <0.5m for more than 10% of length.
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).	Y	No canopy gaps >5m for each segment of hedgerow.

		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).		
C1. Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: - measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and - is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedge. Undisturbed ground should be present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedge. This criterion recognises the value of the hedge base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.	N	At least one side of the hedge has >1m of disturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >10% of length.
C2. Undesirable perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground	The indicator species used are nettles (<i>Urtica</i> spp.), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and docks (<i>Rumex</i> spp.). Their presence, either singly or together, should not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	N	High abundance of indicator species will be present in garden.
D1. Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and recently introduced species	Recently introduced species refer to plant that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives.	Y	No invasives in species mix.
D2. Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (e.g. excessive hedge cutting).	Y	>90% of hedgerow and understorey will be free of damage caused by human activities.
E1. Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), 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.	N	There will be no mature, ancient, or veteran tree present per 20-50m of the hedgerow.

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	No evidence of adverse impacts on tree health.
Condition categories for hedgerows with trees				
Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (score)		
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3		
Moderate	No more than 5 failures in total; AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g., fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 and E1 = Moderate condition).	2		
Poor	Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1		
Score achieved:	Moderate			