LIZARD
Landscape Design and Ecology

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN STATEMENT

GTO House, Bath Road, Twyford

On behalf of: Murray Planning Associates Ltd

Client:	Murray Planning Associates Ltd			
Project:	GTO House, Bath Road, Twyford			
Reference:	LLD3404-ECO-REP-001-01-BNG			
Revision:	**Date:**	**Author**	**Proof**	**Approved**
01	19/02/2025	Will Mills ACIEEM MSci (Hons)	Louise Barker MSc BSc (Hons)	Louise Barker MSc BSc (Hons)

Disclaimer:

The information provided within this report has been prepared and provided in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions.

This report is intended for the sole use of the Client and their agents in accordance with the agreement under which our services were performed. Unauthorised communication, reproduction or usage of this report by any party other than the aforementioned is prohibited. No liability is accepted by Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. This report does not constitute legal advice. No warranty, express or implied, is made as to the advice in this report or any other service provided by us.

Validity:

This report is valid for 18 months from the date of the final survey visit. If works have not commenced by this date, an updated site visit should be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist to assess any changes in the habitats present on site, to inform whether surveys should be updated.

LIZARD
Landscape Design and Ecology
The Old Bank, 34 South Street, Tarring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 7LH
T. 01903 216033 E. office@lizardlandscape.co.uk W. lizardlandscapeecology.com

Contents

LIZARD
Landscape Design and Ecology
The Old Bank, 34 South Street, Tarring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 7LH
T. 01903 216033 E. office@lizardlandscape.co.uk W. lizardlandscapeecology.com

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology has been commissioned to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain Statement for GTO House, Bath Road, Twyford. This report has been written with due regard to best practice guidance for ecological report writing (CIEEM, 2017) and the Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development (CIEEM, 2019) and the Biodiversity Net Gain User Guide (DEFRA, 2023).

1.2 The development does not appear to qualify under any exemption and will therefore be subject to the standard Biodiversity Gain condition.

Site Overview

1.3 The red line covers c. 1.4 hectares (ha) and comprises a large proportion of the grounds of GTO House. The site consists of a building and warehouse complex with associated areas of hardstanding, with introduced shrub in the centre of the site and modified grassland to the east and west, with trees interspersed throughout. Access to the site is via Bath Road or Mumbery Hill running alongside the southern boundary of the site.

Surrounding Landscape

1.4 The site is set within a semi-rural location in the north-western corner of the village of Hare Hatch, Berkshire. Immediately to the east and south of the site are two garden centres and other commercial developments, to the west is a large plant nursery and solar farm, and to the north is a large area of arable land. The site is located within the green belt of Wokingham Borough Council.

Development Proposals

1.5 It is understood that the proposals include the demolition of a warehouse and removal of 3no. trees and 2no. sections of ornamental hedgerow, in order to facilitate the construction of a new warehouse on hardstanding.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Desk Study - Assigning Strategic Significance

2.1.1 Due to the lack of Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) within Berkshire, strategic significance has been assessed as per table 8 of the User Guide (DEFRA, 2023). This included assessing whether the site was located within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as well as examining the local plan for any specific targets regarding creation or retention of certain habitat types.

2.1.2 Where sites were found to be located within any designated area, such as an AONB, policy statement and management plans for the relevant area were examined. High strategic significance was then assigned to any habitat identified as a priority within these documents.

2.1.3 For any sites not located within a designated area, habitats were generally assigned low strategic significance, unless they were considered to provide important ecological linkages in which case they were assigned medium strategic significance.

2.2 Desk Study – Statutory Designated Sites and Irreplaceable Habitat

2.2.1 To identify any designated sites for nature conservation, irreplaceable habitat and/or priority habitats (the presence of which may influence the feasibility of delivering BNG) within or adjacent to the Site, the Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) and The Woodland Trust's Ancient Tree Inventory were reviewed.

2.3 Baseline Habitat Assessment

2.3.1 A baseline habitat assessment in accordance with the UK Habitats Classification Manual (UKHabs Ltd., 2023) was undertaken on the 22nd of November 2024 by Will Mills ACIEEM and Owen Beesley BSc. No habitat degradation had taken place prior to the survey and the baseline data is considered to be an accurate reflection of the ecological value of the site. Full details of the habitats present are summarised herein, in addition to the Ecological Appraisal provided by Clarke Webb Ecology Ltd.

2.3.2 All area based and linear habitats were mapped on site with the aid of aerial imagery and topographical survey where available. The condition of habitats was assessed in accordance with *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric - Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology* (DEFRA, 2024).

2.3.3 The habitats, their condition and strategic importance were input into the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool (DEFRA, 2024). The area of habitats which would be retained or enhanced based upon the current proposals was also added to the calculator. This allowed the existing baseline value and loss of biodiversity units to be established.

2.4 Post-Development Habitats

2.4.1 The proposed landscape plan has been used to inform the post-development scenario. This plan was converted from a PDF document to a GIS environment where it was overlaid on the baseline habitat data. Areas of proposed post development intervention (habitat creation and/or habitat retention / enhancement), including the built development, were calculated using QGIS.

2.4.2 The proposed habitats and strategic importance were input into the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool (DEFRA, 2024). Target condition scores were assigned based upon what could realistically be achieved on site. The area of habitats which would be retained or enhanced based upon the current proposals was also added to the calculator.

2.4.3 The Metric takes into account whether habitat creation or enhancement is delivered in advance of any impact, or whether there will be any significant delay in an intervention relative to the impact. Where delays in habitat creation are anticipated, or habitat creation is to be undertaken in advance, this has been included within the metric and fully explained within section 3 of this report. Where no delays or advance creation shall occur, a standard temporal multiplier has been applied to created habitats.

2.4.4 Once all measures have been input into The Biodiversity Metric Calculation, the overall change in value of the site could then be determined.

2.5 Mitigation Hierarchy

2.5.1 Biodiversity net gain planning practice guidance and Articles 37A and 37D of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, sets out a list of priority actions to ensure adherence to the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy:

- First, in relation to onsite habitats which have a medium, high and very high distinctiveness (a score of four or more according to the statutory biodiversity metric), the avoidance of adverse effects from the development and, if they cannot be avoided, the mitigation of those effects; and
- Then, in relation to all onsite habitats which are adversely affected by the development, the adverse effect should be compensated by prioritising in the following order, where possible, the enhancement of existing onsite habitats, creation of new onsite habitats, allocation of registered offsite gains and finally the purchase of biodiversity credits.

2.6 Survey Constraints / Considerations

2.6.1 Areas and linear lengths have been rounded to the nearest $10m^2$ and measurements input to the metric using three decimal places. Due to the output of the Metric being displayed to two decimal places, slight imprecision in output may occur.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Strategic Significance, Irreplaceable Habitat and Designated Sites.

3.1.1 The site is not within any ecological designation, such as a *Biodiversity Opportunity Area* or *Nature Improvement Area* and no habitats on site are directly referenced in any local plan or other such document. Habitats on site have therefore been classified as being of low strategic significance.

3.1.2 There is no irreplaceable habitat within or immediately adjacent to the site.

3.1.3 The site is not location within any statutory designated site.

3.2 Baseline Habitat Value

Habitat Degradation

3.2.1 No site clearance or habitat degradation was evident, and the baseline information gathered is considered to be a true presentation of the on-site habitats at the time of the survey.

Existing On-Site Habitats

3.2.2 The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment concluded that the existing baseline biodiversity value of the site was **7.01** Habitat Units, consisting of:

- **0.676ha** of Developed Land; Sealed Surface (hardstanding) providing **0.00** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).
- **0.217ha** of Developed Land; Sealed Surface (buildings) providing **0.00** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).
- **0.419ha** of Modified Grassland in poor condition providing **0.84** Habitat Units.
- **0.010ha** of Ruderal/Ephemeral in moderate condition providing **0.04** Habitat Units.
- **0.033ha** of Introduced Shrub providing **0.07** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).
- **0.0122ha** of Urban Trees in poor condition providing **0.05** Habitat Units.
- **0.4479ha** of Urban Trees in moderate condition providing **3.58** Habitat Units.

- **0.171ha** of Urban Trees in good condition providing **2.05** Habitat Units.
- **0.024ha** of Urban Trees in moderate condition providing **0.29** Habitat Units
- **0.001ha** of Ornamental Lake or Pond in poor condition providing **0.00** Habitat Units.
- **0.046ha** of Bare Ground in poor condition providing **0.09** Habitat Units.

3.2.3 A full condition assessment for each existing habitat type is detailed in Appendix A.

Habitat Retention

3.2.4 Some of the existing habitat on site is to be retained in its current condition, meaning the retention of **5.91** Habitat Units comprised of:

- **0.010ha** of Ruderal/Ephemeral in moderate condition providing **0.04** Habitat Units.
- **0.001ha** of Ornamental Lake or Pond in poor condition providing **0.00** Habitat Units.
- **0.033ha** of Introduced Shrub providing **0.07** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).
- **0.0122ha** of Urban Trees in poor condition providing **0.05** Habitat Units.
- **0.4845ha** of Urban Trees in moderate condition providing **3.87** Habitat Units.
- **0.171ha** of Urban Trees in good condition providing **2.05** Habitat Units**.**
- **0.017ha** of Bare Ground in poor condition providing **0.03** Habitat Units.

3.3 Baseline Hedgerow Value

3.3.1 The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment concluded that the existing baseline biodiversity value of the site was **0.18** Hedgerow Units, consisting of:

- **0.025km** of Native Hedgerow in good condition providing **0.15** Hedgerow Units.
- **0.031km** of Non-native and Ornamental Hedgerow in poor condition providing **0.03** Hedgerow Units.

Hedgerow Retention

3.3.2 Some of the existing hedgerow on site is to be retained in its current condition, meaning the retention of 0.15 Hedgerow Units comprised of:

- **0.025km** of Native Hedgerow in good condition providing **0.15** Hedgerow Units.

3.4 Baseline Watercourse Value

3.4.1 No watercourses are present on site.

3.5 Proposed Habitat Creation

3.5.1 Proposals are to result in the creation of new habitat on site resulting in the creation of **0.37** Habitat Units comprised of:

- **0.049ha** of Developed Land; Sealed Surface which includes the proposed part of the proposed building and surrounding hardstanding, providing **0.00** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).
- **0.007ha** of Ponds (non-priority habitat) in moderate condition providing **0.05** Habitat Units.
- **0.0896ha** of native Urban Individual Trees in moderate condition providing **0.27** Habitat Units.
- **0.022ha** of Introduced Shrub providing **0.04** Habitat Units (condition assessment N/A).

3.5.2 A full target condition assessment for each proposed habitat creation type is detailed in Appendix B.

3.6 Proposed Hedgerows

3.6.1 Proposals are to result in the creation of new hedgerow on site resulting in the creation of **0.88** Hedgerow Units comprised of:

- **0.041km** of Species-rich Native Hedgerow in moderate condition providing **0.27** Hedgerow Units, located along the southern boundary of the western field.
- **0.091km** of Species-rich Native Hedgerow in moderate condition providing **0.61** Hedgerow Units, located along the eastern boundary of the site.

3.6.2 A full target condition assessment for each proposed hedgerow creation type is detailed in Appendix B.

3.7 Proposed Habitat Enhancements

3.7.1 **0.257ha** of Modified Grassland within the site shall be enhanced from poor condition to good condition through the over seeding with a native flowering lawn mix, to increase the average sward diversity to >5 species per meter square providing **1.12** Habitat Units.

3.7.2 **0.155ha** of existing poor condition Modified Grassland within the eastern field shall be enhanced to moderate condition Other Neutral Grassland through the re-seeding of the area with an appropriate native wildflower seed mix and careful on-going management as a wildflower meadow to maximise floral abundance providing **0.96** Habitat Units.

3.7.3 A full target condition assessment for each enhanced habitat type is detailed in Appendix B. Enhancement measures shall result in the delivery of **2.08** habitat units.

3.8 Proposed Watercourses

3.8.1 No watercourses are proposed to be created within the scheme.

3.9 Adherence to the Mitigation Hierarchy

Avoidance and Mitigation

3.9.1 The scheme has been designed to avoid impacts to additional individual trees (a medium distinctiveness habitat) through moving the location of the proposed building towards the west. Full details of protection measures are included within the arboricultural package which accompanies this application.

Compensation

3.9.2 In accordance with the hierarchy, there has been a focus on enhancement of existing habitats within the scheme. This includes the enhancement of existing modified grassland from poor to good condition and to moderate condition other neutral grassland through over seeding and management.

3.9.3 New habitat creation has focused on medium distinctiveness habitats which are appropriate to the location and size of habitat parcels. This has included the creation of a wildlife pond and the planting of 22 no. individual native urban trees throughout the site.

3.10 Trading Summary

3.10.1 All trading rules have been satisfied.

3.11 Overall Results

3.11.1 Once all retention, enhancement and habitat creation measures are taken into the account, the scheme currently results in the delivery of **8.56** Habitat Units, resulting in a net increase of **2.02** Habitat Units and a **30.94%** change in Habitat Units.

3.11.2 The scheme shall currently result in **1.03** Hedgerow Units, resulting in a net increase of **0.85** hedgerow Units and a **471.10%** Biodiversity Net Gain in Hedgerow Units.

3.10.4 The on-site gains associated with the traditional orchard, wildlife pond, other neutral grassland, individual urban trees and species-rich native hedgerow habitats are considered significant, and therefore a formal Habitat Management and Maintenance Plan (HMMP) shall be required.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 Metric calculations have identified that the proposed scheme would result in over +10% Biodiversity Net Gain, complying with the current Local Planning policy, subsequent to the provision of legal agreement / conservation covenant, to ensure that the proposed habitats are delivered for at least 30 years.

5.2 To ensure the above habitats are managed into the future, a suitable Habitat Creation Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) should be produced. This should include management prescriptions for new habitat areas including aspects such as mowing regimes, which shall ensure the target conditions are achieved. The HMMP should include details of monitoring intervals and methods for the 30-year period to ensure that the target conditions are achieved. These measures shall ensure that the scheme accords with The Environment Act 2021, and can be secured by the standard Biodiversity Gain pre-commencement planning condition.

6.0 REFERENCES

CIEEM. (2017). Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

CIEEM. (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development. Winchester

Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (2024). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool.*

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

UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.1

Appendix A – Condition Assessment for Existing Habitats

Modified Grassland in Poor Condition:

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Modified grassland			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description
Existing Modified Grassland within the site.

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.	No	Less than 6-8 vascular plant species noted per m².
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	Uniform height of around 6cm.
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* 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 noted at the time of survey.
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	No physical damage noted at the time of survey.
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].	Yes	Cover of bare ground was low at around 1-2%.
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	No bracken was noted at the time of survey.
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).	Yes	No invasive species noted at the time of survey.

		Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)	No
		Number of criteria passed	5
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 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)	X	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

The area could be re-seeded with a higher diversity mix appropriate to the desired target grassland habitat, along with an appropriate management scheme.

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* , spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* , curled dock *Rumex crispus* , broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* , common nettle *Urtica dioica* , creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* , greater plantain *Plantago major* , white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* .

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).

Existing Medium Sycamore Individual Tree in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Medium sycamore to be removed located to the east of the existing workshop building.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Tree species is Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus).
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Tree is semi-mature.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	No	Tree has been heavily pruned resulting in around 65% expected canopy.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes	Lots of ivy present on trunk.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Around 50% of canopy oversailing vegetation.
	Number of criteria passed	4	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]
N/A tree is proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed building.

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - 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)

Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Small Cherry Individual Tree in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Small ornamental cherry located adjacent to the existing workshop building on the southern aspect, to be removed.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	No	Tree is an ornamental cherry species.
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Tree is young.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	Tree subject to a light pruning regime with no adverse impacts on health noted at the time of survey.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	Tree is too young to support natural ecological niches.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Around 90% of canopy oversailing modified grassland.
	Number of criteria passed	3	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]
N/A tree is proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed building.

Footnotes
Footnote 1 - 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) **Footnote 2** - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Medium Cotoneaster Individual Tree in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Medium cotoneaster located between the car parck and small out building to be removed.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	No	Tree is an ornamental cotoneaster species.
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Tree is semi-mature.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	Tree subject to pruning regime, however, no evidence of an adverseimpact upon health noted at the time of survey.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	No natural ecological niches noted at the time of survey.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	100% of canopy oversailing modified grassland.
	Number of criteria passed	3	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]
N/A tree is proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed building.

Footnotes
Footnote 1 - 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) **Footnote 2** - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Individual Trees in Good Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Native tree species located in the area of modified grassland located to the west of the site.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Trees are all native species.
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Trees are semi-mature to early-mature, have extensive growth but still have canopy and stem growth potential.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	Tree has undergone pruning however retains >75% of expected canopy for its age range and height.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes	Loose bark and deadwood present.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Canopy oversailing vegetation.
	Number of criteria passed	5	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	x
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]

Footnotes
Footnote 1 - 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) **Footnote 2** - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Individual Trees in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Native tree species located throughout the site.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Trees are all native species.
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Trees are semi-mature to early-mature, have extensive growth but still have canopy and stem growth potential.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	Tree has undergone pruning however retains >75% of expected canopy for its age range and height.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	Ecological niches not present.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Canopy oversailing vegetation.
	Number of criteria passed	4	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	x
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - 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)

Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Individual Trees in Poor Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
Ornamental tree species located within a strip of modified grassland located in the southeast of the site.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	No	Tree species is non-native.
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).	Yes	Individual trees.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Trees are semi-mature, are established but have significant growth potential.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	No	Trees have undergone extensive pruning.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	None noted.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Canopies oversailing vegetation.
	Number of criteria passed	2	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - 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)

Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Existing Ornamental Pond in Poor condition:

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type			
Habitat Type			
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat) **Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)** **Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)** [Use this condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools, use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes] **Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond** [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental ponds, use Lake condition sheet for Ornamental lakes]			
Habitat Description			
Existing ornamental pond located to the west of GTO house building.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	
Condition Assessment Criteria		**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**	**Notes (such as justification)**
Core Criteria - applicable to all ponds (woodland[1] and non-woodland):			
A	The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. Turbidity is acceptable if the pond is grazed by livestock.	Yes	Water within the pond was clear with no obvious signs of pollution noted at the time of survey.
B	There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10 m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter.	No	Low distinctiveness modified grassland surrounds pond on all sides.
C	Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed *Lemna* spp. or filamentous algae.	Yes	No duckweed noted and algae covers less than 10% of water surface.
D	The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework.	No	Pond and fountain are connected to pipework.
E	Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams[2], pumps or pipework.	No	Pond water levels are managed to be high throughout the year.
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species[3].	Yes	None noted at the time of survey.
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.	Yes	No fish noted at the time of survey.

Additional Criteria - must be assessed for all non-woodland ponds:			
H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)[4] cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.	No	Coverage of floating plants was around 10% at the time of survey.
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.	Yes	No shade noted, the pond is subject to full sun.
	Number of criteria passed	5	

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Results for woodland ponds which require assessment of 7 core criteria		
Passes 7 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Results for non-woodland ponds which require assessment of 9 criteria		
Passes 9 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 6 to 8 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	X

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

N/A this habitat is to be retained in its current condition.

Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat.

Footnote 2 – This excludes natural dams such as those created by Eurasian beaver *Castor fiber* .

Footnote 3 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent: WFD UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:

UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)

• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides* , Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii* , parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum* , floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides* and Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* , giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).
• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus* , zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha* , killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus* , demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes* , carp *Cyprinus carpio* .

Footnote 4 - If the pond is seasonal (as in, it dries out in most summers) then emergent species alone are likely to be found.

Existing Native Hedgerow in Good Condition:

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			
Existing Native Hedgerow consisting entirely of yew, located in the centre of the site between the car park and ornamental pond area.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**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 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 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	Average height >1.5m.
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 *Prunus spinosa* 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).	Yes	Average width > 1.5m.
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	Dense hedgerow growth started <0.5m from the ground.
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	Hedgerow growth uniformly dense with no significant gaps.
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 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 90% 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	Ground vegetation underneath hedgerow subject to regular strimming.
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 *Urtica* spp., cleavers *Galium aparine* and docks *Rumex* spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Yes	Total indicator species cover <20%.

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	None noted at the time of survey.
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	No evidence of human damage or excessive hedgerow cutting noted.
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

N/A Hedgerow is to be retained in it current condtion.

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 (GBNNSS) (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)

Existing Non-Native Ornamental Hedgerow in Poor Condition:

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			
Existing ornamental Hedgerow consisting entirely of cherry laural and privet, located in the centre of the site between the northern and southern car parks.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	22/11/2024 Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**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 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 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	Average height >1.5m.
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 *Prunus spinosa* 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	Average width < 1.5m.
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).	No	Dense hedgerow growth started >0.5m from the ground.
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).	No	Significant gaps noted.
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 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 90% 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	Ground vegetation underneath hedgerow subject to regular strimming.
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 *Urtica* spp., cleavers *Galium aparine* and docks *Rumex* spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	No	Total indicator species cover >20%.

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	None noted at the time of survey.
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	No evidence of human damage or excessive hedgerow cutting noted.
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:	1

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

N/A Hedgerow is to be removed to facilitate the proposed building.

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 (GBNNSS) (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)

Appendix B – Target Condition Assessment for Proposed Habitats

Enhanced Poor Condition Modified Grassland to Moderate Condition Other Neutral Grassland:

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types			
Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland **Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland** **Grassland - Lowland meadows** **Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland** **Grassland - Other neutral grassland** **Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430)** [Not to be confused with the Tall forbs secondary code – see UKHab guidance for details.] **Grassland - Upland acid grassland** **Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland** **Grassland - Upland hay meadows** **Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland**			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	
Habitat Description			
Areas of existing modified grassland to be enhanced to other neutral grassland native wildflower meadow within the western field.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type (and relative to Footnote 3 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description).[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**	Yes	Seed mix to be an appropriate native mix to provide a good example of other neutal grassland.
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 insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	No	Sward height is to be a uniform height.
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens[2].	Yes	Bare ground to be managed within this range.
D	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) is less than 5%.	Yes	No Bracken was noted on site therefore, none is expected.
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.	No	Given the presence of suboptimal species within the existing sward it is likely that their cover wiil be >5%.

Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types			
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m^2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 3 and 5 cannot contribute towards this count). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**	Yes	The seed mix shall include a minimum of 10 vascular species.
	Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)	Yes	
	Number of criteria passed	4	

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Acid grassland types (Result out of 5 criteria)		
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Non-acid grassland types (Result out of 6 criteria)		
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F.	Good (3)	
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A.	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 2 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Area is to be managed as a native wildflower meadow, cut once per year between August and October with all arisings being collected and removed.

Notes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing for plant colonisation, or localised patches not exceeding 5% cover.

Footnote 3 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* , spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* , curled dock *Rumex crispus* , broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* , common nettle *Urtica dioica* , creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* , greater plantain *Plantago major* , white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* . There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 4 – 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, by applying professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Enhanced Poor Condition Modified Grassland to Good Condition:

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	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	
Habitat Description			
Existing Modified Grassland within the site to be retained and enchanced through the over seeding with a native low-flowering lawn mix..			
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	Seed mix to include 6-8 vascular plant species noted per m².
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	Sward height to be of a uniform length.
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* 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 noted at the time of survey, therefore none expected.
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	No physical damage expected.
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].	Yes	Cover of bare ground shall be managed to within this range.
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	No bracken was noted at the time of survey, therefore none expected.
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).	Yes	No invasive species noted at the time of survey, therefore none expected.

		Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)	Yes
		Number of criteria passed	6
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)	X	
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

The areas of retined modified grassland are to be over seeded with a native low-flowering lawn mix and managed as amenity grassland.

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* , spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* , curled dock *Rumex crispus* , broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* , common nettle *Urtica dioica* , creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* , greater plantain *Plantago major* , white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* .

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).

Proposed Wildlife Pond in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type			
Habitat Type			
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat) **Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)** **Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)** [Use this condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools, use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes] **Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond** [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental ponds, use Lake condition sheet for Ornamental lakes]			
Habitat Description			
Proposed wildlife pond to be located to the sotuh-west corner of ther western field.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - applicable to all ponds (woodland[1] and non-woodland):			
A	The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. Turbidity is acceptable if the pond is grazed by livestock.	Yes	The pond is expected to have good wtaer quality.
B	There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10 m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter.	Yes	Other neutral grassland is to surround the pond on all sides.
C	Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed *Lemna* spp. or filamentous algae.	No	The pond is to have minimal management and so the coverage of duckweed and algea cannot be garunteed.
D	The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework.	Yes	Pond is not proposed to be connected via pipework.
E	Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams[2], pumps or pipework.	Yes	Pond water levels are to be allowed to fluctuate naturally throughout the year.
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species[3].	Yes	None expected.
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.	Yes	No fish are to be stocked.

Additional Criteria - must be assessed for all non-woodland ponds:			
H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)[4] cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.	Yes	Coverage of floating plants is to be managed to at least 50%.
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.	Yes	No shade noted, the pond is subject to full sun.
	Number of criteria passed	5	

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Results for woodland ponds which require assessment of 7 core criteria		
Passes 7 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Results for non-woodland ponds which require assessment of 9 criteria		
Passes 9 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 6 to 8 criteria	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

The pond is to be planted with native panting throughout and managed as a wildlife pond with no fish proposed to be stocked.

Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat.

Footnote 2 – This excludes natural dams such as those created by Eurasian beaver *Castor fiber* .

Footnote 3 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent: WFD UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:

UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)

• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides* , Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii* , parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum* , floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides* and Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* , giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).
• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus* , zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha* , killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus* , demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes* , carp *Cyprinus carpio* .

Footnote 4 - If the pond is seasonal (as in, it dries out in most summers) then emergent species alone are likely to be found.

22 .no Proposed Individual Native Trees in Moderate Condition:

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees **Individual trees – Rural trees** Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. ***Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.***			
Habitat Description			
22 no. proposed native small urban trees are proposed across the site.			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. **Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):** Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-Site GTO House	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	Will Mills ACIEEM
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference	SU 79928 78015	**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	All trees are to be native species.
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).	Yes	Individual tree.
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	Trees are to be young.
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	No damage expected.
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	Trees are to be young and therefore unlikely to attain these niches within the 30 year period.
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	100% of canopy is to oversail vegetation.
	Number of criteria passed	4	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	X
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]
N/A trees shall develop features and age to attain additional criteria in time but likely to take longer than the initial 30 year monitoring period.

Footnotes
Footnote 1 - 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) **Footnote 2** - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

25 50 m

1:1,000

Legend

- Native hedgerow
- Species-rich native hedgerow
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Introduced shrub
- Modified grassland
- Ornamental lake or pond
- Other neutral grassland
- Ponds (non-priority habitat)
- Ruderal/Ephemeral
- Bare ground
- Existing Large Urban Tree
- Existing Medium Urban Tree
- Existing Small Urban Tree
- Proposed Small Urban Tree
- Red Line Boundary

LIZARD
Landscape Design and Ecology
The Old Bank, 34 South Street, Tarring, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 7LH
T. 01903 216033 E. office@lizardlandscape.co.uk W. lizardlandscapeecology.com

Client
Murray Associates Ltd

Project Title & Location
GTO House,
Bath Road,
Twyford

Drawn by	Approved by	Rev	Date
WM	LB	01	19/02/25

Figure No. 02 - Proposed Site Habitat Plan