

DUNKIRK FARM, ELLESMERE PORT

Indicative Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

March 2024



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Dunkirk Farm, Ellesmere Port
Project Reference: CW20-1627
Report Title: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Report Reference: CW20-1627 RPT 002
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

Rev	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
/	01/03/2024	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	OC	KB	OC

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Redrow Homes (NW) Ltd and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Redrow Homes (NW) Ltd and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Redrow Homes (NW) Ltd and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	SCOPE & PURPOSE	4
1.2	LOCATION	4
1.3	OBJECTIVES.....	4
1.4	PLANNING CONTEXT	5
2	METHODS	6
2.1.	EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE).....	6
2.2.	PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT).....	6
2.3.	STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC.....	6
2.4.	HABITAT SCORING	6
2.5.	LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT	7
3	BASELINE CONDITIONS - HABITATS	8
3.1.	STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE.....	8
3.2.	HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT	8
3.3.	RETAINED AND ENHANCED HABITATS	9
3.4.	LOST HABITATS	9
3.5.	PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE	9
3.6.	HEDGEROWS PRE-DEVELOPMENT.....	10
3.7.	PRE- DEVELOPMENT HEDGEROW BASELINE.....	10
4	HABITAT CREATION AND ENHANCEMENT	11
5	HEDGEROW CREATION	11
6	SUMMARY	12
7	BIBLIOGRAPHY	13

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Redrow Homes (NW) Ltd to prepare an Indicative Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the proposed masterplan at Dunkirk Farm, Ellesmere Port. The development will include a new residential housing development.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Olivia Collington BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, CEnv Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Olivia is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.

1.1.3. This report has been written broadly following the Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates (CIEEM, 2023).

1.2. LOCATION

1.3.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location.

Figure 1.1 Site Location



1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The report has been produced to document the methods, results and conclusions of a BNG Assessment undertaken based on the proposed development for the site to fulfil the following:

- Ensure that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied;
- Identify the baseline habitats present and provide a condition assessment;
- Identify the post development habitats on site, assess the possible target condition and provide an indication of the likely importance of those habitats;
- Calculate the overall change in biodiversity score from pre- post development
- Provide design recommendations to maximise potential net gain achievable
- Provide an indication of likely outcomes and indicative cost as required.

1.4 PLANNING CONTEXT

- 1.4.1 The Government 25-year Environment Plan states that government will “embed environmental net gain principle for development.”
- 1.4.2 National policy already sets out that planning should provide Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) where possible. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 174(d), 179(b) and 180(d) refer to this policy requirement and the Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further explanation on how this should be done.
- 1.4.3 Under the Environment Act 2021, all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) except for small sites will have to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain from January 2024. BNG will be required for small sites from April 2024. BNG will be measured using Defra’s biodiversity metric and habitats will need to be secured for at least 30 years. Key points regarding BNG are listed below:
- Minimum 10% gain required calculated using Biodiversity Metric & approval of net gain plan.
 - Habitat secured for at least 30 years via obligations/ conservation covenant.
 - Habitat can be delivered on-site, off-site or via statutory biodiversity units.
 - There will be a national register for net gain delivery sites.
 - The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation, and compensation for biodiversity loss.
 - Will also apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs)
 - Does not apply to marine development.
 - Does not change existing legal environmental and wildlife protections.
- 1.4.4 Developers will be required to undertake an assessment (using the nationally set BNG metric tool) of the current biodiversity value of their site both prior to and post the development proposal. In the event that the value of the site post-development is less than 10% better than it was prior to development then the developer will have an obligation to provide additional off-site BNG units to achieve the mandatory 10% net gain.

2 METHODS

2.1. EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE)

2.1.1.A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) of the site was undertaken by Collington Winter Environmental Ltd in February 2024. The methods were based on the standard methodology as detailed by UK Hab Methodology.

2.2. PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)

2.2.1.No masterplan was available at the time of writing. Therefore, an indicative assessment of potential BNG % has been undertaken using the net development area proposed and providing recommendations for habitats within Public Open Space. Please note, the proposed habitats, and areas may change once a formal masterplan becomes available.

2.3. STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC

2.3.1.The BNG calculation was undertaken utilising The Statutory Biodiversity Metric from DEFRA, the site's UK Habitat map and the Site Plan. The calculation was performed by a technically competent and experienced ecologist as detailed in British Standard BS8683 – Suitably qualified person –definition in BS8683:2020.

2.3.2.The Statutory Biodiversity Metric uses habitat features as a proxy measure for capturing the value and importance of nature. The metric considers the size, ecological condition, location and proximity to nearby 'connecting' features. The metric enables assessments to be made of the present and forecast future biodiversity value of a site.

2.4. HABITAT SCORING

2.4.1.The Small Sites Metric supplies reference documents and user guides in which to accurately evaluate and assess the different habitats on site. The methodology for the baseline and post development calculations are demonstrated in the following sections.

Baseline Units

2.4.2.To assess the quality of a habitat and therefore calculate the units scored the Statutory Biodiversity Metric utilises three scoring factors as detailed below.

Condition

2.4.3.The condition of a habitat is assessed utilising the Condition Sheets provided for each habitat type. These list positive indicators for each habitat and indicate how many of these indicators need to be present to meet certain thresholds of condition. These condition sheets can be found in The Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets with instructions tool Technical (Natural England Joint Publication, 2023).

Distinctiveness

2.4.4.The distinctiveness of each habitat (area and linear) is automatically assigned by the tool, based upon national records of the occurrence and rarity of each habitat (The Statutory Biodiversity metric).

Strategic Significance

2.4.5.The idea of strategic significance works at a landscape scale. It gives additional unit value to habitats that are in preferred locations for biodiversity and other environmental objectives. Strategic significance utilises published local plans and objectives to identify local priorities for targeting biodiversity and nature improvement, such as Nature Recovery Areas, local biodiversity plans, National Character Area objectives and green infrastructure strategies.

Post Development Units

2.4.6.Additional factors are implemented when assessing post development habitats.

- Difficulty of Creation/Enhancement
- Temporal Risk "Time to target condition"
- Spatial Risk (when offsite mitigation is necessary)

2.5. LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT

2.5.1. Whilst every effort has been made to provide a comprehensive description of the site, no investigation could ensure the complete characterisation and prediction of the natural environment. The conclusions and recommendations detailed in this report are based upon the site redline boundary and the development proposals as outlined by the client at the time of writing. Should there be any changes to the site redline boundary or development proposals at a later stage, this assessment should be reviewed to determine whether any amendments or additional survey work is required.

2.5.2. Habitat areas (predevelopment) have been measured using online mapping, and therefore will not be completely accurate. Post development areas have been provided by the client.

2.5.3. The Proposed Site Layout used for post development areas is indicative in nature and does not constitute a detailed landscape plan.

Table 2.1 Limitations Review

Limitation	Analysis
Competence of surveyor	Condition Assessment was undertaken by Emma Anderson, Ecologist at Collington Winter and overseen by Olivia Collington BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, CEnv, Managing Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd who holds over 10 years experience in ecological consultancy and holds key experience undertaking BNG assessments and providing advice on habitat creation, management and enhancements for both developers and habitat banks.
Competence of ecologist completing the metric	Metric completed by Olivia Collington who is suitably experienced undertaking BNG Assessments and has attended appropriate training via webinar concerning the Statutory Metric.
Age of survey data	The condition assessment was undertaken in February 2024 and is therefore less than 12 months old. There is no constraint to the age of survey data and this falls within best practice guidance.
Timing of survey	The survey was undertaken in February which is a sub-optimal time of year to undertake condition assessments due to the lack of vegetation and inability to assess presence of invasive non-native species accurately. In this instance, a precautionary approach has therefore been taken and the presence of invasive non-native species assumed as a "worst case" scenario.
Departure from best practice guidance	No departures have been made from best practice guidance. As the masterplan at this stage is "indicative", recommendations have been made for post-development habitats which are realistic for the development type and location.

3 BASELINE CONDITIONS - HABITATS

3.1. STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

3.1.1. The site is “*Formally Identified in Local Strategy*”.

3.2. HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT

Grassland – Modified Grassland

3.2.1. The site comprised a series of grazed modified grassland fields in “Poor” condition, due to comprising less than 6-8 species per m². The fields were waterlogged at the time of survey, though this is not anticipated to be the case year-round.

3.2.2. The field parcel to the southwest of the site, separated by Dunkirk Lane, was found to be in Moderate condition due to hosting a higher number of species per m², as well as meeting the following criteria:

- 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.
- 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.

- Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.
- There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA4).

Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub

3.2.3. A small area covering 0.817 ha of mixed scrub was present along the western boundary of the site. It was assessed as providing “Poor” habitat condition, due to passing two of five criteria as follows:

- There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA5) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover.
- There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges.

Urban – Developed Land; Sealed Surface

3.2.4. The existing farm buildings and associated hardstanding covered an area of approximately 0.45 ha. The metric pre-sets this condition criteria as “N.A – Other”.

Rural Tree

3.2.5. Three mature pedunculate oak trees were located to the south east of the site, not associated with any hedgerows or tree lines. The Tree Constraints Plan (Collington Winter, 2024) identifies the trees as having a stem diameter of 840 mm, making them “Medium” sized. Using the Tree Size Helper tool, this equates to an area of 0.3257 ha. The trees were found to be in “Moderate” habitat condition based on meeting the following criteria:

- The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).
- 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).
- 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.
- Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.

Summary

3.2.6. Table 3.1 summarises the baseline habitats and area size.

Table 3.1 Habitat Type and Condition Assessment (pre-development)

Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition
Modified grassland	No	20.805	Low	2	Poor
Modified grassland	No	0.76	Low	2	Moderate
Mixed scrub	No	0.817	Medium	4	Poor
Rural tree	No	0.0489	Medium	4	Moderate
Developed land; sealed surface	No	0.45	V.Low	0	N/A - Other

3.3. RETAINED AND ENHANCED HABITATS

3.3.1. It is anticipated that the Mixed Scrub along the western boundary of the site can be retained and enhanced to a "Moderate" condition through the following management:

- Management of grassland edges to provide transition habitats
- Management to ensure shrubs of all ages are present (seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature)
- An absence of invasive non – native species and species indicative of sub – optimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover

3.3.2. It is also anticipated that the three mature trees (referenced T37, T38 and T39 in the Tree Constraints Report) are retained through the development.

3.4. LOST HABITATS

3.4.1. All other habitats within the red line boundary are to be lost to development.

3.5. PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE

3.5.1. Please refer to Table 3.2 summarising the Habitat Baseline for the calculation, demonstrating habitats to be retained, enhance and/or lost.

Table 3.2 Habitat Baseline

	On site Baseline	Retained	Enhanced	Lost
Habitat (Area) Units	55.56	0.45	3.76	51.35

3.6. HEDGEROWS PRE-DEVELOPMENT

3.6.1. Several hedgerows and Line of Trees are present within the baseline of the site. References have been used to align with the Tree Constraints Report (Collington Winter, 2024). Please refer to Table 3.3 for a summary of hedgerows and treelines and their condition assessment.

Table 3.3 Baseline Hedgerow and Treeline Condition Assessment

Hedge number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Total hedgerow units
H1	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.15	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.32
H2	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.36	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	3.17
H3	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.36	High	6	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Like for like or better	4.75
H4	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.185	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.63
H6	Native hedgerow	0.047	Low	2	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.21
H7	Native hedgerow	0.16	Low	2	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.70
H8	Native hedgerow	0.133	Low	2	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.59
H10	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.257	High	6	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Like for like or better	3.39
H11	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.13	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.14
H12	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.13	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.14
H13	Native hedgerow with trees	0.12	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.06
H14	Native hedgerow	0.12	Low	2	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.53
H15	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.1	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.88
G10	Line of trees	0.6	Low	2	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	2.64
H17	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.435	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness band or better	3.83

3.6.2. For the purposes of this assessment, and in the absence of a masterplan it is assumed that the boundary treeline G10 can be retained through development. In addition, H1, H2, H4, H7, H11, H14, H10, H17 will be retained and enhanced through development to become species rich hedgerows. All enhanced hedgerows have been shown as “Moderate” condition with a 3 year delay in creation.

3.7. PRE- DEVELOPMENT HEDGEROW BASELINE

3.7.1. Please refer to Table 3.5 summarising the Hedgerow Baseline for the calculation, demonstrating hedgerows to be retained, enhanced and/or lost.

Table 3.5 Hedgerow Baseline

	On site Baseline	Retained	Enhanced	Lost
Hedgerow Units	26.98	2.64	15.71	8.62

4 HABITAT CREATION AND ENHANCEMENT

4.1.1. Please refer to the Appendix for details of the condition criteria targeted for each habitat group (where appropriate). In the absence of a masterplan, habitat areas have been estimated.

4.1.2. For the purpose of this indicative BNG Assessment, it has been assumed that there will be a 3-year delay in creating the proposed habitats.

4.1.3. Note – 70 small trees, and 20 medium sized trees (to be planted as medium sized – 30 – 90 cm DBH) have been proposed in this indicative assessment, to include both Public Open Space trees as well as street trees.

Table 4.1 Post Development Habitats, area sizes and target conditions

Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness		Condition	
			Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	10	VLow	0	N/A - Other	0
Urban	Vegetated garden	5	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1
Grassland	Modified grassland	0.5061	Low	2	Poor	1
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.01	Medium	4	Moderate	2
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.5	Medium	4	Moderate	2
Individual trees	Urban tree	0.285	Medium	4	Moderate	2
Grassland	Modified grassland	1	Low	2	Moderate	2
Individual trees	Urban tree	0.3257	Medium	4	Moderate	2

5 HEDGEROW CREATION

5.1.1. For the purpose of this indicative BNG Assessment, it has been assumed that there will be a 3-year delay in creating the proposed hedgerows.

Table 5.1 Post Development Hedgerow, length and target condition

Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.55	High	6	Moderate	2

6 SUMMARY

6.1.1. This report and the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric submitted have demonstrated that the proposed habitat creation create a net gain of biodiversity within the site of +10.46% in habitat units. **The trading rules have been satisfied.**

6.1.2. The metric shows that a net gain in Hedgerow Units of +11.31% has been achieved.

Figure 5.1 On site net %

FINAL RESULTS		
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	5.81
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	3.19
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	0.00
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	10.46%
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	11.31%
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	0.00%
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓	

6.1.3. It is anticipated that any masterplan could achieve greater than 10% habitats gain through provision of additional trees and hedgerow habitats. In addition, the scheme can positively contribute to local ecological networks and maintain and enhance the sites connectivity to the wider landscape.

6.1.4. It is recommended that a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) be conditioned as part of the planning permission to meeting the targeted conditions of post development habitats. The LEMP will detail full management prescriptions, focussing on the retained trees within the site, for the 30-year period required as best practice for biodiversity net gain. The LEMP will be provided to all tenants and future homeowners in order for retained trees located within private gardens to be in keeping with the management plan for the 30-year period.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CIEEM (2021) Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates.
- DEFRA (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity
- DEFRA (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity. Condition Assessment Sheets (Excel Format)

APPENDIX 1 – POST DEVELOPMENT TARGET HABITAT CONDITIONS

Habitat Type: Other Neutral Grassland		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	<p>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.</p> <p>Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.</p>	Yes
B	<p>Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.</p>	Yes
C	<p>Cover of bare ground between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.</p>	Yes
D	<p>Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble) less than 5%.</p>	Yes
E	<p>Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area.</p> <p>If any invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.</p>	Yes
F	<p>There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m² present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type.</p> <p>Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.</p>	No

Habitat Type: Individual Trees		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Yes
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).	No
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	No
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
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	No

Habitat Type: Modified Grassland		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs. Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.	Yes
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
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus agg.</i> may be present).	Yes
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
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens).	No
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Yes
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA4).	Yes

Habitat Type: Mixed Scrub		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted
A	<p>The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description (where in its natural range).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 80% of scrub is native, - There are at least three native woody species, - No single species comprising more than 75% of the cover (except hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i>, common juniper <i>Juniperus communis</i>, sea buckthorn <i>Hippophae rhamnoides</i> or box <i>Buxus sempervirens</i>, which can be up to 100% cover). 	Yes
B	Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present.	No
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover.	Yes
D	The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat.	Yes
E	There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges.	Yes

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

