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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham, hereafter referred to as 'the Scheme', comprises two sections known as Part A: Morpeth to Felton (Part A) and Part B: Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B). The Scheme aims to increase capacity by widening the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway along an approximately 12.6 km section of Part A (approximately 6.5 km of online widening and approximately 6.1 km of new offline highway) and along an approximately 8 km section of Part B. Most of the work would take place within the highway boundary, however, some additional land would be required alongside the A1 to enable additional lanes to be constructed. All construction works are contained within the Order Limits, which is shown on the figures in Appendix B.

Part A and Part B were subject to individual biodiversity no net loss assessments (see Appendix 9.20: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Part A [APP-246] and Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report Part B [APP-309]) submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. These assessments were undertaken in accordance with industry recognised best practice guidance and using the Defra 2012 Metric, which represented the current metric at the time of assessment.

A biodiversity not net loss assessment for the Scheme as a whole was prepared and issued at Deadline 2 of the examination [REP2-009] and updated at Deadline 4 [REP4-058 and 059] in response to proposed changes to the Scheme, as detailed within the Summary of Proposed Changes to Application [AS-017 and 018] issued to the ExA in December 2020. The proposed changes result in additional woodland loss within the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) as a result of the Stabilisation Works, as outlined in Section 8.8 of Environmental Statement Addendum: Stabilisation Works for Change Request [REP4-063].

The biodiversity no net loss assessment presented within this report has been updated to provide a correction to the biodiversity calculation with regards to hedgerow and woodland habitat. An error in the interpretation of the Part A Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [REP3008] within the previous assessment had overestimated the amount of retained hedgerow (by approximately 1000 m ) but significantly underestimated the amount of created hedgerow (by approximately 7000 m ). The previous assessment also included areas of baseline and post-development habitat associated with the loss of ancient woodland habitat (an irreplaceable habitat), which should be excluded from the biodiversity calculations (as detailed in paragraph 2.4.1(2)). The biodiversity calculation has been updated to correct the errors identified above. The correction has resulted in a positive outcome on the calculation, with a net gain predicted for hedgerow biodiversity units (previously a net loss) and an increase in the net gain of area-based biodiversity units (which includes woodland).

The information presented within this report assumes that the proposed changes are accepted by the ExA and, if accepted, this report would supersede the previous iteration
issued at Deadline 2 of the examination [REP2-009]. In comparison to the original assessments for Part A and Part B [APP-246 and APP-309], the assessment presented has been undertaken in accordance with the same recognised best practice guidance but uses Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 2.0. This metric supersedes and replaces the former Defra biodiversity metric and represents the current metric at the time of assessment. As an assessment utilising the updated metric, the quantitative results of this assessment should not be compared to the previous assessments undertaken for Part A and Part B separately.

As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), there is no legal requirement for the Scheme to achieve no net loss or net gains in biodiversity. However, the Scheme seeks to support the aim of no net loss of biodiversity, as detailed in paragraph 2.2.3, Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [APP-037].

The Scheme has adopted the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 and the biodiversity no net loss assessment presented within this report has been undertaken in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) process. WSP was commissioned by Highways England to carry out a biodiversity no net loss assessment of the Scheme and produce a report which aims to:
a. Establish the total number of Area-based Habitat Biodiversity Units (AHBU), Hedgerow Biodiversity Units (HBU) and River Biodiversity Units (RBU) which would be lost due to construction of the Scheme;
b. Establish the total number of AHBU, HBU and RBU which would be retained, reinstated or created under the Scheme;
c. Determine whether the Scheme would result in a net loss, no net loss or a net gain for biodiversity.
An overview of the methods employed is provided in Section 2 and the methodology is detailed in full in Appendix D of this report. Table 1 details the results of the assessment calculations.

Table 1 - Summary of Assessment Calculation Results

| Biodiversity <br> Units | Baseline <br> Value | Post- <br> Development <br> Value | Change | Outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AHBU | 869.64 | 948.32 | +78.69 | Net Gain <br> $(9.05 \%)$ |
| HBU | 339.49 | 354.99 | +15.50 | Net Gain <br> $(4.57 \%)$ |
| RBU | 46.51 | 41.07 | -5.44 | Net Loss <br> $(11.69 \%)$ |

The Scheme would result in a total loss of 0.96 ha of irreplaceable ancient woodland habitat. This loss of irreplaceable habitat is from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (designated ancient woodland) and Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) (not designated but treated as ancient woodland within the assessment, as detailed in paragraph 9.10.3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048]). An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.1 Part A [APP247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat as a result of Part A. The areas associated with this loss have been excluded from the assessment calculations in accordance with best practice guidelines. It is important to note that biodiversity net loss (or net gain) cannot be achieved for the Scheme as a whole as there is loss of an irreplaceable habitat.

Overall, the Scheme is categorised as achieving a biodiversity net loss due to:

1) A $11.69 \%$ loss of RBU;
2) Loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland habitats within the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and the Coquet River Felton Park LWS.

Whilst no net loss cannot be claimed for the Scheme as a whole due to the loss of irreplaceable habitat (ancient woodland), medium distinctiveness woodland and scrub and river habitat, the assessment calculation does identify a net gain in hedgerows, area-based priority woodland and wetland habitats.

The proposed changes to the Scheme that have informed this updated assessment relate to the loss of woodland within the Coquet River Felton Park LWS, treated as ancient woodland for the purpose of mitigation and compensation. As detailed above, the areas of habitat loss and creation associated with ancient woodland have been excluded from the assessment calculations in accordance with best practice guidelines. As such, the summary of assessment presented in Table 1 and the conclusions drawn remains unchanged from the previous iteration of this report [REP2-009].

It should be noted that this report looks at the biodiversity no net loss assessment results only and does not provide any recommendations to enable a reduction in biodiversity losses and to maximise biodiversity gains.

It is important to recognise that the quantification of biodiversity units is one of a number of factors to be considered when assessing the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity. Another component is the collation of qualitative evidence to review adherence to the BNG Good Practice Principles (refer to Section 3.6).

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1.1. An application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) was made by Highways England (Applicant) on 07 July 2020 to the Secretary of State for Transport via the Planning Inspectorate (Inspectorate) under the Planning Act 2008 (2008 Act). If made, the DCO would grant consent for the A1 in Northumberland: Morpeth to Ellingham, hereafter referred to as 'the Scheme', which comprises two sections known as Part A: Morpeth to Felton (Part A) and Part B: Alnwick to Ellingham (Part B). The Scheme aims to increase capacity by widening the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway along an approximately 12.6 km section of Part A (approximately 6.5 km of online widening and approximately 6.1 km of new offline highway) and along an approximately 8 km section of Part B, both of which are in a predominantly rural area. Most of the work would take place within the existing highway boundary, however, some additional land would be required alongside the A1 at certain points to enable the additional lanes to be constructed. All construction works are contained within the Order Limits for the Scheme, which is illustrated on the figures in Appendix B.
1.1.2. Part A and Part B were previously subject to individual biodiversity no net loss assessments (see Appendix 9.20: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Part A [APP-246] and Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report Part B [APP-309]) submitted as part of the DCO application. These assessments were undertaken in accordance with industry recognised best practice guidance and using the Defra 2012 Metric, which represented the current metric at the time of assessment.
1.1.3. A biodiversity not net loss assessment for the Scheme as a whole was prepared and issued at Deadline 2 [REP2-009] of the examination and updated at Deadline 4 [REP4-058 and 059]in response to proposed changes to the Scheme, as detailed within the Summary of Proposed Changes to Application [AS-017 and 018] issued to the ExA in December 2020. The proposed changes result in additional woodland loss within the Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The biodiversity no net loss assessment presented within this report has been updated to provide a correction to the biodiversity calculation with regards to hedgerow and woodland habitat. An error in the interpretation of the Part A Landscape Mitigation Masterplan [REP3-008] within the previous assessment had overestimated the amount of retained hedgerow (by approximately 1000m) but significantly underestimated the amount of created hedgerow (by approximately 7000 m ). The previous assessment also included areas of baseline and post-development habitat associated with the loss of ancient woodland habitat (an irreplaceable habitat), which should be excluded from the biodiversity calculations (as detailed in paragraph 2.4.1(2). The biodiversity calculation has been updated to correct the errors identified above. The correction has resulted in a positive outcome on the calculation, with a net gain predicted for hedgerow biodiversity units (previously a net loss) and an increase in the net gain of area-based biodiversity units (which includes woodland).
1.1.4. The information presented within this report assumes that the proposed changes are accepted by the ExA and, if accepted, this report would supersede the previous iteration issued at Deadline 2 [REP2-009] of the examination. In comparison to the original assessments for Part A and Part B [APP-246 and APP-309], the assessment presented has been undertaken in accordance with the same recognised best practice guidance but using Natural England's Biodiversity Metric 2.0. This metric supersedes and replaces the former Defra biodiversity metric and represents the current metric at the time of assessment.
1.1.5. As an assessment utilising the updated metric, the quantitative results of the assessment presented within this report should not be compared to the previous assessments undertaken for Part A and Part B separately.
1.1.6. Biodiversity Metric 2.0 has been used to undertake a baseline and preliminary postdevelopment biodiversity unit and linear unit calculation to quantify the biodiversity which would be impacted due to the Scheme. This assessment will provide an indication of the biodiversity which would be replaced through onsite compensation once the Scheme has been built. This information will be used to indicate whether the Scheme is likely to result in a net loss, no net loss or net gain for biodiversity.
1.1.7. The biodiversity assessment provides a quantitative benchmark to inform avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures designed to mitigate for habitat loss due to the Scheme. This includes informing habitat restoration and reinstatement proposals as well as new habitat creation.
1.1.8. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), there is no legal requirement for the Scheme to achieve no net loss or net gains in biodiversity. However, the Scheme seeks to support the aim of no net loss of biodiversity, as detailed in paragraph 2.2.3, Chapter 2: The Scheme of the ES [APP-037]. As detailed in the Applicant's response to BIO.1.1 of the Examining Authorities first written questions [REP1-032], the aim of working towards no net loss of biodiversity relates to the Applicant's own internal requirements (as detailed within Action 3.2, Outcome 3 of the Highways England Biodiversity Action Plan) and national and local policies and strategies, such as the Road Improvement Strategy 2 (RIS2) and the NPS NN.
1.1.9. The biodiversity no net loss assessment (hereafter referred to as 'the assessment') detailed within this report has been undertaken in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Process, detailed below.

### 1.2 BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN PROCESS

1.2.1. The BNG process follows the mitigation hierarchy, which sets out that everything possible must be done to first avoid, secondly minimise and thirdly restore / rehabilitate losses of biodiversity on site. Only as a last resort, residual losses are compensated for using biodiversity offsets, which are distinguished from other forms of mitigation in that they are off the development site and require measurable conservation outcomes.
1.2.2. To generate long-term gains for nature, the good practice principles established by the Business and Biodiversity Offset Programme (BBOP) can be used. These principles have been established in the context of UK development by the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA), the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) (2016) (refer to Appendix A).

### 1.3 SCOPE OF REPORT

1.3.1. This report contains the Biodiversity No Net Loss assessment using the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 and:
a. Establishes the total number of Area-Based Habitat Biodiversity Units (AHBU), Hedgerow Biodiversity Units (HBU) and River Biodiversity Units (RBU) which would be lost due to construction of the Scheme;
b. Establishes the total number of $\mathrm{AHBU}, \mathrm{HBU}$ and RBU which would be retained, reinstated or created under the Scheme;
c. Determines whether the Scheme would result in a net loss, no net loss or a net gain for biodiversity.
1.3.2. This report provides details of the methodology and results of the biodiversity no net loss assessment for the Scheme. It should be noted that this report looks at the biodiversity no net loss assessment results only and does not provide any recommendations to enable a reduction in biodiversity losses and to maximise biodiversity gains.
1.3.3. This Biodiversity No Net Loss assessment report does not cover requirements of the Scheme arising from potential impacts on protected species and designated sites. This information is covered within Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048] and Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B of the ES [APP-049]

### 1.4 RELEVANT LEGALISATION AND POLICY

1.4.1. This appraisal has been compiled with reference to the following relevant nature conservation, legalisation, planning policy and the UK Biodiversity Framework (JNCC, 2012) from which the protection of sites, habitats and species is derived in England:
a. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (HMSO, 2006);
b. National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (Department for Transport, 2014);
c. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2019);
d. UK Government's 25 Year Environmental Plan (DEFRA, 2018);
e. Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services (DEFRA, 2011);
f. Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan (Northumberland Wildlife Trust, 2008);
g. Northumberland Local Plan (Northumberland County Council, 2019); and
h. Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy (Northumberland County Council, 2017).
1.4.2. Details of the legislation, policy and strategic documents relevant to the Scheme are provided in Appendix C and are listed in the subsequent sections.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 OVERVIEW

2.1.1. A summary of the BNG assessment methodology and details of project-specific data sources, assessment limitations, and assumptions are provided in the following methodology section. The full BNG assessment methodology is detailed in Appendix D.

### 2.2 DATA SOURCES

2.2.1. This assessment is informed by:
a. A Phase 1 Habitat survey undertaken in 2016 and 2018 for Part A, and in 2019 for Part B following best practice guidelines (Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC, 2010)). The survey provided a baseline habitat database which details the JNCC habitat types present on site, their area (in hectares), length (in kilometres) and their geographic distribution (Appendix B, baseline figures).
b. Annex A Approach to the Assessment of Losses and Gains for Watercourses [REP2-010], as detailed in paragraph 2.5.2.
c. A habitat condition assessment (HCA) of the habitats identified. HCA was completed in 2016 and 2018 for Part A, and in 2019 for Part B. Where condition assessment data was not collected in the field, assumptions were applied (see Section 2.5 for list of assumptions).
d. A detailed post-development landscape mitigation plan, as illustrated in Figure 7: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (Appendix B, post-development figures).
e. Publicly available Open Source Natural England datasets for HPI, ancient woodland (classed as irreplaceable habitat) and statutory designated sites for nature conservation.
f. Areas of temporary and permanent loss of land within the Order Limits in accordance with paragraph 2.5.2. This land represents the limit within which the contractor shall be able to operate and clear as required for construction operations.

### 2.3 BIODIVERSITY NO NET LOSS ASSESSMENT

2.3.1. This assessment uses the following industry recognised best practice methodologies:
a. CIEEM, CIRIA \& IEMA (2016). Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development (Appendix A);
b. CIEEM, CIRIA \& IEMA (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development. A Practical Guide;
c. Natural England (2019). The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 (December 2019);
d. Natural England (2010). Higher Stewardship, Farm Environment Plan (FEP) Manual, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition;
e. BRE (2018). GN36 - Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), Civil Engineering Environmental Quality Assessment and Award Scheme (CEEQUAL) and Home Quality Mark (HQM) Ecology Calculation Methodology Route 2.
2.3.2. Applying these standardised methods results in the calculation of a baseline biodiversity value; a post-development value; and a net change in biodiversity value associated with the Scheme.
2.3.3. The quantitative outcomes of the BNG assessment calculations can then be categorised as achieving one of the outcomes listed in Table 2-1, as described in GN36 (BRE, 2018). The quantitative outcome awarded to the Scheme will depend on the AHBU or HBU value with the lowest net percentage change value.

## Table 2-1 - Quantitative Outcomes of BNG Calculations

| Post-development biodiversity value | Predicted Scheme-wide outcome |
| :--- | :--- |
| Less than $95 \%$ of the baseline value | Net loss (NL) of biodiversity |
| $95 \%-104 \%$ of baseline value | No net loss (NNL) of biodiversity |
| $105 \%$ or more of baseline value | Biodiversity net gain (BNG) |

2.3.4. The quantitative outcomes of the calculations are one component of the BNG assessment and associated Good Practice Principles (Appendix A). A BNG assessment requires the collation of qualitative evidence on the application of the mitigation hierarchy, stakeholder engagement and post-development habitat management. Collectively, these quantitative outcomes and qualitative evidence are used to inform the outcomes of the Scheme-wide BNG assessment.

### 2.4 OVERVIEW OF METHODS

2.4.1. The assessment for the Scheme comprised the following steps:

1. Survey baseline habitats and their condition. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey and HCA of the habitats identified was completed in 2016 and 2018 for Part A and 2019 for Part B. Where condition assessment data was not collected in the field, assumptions were applied (see Section 2.5 for list of assumptions).
2. Identify irreplaceable habitat and statutory designated sites. Following Defra guidance, irreplaceable habitats and statutory designated sites within the Order Limits were identified and excluded from the biodiversity unit calculations.
3. Calculate baseline biodiversity units using the biodiversity metric. This calculation includes all habitats (minus irreplaceable habitats) within the Order Limits prior to development and is informed by Phase 1 Habitat data and results of the condition assessment.
4. Calculate post-development biodiversity units using the biodiversity metric. This calculation accounts for all of the proposed habitats (including retained habitats and habitats lost or created as a result of the development) within the Order Limits post-
development. The calculation excludes irreplaceable habitats and statutory designated sites. The calculation is informed by Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination).
5. Produce a 'Biodiversity Assessment' report. The report sets out the BNG process in the context of the Scheme and includes the method and results of initial baseline and post-development biodiversity unit calculations.
2.4.2. The results of the Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment, and subsequent recommendations are included within this report.

## IRREPLACEABLE HABITATS AND STATUTORY DESIGNATED SITES

2.4.3. The Order Limits includes approximately 0.96 ha of ancient woodland, which is considered to be an irreplaceable habitat. This loss of irreplaceable habitat is from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (designated ancient woodland) and Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (not designated but treated as ancient woodland within the assessment, as detailed in paragraph 9.10.3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048]). The River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI is also a statutory designated site.
2.4.4. Impacts on ancient woodland and statutory designated sites and measures to address the loss of these habitats are discussed in Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP048]. There are no impacts/losses of ancient woodland and statutory designated sites associated with Part B.
2.4.5. Following Defra guidance, irreplaceable habitats have been excluded from this biodiversity unit calculation (see Principle 2 of CIRIA, CIEEM \& IEMA Good Practice Principles). It is important to note that biodiversity no net loss (or net gain) cannot be achieved for the Scheme as a whole if there is loss of an irreplaceable habitat.
2.4.6. Defra guidance dictates that any compensation offered to address impacts on irreplaceable habitats should be agreed directly with the statutory nature conservation agency (in this case Natural England (NE)). An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21 Part A [APP-247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat as a result of Part A.
2.4.7. Further detail of the assessment methodology can be found within Appendix D.

### 2.5 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

2.5.1. Assumptions associated with the Phase 1 Habitat survey are described in Appendix 9.1
Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report Part A [APP-227] and Appendix 9.1: Habitats
and Designated Sites Part B [APP-298] and are therefore not discussed further within this report.
2.5.2. In the absence of a plan identifying permanent and temporary habitat loss (which is subject to detailed design), the assessment used the indicative extent of land to be permanently acquired and the Order Limits (shown on Figure 4.1 Boundary Plan Part A [APP-073] and Figure 4.2: Boundary Plan Part B [APP-074]) as a proxy to inform the assessment and ensure a worst-case scenario was assessed. For the purposes of the assessment, permanent habitat loss was assumed to occur for all habitats within the permanent land acquisition boundary and temporary habitat loss was assumed to occur for the remainder of habitats within the Order Limits. The only exception is where habitats were clearly described as retained on Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination). A refined approach for identifying permanent and temporary loss for RBU (running water/watercourses) is presented in Appendix A Approach to the Assessment of Losses and Gains for Watercourses [REP2-010]and should be read alongside this report.
2.5.3. The AHBU, HBU and RBU calculations do not account for indirect impacts to habitats outside of the Order Limits as a result of the proposed works. An assessment of indirect impacts is detailed within the biodiversity assessment presented in Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048] and Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B of the ES [APP-049].
2.5.4. Updated Landscape Mitigation Masterplans for the Change Request (Part A [REP4-060] and Part B [REP4-053]) were issued at Deadline 4. The changes between iterations were minor in nature and would not impact the overall conclusions of the biodiversity calculation. The calculations presented within this report are based on the iterations of the landscape mitigation masterplans issued at Deadline 3 for Part A [REP3-008] and with the DCO application for Part B [APP-144].

### 2.6 BASELINE BIODIVERSITY

2.6.1. JNCC Phase 1 Habitat types determined in the habitat survey were translated to UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) habitat types using the habitat translation information provided in the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 to allow for use in the calculation tool. Table 2-2 shows the corresponding JNCC Phase 1 Habitat and UKHab types. Retained habitats in the postdevelopment landscape design maintained the UKHab type assigned to the baseline.

Table 2-2 - Corresponding JNCC Phase 1 Habitat and UK Habitat Classifications

JNCC Phase 1 Habitat Type
A1.1.1 Broadleaved woodland - seminatural

## UK Habitat Classification

Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland

## UK Habitat Classification

Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved

A1.2.2 Coniferous woodland - plantation
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous
woodland

Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed

Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed

Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub
Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; Young trees planted

Grassland - Other neutral grassland
Grassland - Modified grassland
Grassland - Modified grassland
Grassland - Modified grassland
Sparsely vegetated land Ruderal/ephemeral

Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools
Rivers and streams
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
Cropland - Cereal crops
Grassland - Modified grassland

Sparsely vegetated land Ruderal/ephemeral

Urban - Vegetated garden

Urban - Developed land; sealed surface

## UK Habitat Classification

Urban - Vacant/derelict land/bare ground
Urban - Vacant/derelict land/bare ground
Native species-rich hedgerow
J2.1.1 Hedgerow - native species rich (intact)

J2.1.2 Hedgerow - native species poor (intact)

J2.2.1 Hedgerow - native species rich (defunct)

J2.2.2 Hedgerow - native species poor (defunct)

J2.3.1 Hedgerow with trees - native species rich (intact)

J2.3.2 Hedgerow with trees - native species poor (intact)

Native hedgerow

Native hedgerow

Native hedgerow

Native species-rich hedgerow with trees

Native hedgerow with trees

## CONDITION

2.6.2. HCA was not available for all habitats identified. Where condition data was not collected in the field, the following assumptions were applied:
a. All Low distinctiveness habitats were allocated a condition score of Poor.
b. All Medium and High Distinctiveness habitats were allocated a condition score of Moderate.
c. All hedgerows were assumed to be in Good condition. The exception to this rule were defunct hedgerows. Defunct hedgerows were considered to be in Poor condition as they fail one of the FEP condition assessment criteria.
2.6.3. The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 proposes a new condition assessment methodology. This new methodology has been released as a beta version which has not been widely tested. However, field surveys during which condition assessment data was collected were undertaken before the release of Biodiversity Metric 2.0. Therefore, this assessment uses the system presented in Natural England's Farm Environment Plan (FEP) manual (Natural England, 2010) which was the available condition assessment methodology at the time of the surveys. The FEP is compatible with the Biodiversity Metric 2.0.

## CONNECTIVITY

2.6.4. Habitat connectivity values were assigned according to the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 default assumptions of medium ( 1.1 multiplier score) connectivity for high and very high distinctiveness habitats and low (1 multiplier score) connectivity for all other habitats.

## STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

2.6.5. Strategic significance of habitats was assigned with consideration to local policies including the Northumberland Local Plan, Core Strategy and Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan (Northumberland County Council, 2017, 2019, Northumberland Wildlife Trust, 2008). Part A of the Scheme is partially located within the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI. Numerous habitats within the Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan are also encountered within the Order Limits including:
a. Rivers and streams
b. Brownfield land
c. Built environment
d. Fen, marsh and swamp
e. Gardens and allotments
f. Lowland heathland
g. Lowland meadows and pastures
h. Native woodland
i. Ponds, lakes and reservoirs
j. Recreational and amenity spaces
k. Reedbeds
I. Transport corridors
m.Trees and Hedges
2.6.6. Habitats listed in the Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan were determined to be 'Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy' (medium; 1.10 multiplier score).
2.6.7. Habitats not listed in the Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan were determined to be 'Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy' (low; 1 multiplier score).

### 2.7 POST-DEVELOPMENT BIODIVERSITY <br> CREATED HABITATS

2.7.1. The habitat types within the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans (Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10:
Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) were translated into the following UKHab classifications. Table 2-3 shows the corresponding landscape categories and UK Habitat Classification types.

Table 2-3 - Corresponding Landscape Categories and UK Habitat Classifications

## UK Habitat Classification

Grassland - modified grassland
Grassland - other neutral grassland
Woodland and forest - lowland mixed deciduous woodland

Woodland and forest - lowland mixed deciduous woodland

| LE2.6 Shrubs | Heathland and shrub - mixed scrub |
| :--- | :--- |
| LE6.1 Swale / Marginal Planting / Wetland | Wetland - reedbeds |
| Agriculture | Cropland - cereal crops |
| Proposed Conservation Grassland | Grassland - other neutral grassland |
| Grass verge / central reservation | Grassland - modified grassland |

2.7.2. It is assumed that the newly created habitats will reach the following conditions:
a. Grassland - modified grassland - Poor
b. Grassland - other neutral grassland - Good
c. Woodland and forest - lowland mixed deciduous woodland - Good
d. Heathland and shrub - mixed scrub - Good
e. Wetland - reedbeds - Good
f. River and streams - Moderate
2.7.3. Where habitat is temporarily lost during the construction period, it is assumed that it would be reinstated back to the original habitat type and condition on completion of construction.

## 3 RESULTS OF BASELINE AND POST-DEVELOPMENT BIODIVERSITY CALCULATIONS

### 3.1 OVERVIEW

3.1.1. A summary of the quantitative BNG assessment calculation outcomes (Appendix E) is presented in this results section.

### 3.2 IRREPLACEABLE HABITATS

3.2.1. Development of the Scheme would result in a loss of 0.96 ha of ancient woodland at the northern end of Part A along the banks of the River Coquet. This loss of irreplaceable habitat is from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI (designated ancient woodland) and Coquet River Felton Park LWS (not designated but treated as ancient woodland within the assessment, as detailed in paragraph 9.10.3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048]). These habitat areas have been excluded from the baseline BU calculations. There are no other irreplaceable habitats on Site.
3.2.2. An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21 Part A [APP-247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat and impacts to retained woodland as a result of Part A. An overview of the Strategy is listed below:
a. Avoidance measures, including siting of the Part A route alignment to reduce land take and increase retention of ancient woodland;
b. Woodland Creation Area identified to the southwest of the River Coquet Bridge;
c. Salvage of woodland soils and flora;
d. Establishment of 11.26 ha of woodland and the replanting of an area of 0.28 ha, using native species of local provenance; and
e. Sensitive sapling and seed collection from wider ancient woodland as stock plants for the woodland planting area.

### 3.3 BASELINE BIODIVERSITY

3.3.1. The biodiversity baseline for the Scheme is based on habitat types, areas and lengths, their distinctiveness and condition scores, and the number of AHBU, HBU and RBU each type of habitat generates (Appendix E). The baseline biodiversity map showing the Phase 1 Habitats is included in Appendix B.
3.3.2. Within the Order Limits, area-based habitats total 353.21 ha and generate 869.64 AHBU. Linear hedgerow habitats total 53.68 km and generate 339.49 HBU. Linear watercourse habitats total 3.37 km and generate 46.51 RBU.
3.3.3. The Scheme's area-based habitats comprise approximately:
a. Cropland - 131.9 ha ( $37.3 \%$ )
b. Grassland - 129.8 ha (36.7\%)
c. Heathland and scrub - 4.9 ha (1.38\%)
d. Rivers and Standing water -1.7 ha ( $0.48 \%$ )
e. Sparsely vegetated land tall ruderal -5.8 ha ( $1.64 \%$ )
f. Urban - 49 ha (13.8\%)
g. Woodland and forest -30.2 ha ( $8.54 \%$ )

### 3.4 POST-DEVELOPMENT BIODIVERSITY

3.4.1. The landscape planting measures expected on site after construction are based on the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans for the Scheme (Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)).
3.4.2. The retained and created area-based habitats total 353.21 ha and generate 948.32 AHBU. Linear hedgerow habitats total 51.79 km and generate 354.99 HBU .
3.4.3. Retained and created linear watercourse habitat totals 3.07 km and generates 41.07 RBU .

### 3.5 RESULTS SUMMARY

3.5.1. A summary of results of the BNG calculations for $A H B U, H B U$ and RBU is detailed in Table 3-1, along with the percentage change from baseline for each habitat type.
3.5.2. The results show that construction of the Scheme would result in:
a. A 9.05\% net gain in AHBU;
b. A $4.57 \%$ net gain in HBU;
c. A 11.69\% net loss in RBU.

Table 3-1 - Summary of BNG Calculation Results

| Biodiversity Units | Baseline <br> Value | Post- <br> Development <br> Value* | Change | Outcome |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AHBU | 869.64 | 948.32 | +78.69 | Net Gain (+9.05\%) |
| HBU | 339.49 | 354.99 | +15.50 | Net Gain (+4.57\%) |
| RBU | 46.51 | 41.07 | -5.44 | Net loss (-11.69\%) |

*The post-development value includes the sum of the units generated from retained and created habitats.

### 3.6 BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN PRINCIPLES

3.6.1. The quantitative outcomes of the assessment are a singular element of the BNG assessment and associated Good Practice Principles (Appendix A of this report). Table 32 discusses adherence of the Scheme to each of the BNG Good Practice Principles. Whilst the BNG Good Practice Principles seek to offer practical advice to achieve BNG, as a NSIP, there is no legal requirement for the Scheme to achieve no net loss or net gain in biodiversity. However, as detailed in paragraph 1.1.7, the Scheme works towards achieving no net loss of biodiversity. These principles have therefore been assessed in regard to the aims of the Scheme which are to achieve no net loss in biodiversity.

Table 3-2 - Evidence of Project Compliance with BNG Good Practice Principles

| Principle | Description | Evidence | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Apply the mitigation hierarchy | Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision-makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensating for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature conservation, then offset biodiversity losses by gains elsewhere. | Potential impacts and risks to habitats have been considered at the design stage, and wherever possible, avoided or minimised. As an example of avoidance, the siting of the Part A route alignment sought to reduce land take and increase retention of ancient woodland relating to the construction of the new River Coquet Bridge. Full details of avoidance and minimisation (mitigation) are presented in Section 9.9, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048] and Section 9.9, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B of the ES [APP-049]. Mitigation measures are secured by the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [REP3013 and 014]. <br> Where impacts to habitats cannot be completely avoided, new habitats will be created to compensate for the losses. The landscape mitigation plans (Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) partially compensate for habitat losses by creating new habitats within the Order Limits and achieving a net gain in priority woodland and wetland habitats. <br> An Ancient Woodland Strategy [APP-247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat as a result of Part A. <br> However, the Scheme does not fully compensate for the habitat losses due to a net a loss of river habitat and medium distinctiveness woodland and scrub habitat. | Not Achieved |
| 2. Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere | Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity - these impacts cannot be offset to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain. | Development of the Scheme would result in a loss of 0.96 ha of ancient woodland at the northern end of Part A, along the banks of the River Coquet. This loss of irreplaceable habitat is from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (designated ancient woodland) and Coquet River Felton Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS) (not designated but treated as ancient woodland for the purposes of mitigation, as detailed in paragraph 9.10.3, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048] and the Applicant's response to BIO.1.18 of the Examining Authorities first written questions [REP1-032]). <br> As detailed in paragraph 3.3.8 of Chapter 3: Assessment of Alternatives of the ES [APP-038], alternative routes were considered but would not avoid crossing the SSSI and would still require an entirely new bridge crossing to be constructed. Furthermore, other options to avoid the LWS would have required a significant length of additional dual carriageway (between 4 and 5 miles). As a result, no alignments to this effect were considered and the | Not Achieved |


| Principle | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3. Be inclusive and | Engage stakeholders early, and involve them in designing, <br> implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Net Gain. <br> Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible <br> and share the benefits fairly among stakeholders. |
| Apply well-accepted ways to add contingency when calculating |  |
| Biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining |  |

Evidence
Outcome
option of a new bridge crossing the SSSI and LWS adjacent to the existing A1 road bridge was chosen.
The loss of ancient woodland habitat as a result of the Scheme was therefore unavoidable. Whilst the Scheme is not able to fully comply with BNG Policy 2, the Applicant has sought to minimise the impacts to ancient woodland as much as possible.
The Scheme design carefully considered the siting of the Scheme alignment to minimise the extent of ancient woodland loss associated with the new bridge over the River Coquet. Scheme design included reducing the extent of the Order limits to retain woodland habitat; to constrain the extent of construction and infrastructure, including the drainage outflow location and diversion of the public right of way beneath the bridges (as detailed in paragraph 3.2.3 of the Ancient Woodland Strategy Part A [APP-247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)).

An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21 Part A [APP-048] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat and impacts to retained ancient woodland as a result of Part A.

Stakeholders have been engaged with on the habitat creation proposals hrough consultation as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process. As detailed in Table 7-4, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A of the ES [APP-044], preliminary landscape mitigation plans were
discussed with Natural England. As detailed in paragraph 7.9.1, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part A of the ES [APP-044] and paragraph 7.9.1, Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Part B of the ES [APP-045], the Landscape Mitigation Masterplans have been developed through an iterative design process in consultation with Natural England and Northumberland County Council.
The previous Part A and Part B biodiversity no net loss assessments Appendix 9.20: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Part A [APP-246] and Appendix 9.11: Biodiversity No Net Loss Assessment Report Part B APP-309]) were subject to stakeholder review following the DCO application. In response to comments received by the Environment Agency, the assessment for watercourses was refined. Further details are
documented in Annex A Approach to the Assessment of Losses and Gains for Watercourses [REP2-010].

The BNG assessment used industry recognised risk multipliers from The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 Technical Supplement (Natural England, 2019). These multipliers account for uncertainty with creating new habitats. Contingency is added according to the level and type of uncertainty, to

Achieved at EIA stage

| Principle | Description | Evidence | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and the gains being fully realised. | increase the amount of habitat needed to achieve no net loss or net gains in biodiversity. |  |
| 5. Make a measurable Net Gain contribution | Achieve a measurable, overall gain for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing towards nature conservation priorities. | Whilst a Scheme-wide net gain cannot be claimed due to the loss of irreplaceable habitat, medium distinctiveness woodland and scrub and river habitat, the Scheme does demonstrate a measurable overall gain for hedgerows, priority woodland and wetland habitats. | Not achieved |
| 6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity | Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly justified choices when: <br> - Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses; <br> - Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation; <br> - Achieving Net Gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regional and national levels; <br> - Enhancing existing or creating new habitat; <br> Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity. | For priority woodland and wetland habitats, creation will follow the "like-forlike or better" approach. <br> The landscape mitigation plans (Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) partially compensate for habitat losses by creating new habitats within the Order Limits and achieving a net gain in area-based priority woodland and wetland habitats. <br> At a local level, the Scheme complies with the Northumberland Draft Local Plan by: <br> - Avoiding and minimising impacts through the design stage; <br> - Partially compensating for habitat losses; <br> - Achieving net gain of area-based habitats, excluding irreplaceable habitats; <br> - Creation of woodland and wetland priority habitats; and <br> - Creation of a coherent and resilient ecological network. <br> Policy QOP 1 and ENV 2 of the Northumberland Draft Local Plan discuss biodiversity net gains. Compliance with these local policies is detailed within the Applicant's response to BIO.1.7 of the Examining Authorities first written questions [REP1-032]. <br> Compliance with national policy is detailed in Table 9-2, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part A of the ES [APP-048] and Table 9-2, Chapter 9: Biodiversity Part B of the ES [APP-049]. | Not achieved |
| 7. Be additional | Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. do not deliver something that would occur anyway). | The nature conservation outcomes have not been fully met because of impacts on ancient woodland and a net loss in river habitat. <br> However, the Scheme does demonstrate a measurable overall gain for hedgerows, area-based priority woodland and wetland habitat | Not achieved |
| 8. Create a Net Gain legacy | Ensure Net Gain generates long-term benefits by: <br> - Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure Net Gain in perpetuity; | Stakeholders have been actively engaged with on the habitat creation proposals through consultation as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process. | Achieved at EIA stage |


| Principle | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - Planning for adaptive management and securing dedicated funding for long-term management; <br> - Designing Net Gain for biodiversity to be resilient to extern factors, especially climate change; <br> - Mitigating risks from other land uses; <br> - Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another; <br> Supporting local-level management of Net Gain activities. |
| 9. Optimise sustainability | Prioritise BNG and, where possible, optimise the wider environmental benefits for a sustainable society and economy. |
| 10. Be transparent | Communicate all Net Gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders. |

A full account of the stakeholders engaged with and the matters discussed is evidenced in Appendix 4.2: Environmental Consultation [APP-193 and APP-194].

The habitats proposed in the post-development mitigation plan and their associated maintenance would be undertaken by the Applicant or a thirdparty management body appointed by the Applicant.

The landscape mitigation plans (Figure 7.8: Landscape Mitigation Masterplan Part A [REP3-008] (revised Landscape Mitigation Masterplan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination) and Figure 7.10: Landscape Mitigation Plan Part B [APP-144] (revised Landscape Mitigation Plan for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) contain features which have biodiversity value and environmental benefits. However, the mitigation plans do not achieve a no net loss or net gain for river habitat

This Biodiversity No Net Loss Report for the Scheme and its associated assessment calculations was issued at Deadline 2 of the examination and will be available for stakeholders to review.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 CONCLUSIONS

4.1.1. The proposed changes to the application that have informed this updated assessment relate to the loss of woodland within the Coquet River Felton Park LWS, treated as ancient woodland for the purpose of mitigation and compensation. The areas of habitat loss and creation associated with ancient woodland have been excluded from the assessment calculations in accordance with best practice guidelines.
4.1.2. Development of the Scheme would result in a loss of 0.96 ha of ancient woodland at the northern end of Part A along the banks of the River Coquet. This loss of irreplaceable habitat is from the River Coquet and Coquet Valley Woodlands SSSI and Coquet River Felton Park LWS. There are no other irreplaceable habitats on Site.
4.1.3. An Ancient Woodland Strategy (Appendix 9.21 Part A [APP-247] (revised Ancient Woodland Strategy for Change Request is submitted at Deadline 4 of the examination)) has been developed in consultation with Natural England to address the loss of ancient woodland habitat and impacts to retained woodland as a result of Part A. An overview of the Strategy is listed below:
a. Avoidance measures, including siting of the Part A route alignment to reduce land take and increase retention of ancient woodland;
b. Woodland Creation Area identified to the southwest of the River Coquet Bridge;
c. Salvage of woodland soils and flora;
d. Establishment of 11.26 ha of woodland and the replanting of an area of 0.28 ha, using native species of local provenance; and
e. Sensitive sapling and seed collection from wider ancient woodland as stock plants for the woodland planting area.
4.1.4. The Scheme as assessed does not achieve a quantitative and qualitative scheme-wide biodiversity net gain due to the loss of irreplaceable ancient woodland, medium distinctiveness woodland and scrub and river habitat and as the Scheme only passes four out of the ten Good Practice Principles. Whilst no net loss cannot be claimed for the Scheme as a whole, due to the loss of irreplaceable habitat (ancient woodland), medium distinctiveness woodland and scrub and river habitat, the assessment calculation does identify a net gain in hedgerows, area-based priority woodland and wetland habitats.
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# Appendix A 

# CIEEM, CIRIA AND IEMA UK BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES 

# Biodiversity Net Gain <br> Good practice principles for development 

Biodiversily Net Gain is development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before It is also an approach where developers work with local governments, wildife groups, land owners and other stakeholders in order to support their priortites for nature conservation. These ten principles set out good practice for achieving Biodiversity Net Gain and must be applied all together, as one approach.

Principle 1. Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy
Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision-makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensating for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature consevation, then offset biodiversiy losses by gains elsewhere.

Principle 2.Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere

Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity - these impacts cannot be offset to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain.

Principle 3, Be inclusive and equitable
Engage stakeholders eary, and involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Net Gain Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible, and share the benefits fairty among stakehoiders

## Principle 4.Address risks

Mitigate difficulty, uncertainty and other risks to achieving Net Gain. Apply well-accepted ways to add contingency when calculating biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and thefgains being fully realised.

Principle 5: Make a measurable Net Gain contribution
Achieve a measurable, overall gain' for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing towards nature conservation prionties.

[^0]Principle 6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity

Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly-justified choices when:

- Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses
- Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation
- Achieving Net Gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regiona! and national levels
- Enhancing existing or creating new habitat
- Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity


## Principle 7, Be additional

Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (ie. do not deliver something that would occur anyway).

Principle 8. Create a Net Gain legacy
Ensure Net Gain generates long-term benefitt by

- Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure Net Gain in perpetuity ${ }^{2}$
- Planning for adaptive managernent and securing dedicated funding for long-term managernent
- Designing Net Gain for biodiversily to be resilient to external factors, especially climate change
- Mirigating risks from other land uses
- Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another
- Supporting locab-level management of Net Gain activities


## Principle 9. Optimise sustainability

Prioritise Biodiversity Net Gain and, where possible, optimise the wider ervironmental benefits for a sustainable sociey and economy

Principle 10. Be transparent
Communicate all Net Gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders.

[^1]
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## Appendix C

## BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN POLICY AND LEGISLATION

## BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN POLICY AND LEGISLATION

## NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND RURAL COUNTRYSIDE ACT

The Natural Environment and Rural Countryside (NERC) Act (HMSO, 2006) requires public bodies, including local authorities, 'to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England when carrying out their normal functions'.

Section 40 sets out that:

- Paragraph 1. "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity"; and that
- Paragraph 3. "Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat".
Section 41 sets out that:
- Paragraph 1. "The Secretary of State must... publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat ... of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity" based on consultation with Natural England; and that
- Paragraph 3a. Every planning authority must "a) take such steps... to further the conservation of the living organisms and types of habitat included in any list published under this section, or (b) promote the taking by others of such steps".

The forthcoming Environment Bill seeks to expand the duty of public authorities to include a consideration of both the conservation and the enhancement of biodiversity, under amendments to section 40 of the NERC Act 2006.

## NATIONAL POLICY STATEMENT FOR NATIONAL NETWORKS

The National Policy Statement for National Networks (NPSNN) (Department for Transport, 2014) paragraph 5.23 states that:

- "The applicant should show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geological conservation interests."

Maintaining no net loss of biodiversity as a result of the Scheme is consistent with the policy aims of Paragraph 5.25 , which states:

- "As a general principle, and subject to the specific policies below, development should avoid significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, including through mitigation and consideration of reasonable alternatives. The applicant may also wish to make use of biodiversity offsetting in devising compensation proposals to counteract any impacts on biodiversity which cannot be avoided or mitigated. Where significant harm cannot be avoided or mitigated, as a last resort, appropriate compensation measures should be sought."

This sets out that any loss should be compensated for to achieve no net loss or net gain by replacing habitats, exploring the potential for enhancing them, and managing retained features.

## NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2019) refers to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. This requires Local Authorities in England to take measures to:

- Conserve and enhance biodiversity;
- Protect the habitats of these species from further decline;
- Protect the species from the adverse effect of development; and
- Refuse planning permission for development if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

Although not currently a legal obligation, the revised NPPF refers to biodiversity and environmental net gains in the following paragraphs:

- Transport Infrastructure
- Paragraph 102. "Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:
d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified assessed and considered - including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains."
- Planning decisions
- Paragraph 118. "Planning decisions and planning policy should a) encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land ... and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains - such as developments that would enable new habitat creation."
- Paragraph 170. "Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ... d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures."
- Paragraph 174. "To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity plans should b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity."
- Paragraph 175. "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; ... and d) ... opportunities to incorporate
biodiversity improvements in and around developments, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity."


## UK GOVERNMENT'S 25 YEAR ENVIRONMENT PLAN

The UK Government's 25 Year Environment Plan (DEFRA, 2018) states a desire to "embed a 'net environmental gain' principle for development to deliver environmental improvements locally and nationally." and plans to consult on making Biodiversity Net Gain a mandatory requirement.

## BIODIVERSITY 2020: A STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND'S WILDLIFE AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services (DEFRA, 2011) is the national strategy for biodiversity. This sets out an ambition to halt the loss of biodiversity and see an increase in the area of priority habitats by 200,000 ha by 2020. Biodiversity 2020 sets in policy the objectives to improve our wildlife sites, make them bigger, develop more of them and join them up (summarised as 'Bigger, Better, More and Joined').

## LOCAL POLICY

In this case, the public authority mentioned in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 40 (1) is deemed to be the local planning authority (Northumberland County Council).

Within the Northumberland Biodiversity Action Plan a list of HPI are recorded as priority habitats. These priority habitats are then referred in the following local plans.

The Northumberland Local Plan Core Strategy was withdrawn in April 2017 in favour of the Northumberland Local Plan (Northumberland County Council, 2019) but states that:

There should be "no net loss of biodiversity, with the creation of new priority habitats and green infrastructure"; and that
"Moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature is central to sustainable development and that contributing to conserving and enhancing the natural environment is a core planning principle".

Within the draft Northumberland Local Plan, net gains for biodiversity and priority habitats are mentioned as follows:

Policy STP 3 states that a development should adhere to principles that "Contribute to net gains for biodiversity and establish a coherent and resilient ecological network";

Section 10.9. "Moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains is central to sustainable development and that contributing to conserving and enhancing the natural environment is a core planning principle";

Policy ENV 2 (1) states that "Development proposals affecting biodiversity and geodiversity will minimise their impact and net gains for biodiversity will be secured by: a) Avoiding
significant harm through location and / or design. Where significant harm cannot be avoided, applicants will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts will be adequately mitigated or, as a last resort compensated for; b) Securing net biodiversity gains and / or wider ecological enhancements through new development";

Policy ENV 2 (4) states that "The conservation, restoration, enhancement, creation and / or (where appropriate) the re-creation of priority habitats" will follow an ecosystem approach; and

Policy MIN 1 states that "The conservation and enhancement of nature conservation and geological sites, including internationally, nationally and locally designated sites, priority habitats and protected and priority species - applicants will be required to demonstrate that their proposal will deliver a net gain for biodiversity where possible through the creation of priority habitats and by contributing to the creation of a coherent and resilient ecological network and that there will be no unacceptable adverse effects on national or international nature conservation designations or irreplaceable habitats".

## Appendix D

## BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

## BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

## OVERVIEW

BNG assessment calculations are separated into four key sections which are used to produce the quantitative outcomes. They are:

- Separating out irreplaceable baseline habitats and any mitigation proposed for impacts to irreplaceable habitats;
- Quantification of baseline biodiversity units using Phase 1 Habitat data and habitat condition assessment data;
- Quantification of post-development biodiversity units using Phase 1 Habitat data derived from the post-development landscape mitigation plan; and
- Assessing the net change in biodiversity value as a result of the Scheme.

Collectively these elements of the BNG assessment are used in conjunction with qualitative information relating to the BNG Good Practice Principles (Appendix A) to produce a scheme wide BNG assessment outcome. The principles and rules for using the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 are detailed in Appendix F.

## IRREPLACEABLE HABITATS

It is important to note that BNG or no net-loss cannot be achieved for the development as a whole if there is a negative impact on an irreplaceable habitat (Appendix A - Principle 2). Best practice guidance advises that irreplaceable habitats should not be included in any BNG assessment of impacts (CIEEM, IEMA and CIRIA, 2019 and Natural England 2019).

In these situations, any compensation offered to address impacts on irreplaceable habitats should be agreed directly with the relevant statutory nature conservation agency (in this case Natural England).

Unavoidable impacts on irreplaceable habitats should not undermine the BNG assessment process for other habitats. Projects should still aim to achieve no net loss or net gains for non-irreplaceable habitats.

## HABITAT TYPES

The BNG assessment used Phase 1 habitat types to describe the different habitat types. These were translated into the UKHab-based Biodiversity Metric 2.0 Calculation Tool habitat categories and associated default distinctiveness scores; informed by the UKHab classification system and the Calculation Tool.

## BASELINE ASSESSMENT

## BIODIVERSITY UNIT CALCULATION

A baseline biodiversity unit calculation was completed for all existing habitats within the Scheme. Calculations were undertaken separately for hedgerow habitats measured as
linear features in kilometres and all remaining habitats measured as area-based features in hectares.

These calculations were carried out using the Biodiversity Metric 2.0, released by Natural England in 2019. Biodiversity Metric 2.0 refers to the Beta Test version update to the former 'Defra 2012 Metric' used for calculating biodiversity units in England.

Distinctiveness, condition, connectivity and strategic significance are given numerical 'scores' within the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 which are multiplied, together with hectares (ha) or length in kilometres (km) of each habitat to give the number of baseline AHBU or HBU:

Baseline Area Habitat Biodiversity Units (AHBU) = Area (ha) x Distinctiveness $x$ Condition $x$ Ecological Connectivity x Strategic Significance

Hedgerow Biodiversity Units $(\mathrm{HBU})=$ Length $(\mathrm{km}) \times$ Distinctiveness $\times$ Condition $\times$ Ecological Connectivity x Strategic Significance
This calculation was applied to all polygons (AHBU) and polylines (HBU) within the Scheme's footprint and then summed by habitat type.

## DISTINCTIVENESS

Habitat distinctiveness is defined as a collective measure of biodiversity and includes parameters such as the number and variety of species found within the habitat (richness and diversity), how rare the species are, and how many species the habitat supports that are not common elsewhere.

Default distinctiveness bands and habitat types were assigned as per the Table D-1 below.
Table D-1 - Habitat Distinctiveness Bands and Scores

| Distinctiveness <br> Band | Distinctiveness <br> Score | Habitat Types Included |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very High | 8 | Priority habitats as defined in Section 41 of the <br> NERC Act that are highly threatened, <br> internationally scarce and require conservation <br> action, e.g. blanket bog. |
| High | 6 | Priority habitats as defined in Section 41 of the <br> NERC Act that require conservation action, e.g. <br> lowland fens. |
| Medium | 4 | Other semi-natural habitats that do not fall within <br> the scope of habitats of principle importance <br> definitions, i.e. all other areas of woodland (e.g. <br> non-native coniferous plantation), other grassland <br> (e.g. species poor semi-improved), uncultivated <br> field margins, road verges and railway |


| Distinctiveness <br> Band | Distinctiveness <br> Score | Habitat Types Included |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | embankments (excluding those that are intensively <br> managed). |
| Low | 2 | Improved grassland, arable fields (excluding any <br> uncultivated margins), domestic gardens, verges, <br> and hrododendron scrub associated with transport <br> corridors. |
| Very Low | 0 | Little or no biodiversity value e.g. developed land <br> or sealed surface. |

## CONDITION

Condition, in the context of BNG, is defined as the quality of a habitat. For example, a habitat is in poor condition if it fails to support the rare or notable species for which it is valued, or if it is degraded as a result of pollution, erosion, invasive species or other factors.

The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 proposes a new condition assessment methodology. This new methodology has been released as a beta version which has not been widely tested. However, field surveys during which condition assessment data was collected were undertaken before the release of Biodiversity Metric 2.0. Therefore, this assessment uses the system presented in Natural England's Farm Environment Plan (FEP) manual (Natural England, 2010) which was the available condition assessment methodology at the time of the surveys. The FEP is compatible with the Biodiversity Metric 2.0.

Table D-2 - Habitat Condition Bands and Scores

| Condition Band | Condition Score | Criteria for Assigning Condition |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Good | 3 | Any habitat which passes all the FEP criteria. |
| Moderate | 2 | Any habitat which fails one FEP criterion. |
| Poor | 1 | Any habitat which fails two or more FEP criteria. |

## STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

The idea of strategic significance works at a landscape scale, taking account of published Nature Recovery Strategies, local biodiversity plans, and local plans for targeting green infrastructure and biodiversity. This component gives extra value to habitats that are located in prioritised locations for biodiversity and other environmental objectives.

Table D-3 - Strategic Significance Scores

| Category | Strategic <br> Significance | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Within area formally identified in local policy | High | 1.15 |
| Location ecologically desirable but not in local policy | Medium | 1.1 |
| Area/compensation not in local policy/ no local policy | Low | 1 |

## CONNECTIVITY

The focus of connectivity in the metric is the relationship of a particular habitat patch to other surrounding similar or related semi-natural habitats facilitating flows of species and ecosystem services. Connectivity is applied to both baseline and post-development biodiversity units. The connectivity of each habitat was assessed in accordance with Natural England's Geographical Information System (GIS) based connectivity tool which was released in December 2019. The tool can be found here; http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5850908674228224

## Table D-4 - Connectivity Risk Factors

| Score | Description | Risk Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Score 57-81 | Highly aggregated / connected | 1.15 |
| Score 33-56 | Moderate aggregation / connectivity | 1.1 |
| Score 9-32 | Low aggregation / connectivity | 1 |

## POST DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

## POST DEVELOPMENT BIODIVERSITY UNIT CALCULATION

Post-development biodiversity units were calculated for all the habitats retained, enhanced or created within the off-site compensation area.

Calculations were undertaken separately for hedgerow habitats (measured in kilometres) and all remaining habitats (measured in hectares).

These calculations were carried out using the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 and associated guidance and calculation tool.

Post-development biodiversity units are calculated in a similar way to baseline biodiversity units. However, in addition to the proposed habitats' area, condition, distinctiveness, connectivity and strategic significance, the key risks to delivery are taken into account
through incorporation of risk factors. The metric sets out three risk factors: distance from the Scheme (off-site risk); time taken for created or enhanced habitats to reach target condition (temporal risk); and how difficult it is to create or enhance any given habitat (difficulty risk). The specific details and values of these risk factors are listed below (see Post-Development Risk Factors).

To calculate post-development Biodiversity Units for the area-based habitats from creation of new or enhancement of existing habitats, the following equations from the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 were used:
t1 Creation AHBU
$=\left\{\left[A^{t 1} \times Q_{D}^{t 1} \times Q_{C}^{t 1}\right] \times\left[R_{D} \times R_{T}\right] \times\left[Q_{S C}^{t 1} \times Q_{S S}^{t 1}\right]\right\} \times R_{o S}$
t1 Enhancement AHBU
$=\left[\left[\left(\left[\left\{A^{t 1} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{D}^{t 1} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{C}^{t 1}\right\}-\left\{A^{t 0} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{D}^{t 0} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{C}^{t 0}\right\}\right] \times\left\{\boldsymbol{R}_{D} \times R_{T}\right\}\right)\right.\right.$
$\left.\left.+\left\{A^{t 0} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{D}^{t 0} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{C}^{t 0}\right\}\right] \times\left\{\boldsymbol{Q}_{s c}^{t 1} \times \boldsymbol{Q}_{s s}^{t 1}\right\}\right] \times R_{o S}$
Where:
A is area of habitat (hectares)
RD is difficulty (a risk factor)
RT is time to target condition (a risk factor)
ROS is off-site Risk
t0 is before intervention
t1 is post intervention
QC is condition (a quality measure)
QD is distinctiveness (a quality measure)
QSC is connectivity (a quality measure)
QSS is strategic Significance (a quality measure)
H 1 is area of habitat type before intervention
H 2 is area of habitat type post intervention

## APPLYING RISK FACTORS TO THE POST-DEVELOPMENT CALCULATION

## DIFFICULTY OF CREATION RISK

This is the risk associated with the difficulty to create or restore any specific habitat. Values for this risk factor were automatically populated within Defra's Calculator Tool. Table D-5 shows the risk factors assigned to each level of Difficulty Risk for habitats created or enhanced on site.

## Table D-5 - Delivery Risk Factors

| Difficulty of Creation or Restoration | Difficulty Risk Factor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Very High | 0.10 |
| High | 0.33 |
| Medium | 0.67 |
| Low | 1.00 |

## TEMPORAL RISK

In delivering compensation for loss of habitats, the timing of impact may not coincide with the new habitat reaching the required quality or level of maturity which could result in loss of biodiversity for a period of time. This risk is accounted for by applying a 'temporal risk' factor to the biodiversity unit calculations.

Values for this risk factor were automatically populated within Defra's recently released calculator tool for particular target habitat types and conditions. The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 uses a $3.5 \%$ 'standard discount rate', which is the value recommended in the HM Treasury Green Book. The metric also employs two assumptions in terms of temporal risk:

- There is a quality 'jump' from the baseline condition to the target condition once the relevant number of years have passed. Metric calculations do not need to be redone annually, and;
- Sets a limit on the discount rate used for temporal risk. The metric's risk factor has a limit of 0.320 to take account of temporal risk. This equates to approximately 32 years.

Risk factors were assigned based on the criteria set out in Table D-6.

## Table D-6 - Temporal Risk Factors

| Years to Create | Temporal Risk Factor | Years to Create | Temporal Risk Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 1.000 | 17 | 0.546 |
| 1 | 0.965 | 18 | 0.527 |
| 2 | 0.931 | 19 | 0.508 |
| 3 | 0.899 | 20 | 0.490 |
| 4 | 0.867 | 21 | 0.473 |
| 5 | 0.837 | 22 | 0.457 |


| Years to Create | Temporal Risk Factor | Years to Create | Temporal Risk Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0.808 | 23 | 0.441 |
| 7 | 0.779 | 24 | 0.425 |
| 8 | 0.752 | 25 | 0.410 |
| 9 | 0.726 | 26 | 0.396 |
| 10 | 0.700 | 27 | 0.382 |
| 11 | 0.676 | 28 | 0.369 |
| 12 | 0.652 | 29 | 0.356 |
| 13 | 0.629 | 30 | 0.343 |
| 14 | 0.607 | 31 | 0.331 |
| 15 | 0.586 | $32+$ | 0.320 |
| 16 | 0.566 | Not Possible | N/A |

## NET CHANGE IN BIODIVERSITY VALUE AND ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

The baseline and post-development biodiversity units were compared for each option to assess whether they achieved a quantitative biodiversity net gain.

The following formula was used to calculate the change in BU:
Net change in biodiversity value $=$ Post-Development BU - Baseline BU
If the resulting score is negative, there is a loss in biodiversity that should be compensated for by on-site design changes or, where this is not possible, off-site compensation.

To determine the percentage net gain that the scheme delivers, the following formula was used:

Percentage change of biodiversity units $=($ Post-Development BU $/$ Baseline BU) $\times 100$
The percentage should be rounded to the nearest whole percentage point ( 0.5 and above is to be rounded up to 1 and anything below 0.5 should be rounded down).
Outcomes greater than $100 \%$ could be deemed to achieve net gain. However, organisations and decision makers are setting specific targets in recognition of the current local and global challenges for biodiversity and potential inaccuracies in the measurement of losses and gains through use of the metric. The Environment Bill proposes a target for development in England of $+10 \%$ net gain ( $110 \%$ percentage change), but BREEAM provides a useful
framework that also includes the levels of percentage change that constitute no net loss or net loss. This is set out in Table D-7 below.

To fully demonstrate biodiversity net gain, the scheme should not only achieve a suitable quantitative net gain, but also meet the other qualitative aspects of the industry Good Practice Principles (Appendix A).

| Table D-7 - Quantitative outcomes of BNG calculations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Calculation Result | Predicted Outcome |
| Less than $95 \%$ of the baseline value | Net loss (NL) of biodiversity |
| $95 \%-104 \%$ of baseline value | No net loss (NNL) of biodiversity |
| $105 \%$ or more of baseline value | Biodiversity net gain (BNG) |
| $110 \%$ or more of baseline value | Significant BNG. |

## Appendix E

## BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENT CALCULATIONS

| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { A1 M2E } \\ \hline \text { A-1 Site Habitat Baseline } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condense / Show Colums |  | Condense / Show Rows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M an M enu |  | Instructions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Habitats and areas |  |  | Habitat <br> distinctiveness | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Habitat } \\ \text { condition } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Ecological } \\ \text { connectivity } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Strategic significance | Suggested action to address habitat losses | Ecological baseline | Retention category biodiversity value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Bespoke } \\ \text { componstion } \\ \text { agread for } \\ \text { unaceptatale } \end{array}$ |
| Ref | Broad Habitat | Habitat type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { (hectares) } \end{gathered}$ | Distintiveness | Condition | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Ecological } \\ \text { connectivity } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Strategic significance |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Total habitat } \\ \text { units } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Area } \\ \text { retained } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { enhanced } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \text { sucession } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Baseline } \\ \text { Bunits } \\ \text { retained } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Baseline units } \\ \text { succession } \end{array}$ | Area lost | Units lost |  |
| 1 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 1.04 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 15.10 | 0.02 |  |  | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 14.81 |  |
| 2 | Woodland and forest | Wooolland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.14 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required distinctiveness habitat required | 1.12 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 1.12 |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 0.18 | High | Good | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 3.92 | 0.01 |  |  | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 3.70 |  |
| 5 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 0.28 | High | Moderate | Medium | $\left.\right\|_{\substack{\text { Location ecologogially desirable but } \\ \text { not in local strategy }}}$ | Same habitat required | 4.07 | 0.26 |  |  | 3.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.29 |  |
| 6 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; broadleaved | 0 | M edium | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 7 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; broadleaved | 4.35 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 38.28 | 0.36 |  |  | 3.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.99 | 35.11 |  |
| 8 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; broadleaved | 0.82 | M edium | Poor | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 3.61 | 0.02 |  |  | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 3.52 |  |
| 9 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- - Other coniferous woodland | 0 | Low | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 10 | Wooolland and forest | Woodland and forest-Other coniferous woolland | 0.44 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Same distinctiveness or better } \\ \text { habitat required } \end{array}$ | 0.88 | 0.08 |  |  | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.72 |  |
| 11 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; mixed | 0.5 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 4.00 | 0.01 |  |  | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 3.92 |  |
| 12 | Heathland and shrub | Heathland and strub - M ixed scrub | 0.15 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 1.20 | 0.07 |  |  | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.64 |  |
| 13 | Heathland and strub | Heathland and shrub - M i ied scrub | 0 | M edium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 14 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest -Other woodland; Young Trees planted | 0 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 15 | Grasland | Grassland- Other neutral grassland | 0 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 16 | Grassland | Grasland - M odified grassland | 33.71 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Same distinctiveness or better } \\ \text { habitat required } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 67.42 | 0.16 |  |  | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 33.55 | 67.10 |  |
| 17 | Grassland | Grassland - Modified grassland | 0.29 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinntiveness or better habitat reauired | 0.58 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.58 |  |
| 18 | Grasland | Grassland - M odified grassland | 1.17 | Low | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinntiveness or better | 4.68 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 4.68 |  |
| 19 | Grassland | Grasland- M odified grassland | 14.85 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 29.70 | 0.46 |  |  | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14.39 | 28.78 |  |
| 20 | Sparsely vegetated land | Sparsely vegetated land- -uderal/Ephemeral | 1.02 | Low | Poor | Low | Arealcompensation not in local strategen nolocal stratecy | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Same distintivivenesssor better } \\ \text { habitat required } \end{array}$ | 2.04 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 2.04 |  |
| 21 | Lakes | Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools | 1.17 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 16.99 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 16.99 |  |
| 22 | Urban | Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 15.6 | v.low | N/A - Other | N/A | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Compensation Not Reauired | 0.00 | 0.02 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 15.58 | 0.00 |  |
| 23 | Cropland | Cropland - Cereal crops | 32.71 | Low | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { N/A. } \\ \hline \text { Agrialtural } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 65.42 | 0.08 |  |  | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 32.63 | 65.26 |  |
| 24 | Grassland | Grassland-M Modified grassland | 4.3 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better <br> habitat required | 8.60 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.30 | 8.60 |  |
| 25 | Sparsely vegetated land | Sparsely vegetated land- -uderal/Ephemeral | 2.1 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Same distintiviveness or better } \\ \text { habitat required } \end{array}$ | 4.20 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.10 | 4.20 |  |
| 26 | Urban | Urban - Vegetated garden | 0.01 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better anbitat reauired | 0.02 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 |  |
| 27 | Urban | Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 0.2 | V.Low | N/A - Other | N/A | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Compensation Not Required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 |  |
| 28 | Urban | Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 2.76 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat reauired | 5.52 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.76 | 5.52 |  |
| 29 | Urban | Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 0.27 | v.low | N/A - Other | N/A | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Compensation Not Required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.27 | 0.00 |  |
| 30 | Urban | Urban - Vacant/derelit land/ bareground | 1.73 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 3.46 | 0.11 |  |  | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.62 | 3.24 |  |


| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 0.31 | High | Poor | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 2.25 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 2.25 |  |
| 33 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woolland | 0.78 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirible but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 11.33 | 0.37 | 5.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | . 41 | 5.95 |  |
| 34 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.13 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 1.56 | 0.13 | 1.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 35 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 36 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.31 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { Same broad habitat or a higher } \\ \text { distinctiveness habitat required } \end{array}\right\|$ | 3.72 | 0.03 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 3.36 |  |
| 37 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 5.05 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 40.40 | 1.45 | 11.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.60 | 28.80 |  |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Lowland mixed dediduous woodland | 0.55 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat reauired | 7.99 | 0.32 | 4.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 3.34 |  |
| 40 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deeduous woolland | 0.06 | High | Poor | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in loal strategy | Same habitat required | 0.44 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.44 |  |
| 41 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved | 4 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 35.20 | 2.28 | 20.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.72 | 15.14 |  |
| 42 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; broadleaved | 0.92 | Medium | Poor | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 4.05 | 0.03 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 3.92 |  |
| 43 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland | 0.85 | Low | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better <br> habitat required | 5.10 | 0.43 | 2.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 2.52 |  |
| 44 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland | 0.4 | Low | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} \text { Same distinntiveness or better } \\ \text { habitat required } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.60 | 0.11 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 1.16 |  |
| 45 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland | 1.93 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distintivenenss or better habitat reauired | 3.86 | 0.57 | 1.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.36 | 2.72 |  |
| 46 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.47 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in loca strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 5.64 | 0.33 | 3.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 1.68 |  |
| 47 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; mixed | 0 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 48 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 2.28 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 27.36 | 1.49 | 17.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 9.48 |  |
| 49 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- -Other woodland; mixed | 3.67 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 32.30 | 1.5 | 13.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.17 | 19.10 |  |
| 50 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest- Other woodland; mixed | 0.23 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.92 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.92 |  |
| 51 | Heathand and shrub | Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.07 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.84 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.84 |  |
| 52 | Heathland and shrub | Heathland and strub - M i ied scrub | 0.97 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 7.76 | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.91 | 7.28 |  |
| 53 | Heathland and shrub | Heathland and shrub - M ieed scrub | 1.69 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | ${ }^{6.76}$ | 0.21 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.48 | 5.92 |  |
| 54 | Heathand and shrub | Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.17 | Medium | Good | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 2.04 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 2.04 |  |
| 55 | Heathand and shrub | Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.87 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | ${ }^{6.96}$ | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 6.96 |  |
| 56 | Heathand and shrub | Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 1.02 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 4.08 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 4.08 |  |
| 57 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest-Other Woodland; Young Trees planted | 0.39 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 1.56 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 1.56 |  |
| 58 | Woodland and forest | Woodland and forest-Other Woodland; Young Trees planted | 0.08 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 0.32 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.32 |  |
| 59 | Grasland | Grassland - Other neutral grassland | 0.2 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 1.60 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 1.44 |  |
| 60 | Grassland | Grassland - Other neutral grassland | 4.9 | Medium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required | 19.60 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.85 | 19.40 |  |
| 61 | Grassland | Grassland - Modified grassland | 25.83 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinntiveness or better habitat reauired | 51.66 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25.79 | 51.58 |  |
| 62 | Grassland | Grassland - M odified grassland | 1.67 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better | 3.34 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.64 | 3.28 |  |


| 63 | Grassland | Grassland - M odified grassland | 41.34 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in loca strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 82.68 | 0.94 |  |  | 1.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.40 | 80.80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 | Sparsely vegetated land | Sparsely vegetated land- Rudera/Ephemeral | 2.65 | Low | poor | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 5.30 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.39 | 4.78 |
| 65 | Lakes | Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools | 0.52 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same habitat required | 7.55 | 0.16 |  |  | 2.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 5.23 |
| 66 | Cropland | Cropland - Cereal crops | 99.19 | Low | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { N/A - } \\ \text { Agriciltural } \end{array}\right\|$ | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 198.38 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99.19 | 198.38 |
| 67 | Grassland | Grasland - M odified grassland | 1.54 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better abitat required | 3.08 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.54 | 3.08 |
| 68 | Urban | Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 0.05 | v.Low | N/A - Other | N/A | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Compensation Not Required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| 69 | Urban | Urban - Vacant/derelit land/ bareground | 0.69 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distinctiveness or better habitat required | 1.38 | 0.01 |  |  | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 1.36 |
| 70 | Urban | Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 0.12 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in loca strategy/ no local strategy | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Same distinctiveness or better } \\ \text { habitat required } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.24 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.24 |
| 71 | Urban | Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 27.52 | v.low | N/A - Other | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Compensation Not Required | 0.00 | 0 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 27.52 | 0.00 |
| $\frac{72}{73}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 76 |  | Total site area ha | 353.21 |  |  |  |  | Total S Sit baseline | 869.64 | 12.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 340.73 | 770.18 |

## A1 M2E

A-2 Site Habitat Creation


| Post development/ post intervention habitats |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Habitat units delivered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed habitat | Area (hectares) | Distinctiveness | Condition | Ecological | Strategic significance | Temporal multiplier | Difficulty |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ecological connectivity | Strategic significance | Time to target condition/ years | Difficulty of creation category |  |
| Cropland - Cereal crops | 14.94 | Low | N/A - <br> Agricultural | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 28.83 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 3.2 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 6.18 |
| Grassland - Other neutral grassland | 29.66 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 10 | Low | 182.78 |
| Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 9.82 | High | M oderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 32+ | High | 15.05 |
| Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.68 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 4.89 |
| Wetland - Reedbeds | 3.93 | High | Moderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 10 | M edium | 26.77 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 0.01 | High | Moderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 32+ | High | 0.02 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved | 0.13 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 30 | M edium | 0.26 |
| Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland | 0.35 | Low | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | Low | 0.57 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.22 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | M edium | 0.48 |
| Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.07 | M edium | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 0.50 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; Young Trees planted | 0 | M edium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | Low | 0.00 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; Young Trees planted | 0 | M edium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | Low | 0.00 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 5.07 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 9.79 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 0.03 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 0.06 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 2.31 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 4.46 |
| Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral | 0.02 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 0.04 |


| Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools | 1.17 | High | M oderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 5 | Medium | 9.52 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cropland - Cereal crops | 7.2 | Low | N/A Agricultural | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 13.90 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 1.5 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 2.90 |
| Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral | 2.1 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 4.05 |
| Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub | 0.01 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 0.07 |
| Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 2.53 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 4.88 |
| Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 1.36 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 2.62 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cropland - Cereal crops | 5.88 | Low | N/A Agricultural | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 11.35 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 18.33 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 35.38 |
| Wetland - Reedbeds | 7.88 | High | M oderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 10 | Medium | 53.68 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 0.93 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 1.79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grassland - Other neutral grassland | 45.59 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 10 | Low | 255.41 |
| Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.32 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 2.30 |
| Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 25.54 | High | Moderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 32+ | High | 39.14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland | 0.47 | High | M oderate | Medium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 32+ | High | 0.72 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved | 0.98 | Medium | Moderate | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 30 | Medium | 1.98 |
| Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland | 0.5 | Low | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | Low | 0.82 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.17 | M edium | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | M edium | 0.37 |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed | 0.74 | M edium | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | M edium | 1.63 |
| Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 1.08 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 7.76 |


| Heathland and shrub - M ixed scrub | 0.12 | M edium | Moderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 3 | Low | 0.86 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Woodland and forest - Other woodland; Young Trees planted | 0.04 | M edium | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 25 | Low | 0.07 |
| Grassland - Other neutral grassland | 0.6 | M edium | M oderate | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 10 | Low | 3.36 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 8.77 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 16.93 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 0.28 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 0.54 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 16.17 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 31.21 |
| Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral | 0.78 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 1.51 |
| Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools | 0.12 | High | M oderate | M edium | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | 5 | Medium | 0.98 |
| Cropland - Cereal crops | 30.88 | Low | N/A Agricultural | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 59.60 |
| Grassland - M odified grassland | 0.81 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 1.56 |
| Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 0.57 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 1.10 |
| Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground | 0.1 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 1 | Low | 0.19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 5.15 | V.Low | N/A - Other | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 0 | Low | 0.00 |
| Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 0.06 | V.Low | N/A - Other | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 0 | Low | 0.00 |
| Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 0.01 | V.Low | N/A - Other | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 0 | Low | 0.00 |
| Urban - Developed land; sealed surface | 81.55 | V.Low | N/A - Other | Low | Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | 0 | Low | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 340.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 848.87 |


| A1M2E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B-1 Site Hedge Baseline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condense / Show Coumns |  | Condense / Show Rows |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | M ain Menu Instructions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UKHabitats - existing habitats |  |  | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { Habitat } \\ \text { distinctiveness } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Habitiat } \\ \text { condition } \end{gathered}$ | Ecalogical connectivity | Strategic siginificance | Suggested action to address habitat losses Like for like or better |  | Retention category biodiversity value |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Baseline } \\ \text { ref } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hedge } \\ & \text { number } \end{aligned}$ | Hedgerow type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { length } \\ \mathrm{kM} \end{array}$ | Distintiveness | Condition | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ecological } \\ & \text { connectivity } \end{aligned}$ | Strategic significance |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & \text { rentrined } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ \text { enhanced } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Units } \\ \text { retained } \end{array} \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Units } \\ \text { enhanced } \end{gathered}$ |  | Units lost |
| 1 |  | Native Species Rich Hedgerow | 0.186 | Medium | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy |  | 2.4552 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.186 | 2.4552 |
| 2 |  | Native Hedgerow | 11.752 | Low | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same distinntiveness band or better | 77.5632 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11.752 | 27.5632 |
| 3 |  | Native Hedgerow | 0.163 | Low | Poor | Low | Area/ compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy | Same distintivenenss band or better | 0.326 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.163 | 0.326 |
| 4 |  | Native Hedgerow | 1.131 | Low | Poor | Low | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Area/compensation not in iocal strategy/ no } \\ & \text { local streag } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Same disistintiveness } \\ \text { band or better } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2.262 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1.131 | 2.262 |
| 5 |  | Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees | 1.802 | Medium | Good | Low |  | Like for like or better | 23.7864 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1.802 | 23.786 |
| 6 |  | Native Hedgerow with trees | 4.547 | Low | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same disitintiveness band or better | 30.0102 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4.547 | 30.0102 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  | Native Species Rich Hedgerow | 0.245 | Medium | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Like for like or better | 3.234 | 0.02 |  | 0.264 | 0 | 0.225 | 2.97 |
| 9 |  | Native Hedgerow | 19.107 | Low | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same distindiviveness band or epeter | 126.1062 | 3.66 |  | 24.156 | 0 | 15.447 | 101.9502 |
| 10 |  | Native Hedgerow | 5.126 | Low | Poor | Low |  | Same distindiveness band or better | 10.252 | 0.62 |  | 1.24 | 0 | 4.506 | 9.012 |
| 11 |  | Native Hedgerow with trees | 9.62 | Low | Good | Low | Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy | Same distinditiveness band or better | 63.492 | 1.3 |  | 8.58 | 0 | 8.32 | 54.912 |
| $\frac{12}{13}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{13}{14}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Site lenoth/KM | 53.68 |  |  |  |  | Total Site baseline | 339.49 | 5.60 | 0.00 | 34.24 | 0.00 | 48.08 | 305.25 |




## A1M2E

C-2 Site River Creation
Condense/ Show Columns
Condense / Show Rows
Main M enu
Instructions

|  | Proposed habitats |  | Halital distinctiveness | Habitat condition | Strategic significance |  | Temporal multiplier | Difficulty of creation category | Riparian encroachment | River units delivered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baseline ref | River type | Length km | Distinctiveness | Condition | Strategic significance | Strategic significance | Time to target condition/ years |  | Extent of encroachment |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Rivers \& Streams (Other) | 0.13 | Medium | Moderate | Delivery within Local Plans | High strategic significance | 5 | High | 0m | 0.50 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Creation Length/ KM | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |
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[^0]:    1 Net Gain has been described as a measurable target for developmert projects where impacts on biodiversty are outweghed ty a clear mitigation herarcty approach to first avoid and then minimise impacts, including throughrestoration and / or cornpensation Adhering to these Net Gain principles fie pursuing all principles togatherl will help in urder-pirning good practice for achieving and sustaining Net Cain.

[^1]:    2 Biodiversity compensatuon should be planned for a sustained Net Gain over tha longest possible tmelrame For developrnent in the UK the expectation is that compensation siteswill be secured for at least the lifetime of the development (eg ofter $25-30$ years) with the objective of Nes Gain management continuing in the future

