

Temple Group

Horsham District Council

Biodiversity Net Gain Thresholds, Site Assessment Study & Green Call for Sites

Prepared for:	Rebecca Fry, Emma Frith
	Horsham District Council
	Parkside Chart Way Horsham West Sussex RH12 1RL
	Tel 01403 215100 Email: <u>rebecca.fry@horsham.gov.uk</u> <u>emma.faith@horsham.gov.uk</u> <u>strategic.planning@horsham.gov.uk</u>
	www.horsham.gov.uk
Prepared by:	David Coote
	Associate Director
	Temple Group Limited The Clove Building 4 Maguire Street London, SE1 2NQ
	Tel 020 7394 3700

david.coote@templegroup.co.uk

www.templegroup.co.uk

Document Control

Version	Date	Author	Reviewed	Approved
V0.1 (DRAFT)	25/11/2022	David Coote Mphys MSc		
V0.2 (DRAFT)	02/12/2022	David Coote Mphys MSc	Jess Clitheroe BSc	
V1.0	05/12/2022	David Coote Mphys MSc	Andy Smith MESci (SQW)	Jon Riley MSc MCIEEM
V2.0	20/12/2022	David Coote Mphys MSc		Jon Riley MSc MCIEEM
V2.1	05/01/2023	David Coote Mphys MSc		
V2.2	19/01/2023	David Coote Mphys MSc		



Contents

1	Executive summary	1
2	Introduction	3
Ba	ckground to the study	3
3	Methodology	5
As	sessment process	5
Ро	licy and context review	6
Lo	cal Plan example sites	6
Ту	pologies and site selection	6
Ca	lculation of Biodiversity Net Gain	7
Со	ost analysis	9
Gr	een call for sites	10
Gr	een call consultation	10
Gr	een call site biodiversity net gain analysis	11
4	Results	13
Lo	cal Plan example sites	13
Gr	een call for sites	22
5	Discussion and Conclusions	25
Lo	cal Plan example sites	25
Lii	mitations on the application of the results for future Local Plan sites	26
Gr	een call for sites	27
Lii	mitations on the application of the results for the Green Call	28
Re	ferences	29
Ар	pendix 1: Green call for sites – supporting information	31
Ар	pendix 2: Figures	42
Ар	pendix 3: Example Sites biodiversity net gain calculations	48
Ар	pendix 4: Green call questionnaire responses	90
Ар	pendix 5: Green call for sites biodiversity net gain calculations	102



1 Executive summary

- 1.1 Temple was commissioned by Horsham District Council to undertake a study to provide evidence in support of the emerging Local Plan. This study will inform a formal viability assessment to establish and justify the percentage biodiversity net gain requirement that is 'feasible' and 'achievable' for development to deliver in the district. The study also includes a green call for sites to provide an indication of the likely quantum and capacity of sites available within the district for providing biodiversity enhancements to offset losses resulting from developments.
- 1.2 In order to evaluate the level of biodiversity net gain that is reasonably achievable on potential development sites, the study examined 44 sites promoted by landowners/ developers as potential allocations within the emerging Local Plan and / or Neighbourhood Plans, taking into account details from relevant planning applications. These were grouped into typologies of large strategic greenfield sites, medium greenfield sites, small greenfield sites and commercial greenfield sites. All three strategic sites were evaluated individually; a sample of three medium greenfield, three small greenfield and two commercial greenfield sites were evaluated. In addition, two indicative theoretical brownfield were evaluated to represent potential windfall sites not covered by the typologies in the example sites list.
- 1.3 The best reasonably achievable level of biodiversity net gain deliverable within each of the evaluated representative sites was calculated using the Natural England Biodiversity Net Gain metric v3.1. Baseline and proposal habitat information was based on application information provided by Horsham District Council where available. In addition, aerial imagery, online habitat data and professional judgement were applied where information was limited.
- 1.4 Viability testing will be required, taking account of the cost of providing off site biodiversity enhancement (offsetting) where sites cannot deliver target levels of net gain on site. The cost of offsetting has been calculated at a rate of £20,000 per biodiversity unit.
- 1.5 The study showed that net gains of between 7.29% and 13.31% would be achievable within the proposed design parameters for the three large strategic sites assessed. Offsetting or adjustments to design parameters would therefore be required to achieve minimum targets over 10%; offsetting costs and potential



changes to net to gross ratios have been provided to inform the assessment of viability.

- 1.6 A target of 15% is likely to be achievable on-site for all of the medium greenfield sites tested.
- 1.7 Small greenfield sites are more variable in their capacity to deliver biodiversity net gains on site due to the limited space for compensation, leading to on site delivery falling below 10%. Offsetting costs and potential changes to net to gross ratios have been provided to inform the assessment of viability of delivery.
- 1.8 The commercial/ employment sites tested achieved minimal net gain of biodiversity, and remaining sites in the example sites list are likely to have similar outcomes. This is because of the relatively higher value of the baseline habitats and limited space for on-site compensation. Offsetting costs and potential changes to net to gross ratios have been provided to inform the assessment of viability of delivery.
- 1.9 The analysis of indicative brownfield sites showed that high levels of biodiversity net gain, over 25% are likely to be achievable on sites that are largely urbanised; however, this is highly sensitive to the extent of any existing habitats, even of low value. Development of brownfield sites that have established colonising vegetation are likely to result in significant net losses unless there is a strong commitment to providing high quality biodiversity solutions such as green roofs on site.
- 1.10 Most of the sites that cannot achieve 12% net on site with the proposed designs used for assessment could achieve this target value with no more than 2% reduction in net to gross ratio, the exceptions being commercial sites and small greenfield sites with higher baseline biodiversity value.
- 1.11 The green call for sites received sixteen respondents in total, with land parcels for biodiversity enhancement ranging from 1.55ha to 89.81ha. These could deliver a total of 1761.28 biodiversity units, over four times that required to offset all of the listed example sites being required to deliver 25% net gain. These sites are all at least partially within or adjacent to areas identified within the Wilder Horsham draft Nature Recovery Network.



2 Introduction

Background to the study

- 2.1 As the environmental impact of development on the natural world is becoming ever more apparent, the UK Government has made a number of commitments to reverse the decline of biodiversity, particularly through the 25-Year Plan (Defra, 2018), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2021) principles for sustainable development and the Environment Act 2021 (Defra, 2021). Many authorities across the UK are declaring ecological and climate emergencies and introducing policies to mitigate developments' impact on the environment.
- 2.2 While the Environment Act sets out the framework for requiring development proposals to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG), many local authorities are implementing higher minimum requirements to address the challenges of balancing unprecedented demand for development with the need to protect and restore the natural environment, both for its intrinsic value and for the ecosystem services it provides.
- 2.3 The strategy for development within Horsham District Council is set out in the current Local Plan (the Horsham District Planning Framework), which was adopted in 2015. This document is now under review, with a new Local Plan being developed. Both the existing and the emerging Local Plan set a framework that seeks to ensure that development takes place in a manner that ensures the settlement pattern and rural landscape character of the district are retained and enhanced.
- 2.4 A key priority of the emerging Local Plan is that it delivers development to the highest possible environmental standards. Emerging local draft planning policies sought to require 10% biodiversity net gain in view of the Environment Act (Defra, 2021); the evidence base for the Horsham District Council draft Local Plan to date has demonstrated that a requirement for a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain, would be achievable in the large majority of cases. Horsham District Council wish to explore whether a higher required minimum biodiversity net gain would be achievable. Temple have therefore been commissioned by Horsham District Council to undertake a study to provide evidence that can be used to inform the Local Plan, including a formal Local Plan viability assessment in relation to the application of biodiversity net gain. The study is intended to establish and



justify the percentage biodiversity net gain threshold that is 'feasible' and 'achievable' for development to deliver in the district.

- 2.5 Temple, supported by viability experts SQW, have consulted and collaborated with Aspinall Verdi (the company appointed to undertake the Local Plan viability assessment) to ensure that the output of this study can apply efficiently and consistently with other policy costs within the emerging Local Plan Viability assessment.
- 2.6 Temple was also instructed to deliver a green call for sites¹ to establish if there is likely to be sufficient available supply of green sites within the district to address any shortfall of provision of biodiversity units (BU) within the proposed development sites and, consequently, whether there will need to be a reliance upon the national biodiversity credits to meet some biodiversity net gain targets.

¹ A formal call for sites is typically used to collect applications or proposals for sites to be considered for allocation or use in delivery of planning objectives, such as developments sites, public green space or biodiversity offsetting. This is an informal call that follows a similar process, but with no commitment by the LPA or respondents, intended as an information gathering exercise.

3 Methodology

Assessment process

3.1 The overall process for the study is illustrated in the flow diagram below. Details of the stages are then explained in detail in the following sections.





Policy and context review

- 3.2 In order to understand the background policy and local strategy context, a review of relevant information was undertaken. This included publicly available documents and information provided by Horsham District Council including
 - Defra consultation on BNG regulations and BNG and Local Nature Recovery Strategy Impact Assessment (Defra, 2019);
 - the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, 2021) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on the Natural Environment (MHCLG & DLUHC, 2019a). and Viability (MHCLG & DLUHC, 2019b);
 - Wilder Horsham's draft Horsham Nature Recovery Network (HDC, 2021_1);
 - Sussex Nature Partnership's Natural Capital Investment Strategy (SNP, 2019);
 - Horsham District draft Local Plan (Regulation 18, February 2020);
 - Horsham District draft Local Plan (15 July 2021 Cabinet draft which was not progressed to Council due to NPPF amendments),
 - data from previous ecological assessment for Horsham District Council on the application of minimum10% biodiversity net gain to inform the draft Local Plan;
 - Horsham District Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy (HDC, 2014) and 2021 updated map;
 - South Downs National Park calls for sites for development and off-setting and for Local Green Spaces (SDNP, 2022); and
 - Viability Assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain in Kent (co-authored by Temple) (KCC, 2022).

Local Plan example sites

Typologies and site selection

- 3.3 Horsham District Council have provided a list of sites, taking into account those included in the draft Local Plan considered at the July 2021 Cabinet and relevant planning applications, for consideration in this study, along with mapping of sites and baseline information where this was available.
- 3.4 In order to representatively assess potential sites in the local plan and potential windfall sites, a typology approach has been adopted; sites were stratified into typologies based on factors such as size, development type, development density and existing landscape type (e.g. greenfield or previously developed land) in accordance with the national Planning Practice Guidance on viability assessment (MHCLG & DLUHC, 2019b).



- 3.5 A representative sample of sites from each typology was then taken forward for analysis. All large strategic sites were analysed individually to ensure the results are specifically relevant to their particular baseline and proposal parameters.
- 3.6 Where potential types of windfall site were not represented within the range of sites considered, theoretical indicative typical sites were used.

Calculation of Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.7 This habitat information was used to calculate baseline biodiversity unit values for each typology and strategic site using the Natural England BNG metric v3.1 (Natural England, 2022). This metric multiplies the area of a habitat by set factors to represent:
 - distinctiveness the rarity and importance of the habitat to biodiversity (automatically determined by the habitat type);
 - condition the quality of a habitat at a point in time based on management, disturbance and other environmental factors (and reported on scale of high, moderate and low); and
 - strategic significance whether the location of the habitat has been identified in local biodiversity strategy or is otherwise of potential strategic value for nature.
- 3.8 For each of the sites identified, baseline habitat types were calculated using existing planning information where available (e.g. ecological survey data, proposed masterplan, biodiversity net gain assessments). Where this was not available, aerial photography and information on habitats and designated sites available from the Local Plan and online habitat data (available from Magic²) were used to provide a best estimate of habitat type ('moderate' condition being used where there was no clear indication).
- 3.9 For indicative windfall sites, areas of typical baseline habitat types were estimated with reference to previous project experience (including Temple's work for Kent County Council: KCC, 2022) and reviews of planning applications to compare examples of similar schemes. Conditions of habitats were also estimated to represent typical sites.
- 3.10 For each typology, a reasonable best case biodiversity enhancement (best reasonably achievable) scenario was developed to characterise the optimum value

² https://magic.defra.gov.uk/



habitat creation that could reasonably be expected to be delivered³. This process was based on application information provided by Horsham District Council (where available), combined with comparison between similar sites within the example sites list and prior experience of similar project examples. It took account of typical site parameters such as net to gross ratios, infrastructure requirements and locally relevant strategic and policy considerations (e.g. green networks and priority habitat types). Site boundaries were based on information provided by Horsham District Council (HDC, 2021_2)⁴.

- 3.11 Once the best reasonably achievable post-development habitats had been determined, these were also entered into the post-development section of the BNG 3.1 metric. This evaluates proposed habitats in the same way as baseline habitats, but also applies reducing factors (multipliers less than 1) to represent the "time to achieve target condition" and the "difficulty of creation or enhancement"⁵ (risk factors). Comparison of the baseline and post-development biodiversity unit score provided an upper limit of net gain that was considered feasible and achievable on-site without altering the development parameters.
- 3.12 In order that viability testing could be applied at different potential target levels of net gain in planning policy requirements, sites were tested against biodiversity net gain uplifts of 10%, 12%, 15%, 20% and 25%. The number of additional biodiversity units required to achieve each level has been calculated, where it is not reasonably achievable on site. This has been presented as the number of biodiversity units required in addition to the best reasonably achievable gain and as the number required in addition to achieving 10% gain.
- 3.13 In addition, following an initial review of data, it was considered likely that a minimum target of 12% would be reasonable in most cases. Therefore, as a result of discussion with Horsham District Council and Aspinall Verdi (consultants undertaking the Local Plan viability assessment), it was agreed that the data should also be tested against a minimum target of 12% net gain. Therefore, where 12% net gain could not be reasonably achieved on site within the previously assumed development parameters, the additional area of land that would be required to achieve 12% net gain on site (by reducing the net development plot

³ While this process aimed to exclude unreasonably expensive interventions, detailed consideration of cost viability is beyond the scope of this study.

⁴ The assessment has used site boundaries as provided by Horsham District Council at the time of writing; these may differ from actual development proposal boundaries as they are brought forward.

⁵ Advanced/ Delayed habitat creation factors have not been applied in this study as these are not typically made use of as standard



area to allow for additional habitat creation) was calculated. This was done by assuming that 'other neutral grassland' in 'fairly good' condition would replace the necessary area of developed land (based on 70% built and 30% garden for residential sites and 100% built for commercial sites) in the calculation. This allows for direct conversion rates of 0.1387ha/BU required for residential sites and 0.1284ha/BU for commercial sites.

3.14 For targets above 12% net gain, the number of additional biodiversity units required (in excess of achieving 12% gain) is also presented. This allows for viability assessment to be carried out on the basis that net gain of up to 12% would be delivered on site, adjusting net to gross ratios if needed, and any additional biodiversity units required to achieve higher targets would be delivered off site. This was considered, in discussion with Aspinal Verdi, as likely to be the most representative approach to inform their viability assessment.

Cost analysis

- 3.15 Delivery of biodiversity enhancements within a site will result in additional costs. However, where the target net gain is achievable on-site, without reducing the development footprint, it is assumed that the cost of delivering biodiversity enhancements will not be significant compared with the total development costs of a residential or commercial scheme. This is evidenced in the work we undertook with SQW for Kent County Council in 2022 (KCC, 2022)⁶.
- 3.16 Where the best reasonably achievable net gain does not meet target values at 10%, 12%, 15%, 20% and 25%, the number of additional biodiversity units required to meet that target was used to estimate the cost of delivery off site, assuming that available onsite options will also be fully employed. A standardised estimate of £20,000/BU was used, which was determined from looking at evidence provided by a number of external sources including:
 - Environment Bank (Direct provision to LPA for planning) indicates costs between £18,000/BU and £24,000/BU;
 - previous consultations with local planning authorities (various habitat costs);
 - subcontractor responses at consultation on a previous project (various habitat costs);

⁶ The viability assessment showed that the highest percentage increase in costs to deliver on site biodiversity net gain occurred on strategic greenfield sites. On these sites, the build cost was shown to increase by just 1.04% to deliver 20% net gain, above that required to deliver 10% net gain. While local values and costs will vary, the order of magnitude of BNG cost increase in the tested scenarios relative to total scheme development costs is considered to be broadly applicable across the South-East.



- Defra Impact Assessment uses cost of £11,000 but states existing evidence suggests range between £6,000-25,000 (Defra, 2019)
- Biodiversity Net Gain: Market Analysis study, Defra (2021) which had an estimate of £20,000/BU rising to £25,000/BU in areas of scarcity.
- The Delivering Environmental Net Gain webinar: Delivering Environmental Net Gain (Environment Analyst, 2022). This provided a reiteration of research carried out by Arcadis suggesting biodiversity credits can range in cost from £4-35k/BU.
- 3.17 In addition it is worth noting that there is expected to be a standardised approach to these costs from the Natural England Biodiversity Credit Scheme Pilot. The likely costs for these national credits are not known at this stage, but the intention is for these to exceed the typical costs for local delivery. Currently there is also a consultation taking place on further defining net gain policy, and this includes discussion around the process of securing off-site Biodiversity Credits, so these costs may vary in future.

Green call for sites

Green call consultation

- 3.18 The green call at this stage was designed to be a 'theoretical' call, meaning that it was to establish interest from local landowners and land managers who would be keen to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain on their land. However, it did not represent any commitment made on either the participants' or Horsham District Council's side.
- 3.19 Following the inception meeting with Horsham District Council it was agreed that an online consultation, via a dedicated microsite⁷ with an additional postal option was to be used. The dissemination of the associated questionnaire was primarily to be pursued through Horsham District Council contacts at Wilder Horsham and the National Farmers Union. The green call for sites was also discussed with Knepp Wildlife Foundation, in relation to Horsham District Council's and the Foundation's shared objectives, engagement with landowners and other partners, and availability of land for securing biodiversity net gain credits.
- 3.20 The microsite was developed in conjunction with key contacts from Horsham District Council. It was essential that landowner expectations were appropriately

⁷ A set of webpages forming a dedicated site hosted within Temple's web domain, with an associated contact email address.



managed throughout the consultation process. Therefore, the presentation of the purpose of the call needed to be carefully designed. The microsite included key information about the consultation, background information on biodiversity net gain (including the scope of commitment required for offsetting provision), access to the online call for sites questionnaire, information on GDPR and data privacy, and FAQs (see Appendix 1). A monitored email inbox was also provided to respond to questions and an option for postal responses was also provided. The site was designed so that the data provided could be fed directly into the overall study.

- 3.21 The Horsham District Council green call for sites was conducted from the 18th of October until the 4th of November 2022.
- 3.22 The microsite was promoted through press releases in local newspaper, West Sussex County Times, as well as through local networks newsletters and contact lists including: Country Land and Business Association, Wilder Horsham, the National Farmers Union, and the Council's 'Stay Connected Network'. Contact was also made with local Facebook groups 'Horsham in Bloom' and 'Visit Horsham', as well as the Sussex Young Farmers Association requesting to promote the consultation. Additionally, Temple and Horsham District Council shared promoted launch of the consultation on social media accounts (Linkedin and Twitter). Horsham District Council also shared the consultation with the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) database contacts, the Agents Forum and via the Council's planning website.

Green call site biodiversity net gain analysis

- 3.23 The purpose of the analysis of the green sites was to evaluate the availability and capacity of land outside of the potential development sites to deliver biodiversity compensation that could be used to offset losses or shortfall in delivery of biodiversity net gain targets on site in developments in the district. This would then provide an indication of the extent of biodiversity gain that could be achieved.
- 3.24 Responses from interested parties were collated through the microsite into Temple's GIS analysis platform, Areal. This provided the site boundaries with all of the associated consultation data.
- 3.25 The likely baseline biodiversity units present at each site was established in a similar way to the analysis of the development sites. Information provided by



respondents and additional investigation of the habitats present using aerial photography, online habitat datasets and information from Horsham District Council was used to determine habitat type (and distinctiveness) and condition. Green infrastructure and nature conservation strategies (principally Wilder Horsham, the local nature recovery network) were included in the analysis to determine the strategic significance. This information was entered into the Natural England 3.1 metric to determine the baseline biodiversity unit value.

3.26 Based on the information provided by respondents, the nature of the baseline habitats and professional experience of habitat enhancement and management, a set of reasonable biodiversity enhancements was determined for each site. Where assumptions were made regarding baseline habitats, enhancements were restricted to improving condition rather than targeting improvement to a higher distinctiveness habitat (e.g. enhancing "non-priority habitat" ponds from moderate to good condition, but not trying to achieve "priority habitat" ponds) to avoid overestimation of achievable improvements. This was also entered into the metric calculator to determine a potential post-intervention biodiversity unit value and therefore determine the available net gain.



4 Results

Local Plan example sites

- 4.1 A total of 44 sites were reviewed taking into account promoted sites, the potential Local Plan allocations within the draft Local Plan considered at the July 2021 Cabinet meeting, Neighbourhood Plans and sites proposed through planning applications. Three sites were large strategic residential and mixed use proposals; the remainder were predominantly residential developments on greenfield sites, with four commercial developments also on greenfield, ranging from 0.26 to 13.6 ha.
- 4.2 The sites were grouped into typologies as 'small greenfield' (up to c. 50 dwellings), 'medium greenfield' (up to c. 500 dwellings), 'large strategic', and 'commercial'. All large strategic sites were taken forward for assessment. Three sites were selected to represent each of the small greenfield and medium greenfield site typologies and two sites to represent the commercial typology. These sites were selected on the basis of the level of existing information and being representative of the range of developments. All of the sites considered are listed in Table 1; sites taken forward for analysis are highlighted in bold type and their locations are mapped on Figure 1 (Appendix 2).

Site name	Ref Number	Туроlоду	Dwellings/ floorspace	Site area (ha)
Graylands Estate	SA363	Greenfield Commercial Site	9025sqm	3.2
South of Star Road	SA063	Greenfield Commercial Site	9000sqm	3.9
Broomers Hill Business Park	SA385	Greenfield Commercial Site	7000sqm	2.7
Southwater	SA703	Greenfield Commercial	3000sqm	1
employment site		Site		
Slaughterford Farm	SA613	Low Density Brownfield Site	30	1.9
Kilnwood Vale	SA291	Medium Greenfield Site	350	13.3
Mercer Road	SA568	Medium Greenfield Site	300	13.5
Glebe Farm	SA742	Medium Greenfield Site	265	13.13
Hornbrook Farm	SA074	Medium Greenfield Site	175	10
Broadridge Heath	SA386	Medium Greenfield Site	150	6.82
Drovers Lane	SA445	Medium Greenfield Site	150	10.2
Dunstons Farm	SA433	Medium Greenfield Site	120	7.11
Church Road	SA320	Medium Greenfield Site	80	4.92

Table 1: Summary of example sites considered

Site name	Ref Number	Туроlоду	Dwellings/ floorspace	Site area (ha)
Mousdell Close	SA866	Medium Greenfield Site	75	2.27
Melton Drive	SA361 & SA732	Medium Greenfield Site	70	4.795
Pulborough Greendene	SA112	Medium Greenfield Site	70	3.92
Guildford Road	SA574	Medium Greenfield Site	60	4.9
Partridge Green	SA274	Medium Greenfield Site	55	4.24
Rock Road	SA384	Medium Greenfield Site	55	3.3
Sandgate Nurseries	SA317	Medium Greenfield Site	55	3.06
Shoreham Road, Small Dole	SA538	Small Greenfield Site	40	5.47
Smugglers Lane	SA006	Small Greenfield Site	50	3.3
Stream House	SA873	Small Greenfield Site	40	1.9
Brook Hill and Cowfold Glebe	SA076 & SA083	Small Greenfield Site	35	1.95
West of Cowfold	SA609	Small Greenfield Site	35	2.02
West of Cowfold	SA610 & SA611	Small Greenfield Site	35	2.03
Glayde Farm	SA567	Small Greenfield Site	30	2.71
High Bar Lane	SA039	Small Greenfield Site	25	0.95
Highfields, Codmore Hill	SA556	Small Greenfield Site	25	1.26
Muntham Drive	SA510	Small Greenfield Site	25	1.89
Bell Road	SA071	Small Greenfield Site	20	0.73
Christs Hospital	SA129	Small Greenfield Site	20	4.27
East Street Rusper	SA872	Small Greenfield Site	20	0.91
North of Sandygate Lane	SA575	Small Greenfield Site	20	1.13
Hatches Estate	SA066	Small Greenfield Site	15	0.9
Smock Alley	SA429	Small Greenfield Site	15	2.43
Rusper Glebe	SA080	Small Greenfield Site	12	0.57
East of Hatches Estate	SA500	Small Greenfield Site	8	0.7
Church Farm House	SA584	Small Greenfield Site	7	0.48
East Street, Rusper	SA465	Small Greenfield Site	6	0.4
Pig Farm, Bucks Green	SA794	Small Greenfield Site	6	0.26
West of Ifield	SA101	Strategic Large Greenfield Site	3250	170
Land West of Southwater	SA119	Strategic Large Greenfield Site	1200	154
Land East of Billingshurst	SA118	Strategic Large Greenfield Site	650	37

4.3 In addition to the sites listed above, consideration has been given to potential windfall sites. Most types of windfall sites would be covered by the typologies



identified above, with the exception of brownfield developments. Therefore two indicative windfall site typologies have been analysed⁸:

- Indicative Brownfield Windfall Site A assumed to be existing built environment with a total site area of 1.9ha, 95% developed for residential houses and flats.
- Indicative Brownfield Windfall Site B assumed to be existing built environment with a total site area of 0.26ha, 97.5% developed for residential flats.
- 4.4 The best reasonably achievable level of biodiversity net gain calculated for each site is presented in Table 3⁹. This also shows the number of total biodiversity units required in excess of those deliverable on site to achieve target levels of net gain of +10%, +12%, +15%, +20% and +25%. The number of biodiversity units required in excess of the assumed mandatory +10% is also shown in brackets. Where a net gain of 10% is not achievable on site within the assumed parameters, the additional area of land (to be taken from the net development area) required to achieve this level is shown, along with the adjusted net to gross ratio and change from the initial ratio. Costs are shown for off-site delivery of biodiversity offsetting using a multiplier of £20,000 per biodiversity unit (as set out above in section 3.16). Full biodiversity net gain calculations for each site are provided in Appendix 3.
- 4.5 The output of the analysis presented in Table 3 is colour coded in relation to the differing categories for net gain stated above, as shown in Table 2; where no additional biodiversity units are required to achieve target levels, these are indicated by light green shading.

⁸ Note, there is a slight variance with net to gross figures shown in Table 4 due to rounding.

⁹ Biodiversity net gain results vary in some cases in relation to submitted planning documents or values used to inform the emerging Local Plan evidence where these previous values were calculated using earlier versions of the metric due to differences in the habitat value calculations.



Table 2: Colour coding for biodiversity net gain outcome achievable on site within existing development parameters

Biodiversity net gain achievable (banded in line with target levels)	Colour coding (Table 3, Table 4)
<0% (Net loss)	
0%-9.9%	
10%-11.9%	
12%-14.9%	
15%-19.9%	
20%-24.9%	
25% and over	

Table 3: Summary of best reasonable achievable biodiversity net gain compared to minimum 10% target on representative sites (values required to achieve targets over those needed to achieve 10% are shown in parentheses)

Site Name	Typology	Maximum BNG ¹⁰ Increase	Additional BU ¹¹ / cost to achieve 10%	Adjusted net to gross ratio to achieve 10% (change)	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 12%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 15%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 20%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 25%
Indicative Windfall Site A	Brownfield (large)	33.33%	0 - £0	96% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)
Indicative Windfall Site B	Brownfield (small)	38.45%	0 - £0	98% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)
Graylands Estate	Commercial Greenfield	1.93%	1.42 - £28,400	90% (-5%)	1.78 (0.35) - £35,600 (£7,000)	2.31 (0.88) - £46,200 (£17,600)	3.19 (1.76) - £63,800 (£35,200)	4.07 (2.65) - £81,400 (£53,000)
Southwater employment site	Commercial Greenfield	0.32%	0.43 - £8,600	54% (-6%)	0.51 (0.09) - £10,200 (£1,800)	0.65 (0.22) - £13,000 (£4,400)	0.87 (0.44) - £17,400 (£8,800)	1.09 (0.66) - £21,800 (£13,200)
Land East of Billingshurst	Large Strategic Greenfield	10.78%	0-£0	45% (0%)	1.94 (3.18) - £38,800 (£63,600)	6.71 (7.95) - £134,200 (£159,000)	14.66 (15.91) - £293,200 (£318,200)	22.61 (23.86) - £452,200 (£477,200)
Land West of Southwater	Large Strategic Greenfield	13.31%	0-£0	27% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	21.11 (62.65) - £422,200 (£1,253,000)	83.77 (125.3) - £1,675,400 (£2,506,000)	146.42 (187.95) - £2,928,400 (£3,759,000)

¹⁰ BNG = Biodiversity net gain

¹¹ BU = Biodiversity Units (as derived from the Natural England biodiversity net gain metric)

Site Name	Typology	Maximum BNG ¹⁰ Increase	Additional BU ¹¹ / cost to achieve 10%	Adjusted net to gross ratio to achieve 10% (change)	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 12%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 15%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 20%	Additional BU/ cost to achieve 25%
West of Ifield	Large Strategic Greenfield	7.29%	31.42 - £628,400	41% (-2%)	54.6 (23.18) - £1,092,000 (£463,600)	89.37 (57.95) - £1,787,400 (£1,159,000)	147.32 (115.9) - £2,946,400	205.27 (173.85) - £4,105,400
Church Road	Medium Greenfield	19.55%	0-£0	96% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0.07 (1.63) - £1,400 (£32,600)	0.89 (2.45) - £17,800 (£49,000)
Glebe Farm	Medium Greenfield	17.58%	0 - £0	75% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0.98 (4.05) - £19,600 (£81,000)	3.01 (6.08) - £60,200 (£121,600)
Partridge Green	Medium Greenfield	19.22%	0-£0	61% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0.14 (1.74) - £2,800 (£34,800)	1.01 (2.61) - £20,200 (£52,200)
High Bar Lane	Small Greenfield	-0.30%	0.35 - £7,000	61% (-6%)	0.41 (0.07) - 0.51 £8,200 £10, (£1,400) (£3,4		0.68 (0.34) - £13,600 (£6,800)	0.85 (0.5) - £17,000 (£10,000)
Smock Alley	Small Greenfield	12.70%	0-£0	67% (0%)	0 (0) - £0 (£0)	0.26 (0.56) - £5,200 (£11,200)	0.82 (1.12) - £16,400 (£22,400)	1.38 (1.68) - £27,600 (£33,600)
West of Cowfold	Small Greenfield	5.00%	0.33 - £6,600	97% (-3%)	0.46 (0.13) - £9,200 (£2,600)	0.66 (0.33) - £13,200 (£6,600)	0.99 (0.66) - £19,800 (£13,200)	1.32 (0.99) - £26,400 (£19,800)



4.6 In order to assist viability assessment on the basis of a likely minimum 12% net gain requirement, Table 4 presents the number of biodiversity units required in excess of the 12% to achieve higher targets. Where a net gain of 12% is not achievable on site within the assumed parameters, the additional area of land (to be taken from the net development area) required to achieve this level is shown, along with the adjusted net to gross ratio and change from the initial ratio. Costs are shown for off-site delivery of biodiversity offsetting using a multiplier of £20,000/BU (as set out above in section 3.16); colour coding for best achievable outcomes is as shown in Table 2.

Table 4: Summary of best reasonable achievable biodiversity net gain compared to minimum 12% target on representative sites

Site Name	Typology	Best reasonably achievable BNG ¹²	Total Extra BU ¹³ and cost to achieve 12%	Additional area to achieve 12% (ha)	Adjusted net to gross ratio to achieve 12% (change)	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 15%	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 20%	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 25%
Indicative Windfall	Brownfield							
Site A	(large)	33.33%	0 - £0	0	96% (0%)	0 - £0	0 - £0	0 - £0
Indicative Windfall	Brownfield							
Site B	(small)	38.45%	0 - £0	0	98% (0%)	0 - £0	0 - £0	0 - £0
	Commercial		1.78 -			0.53 -	1.41 -	2.29 -
Graylands Estate	Greenfield	1.93%	£35,600	0.23	88% (-7%)	£10,600	£28,200	£45,800
Southwater	Commercial		0.51 -	0.07				0.57 -
employment site	Greenfield	0.32%	£10,200		53% (-7%)	0.13 - £2,600	0.35 - £7,000	£11,400
Land East of	Large Strategic		1.94 -			4.77 -	12.72 -	20.68 -
Billingshurst	Greenfield	10.78%	£38,800	0.27	44% (-1%)	£95,400	£254,400	£413,600
Land West of	Large Strategic					37.59 -	100.24 -	162.89 -
Southwater	Greenfield	13.31%	0 - £0	0	27% (0%)	£751,800	£2,004,800	£3,257,800
	Large Strategic		54.6 -			34.77 -	92.72 -	150.67 -
West of Ifield	Greenfield	7.29%	£1,092,000	7.57	39% (-4%)	£695,400	£1,854,400	£3,013,400
	Medium						1.31 -	2.12 -
Church Road	Greenfield	19.55%	0 - £0	0	96% (0%)	0 - £0	£26,200	£42,400
	Medium						3.24 -	5.27 -
Glebe Farm	Greenfield	17.58%	0 - £0	0	75% (0%)	0 - £0	£64,800	£105,400
	Medium						1.39 -	2.27 -
Partridge Green	Greenfield	19.22%	0 - £0	0	61% (0%)	0 - £0	£27,800	£45,400

¹² BNG = Biodiversity net gain

¹³ BU = Biodiversity Units (as derived from the Natural England biodiversity net gain metric)

Site Name	Typology	Best reasonably achievable BNG ¹²	Total Extra BU ¹³ and cost to achieve 12%	Additional area to achieve 12% (ha)	Adjusted net to gross ratio to achieve 12% (change)	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 15%	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 20%	Extra BU and cost (over 12%) to achieve 25%
	Small							
High Bar Lane	Greenfield	-0.30%	0.41 - £8,200	0.06	60% (-7%)	0.1 - £2,000	0.27 - £5,400	0.44 - £8,800
	Small						0.89 -	1.45 -
Smock Alley	Greenfield	12.70%	0 - £0	0	67% (0%)	0.34 - £6,800	£17,800	£29,000
	Small						0.53 -	0.86 -
West of Cowfold	Greenfield	5.00%	0.46 - £9,200	0.06	96% (-4%)	0.2 - £4,000	£10,600	£17,200



Green call for sites

- 4.7 Sixteen separate submissions where received online in total. Seven postal requests were sent out, with zero returns. During the consultation period, emails from twelve individuals in the dedicated Horsham expressions of interest inbox resulted in further conversations, submissions and requests to be informed on updates to Horsham District Council's biodiversity net gain approach moving forward.
- 4.8 Sites ranged from 1.55ha to 89.81ha and included a range of habitat types, although generally dominated by cereal crops and modified grassland. These sites are summarised in Table 5. Full response details are provided in Appendix 4 and biodiversity net gain calculations are provided in Appendix 5. The locations of these sites are shown in Figure 2 (Appendix 2), alongside mapping of the Wilder Horsham draft Nature Recovery Network areas.
- 4.9 Dialogue with Knepp Wildlife Foundation demonstrated alignment and potential synergies in the delivery of positive, landscape level outcomes for biodiversity that both Horsham District Council and the Foundation seek to achieve. For example, the Foundation's involvement in stakeholder engagement, dialogue and training could support Horsham District Council's role in delivering mandatory biodiversity net gain for 30 or more years in a way that is more integrated and sustainable than would be possible without partnership working.

Table 5: Summary of green call for sites responses

	Size			Baseline BU ¹⁴	Enhanced	Net BU	Net BU %
Site reference	(ha)	Habitats present	Opportunities for enhancement	Value	BU Value	Gain	Gain
Barns Green Road,							
Coolham, North of			Change cereal crops to other				
Wisteria Place	2.54	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	5.84	22.76	16.92	289.64%
		Built linear features,	Change cereal crops to other				
		cereal crops, ponds	neutral grassland, enhance				
		(non-priority habitat),	condition of other woodland, and				
Bury St Austens Farm	72.36	other woodland	ponds (non-priority habitat)	179.06	651.62	472.56	263.92%
			Change cereal crops to other				
East Clayton Farm	29.95	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	68.89	230.58	161.69	234.73%
			Change cereal crops to other				
			neutral grassland, enhance				
		Cereal crops, mixed	condition of mixed scrub, and				
Lambs Green, Rusper	7.34	scrub, other woodland	other woodland	47.49	71.99	24.2	50.63%
			Enhance condition of fens (upland				
		Fen, mixed scrub, other	and lowland), mixed scrub, and				
Land at Knepp	27.12	woodland	other woodland	354.84	400.43	45.58	12.85%
			Change cereal crops to other				
Land at Little			neutral grassland, enhance				
Thakeham Farm,		Cereal crops, mixed	condition of mixed scrub, and				
Storrington	89.81	scrub, other woodland	other woodland	316.6	838.31	521.71	164.79%
			Change modified grassland to				
		Modified grassland,	other neutral grassland, enhance				
Land at Old Camp		other woodland, ponds	condition of other woodland, and				
Farm, Brighton Road	12.29	(non-priority habitat)	ponds (non-priority habitat)	79.12	120.71	41.59	52.56%

¹⁴ BU = Biodiversity Units (as derived from the Natural England biodiversity net gain metric)

	.			Baseline	- • •		
Site reference	Size (ba)	Hahitats present	Opportunities for enhancement	BU'* Value	Enhanced BUI Value	Net BU Gain	Net BU %
Site reference	(114)	Habitats present	Change modified grassland to	Value	bo value	Gam	Gam
		Modified grassland	other neutral grassland enhance				
Land at the		other woodland ponds	condition of other woodland, and				
Hermitage Tower Hill	1 55	(non-priority habitat)	ponds (non-priority habitat)	5.67	13 48	7 81	137 94%
Land Fast of School	1.55			5.07	13.40	7.01	137.9470
Lane Stevning Road			Change cereal crops to other				
Wiston	4 06	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	8 93	34 80	25.87	289 64%
			Change cereal crops to other	0.55	5 1100	20107	20010170
Land West of		Cereal crops other	neutral grassland enhance				
Kingsfold	24.50	woodland	condition of other woodland	88.42	220.84	132.42	149.76%
			Change cereal crops to other				
Langlev Fields	5.98	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	13.16	51.26	38.1	289.64%
			Change modified grassland to				
Long House, Long		Modified grassland,	other neutral grassland, enhance				
House Lane, Cowfold	3.33	other woodland	condition of other woodland	17.91	30.09	12.17	67.95%
			Change cereal crops to other				
Mayes Park (North)	13.41	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	30.84	120.18	89.33	289.64%
			Change cereal crops to other				
		Cereal crops, other	neutral grassland, enhance				
Mayes Park (South)	21.40	woodland	condition of other woodland	62.19	195.85	133.65	214.91%
			Enhance condition of fens (upland				
		Fen, mixed scrub, other	and lowland), mixed scrub, other				
		woodland, ponds (non-	woodland, and ponds (non-priority				
Mount Wood	5.28	priority habitat)	habitat)	48.58	61.60	13.03	26.82%
			Change cereal crops to other				
Theale Farm	3.70	Cereal crops	neutral grassland	8.51	33.16	24.65	289.64%



5 Discussion and Conclusions

Local Plan example sites

- 5.1 Analysis of the best reasonably achievable biodiversity net gain showed a range in the potential on site delivery of biodiversity net gain. The figures presented in Table 3 and Table 4 above should be taken forward to inform the Local Plan viability assessment by applying the additional costs as a factor alongside other cost considerations.
- 5.2 For large strategic sites; Southwater delivers over 13%, Billingshurst delivers just over 10% and West of Ifield delivers a little under 10%. The variation in these figures depends largely on the quality of the baseline habitats and the potential for enhancement of retained features. These figures indicate that at least 10% net gain would be achievable on site within the assumed development parameters on two out of the three sites. Offsetting or adjustment of net-to gross ratios would be required to achieve higher levels of net gain, which will be tested by the viability assessment.
- 5.3 Medium greenfield sites were consistently well above 15% biodiversity net gain. This is largely because the sites were generally poor baseline habitats, which could easily be compensated within the site boundary through habitat creation. From this sample, it would be reasonable to suggest that a 15% minimum requirement for this type of site would be achievable, subject to the findings of the viability assessment.
- 5.4 Small greenfield sites were more variable with one site over 13%, one at 5% and one a slight net loss. Small sites often have a much lower proportion of land available outside the development footprint, so where there is habitat of any value, such as grassland that is not heavily modified, it is not usually possible to achieve a significant gain on site. However, as the baseline habitats for these sites are rarely of high biodiversity value, and the areas are relatively small, the additional cost of offsetting may not be large. Viability testing for minimum levels of net gain over 10% will be required to determine whether these additional costs would be viable.
- 5.5 Neither of the commercial/ employment sites tested delivered significant net gain, with both delivering under 2%. Both sites included areas of medium distinctiveness grassland habitats, which would not be possible to compensate for



and enhance within the site boundary in the area available outside the development plot. The other two commercial sites shown in Table 1 are similar in baseline features, consisting of grassland and scrub. In these cases, and any similar commercial windfall sites, significant offsetting would be required, which will need to be viability tested, however other windfall sites on low value greenfield sites would be much more likely to deliver significant net gain.

- 5.6 The indicative brownfield sites allow for delivery of high levels of net gain, over 25%. Brownfield sites tend to be highly sensitive to variances in baseline and the type of scheme. Sites that predominantly comprise built infrastructure can achieve very high percentage gains with fairly low levels of intervention, whereas those with even relatively small amounts of habitat, even low distinctiveness, can be very hard to improve or in many cases avoid net loss. The low value and small scale of such features, however, generally means that the cost of offsetting is relatively low. Derelict brownfield sites that have been partially or wholly colonised by vegetation are better considered as similar to greenfield sites as they can support habitats of value that can be difficult to compensate for in an urban environment.
- 5.7 Of the sites tested, the strategic, medium greenfield and brownfield sites could either achieve at least 12% biodiversity net gain on site within the existing parameters, or could achieve this with no more than 2% reduction in net to gross ratio. It is therefore likely that a 12% minimum net gain target would be reasonable for these typologies, although this will require viability testing to confirm.
- 5.8 The commercial or small greenfield sites tested generally could not achieve 12% net gain on site if this were to be set as a minimum requirement. To achieve a 12% net gain on site, the commercial sites would require a 7% to 50% reduction in net to gross ratio and the small greenfield sites would require 0% to 7% reduction. These adjustments to net to gross ratios will need to be taken into consideration, alongside off site offsetting costs, for viability assessment to test if a 12% minimum biodiversity net gain target is feasible for these typologies.

Limitations on the application of the results for future Local Plan sites

5.9 The typology approach is a recognised method for viability assessment that allows for a relatively large number of sites to be represented efficiently with a suitable degree of accuracy. It is not intended, however, to provide a detailed assessment of every available potential development site, so there will be a significant degree



of variation between sites that is not directly captured in this assessment. Even where this assessment and/ or the subsequent plan viability assessment find that a given level of biodiversity net gain is feasible and achievable across a typology, this does not guarantee that this will be the case for all sites proposed.

5.10 Analysis of the representative sites has been carried out as an estimation, using available planning information, aerial imagery and desk-based data gathering. These assessments cannot be taken to replace the need for detailed site survey and ecological and biodiversity net gain assessments to support individual planning applications.

Green call for sites

- 5.11 The sixteen sites received from the green call for sites consultation have capacity to deliver a range of habitats; areas of agricultural grassland and crops have generally been assumed to provide opportunities to create scrub planting and wildflower grassland¹⁵, although nutrient levels may prevent creation of high quality meadow within a reasonable timescale. Woodland planting on these areas is possible and would be desirable in the landscape context for many sites, although it returns relatively low rates of biodiversity units due to the time taken to establish, and is relatively expensive to establish on a per biodiversity unit basis.
- 5.12 Other habitats included woodland, grassland and wetland habitats that would be suitable for enhancement through dedicated management for biodiversity.
- 5.13 These sites are all closely linked to areas identified in the Wilder Horsham draft Local Nature Recovery Network. Three sites are adjacent to target areas, seven sites partially overlap and six lie almost entirely within the network of target areas. This is of value for building resilience and connectivity within the Nature Recovery Network and strategy.
- 5.14 The Nature Recovery Network areas also provide significant opportunities for biodiversity offsetting and delivery of overall biodiversity improvements across the district, which are significantly greater than the capacity of the sites identified in the green call.

¹⁵ Wildflower grassland, classified as 'Other neutral grassland' in Good condition; nutrient levels are likely to prevent reversion to priority lowland meadow habitat within a reasonable timescale



- 5.15 The cumulative capacity for these sites to deliver biodiversity net gains within the district, based on the reasonable scenarios developed, total 1761.28 biodiversity units. The number of units required to offset all of the example sites listed in Table 1 at the maximum assessed net gain of 25% is 374.41 biodiversity units. This demonstrates that these sites from the green call alone have capacity to deliver more than four times the offsetting requirement for the example sites listed in Table 1, which would adequately provide for these representative¹⁶ sites and any windfall sites likely to come forward.
- 5.16 The green call study shows that, combined with the wider Horsham Nature Recovery Network, there is significant scope to improve biodiversity across the district over and above that required to offset proposed developments.

Limitations on the application of the results for the Green Call

5.17 The Green Call consultation was intended as an evidence-gathering approach to landowners to test the potential availability of sites for biodiversity offsetting. No commitment was implied in the process, so there is no guarantee that sites put forward for this study would become available in a formal green call for sites. Conversely, due to the timescales for delivery in line with programme set, it is possible that a number of additional sites could have been proposed if the consultation had remained open longer. However, the level of response for this call was in line with other recently published consultations such as Winchester City Council and Greater Cambridge Shared Planning.

¹⁶ The sites are only example / representative sites and no presumption should be made over future officer recommendations and what may form Council agreed site allocations.



References

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2018). *A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment.* Available at: <u>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme</u> <u>nt_data/file/693158/25-year-environment-plan.pdf</u>

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2019). *Biodiversity net gain and local nature recovery strategies*. Available at: <u>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/839610/net-gain-ia.pdf</u>

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021). *Environment Act 2021.* Available at: <u>https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted</u>

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2021). *Biodiversity Net Gain: Market analysis study*. Available at: <u>https://randd.defra.gov.uk/ProjectDetails?ProjectID=20608</u>

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities & Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG & DLUHC, 2019a). *Planning practice Guidance: Natural Environment*. Available at <u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/naturalenvironment</u>

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities & Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG & DLUHC, 2019b). *Planning practice Guidance: Viability*. Available at <u>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/viability</u>

Environment Analyst (2022). *Delivering Environmental Net Gain*. Available at: <u>https://app.livestorm.co/environment-analyst/delivering-environmental-net-gain</u>

Horsham District Council (HDC) (2014). *Horsham District Green Infrastructure Strategy.* Available at <u>https://www.horsham.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/66544/Green-</u> <u>Infrastructure-Study.pdf</u>

Horsham District Council (HDC) (2020). *Horsham District Draft Local Plan*. Available at <u>https://strategicplanning.horsham.gov.uk/consult.ti/LocalPlanReview/consultationHome</u>

Horsham District Council (HDC) (2021_1). *Horsham District Nature Recovery Network report.* Available at <u>https://www.horsham.gov.uk/climate-and-</u>



<u>environment/wilderhorshamdistrict/horsham-district-nature-recovery-</u> <u>networks/horsham-district-nature-recovery-network-report</u>

Horsham District Council (HDC) (2021_2) *Assessment of Potential Housing Allocations for Allocation in the Horsham District Local Plan, July 2021*. Available at <u>https://horsham.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s17756/6 Appendix 6 - Site Assessment</u> <u>Summary.pdf</u>

Kent County Council (KCC) (2022). *Viability-Assessment of Biodiversity Net Gain in Kent.* Available at: <u>https://kentnature.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Viability-</u> <u>Assessment-of-Biodiversity-Net-Gain-in-Kent-June-2022.pdf</u>

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) (2021). *National Planning Policy Framework.* Available at:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachme nt_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

Natural England (2022a). *The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool*. Available at: <u>http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720</u>

South Downs National Park (SDNP) (2022). *Call for sites, 2022*. Available at <u>https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/south-downs-local-plan-review/call-for-sites-2022/</u>

Sussex Nature Partnership (SNP) (2019). *Sussex Natural Capital Investment Strategy.* Available at <u>http://sussexInp.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/24.-Natural-Capital-Investment-Strategy_ADOPTED_Final_Dec-2019.pdf</u>



Appendix 1: Green call for sites – supporting information



Expression of Interest: Green Call for Sites within Horsham District

Purpose of this expression of interest (EOI)

We want to know if landowners and managers have land that could potentially be made available for habitat creation for use as a biodiversity net gain (BNG) offset site.

The Environment Act 2021 introduced, subject to Regulations, a planning condition for at least 10% BNG that must be met before development may commence. The habitat is to be secured for at least 30 years. The Regulations are expected to be in place in November 2023. BNG can be delivered within a development site or, where this is not possible, it can be delivered through habitat creation off-site (this is called offsetting) or via statutory (*national*) biodiversity credits. *For more information see the guidance note.*

Temple has been commissioned by Horsham District Council to undertake a study that seeks to understand the level of BNG that can be delivered within development sites and whether local landowners can help contribute to the delivery of BNG. A key aim of the study is to establish an appropriate BNG target for the district and to provide robust evidence which will inform the council's emerging Local Plan. The EOI data collected by Temple will help to provide an understanding of the potential for biodiversity offsetting within the District of Horsham which is to be addressed in the study.

This green call for sites is therefore an invitation for landowners to propose land parcels that they are happy to be used to deliver biodiversity net gain (BNG) for at least 30 years. This is a theoretical exercise whereby the submission of a site does not represent a commitment from the landowner, Temple or HDC to progress to delivery.

Use of information provided

The information collected in the response forms will be used by Temple to inform the study being undertaken for Horsham District Council. The study will depict the land available for BNG. The information collected will be passed on to Horsham District Council and Council officers may contact respondents in connection with the study prior to the adoption of the emerging Local Plan. The study will provide important background evidence to the Local Plan.

By responding you are accepting that your response and the information within it will be in the public domain, and that it may be disclosed if requested under the Freedom of Information Act. However, any published information will not contain personal details of



individuals. Further information about how personal information is processed can be found here (address to privacy notice).

How to respond to the EOI

The response involves completing the questionnaire and identifying the land available for BNG offsetting using the online mapping tool.

<Please click here to access the questionnaire.>

For more information on how to respond to this expression of interest (EOI), please see the FAQs.



FAQs

How will HDC use the information obtained from the EOI?

It is for theoretical purposes only to help inform how much land is potentially available in Horsham District for the enhancement of biodiversity for the purposes of BNG offsetting.

This is being explored due to national requirements being introduced that will require development to deliver the minimum requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) that is included in the Environment Act, and that is expected to be in place in November 2023.

Temple is therefore undertaking a study for Horsham District Council (HDC) which explores how the 10% BNG is likely to be delivered in the District and, also, if a higher percentage of BNG could be delivered in the District.

This green call for sites will therefore inform this study. There is an expression of interest only and you will not be held to any commitments through responding to this EOI.

What benefit is there to a landowner if just theoretical?

In the future and subject to appropriate agreements BNG can provide the opportunity for landowners to obtain funding for creating habitat on their land that will contribute to BNG targets. Following the Environment Act 2021, both the private and public sector are exploring biodiversity offsetting schemes whereby 'biodiversity units' derived from habitat created by landowners / land managers can be purchased by developers so that they can achieve BNG. This EOI will pull together initial essential information that could inform a future offsetting scheme.

It is likely that either a private or public sector body will take into account the sites submitted as they look to co-ordinate a BNG offset scheme, potentially offering support and land management advice to landowners and managers that wish to become involved in the scheme.

In addition, or alternatively, evidence of a clear intent to make land available for BNG may open up other funding streams and / or appropriate land management advice from recognised nature conservation bodies.


Can my details and the land parcel be kept confidential and anonymous?

For the purposes of this exercise anonymous submissions cannot be taken into account and neither can the site details be kept confidential.

The information obtained from the EOI will provide important background evidence and inform HDC's emerging Local Plan. As such its validity will be tested, which means we must be confident the information is accurate.

This is necessary in case landownership or any other information in an EOI is contested. Appropriate measures to comply with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) will be implemented, including the redaction of some personal information in Temple's report on the green call for sites to HDC. Additionally, both Temple and HCD will delete irrelevant personal data once the Local Plan is past any legal challenge (e.g. held for at least 6 weeks after the Local Plan has been adopted or once the judicial review period and any challenges have been concluded).

What type of land is suitable as a BNG offset site?

Any land could be used for habitat creation and/or management to improve biodiversity, in addition to any existing commitments, for at least 30 years.

This information will inform our study by providing an understanding of the extent of land available and the nature of biodiversity improvements that could be achieved.

What is a BNG land parcel?

A BNG land parcel is the area of land, within an overall land holding, that would be suitable to be considered as a BNG offset site, through habitat creation or management to increase biodiversity.

How can I respond to this EOI?

Please respond to this EOI via the online questionnaire which asks a series of questions about the land parcels proposed as potential BNG offset sites covering land ownership and management, current use and future commitments, and constraints and opportunities for habitat creation. There is an associated online mapping tool (see below) with which the location and extent of each land parcel should be drawn.

How do I fill in the online response form for multiple BNG land parcels?

If you have multiple BNG land parcels within your site, or across different landholdings, please fill out a separate response form for each parcel.



How much detail do I need to provide?

Please provide as much detail as is known in response to each question. However, do not worry if you cannot answer all the questions in full.

How do I provide the mapped information?

Below the questionnaire there is an interactive tool to allow you to draw the land parcel that you are proposing for BNG purposes. This must be completed before you can submit your EOI and involves the following four steps:

- Locate the area of the land parcel using the Pan <Pan button image> and Zoom
 <Zoom button image> buttons.
- Once in the correct location, click on the Sketch <Sketch button image> button, this starts your sketch session. To sketch the land parcel you click down with your mouse where you want to begin the sketch – you need to keep the mouse clicked down throughout the duration of the sketch.
- 3. Move your mouse to draw the shape on the map. When you get back to the start point of the sketch you should release the mouse button
- 4. To end the sketch session and complete your land parcel sketch. If you are happy with the sketch, click the Confirm button. If you wish to improve the sketch click the Sketch button again and repeat the above process.

If I can't submit the online form, is there another way to submit my EOI?

If you are unable to respond online you may request a postal pack through <u>horshameoi@templegroup.co.uk</u>. Please provide your name and postal address for this option, as well as the number of land parcels you wish to submit.

You will receive a questionnaire allowing you to provide details of land potentially available for BNG offsetting, which we will ask you to complete and return to the postal address provided. You will also need to provide a map clearly marked with the outline of the land areas available and annotated with any specific details referred to in the questionnaire response.

Further Questions

If you have any further questions, please contact <u>horshameoi@templegroup.co.uk</u>. This inbox will be monitored until the end of the consultation on 31/10/2022¹⁷.

¹⁷ Please note, the consultation was extended by a week and closed on 4th November 2022.



Privacy Notice

This Privacy Notice explains how the Temple will hold and process your information during this expression of interest (green call for sites).

Temple are the data controllers of your personal data and the data processer.

In relation to your personal data we are committed to collecting, using and protecting it appropriately. This privacy notice explains:

- The rights and choices you have in relation to the personal data that we hold about you,
- Why we collect and use your personal data,
- The type of personal data that we collect, and
- When and why we will share personal data with other organisations

Your rights

You have certain rights under UK Data Protection law including:

- The right to be informed
- The right of access to your personal data
- The right of rectification (to have any inaccuracies corrected)
- The right of erasure (to have your records deleted)
- The right to restrict processing
- The right to data portability
- The right to object
- Rights in relation to automated decision-making and profiling

More <u>information about your rights is available on the website of the Information</u> <u>Commissioner's Office</u>. If you have a concern about the way that we are collecting or using your personal data, we ask that you contact <u>horshameoi@templegroup.co.uk</u>. Or you can <u>contact the Information Commissioner's Office</u>.

Why we need your personal data

We are undertaking a task that falls under Article 6 (1)(a) & (e) within GDPR, which means that we need to process personal data as part of carrying out a public task, defined as 'processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority vested in the controller'.



As this exercise is to fulfil Horsham District Councils statutory plan making duty, processing this data is necessary for the performance of a task (statutory plan making and associated policy work) carried out in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority vested in the Council.

What we collect and how it is shared

Temple will collect personal details including names, addresses and other contact details. This information will be passed on to HDC who will then be responsible for this information.

Expressions received are not confidential and information received in relation to the site and its availability will be published may be published as part of the Local Plan preparation or a freedom of information request and this may include the site address and the name of the site owner. All other personal information will be omitted or redacted - this includes the contact details and signatures of individuals.

How long the information is kept for

Temple will retain personal details for 6 months after this consultation has finished, after which it will be deleted or destroyed.

How to contact us

If you have any questions about this process, please contact: horshameoi@templegroup.co.uk

If you decide that you want to withdraw from the EOI or you want to have any information deleted after Temple has completed the study, please contact HDC at <u>strategic.planning@horsham.gov.uk</u>



Guidance Note – What is Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain delivers measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development. Biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site and off-site measures.

Under the Environment Act 2021 all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) will have to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain from an as yet unconfirmed date, expected to be in November 2023 and the created habitats will need to be secured for at least 30 years.

Biodiversity net gain is concerned with measuring changes in habitats, which are a proxy for the biodiversity they support, which is too complex to be readily evaluated.

Natural England have produced a biodiversity metric (currently version 3.1) calculator which will be the standard used to calculate net change in biodiversity as required under the Environment Act. This tool assigns values to habitats present prior to development according to a number of factors: distinctiveness (ecological value), condition and strategic significance, which are multiplied with habitat areas to provide a score in 'biodiversity units'. Post-development habitats are evaluated in the same way, also taking account of additional risk factors in relation to time and difficulty of habitat creation to provide a biodiversity unit score. Compensatory habitat must of sufficient extent and distinctiveness to provide a minimum 10% uplift in biodiversity units.

Development that affects habitat types of higher distinctiveness is discouraged because they have a greater number of biodiversity units for a given area, that require a comparatively greater area of compensatory habitat to achieve 10% net gain. In addition, the 'mitigation hierarchy' requires that loss of important habitat it avoided or minimised, and only loss that is demonstrably unavoidable can be addressed through compensation in accordance with the biodiversity metric. This is also addressed by 'trading down' rules, which prevent replacement of high value habitats with larger areas of lower value habitats. Certain habitats such as ancient woodland are irreplaceable and, therefore, cannot be included in a biodiversity net gain assessment. Their loss can only be considered in wholly exceptional circumstances and with specific compensatory measures.

Wherever possible biodiversity net gain should usually be provided within the site affected by development, by retaining high distinctiveness habitats and replacement of habitats of lower distinctiveness with those of a greater value. In cases where biodiversity net gain cannot be fully achieved on site, then a developer may offset the



shortfall with habitat creation in the vicinity. The Environment Act requires local planning authorities to prepare spatial strategies for nature: 'Local Nature Recovery Strategies', that will provide guidance on the types and location of habitat that should be created in their area. The delivery biodiversity net gain will also involve local communities, landowners and farmers, especially where delivery of biodiversity net gain happens off the development site and there is a need to identify sites for habitat compensation.

The application of biodiversity net gain at the site level and circumstances in which offsite compensation is required are illustrated in the Biodiversity Metric 3 user guide and reproduced below. This material was prepared before the requirement for a minimum 10% net gain and instead refers to avoiding net loss of biodiversity.



BOX 2-2: Practical application

To calculate the change in biodiversity unit value resulting from a development (or other intervention) you first survey and then divide the site up into distinct parcels of differing habitat type and condition (i.e. the same habitat type in different condition should be recorded separately within the metric).

Using this information, you can calculate the baseline (or pre-intervention) biodiversity unit value of each habitat parcel using the free calculation tool provided for use with biodiversity metric 3.0.

Next, using your design plans for the development you calculate the biodiversity unit value for the habitats that are expected to be retained, plus the values for any enhanced or newly created habitats (post-intervention).

The change in biodiversity is worked out by subtracting the site's baseline biodiversity unit value from the sum of post-intervention values for retained, created and enhanced habitats. This is then combined with any off-site gains to give a final biodiversity unit value from which net gain or loss for the scheme can be assessed. This is illustrated in the graphic below:





Appendix 2: Figures

Figure 1: Example sites assessed (1 page)

Figure 2: Green call for sites & Nature Recovery Networks (4 pages)













Appendix 3: Example Sites biodiversity net gain calculations

Note: some data may require viewing at greater than 100% zoom for clarity, particularly on smaller or low-resolution screens.



Indicative Windfall Site A (Large Brownfield) Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strate	egic signi	ficance		ungested	action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strate	egic signi	ficance	ad	ldress hab	itat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Vacant/derelict land/ bareground	0.1	Low	Poor	Area/compen	sation not i o local strat	n local strate tegy	gy/ San	ne distinctive habitat re	ness or better quired≥	0.20
2	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.4049	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy no local strategy		egy/ Compensation Not Rec		Not Required	0.00	
3	Urban	Built linear features	0.359	V.Low	N/A - Other	Arealcompen	sation not i o local strat	n local strate tegy	^{gyl} Co	mpensation	Not Required	0.00
4	Heathland and shrub	Bramble scrub	0.03	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy			^{gyl} San distir	ie broad hab notiveness h (≥)	itat or a higher abitat required	0.12
5	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.02	Low	Poor	Area/compen	compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy		gy/ San	ne distinctive habitat re	ness or better quired≥	0.04
		Total habitat area	1.91								0.36	
							Retention category biodiversi			liversity value	•	
							Area retaine d	Area Area Daselin Daseline retaine enhance e units units Area d d retaine enhance habitat los				Units lost
									0.00	0.00	0.10	0.20
									0.00	0.00	1.40	0.00
									0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00
								0.03	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.00
									0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04
0.00 0.03 0.00				0.12	1.88	0.24						
							Total a Urba	area lost (e an trees ar	xcluding Id Green	area of valls)	1.88	



Indicative Windfall Site A (Large Brownfield) Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

					Post developmentr post in	certencion hadicacs			
			Distinctivene	Conditio	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctivene ss	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/yea rs	Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.8139	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.03	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.06
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.025	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.17
Urban	Introduced shrub	0.01	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.02
Urban	Urban Tree	0.005	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.02
								<u> </u>	
	Total kabitat area	1.88							0.26
	i otar napitat area	1.00							0.20
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	1.88	1						



Indicative Windfall Site A (Large Brownfield) Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Po	st development/ post interver	tion habita	its			
	Baseline habitats	Proposed I	labitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	4443		
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat Di		Condition change	(hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition
4	Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Condition Assessment N/A - Moderate	0.03	Medium	Moderate
						0.03		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	iplier	Difficulty risk	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/yea rs	Final difficulty of enhancement	nabitat units delivered
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.22
				0.22



Indicative Windfall Site B (Small Brownfield) Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested seties to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Vacant/derelict land/ bareground	0.02	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	0.04
2	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.2164	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
		Total habitat area						0.04

	Rete	ntion cat	egory biod	liversity value	•
Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04
		0.00	0.00	0.22	0.00
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.04
Total a Urba	area lost (e an trees ar	xcluding d Green	area of valls)	0.24	



Indicative Windfall Site B (Small Brownfield) Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

10		152	10 I	2014 - P	rost deteropment/ post mie	a realing manufact			
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	***
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (bectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.24	VLow	N/A - Other	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.0054	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.04
Urban	Urban Tree	0.0041	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.01
<u></u>			<u> </u>	13 I	2.030				
<u>.</u>			8	1					
		2	0	1			() () () () () () () () () () () () () (1	
	Total habitat area	0.25	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						0.06
			1						
4	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	0.25							

No habitat enhancement practically achievable



		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Guaranteed postion to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	2.95	Low	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	12.98
2	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.48	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	4.22
3	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.05	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.44
4								
5								
7								
8								
		Total habitat area	3.48			1		17.64

Graylands Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Rete	ntion cat	egory biod	liversity value	•
Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	2.95	12.98
	0.48	0.00	4.22	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.05	0.44
0.00	0.48	0.00	4.22	3.00	13.42

Total area lost (excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls) 3.00



Graylands Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

					Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.8	V.Low	N/A - Other	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	o	Medium	0.00
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	9.24
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	0.92
Urban	Urban Tree	0.3	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	1.01
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.1	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.10
	Total habitat area	3.30							12.28
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	3.00]						



Graylands Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Post development/ post interven							
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinction	eness and condition			
Baselin e ref	Baseline kabitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	Distinctivenes s	Conditio
2	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.48	Medium	Good
						0.48		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	tiplier	Difficulty risk	H-Lin-A
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/yea rs	Final difficulty of enhancement	nabitat units delivered
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	5.70
				5.70



Southwater Employment Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Habitats and areas		Distinctiven	ess	Conditi	оп	Strategic sigui	ficance	×	Commented and inside address	Ecological baseline
Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier	habitat losses	Total habitat units
Grassland	Modified grassland	0.9	Low	2	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	3.60
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (2)	0.80
			2					8			
				1		8					1
3											
	Total habitat area	1.00									4.40

Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
	0.3	0.00	1.20	0.60	2.40
0.1		0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.10	0.30	0.80	1.20	0.60	2.40



Southwater Employment Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		12		(c)	Post development/ post int	tervention habitats			
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Unbitat
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.4	VLow	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Biodiverse green roof	• 0.2	Medium	Fairly Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	8	Medium	1.01
		10							
									4
				-					
		52 C							
	Total habitat area	0.60				45	L	L	1.01
		2.00							
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	0.60]						

Southwater Employment Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation Post development/ post intervention babitats

	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	Proposed Habitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)		eness and condition			
Baselin e ref	Baseline kabitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	Distinctivenes s	Conditio B
1	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.3	Medium	Good
						0.30		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	tiplier	Difficulty risk	H-Line
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/yea rs	Final difficulty of enhancement	nabitat units delivered
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	3.24
				3.24



West of Ifield Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiven	iess	Conditio	on	Strategic sign	ificance		Current de chier te	Ecological baseline
Re f	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivene ss	Scor e	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	28.76	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	396.89
2	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	62.75	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	577.30
3	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	1.48	Medium	4	Poor	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	strategic	1.1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	6.51
4	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	45.7	Low	2	Assessment	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	strategic	1.1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	100.54
5	Grassland	Modified grassland	33.06	Low	2	Poor	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	strategic	1.1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	72.73
6	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	4.07	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	strategic	1.1	Compensation Not Required	0.00
7	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	1.14	Medium	4	Poor	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	strategic	1.1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	5.02
8												
9												
10												
11												
12		Total kabitat area	170.00									1150.00
		l otal nabitat area	176.96									1156.33

	Reter	ntion cat	egory biod	liversity valu	16
Area retaine d	Area enhance d	ne ne units	e units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost
28.76		396.89	0.00	0.00	0.00
	23	0.00	211.60	39.75	365.70
		0.00	0.00	1.48	6.51
		0.00	0.00	45.70	100.54
		0.00	0.00	33.06	72.73
		0.00	0.00	4.07	0.00
	1.14	0.00	5.02	0.00	0.00
28.76	24.14	396.89	216.62	124.06	545.48



West of Ifield Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation



					Post development/ post in	tervention habitats			
		Area	Distinctivene	Conditio	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Hahitat
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	(hectare s)	Distinctivene ss	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/yea	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland	Modified grassland	10.6	Low	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	54.52
Urban	Allotments	1.4	Low	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	5.94
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	27.57	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	254.85
Grassland	Lowland meadows	12	V.High	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	High	48.81
Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	16	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	82.51
Urban	Sustainable urban drainage feature	2	Low	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Medium	7.40
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	4	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	36.97
Urban	Urban Tree	8	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	26.90
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	2	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	15.82
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	32.06	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Vegetated garden	15	Low	Condition Assessme nt N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	28.95
Urban	Built linear features	1.43	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Low	0.00
					L				
	Total habitat area	132.06	1						562.68
	Site Area (Evaluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	124.00	1						
	one Area (Excluding area of Orball frees and Green waits)	124.06							



West of Ifield Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

				PO	st developmentr post intervel	ICION NADIC	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinction	reness and condition	Area	Distinctions	Conditio
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare \$)	s	n n
2	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	23	Medium	Good
7	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Priority Habitat)	Medium - High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	1.14	High	Moderate
						24.14		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	iplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	273.27
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Medium	10.64
				283 91
				200.01



Ĩ		Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance		Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to address habitat losses Ec 100 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 101 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 101 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 102 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 103 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 103 Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2 1 103 Same distinct	Total habitat units
1	Oropland	Ceresi crops	31.3724	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	62.74
2	Cropland	Cereal crops	10.1862	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better babitat required 2	20.37
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	6.204	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required >	12.41
4	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.884	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat recuired 2	5.77
Б	Cropland	Ceresì crops	0.2447	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat recuired >	0.40
6	Cropland	Cereal crops	0.0497	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	0.10
7	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	4.0767	Low	Condition Assossment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no	Same distinctiveness or better	8.15
8	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	2.4263	Low	Condition Assossment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no	Same distinctiveness or better babitat varning 2	4.85
9	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	0.8382	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy/ no	Same distinctiveness or better hubitat permitted 2	1.68
10	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	0.1045	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	0.21
11	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	0.9004	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	1.80
12	Graesland	Modified grassland	6.3028	Low	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	37.82
13	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.5768	Low	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat remained >	9.46
14	Oraesland	Modified grassland	0.6835	Low	Good	Azea/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat recuired 2	4.10
15	Grassland	Modified grassland	0.153	Low	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat remired 2	0.92
18	Orassland	Modified grassland	0.0197	Low	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat recutived >	0.13
17	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	20.4489	Medhim	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	distinctiveness habitar required	260.93
18	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	8.7980	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a bigher distinctiveness habitat received	116.15
19	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	11.0375	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinguised habitat combred	97.13
20	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.2555	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local stratecy	Same broad habitat or a high-se distinctiveness habitat perceive?	2.25
21	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.7364	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitar or a higher distinctiveness habitat remained	6.48
22	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.271	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitst or a higher distortionness habitst comment	2.38

West of Southwater Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation



23	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.085	Medium	Poor	Location ecologically destrable but not in local strategy	Batter broad habitat or a ligher distinctiveness liabitat required	0.29
34	Heathland and shrub	Bramble acrub	0.0144	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	Location ecologically desirable but not in local atrategy	Same broad habiter or a higher distinctiveness habiter required	0.08
25	Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.0304	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habits or a higher distinctiveness habits remined	0.28
26	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.4394	VLow	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
27	Urban	Vacant/derellict land/ bareground	0.6042	Low	Foor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	1.21
28	Urban	Vacant/derelict land/ bareground	1.2091	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	2.43
29	Urban	Vegetated garden	0.2562	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.51
30	Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	7.8918	High	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Same babitat required =	163.36
31	Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	0.44	High	Moderate	FormaDy identified in local strategy	Same habitat required =	6.07
32	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadlaaved	0.306	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habiter or a higher distinctiveness habiter required (2)	2.82
33	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.9491	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness fabilitie required (2)	8.73
34	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.171	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same Inroad liabilit or a higher distinctiveness liabilit required (2)	1.57
35	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	5.9254	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad babiliti or a lingber distortiveness fabilitit required (3)	54.51
38	Urban	Urban Tree	10.7	Medium	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitst or a higher distinctiveness habitst required (2)	147.86
37			2 5					
39					4		-	
40			<u>}</u>	8	2			
42					1			
43			£		1			
45			0		-			-
-		Total habitat area	138.57					1054.81



1	Retention category biodiversity value							
Ref	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline Baseline units units retained enhanced		Area habitat Joat	Units lost		
1	0	0	0.00	0.00	31.37	62.74		
2	0	10.1862	0.00	20.37	0.00	0.00		
3	٥	6.204	0.00	12.41	0.00	0.00		
4	0	2.884	0.00	5.77	0.00	0.00		
5	0	0.2447	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.00		
6	0	0.0497	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00		
7	٥	0	0.00	0.00	4.08	8.15		
8	0	2.4263	0.00	4.85	0.00	0.00		
9	0	0.8382	0.00	1.68	0.00	0.00		
10	0	0.1045	0.00	0.21	0.00	0.00		
11	٥	0.9004	0.00	1.80	0.00	0.00		
12	2.0238	0	12.14	0.00	4.28	25.67		
13	0	1.5768	0.00	9.46	0.00	0.00		
14	0	0.6835	0.00	4.10	0.00	0.00		
15	٥	0.153	0.00	89.0	0.00	0.00		
18	0	0.0197	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00		
17	9.6935	0	127.95	0.00	10.76	141.97		
18	0	8.1989	0.00	116.15	0.00	0.00		
19	2.7506	0	34.20	0.00	8.29	73.93		
20	0	0.2555	0.00	2.25	0.00	0.00		
21	0	0.7364	0.00	6.48	0.00	0.00		
22	0	0.271	0.00	2.38	0.00	0.00		



23	0	0.065	0.00	0.29	0.00	0.00
24	Q	0.0144	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00
25	0	0.0304	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.00
28	0.568	0	0.00	0.00	0.87	0.00
27	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.60	1.21
28	0	1.2091	0.00	2.42	0.00	0.00
29	0.2562	0	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00
30	7.8918	0	163.36	0.00	0.00	0.00
31	0	0.44	0.00	6.07	0.00	0.00
32	0.2734	o	2.52	0.00	0.03	0.30
33	0	0.9491	0.00	8.73	0.00	0.00
34	0.0696	0	0.64	0.00	0.10	0.93
35	٥	5.9254	0.00	64.51	0.00	0.00
36	9.9326		137.07	0.00	0.77	10.50
37	0		3 2			s (9)
38	<u> </u>		5 S	3		1
30	2					-
41	-					2 2
42	1 23		18 - S			5
43	S - 33		8 - 3			1
44	2 - 92	-	\$ 3			8 (d)
40	33.46	44.97	488.40	261.91	61.15	324.50



West of Southwater Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

ē		1 C	a = b		Post development/ post inter	vention habitats		- 28/10/05/28	62
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Dilicuity	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Grassland	Lowland meadows	0.0397	VHigh	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	High	0.21
Grassland	Modified grassland	12.4757	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	4	Low	43.27
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.189	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	1.75
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.5431	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	4.00
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	2.0525	Medium	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	19.84
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.0866	Medium	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.00
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	1.5279	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	12.63
Urban	Allotments	0.4478	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	I	Low	0.86
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	34.0134	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Sustainable urban drainage feature	1.0122	Low	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Medium	3.75
Urban	Vegetated garden	7.8208	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	15.09
Wetland	Sustainable urban drainage feature	0.1712	Low	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Medium	0.63
Urban	Urban Tree	2.23B2	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	7.53
11	Total habitat area	62.62		1					110.56
									· · · · · · · ·
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	60.38							



West of Southwater Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Post development/ post interven				n habstats		
17	Baseline habitats	Propos	ed Habitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area		-
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition
2	Cropland - Cereal crops	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Low - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	10.1862	V.High	Good
з	Cropland - Cereal crops	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	6.204	Medium	Good
4	Cropland - Cereal crops	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	2.884	Medium	Moderate
Б	Cropland - Cereal crops	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.2447	Medium	Good
6	Cropland - Cereal crops	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.0497	Medium	Good
8	Cropland - Non-cereal crops	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Low - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	2.4263	V.High	Good
9	Cropland - Non-cereal crops	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.8362	Medium	Good
10	Cropland - Non-cereal crops	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	0.1045	Medium	Moderate
11	Cropland - Non-cereal crops	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.9004	Medium	Good
13	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	1.5768	Medium	Good
14	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	0.6835	Medium	Moderate
15	Grassland - Modified grassland	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.153	Medium	Good
16	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.0197	Medium	Good
18	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Medium - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	8.7969	V.High	Good
20	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.2555	Medium	Good
21	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Traditional orchards	Medium - High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	0.7364	High	Moderate



22	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.271	Medium	Good
23	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Medium - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.065	V.High	Good
24	Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Condition Assessment N/A - Good	0.0144	Medium	Good
25	Lakes - Fonds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.0304	Medium	Good
28	Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bareground	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	1.2091	Medium	Good
31	Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	High - High	Moderate - Good	0.44	High	Good
33	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.9491	Medium	Good
35	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	5.9254	Medium	Good
			<u></u>					
							2	
				3 U	1			5



	Strategic significance	Temporal risk multip	Difficulty risk multipliers	Habilet		
Baseline ref	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of enhancement	delivered	
2	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	124.61	
з	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	53.64	
4	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	19.67	
Б	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	2.53	
8	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	25	Low	0.35	
8	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	29.68	
9	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	7.25	
10	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	0.71	
11	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	9.32	
13	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	16.51	
14	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	5.58	
15	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	1.79	
16	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	0.21	
18	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	169.10	
20	ocation ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	IOWS INK V	3.04	
21	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	20	Medium	7.89	



22	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	3.61
23	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	0.89
24	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	0.16
25	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	4	Medium	0.38
28	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	10.45
31	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	20	High	6.56
33	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	11.79
35	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	73.60
	-				
-					000.00


West of Southwater Off-site Baseline Habitat Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Habitat distinctiveness	Habitat condition	Strategic significance		Ecological baseline
Baseline ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	13.773	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	came proac napitat or a nigher distinctiveness habitat required	181.80
2	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.0292	Medium	Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.13
3	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.061	Medium	Fairly Poor	Formally identified in local strategy	clistingtiveness habitat required	0.42
4	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.2149	V Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
5	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.0842	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.77
6	Urban	Urban Tree	0.992	Medium	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	clistinctiveness habitat required	13.69
7	Urban	Urban Tree	0.1528	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	1.41
8								
10			8					
11								
12			14.16			1	Total Site baseline	198.22

Retention category biodiversity value

Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area lost	Units lost
0	13.773	0.00	181.80	0.00	0.00
0	0.0292	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00
0	0.061	0.00	0.42	0.00	0.00
0.2149	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.0842	0	0.77	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.992		13.69	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.1528		1.41	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.44	13.86	15.87	182.35	0.00	0.00



West of Southwater Off-site Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

			4482			Post development/ post i		
Baseline habitats	Proposed Hab	itat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinct	veness and condition				
Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed Habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	Area ha	Distinctiveness	Condition	
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Medium - V High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	13.773	V.High	Good	
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Lowland meadows	Medium - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good 0.0292		V.High	Good	
Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Fairly Poor - Good	0.061	Medium	Good	
				C				
					13.86			

Strategic significance	Temporal multipl	ier	Difficulty multipliers	Spatial risk multiplier	Habitat	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Difficulty	Spatial risk category	units delivered	
Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	Compensation inside LPA or NCA, or deemed to be sufficiently local, to site of biodiversity loss	264.69	
Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Medium	Compensation inside LPA or NCA, or deemed to be sufficiently local, to site of biodiversity loss	0.40	
Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	6	Medium	Compensation inside LPA or NCA, or deemed to be sufficiently local, to site of biodiversity loss	0.65	
					265.74	



Church Road Habitat Baselli	пе віодічен	sity wetri	c Calculation	
Habitats and areas	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	

Church Road Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Commente de estimate	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	1.9	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	3.80
2	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.16	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	8.64
3	Heathland and shrub	Bramble scrub	0.04	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.16
4	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.46	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	3.68
5	Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.01	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.04
6								
7								
8								
10								
10	1	Total habitat area	4.57					16.32
		l otal nabitat area	4.01	J				10.32

Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	1.90	3.80
		0.00	0.00	2,16	8.64
		0.00	0.00	0.04	0.16
	0.46	0.00	3.68	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04
0.00	0.46	0.00	3.68	4.11	12.64



Church Road Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

					Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			
		0	Distinctivenes	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Habbar
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/year	Final difficulty of creation	delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.7	V.Low	N/A - Other	Arealcompensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.2	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	1.44
Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.2	Medium	Moderate	Arealcompensation not in local strategyl no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	0.94
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.6	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	1.16
Grassland	Modified grassland	0.2	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	4	Low	0.69
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.18	Medium	Fairly Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	9.20
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.03	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.20
Urban	Urban Tree	0.3	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.92
	- · · · ·								
	l otal habitat area	4.41	1						14.54
		4 44	1						
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	4.11	1						



Church Road Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

A	-3 Site Habita	t Enhancement							
Condense / Show Columns Condense / Show Rows)						
Main Menu Instructions]		Po	st development/ post interver	tion habit	ats	
	Bas	eline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiveness and condition		Area	Distinction	Constitution
Baselin e ref	Bas	Baseline habitat Proposed Broad Hab		Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	s	n n
4	Woodland and fores	t - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	0.46	Medium	Good
							0.46		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	Difficulty risk	Habitat		
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered	
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	4.97	
				4.97	



		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Commente di antian ta	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.1	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
2	Urban	Vegetated garden	0.01	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	0.02
3	Grassland	Modified grassland	6.62	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	13.24
4	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.2	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	12.80
5	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.83	Medium	Fairly Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	10.98
6	Heathland and shrub	Bramble scrub	0.28	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	1.12
7	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.08	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.32
8	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	1.01	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	2.02
9								
10								
12								
13								
		Total habitat area	13.13					40.50

Glebe Farm Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation



		Retention category biodiversity value												
Ref	Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost								
1			0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00								
2			0.00	0.00	0.01	0.02								
3		0.48	0.00	0.96	6,14	12.28								
4		1.94	0.00	7.76	1.26	5.04								
5			0.00	0.00	1.83	10.98								
6			0.00	0.00	0.28	1.12								
7		0.08	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00								
8		0.96	0.00	1.92	0.05	0.10								
9														
11	<u> </u>													
12														
13														
	0.00	3.46	0.00	10.96	9.67	29.54								



Glebe Farm Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		A4	3a		Post development/ post int	tervention habitats			
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	77-3-34-4
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	5.16	VLow	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Vegetated garden	2.03	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	3.92
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.17	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	7.83
Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.11	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	0.79
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.44	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	2.95
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.56	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.75
Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.2	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	0.94
Urban	Urban Tree	0,2	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.61
			8						4
		1		1					+
				1					
		0.07		L	·				00.00
	Total habitat area	9.87	J						20.79
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	9.67	1						



Glebe Farm Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		1		Po	st development/ post intervei	ntion habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinguis	Condition
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	s	B
3	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	0.48	Medium	Moderate
4	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Medium - Medium	Poor - Fairly Good	1.94	Medium	Fairly Good
7	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium - Medium	Poor - Fairly Good	0.08	Medium	Fairly Good
*	Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Fairly Good	0.96	Medium	Fairly Good
						3.46		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	Difficulty risk	Habitat	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	2.98
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	12	Low	15.35
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	0.60
Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	7.90
				26.83



		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested paties to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.02	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
2	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.22	Medium	Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.97
3	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.05	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.44
4	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.05	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	0.10
5	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.6	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	2.40
6	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.07	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	distinctiveness habitat required	0.56
7	Grassland	Modified grassland	3.24	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	12.96
8	Grassland							
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
		Total habitat area	4.25					17.43

Partridge Green Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation



	Retention category biodiversity value												
Ref	Area retaine d	rea Area e units units Area taine enhance e units units habitat lost d d d				Units lost							
1			0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00							
2		0.22	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.00							
3			0.00	0.00	0.05	0.44							
4			0.00	0.00	0.05	0.10							
5		0.16	0.00	0.64	0.44	1.76							
6			0.00	0.00	0.07	0.56							
7		1.27	0.00	5.08	1.97	7.88							
8					0.00								
9													
10													
11													
12													
13	0.00	165	0.00	6 6 9	2.60	10.74							
	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.03	2.00	10.74							



Partridge Green Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

			Diational and	C divisor	Post development post int			D:((:	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/year	Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.3	Medium	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.01
Urban	Urban Developed land; sealed surface		V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.02	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.49	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.95
									L
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.12	Medium	Good	Arealcompensation not in local strategyl no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	1.01
Grassland	Other neutral grassland		Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.00
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.2	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.34
	Total habitat area	2.60							6.31
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	2.60							



Partridge Green Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

· · · · ·	Post development/ post intervention										
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiveness and condition							
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)					
z	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium - Medium	Poor - Good	0.22					
5	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Poor - Fairly Good	0.16					
7	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	1.27					
		•			•	1.65					

ats						
D	0	Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	iplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Distinctivenes s	L'onditio B	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered
Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	20	Low	1.92
Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	1.53
Medium	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	15	Low	11.03
						14.48



High Bar Lane Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiven	iess	Conditi	DN	Strategic sign	ificance		Concentration to	Ecological baseline
Re f	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivene ss	Scor e	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Jrban Developed land; sealed surface 0.06		V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Compensation Not Required	0.00
2	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.06	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	0.24
3	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.78	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat	3.12
4								-				
5												
6												
7												
8												
		Total habitat area	0.90									3.36

Retention category biodiversity value

Area retaine d	Area enhance d	ne units	e units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00
		0.00	0.00	0.06	0.24
		0.00	0.00	0.78	3.12
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.90	3.36



High Bar Lane Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Post development/ post intervention habitats											
		0	Distinctivenes	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Halisas			
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/year	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered			
Heathland and shrub	hrub Mixed scrub		Medium	Fairly Good	Arealcompensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	0.39			
Grassland	Grassland Other neutral grassland		Medium	Fairly Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	1.95			
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.21	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.41			
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.39	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00			
Urban	Urban Tree	0.2	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.61			
	Total habitat area	1.10							3.35			
1	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	0.90	1									

No habitat enhancement practically achievable



Smock Alley Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to address	Ecological baseline
	Broad Habitat Type		Area (bectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	babitat losses	Total habitat units
	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.93	Low	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	8.88
10	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.5	Medium	Poor	Formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (2)	2.30
					12	5		
t								
+			2		8			
		Total habitat area	2.43	j '				11.18

retained	units enhanced	lost	Units lost
 0.00	0.00	1.93	8.88
0.00	0.00	0.50	2.30
0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00 0.00 2.43



Smock Alley Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Post development/ post intervention habitats								
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier	an announce on a	Difficulty	TT. 1
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (bectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Urban	Urban Tree	0.48	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	1.69
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.956	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	2.12
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.423	VLow	N/A - Other	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	ം.00
Grassland	Modified grassland	0.121	Low	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	4	Low	0.48
Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.04	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	0.33
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.3	Medium	Fairly Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	2.69
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.59	Medium	Fairly Good	Formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	5.29
				Fairly Good	Formally identified in local strategy				
									2
	Total habitat area	2.01						L	12.60
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	2.43]						

No habitat enhancement practically achievable



West of Cowfold Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.65	Low	Moderate	Arealcompensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required≥	6.60
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
	Total habitat area							6.60

	Retention category biodiversity value							
Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area habitat lost	Units lost			
		0.00	0.00	1.65	6.60			
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.65	6.60			



West of Cowfold Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

					Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			
		0	Distinctivenes	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Halisas
Broad Habitat	d Habitat Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/year	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.63	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.21	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.41
Lakes	Ponds (Priority Habitat)	0.05	High	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Medium	0.36
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.13	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.87
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.63	Medium	Good	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	5.29
	To the loss see	1.05		Į					0.00
	i otal nabitat area	1.65	1						0.93
	Site Area (Excluding area of Urban trees and Green walls)	1.65]						

No habitat enhancement practically achievable



Appendix 4: Green call questionnaire responses



	e Gr s 'n ar Be	oa R D	ist ≮of thor N → Thor C c ,	e aC aC
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
ţ	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	consider suitable?
Icen	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	N/A	
han	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
oitat	Amenity grassland			
Hab	Heathland			
for	Scrub			
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
S	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
u	Other produce		Sheep grazing	
atic	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
labi	Amenity grassland	Х		
or H	Heathland			
le f	Scrub			
itab	Hedgerows			
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops			biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Other produce		Agricultural land classification	Yes
_	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	12,350		
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	12,350		
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
oitai	Heathland			
Hak	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

			Bury St Austens Farm	
nent	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas Cereal crops	Х	Please provide details if the proposed BNG parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would consider suitable?
vitat Enhancen	Livestock grazing (including equestrian) Dairy, pig, or poultry farming Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow Amenity grassland		Countryside Stewardship Scheme rotational arable options	Wildflower meadows
for Hab	Heathland Scrub		-	
Suitable	Hedgerows Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating Wetland area		-	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches Buildings, vards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
ion	Cereal crops	Х	managed?	consider unsuitable?
eati	Other produce		Cereal rotation	
t Cr	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
oital	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		_	
Hak	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow		_	
for	Amenity grassland		-	
ole 1	Heathland		-	
itak	Scrub		-	
Sui	Hedgerows		-	
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			



			Bury St Austens Farm	
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas			Is the cite available for at least 20 years for
		1,800,	Policy and / or environmental constraints	high high high high high high high high
	Cereal crops	000		biodiversity het gain purposes:
	Other produce		Agricultural land classification	Yes
η ²)	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
n) e	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
Vres	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
at ⊿	Amenity grassland			
bit	Heathland			
На	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

			East Clayton Farm		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG		
Ţ	Cereal crops	Х	parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would	
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	consider suitable!	
Icen	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	Part of a whole farm Higher Level Scheme,	Wildflower meadow, heathland	
har	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		but there are no management options on		
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow		these fields		
oita	Amenity grassland				
Hal	Heathland				
for	Scrub				
ble	Hedgerows				
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating				
S	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches				
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would	
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?	
uc	Other produce		Ley grazing		
eatio	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х			
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming				
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow				
Hab	Amenity grassland				
for	Heathland				
ole 1	Scrub				
uital	Hedgerows	Х			
Sı	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating				
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches				
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas			Is the site available for at least 30 years for	
		750,00	Policy and / or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?	
	Cereal crops	0		Vec	
	Other produce	750.00	-	Yes	
²)	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	750,00 0			
m)	Dairy nig or poultry farming	0	-		
١rea	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow		-		
at ⊿	Amenity grassland				
abit	Heathland				
Ĩ	Scrub				
	Hedgerows				
	Woodland - native. natural. or regenerating				
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches				

		La	bs Gr R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R	
for	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	Are there any habitat types that you would
ole f	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would consider suitable?
itak	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
Su	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	Not currently in offsetting scheme	



		La	m G R R r r	
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
	Amenity grassland	Х		
	Heathland	Х		
	Scrub	Х		
	Hedgerows	Х		
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
u	Other produce		Not actively managed – some sporadic	
atic	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	animal grazing	
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
labi	Amenity grassland	Х		
or F	Heathland	Х		
le f	Scrub	Х		
iitak	Hedgerows	Х		
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or onvironmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops			biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Other produce			Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
bital	Heathland			
Hat	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

			p p a x at d n La	
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
f	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
hancemen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	N/A	Wetland creation and meadows
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
oita	Amenity grassland			
Hat	Heathland			
for	Scrub	Х		
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	х		
S	Wetland area	Х		
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
uc	Other produce		Annual topping	
eatic	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		_	
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х	_	
Hab	Amenity grassland		_	
for	Heathland		_	
ole 1	Scrub	Х	_	
iitał	Hedgerows		_	
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х	_	
	Wetland area	Х	_	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
oita	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
Hal	Cereal crops		roncy and y or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?



		р та at at at b	
Other produce		Flood risk	Yes
Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
Amenity grassland			
Heathland			
	130,0		
Scrub	00		
Hedgerows			
Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	58,00		
Wetland area	0		
Water bodies including drainage ditches			

	La d d tttl Th	ak eh	→」 to st → I → I → I → I → I → I → I → I → I →	ak maken m Maken maken
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas	Х	Please provide details if the proposed BNG	Arothoroony behitet twees that we wild
Ŀ	Cereal crops	Х	parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	Grassland has been entered into a	
oitat Enhan	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		Countryside Stewardship Scheme with the	
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х	grass managed to provide nectar and shelter for invertebrates and an increase in food	
	Amenity grassland			
Hak	Heathland			
for	Scrub	Х		
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
S	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas	Х	How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops	Х	managed?	consider unsuitable?
u	Other produce		Grazed, arable, or not actively managed	
atic	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х		
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
labi	Amenity grassland			
or H	Heathland			
le f	Scrub	Х		
itab	Hedgerows	Х		
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Delicy and / or onvironmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops		Policy and / or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Other produce		Guy Hurst Copse is an ancient woodland	Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (I	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
Are	Amenity grassland			
itat	Heathland			
Hab	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

	- a b d O d d a a	. E .	s S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S		
e for Habitat	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas Cereal crops Other produce		Please provide details if the proposed BNG parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a conservation / off setting scheme?	Are there any habitat types that you would consider suitable?	
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		Awaiting stewardship agreement	Native Woodland regeneration & creation, enhancement of wildlife corridors,	
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming				
able	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		hedgerow restoration & new native	
uita	Amenity grassland			nedgerows, creation of traditional coppice	
S	Heathland			enhancement. habitat creation &	
	Scrub	Х			



	a r a c d z c d a 'a	- 8 -	ла wato скадуро с <u>s</u> s	
	Hedgerows	X		enhancement for bats. owls. and other
	Woodland - native natural or regenerating	X	-	species as advised, native orchard creation,
	Wetland area	~	-	wildflower meadow creation, converting the
				low diversity grassland fields into species-
				rich meadows, restore naturally functioning
				habitat mosaics within which all
				woodland dependent butterflies insects and
				invertebrates, management of woodlands
				for ecological benefit e.g. providing dead
		X		and decaying wood for invertebrates,
		X		provision of bird of prey and owl boxes on a
				site where these are already known to nest,
				species diversity, provision of beneficial
				measures to encourage & protect both flora
				and fauna including Insects, Fish, Reptiles,
				Amphibians etc, renewable energy schemes.
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed ?	consider unsuitable?
ion	Other produce		Grazed by sheep and annual hay crop	All proposals would have to be presented for
bitat Creat	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		-	clearly articulated and measurement criteria
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			prior to any agreements being considered.
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		Management fees and payments to us as the
. Ha	Amenity grassland			landowners would need to be agreed prior
for	Heathland	X	-	to any proposal, scheme or improvement
able	Scrub	X	-	activity being considered.
uita	Hedgerows	X	-	
0	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	X	-	
	Wetrand area	~	-	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	~		le the site evailable for at least 20 years for
	Coroal crops		Policy and / or environmental constraints	high high high high high high high high
	Other produce			Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		-	
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		-	
m²)		79,00	-	
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	0		
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
itat	Heathland			
Hab	Scrub	1,000		
	Hedgerows			
		42,00		
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	0		
	Wetland area		-	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	4,500		

	that d	E e	ы а Усн, Некорани и Собании и С
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG
Ħ	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a
ner	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?
Icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		N/A
har	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		

<u>+</u>				
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
oita	Amenity grassland			
Hał	Heathland			
for	Scrub			
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
S	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
tat	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
labi	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
or H	Other produce		Annual grass cutting or hay crop if possible	
le fo	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
tab	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
Sui	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		



	t a d d	ΞΨΗ	er B	ы <mark>е</mark> е, ад і	да Устіні <mark>к</mark> 7е <u>я</u> т
	Amenity grassland				
	Heathland				
	Scrub				
	Hedgerows	Х			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х			
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas			Policy and / or environmental constraints	Policy and / or environmental constraints Is the site available for at I
	Cereal crops				biodiversity net gain
	Other produce				Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)				
(דר	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming				
a (n		13,50			
Are	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	0	_		
at /	Amenity grassland				
abit	Heathland				
Ξ_	Scrub				
	Hedgerows	1,000			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	600			
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	900			

	La L	ь х ч	vd, a contraction of the state	o n
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
Ţ	Cereal crops	Х	parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
Icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		Field margins to field boundary to north and	Field parcel adjoined to southern boundary
at Enhan	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		south are currently subject to grassland	by area of woodland and elsewhere by field
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow		management as part of Entry Level	margins that include mature hedgerows and
oita	Amenity grassland		stewardship scheme	
Hal	Heathland			
for H	Scrub			
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
S	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
uo	Other produce		Currently managed as part of a wider	
Creatio	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		agricultural land holding. Field parcel used	
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		for arable crop production	
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
Hab	Amenity grassland			
for	Heathland			
ole 1	Scrub			
lital	Hedgerows	Х		
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas			Is the site available for at least 30 years for
		40,00	Policy and / or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Cereal crops	0		
	Other produce			Yes
η ²)	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		-	
a (n	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
Are	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
tat ,	Amenity grassland			
labi	Heathland		-	
Т	Scrub		-	
	Hedgerows	4,800	-	
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating		-	
	Wetland area		-	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			



	d وا علي المالية المالي					
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG			
t	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would		
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?			
icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		N/A	Initial assessments have assumed that circa		
han	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			20% BNG could be achieved.		
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х				
oitai	Amenity grassland	Х				
Hab	Heathland					
for	Scrub					
ble	Hedgerows	Х]			
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х				
S	Wetland area					
	Water bodies including drainage ditches					
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would		
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?		
ation	Other produce		The land is currently subject to farming. It			
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		forms part of the proposed submission to			
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		the HEELA for a larger residential site at			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х	submission represents what would be the			
Hab	Amenity grassland	Х	Country Park.			
for I	Heathland					
ole f	Scrub					
litak	Hedgerows	Х				
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х				
	Wetland area					
	Water bodies including drainage ditches					
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for		
	Cereal crops		Toney and y or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?		
	Other produce		Protected species/priority habitat,	Yes		
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		agricultural land classification			
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming					
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow					
t Ar	Amenity grassland					
oita:	Heathland					
Hat	Scrub					
	Hedgerows					
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating					
	Wetland area					
	Water bodies including drainage ditches					

		Lang	ley Fields, Lyons Road, Slinfold	
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
nent	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would consider suitable?
	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
าсег	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	N/A	
har	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
bita	Amenity grassland			
Hal	Heathland			
for	Scrub			
ble	Hedgerows	Х	_	
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
S	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
ſ	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
tior	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
rea	Other produce		Not actively managed	
at C	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	_	
abit	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
r Ha	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
e fo	Amenity grassland			
able	Heathland			
Suit	Scrub			
	Hedgerows	х		



	Langley Fields, Lyons Road, Slinfold				
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating				
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches				
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or onvironmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for	
	Cereal crops		Policy and 7 of environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?	
	Other produce		Agricultural land classification	Yes	
		33,00			
²)	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	0	_		
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming				
vrea	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	8,000			
at ⊿	Amenity grassland				
abit	Heathland				
Ĥ	Scrub				
	Hedgerows	2,000			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating				
	Wetland area				
	Water bodies including drainage ditches				

	Lo H o Su	e,	N C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	σ
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
Ŀ	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
Icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		The estate has a parcel called three bogs a	Various habitat opportunities exist both in
har	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		wetland area. In addition, the estate has	the bog areas, wetland, ditches, hedgerows,
e for Habitat Enh	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	<	existing Stewardship schemes in place and	forestry and along the banks of the
	Amenity grassland		various forestry schemes. The estate	watercourses.
	Heathland		schemes.	
	Scrub >	<		
ble	Hedgerows >	<		
uita	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	<		
S	Wetland area	(
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	(
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
uc	Other produce			
Habitat Creatio	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	(
	Amenity grassland			
for	Heathland			
ole 1	Scrub >	(
lital	Hedgerows >	<		
SL	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	(
	Wetland area	(
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	<		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops			biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Other produce		Heritage conservation area, agricultural land	Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		classification	
(m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
oitaí	Heathland			
Hat	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

	M A Pa Pa	≚ · ≥	ay es n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n es n n es n n es es es n es n es n es n es es es es es es es es es es es es es	· + ·
or	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	Are there any hebitat types that you would
le f	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would consider suitable?
itab	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	consider suitable:
Sui	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х		



	ay M Pa	·Σ	S M a K · La	-			
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			Land parcel adjoins ancient and semi-natural woodland to northern boundary and priority			
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х					
Habitat Area (m ²) Suitable for Habitat Creation	Amenity grassland			habitat deciduous woodland to east and			
	Heathland		Countryside Stewardship mid-tier grassland	south. There are ponds adjoining edge of			
	Scrub		scheme	east. Land parcel comprises fields bound by			
	Hedgerows	Х		mature hedgerows with specimen trees.			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х					
	Wetland area	Х		Land parcel would be suitable for enhanced			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	х		grassland, woodland and wetland habitats.			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would			
or Habitat Creation	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?			
	Other produce		Predominantly managed grassland				
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х					
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming						
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х					
	Amenity grassland						
	Heathland						
ole 1	Scrub						
uital	Hedgerows	Х					
SI	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х					
	Wetland area	Х					
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х					
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for			
	Cereal crops			biodiversity net gain purposes?			
	Other produce			Yes			
_	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)						
(m ²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming						
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow						
t Ar	Amenity grassland						
oita	Heathland						
Hal	Scrub						
	Hedgerows						
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating						
	Wetland area						
	Water bodies including drainage ditches						

	rk es M	· Σ	ay ak ar	h ut of the second s
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	consider suitable?
	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х	Countryside Stewardship mid-tier grassland	Land Parcel predominantly comprises
ent	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		scheme	managed grassland fields.
ancem	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
	Amenity grassland			ancient and semi-natural woodland, with
Enh	Heathland			further such designation close to the eastern
tat	Scrub			boundary. Priority Habitat Deciduous
labi	Hedgerows	Х		Woodland adjoins the north-west boundary.
ы Н	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
le f(Wetland area	Х		There are 'gill' watercourses along the
tab				southern boundary and running east
Sui				through the land parcel.

	Water bodies including drainage ditches	х		Land is predominantly boundary by mature hedgerows, including specimen trees, and woodland shaws. There are a number of mature specimen trees within the fields.
uo	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
Creatio	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
	Other produce		Proactively managed grassland	
itat	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	Х		
Hab	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
orł	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
ole f	Amenity grassland			
iitak	Heathland			
Su	Scrub			



	ay A Pa	É · ≥	ay Reservers ar C(S) C(S) C(S) C(S) C(S) C(S) C(S) C(S)	۲ n f
	Hedgerows	Х		
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area	Х		
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or onvironmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops			biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Other produce			Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
ital	Heathland			
Hat	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			

			≥ o n t ≥ 8 p	
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Please provide details if the proposed BNG	
Ŀ	Cereal crops		parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	Are there any habitat types that you would
nen	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?	
Icer	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		N/A	
han	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
t En	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
oita	Amenity grassland			
Hat	Heathland			
for	Scrub	Х		
ble	Hedgerows	Х		
Suitat	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	Х		
	Wetland area	Netland area		
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	Х		
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops		managed?	consider unsuitable?
uc	Other produce		A woodland management plan submitted to	
ole for Habitat Creatic	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		the forestry commision	
	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow	Х		
	Amenity grassland			
	Heathland			
	Scrub			
iitak	Hedgerows	Х		
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area	Х		
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		Policy and / or environmental constraints	Is the site available for at least 30 years for
	Cereal crops		Foncy and y or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?
ea (m²) Suitable for Habitat Creation	Other produce		Flood risk, pollution	Yes
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
m²)	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
ea (Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
t Ar	Amenity grassland			
oitat	Heathland			
Hab	Scrub	1,000		
	Hedgerows	1,000		
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating	7,000		
	Wetland area	200		
	Water bodies including drainage ditches	1,000		

			Th Fa M			
e for	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas	ldings, yards, and hard surface areas		Are there any habitat types that you would		
	Cereal crops	Х	parcel is currently in stewardship and / or a	consider suitable?		
able	Other produce		conservation / off setting scheme?			
suit	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)	vestock grazing (including equestrian)		Wildflower meadow, wetland		
S	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming					



			m r Fa	
	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
	Amenity grassland			
	Heathland			
	Scrub			
	Hedgerows			
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas		How is the proposed BNG parcel currently	Are there any habitat types that you would
	Cereal crops	Х	managed?	consider unsuitable?
ation	Other produce		Cereal/break crop rotation	
	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)			
Cre	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming			
itat	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow			
lab	Amenity grassland			
orF	Heathland			
ole f	Scrub			
itab	Hedgerows			
Su	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating			
	Wetland area			
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			
	Buildings, yards, and hard surface areas			Is the site available for at least 30 years for
		98,30	Policy and / or environmental constraints	biodiversity net gain purposes?
	Cereal crops	0		
	Other produce			Yes
(⁷ 1	Livestock grazing (including equestrian)		-	
ת) פ	Dairy, pig, or poultry farming		-	
Åre	Natural or semi-natural grassland/meadow		-	
tat /	Amenity grassland		-	
abit	Heathland		-	
T	Scrub		-	
	Hedgerows		-	
	Woodland - native, natural, or regenerating		-	
	Wetland area		-	
	Water bodies including drainage ditches			



Appendix 5: Green call for sites biodiversity net gain calculations



Barn's Green Road, Coolham, North of Wisteria Place Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Habitats and areas			Distinctivenes s Condition Strategic significance			Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.54	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.84
2								
3								
4								
5								
								5.84

Retention category biodiversity value											
	Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area lost	Units lost					
			0.00	0.00	2.54	5.84					
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.54	5.84					



Barn's Green Road, Coolham, North of Wisteria Place Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

Barns Green Road, Coolham, North of Wisteria Place A-2 Site Habitat Creation										
Condense / Show Columns Condense / Show Rows										
Main Me	enu	Instructions								
						Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			
	bitat Proposed habitat			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	TT-bit-t
Broad Habitat			Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	2.54	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	22.76
									L	
									 	
		Total area	2.54		1					22.76

No habitat enhancement proposed.



	Habitats and areas				Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Urban	Built linear features	0.05	V.Low	N/A - Other	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
2	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.72	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	10.86
3	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.04	Medium	Fairly Poor	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.28
4								
5	Cropland	Cereal crops	11.3	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	25.99
6								
7	Cropland	Cereal crops	16.8	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	38.64
8	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.15	Medium	Fairly Poor	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1.04
9								
10	Cropland	Cereal crops	23.9	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	54.97
11								
12	Cropland	Cereal crops	13.68	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	31.46
13	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.72	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	15.82
248								
			72.36					179.06

Bury St Austens Farm Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation



	Retention category biodiversity value								
Ref	Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	baseline units enhance	Area lost	Units lost			
1	0.05		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
2			0.00	0.00	4.72	10.86			
3		0.04	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.00			
4									
5			0.00	0.00	11.30	25.99			
6									
7			0.00	0.00	16.80	38.64			
8		0.15	0.00	1.04	0.00	0.00			
9									
10			0.00	0.00	23.90	54.97			
11									
12			0.00	0.00	13.68	31.46			
13		1.72	0.00	15.82	0.00	0.00			
1	0.05	1.91	0.00	17.14	70.40	161.92			


Bury St Austens Farm Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Habitat Creation									
Condense / Show	r Columns Condense / Show Rows									
Main Me										
		Post development/ post intervention habitats								
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Habitat	
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered	
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.72	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	42.30	
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	11.3	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	101.27	
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	16.8	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	150.56	
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	23.9	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	214.18	
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	13.68	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	122.60	
									-	
	Total area	70.40							630.90	



Bury St Austens Farm Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

-		ſ		Po	st development/ post interve	ntion habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	Area		Cardinia	
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	s	- B
3	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Fairly Poor - Moderate	0.04	Medium	Moderate
*	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Fairly Poor - Moderate	0.15	Medium	Moderate
13	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.72	Medium	Fairly Good
						1.91		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	nporal risk multiplier Difficulty risk			
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered	
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Medium	0.33	
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Medium	1.25	
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	19.13	
				20.72	



		Habitats and areas		Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	Successful and a stress to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	6.74	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	15.50
2								
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.05	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	11.62
4								
5	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.89	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	11.25
6								
7	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.02	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	9.25
8								
9	Cropland	Cereal crops	6.07	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	13.96
10								
11	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.18	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	7.31
			29.95					68.89

Retention category	biodiversity value
--------------------	--------------------

Area retaine d	Area enhance d	Area hance d retaine enhance		Area lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	6.74	15.50
		0.00	0.00	5.05	11.62
		0.00	0.00	4.89	11.25
		0.00	0.00	4.02	9.25
		0.00	0.00	6.07	13,96
		0.00	0.00	3.18	7.31
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.95	68.89



East Clayton Farm Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		-									
	A-2 Site Habitat Creation										
Condense / Show	Columns Condense / Show Rows										
Main Mer	nu Instructions										
					Post development/ post int	ervention habitats					
		_	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Habitat		
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat		d Habitat Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	6.74	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	51.89		
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.05	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	38.88		
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.89	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	37.65		
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.02	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	30.95		
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	6.07	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	46.73		
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.18	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	24.48		
		-									
	Total area	29.95							230.58		

No habitat enhancement proposed



Lamb's Green, Rusper Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas	Distinctivenes s Condition Strategic significance			Successful antice to	Ecological baseline	
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	on Strategic significance address habitat losse		Total habitat units
1	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.52	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	13.98
2								
3	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.63	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	5.80
4	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	2.08	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	19.14
5								
6	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.69	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	3.89
7	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.25	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	2.30
8								
9	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.17	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	2.69
								47.79

	Retention category biodiversity value										
Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area lost	Units lost						
	1.52	0.00	13.98	0.00	0.00						
	0.63	0.00	5.80	0.00	0.00						
	2.08	0.00	19,14	0.00	0.00						
		0.00	0.00	1.69	3.89						
	0.25	0.00	2.30	0.00	0.00						
		0.00	0.00	1.17	2.69						
0.00	4.48	0.00	41.22	2.86	6.58						



Lamb's Green, Rusper Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation





Lamb's Green, Rusper Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

Post develo						ition habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinguis	Cardinia
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare \$)	s	- B
1	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.52	Medium	Fairly Good
3	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.63	Medium	Fairly Good
4	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	2.08	Medium	Fairly Good
7	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.25	Medium	Fairly Good
								
		•			I	4.48		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	Difficulty risk	Habitat	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	16.91
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	7.15
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	23.14
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	2.78
				49.98



Ref I				s	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	baseline
	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	6.74	V.High	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Bespoke compensation likely to be required	124.02
2								
3	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	4.71	V.High	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Bespoke compensation likely to be required	86.66
4 Wo	/oodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.34	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	3.13
5								
6 He	leathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	4.89	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	44.99
7								
8 He	leathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	4.02	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	36.98
9								
10 He	leathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	6.07	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	55.84
11 We	/oodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.35	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	3.22
			27.12					354.84

Land at Knepp Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation



		Rete	ntion cat	egory biod	iversity value	•
Ref	Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area lost	Units lost
1		6.74	0.00	124.02	0.00	0.00
2						
3		4.71	0.00	86.66	0.00	0.00
4		0.34	0.00	3.13	0.00	0.00
5						
6		4.89	0.00	44.99	0.00	0.00
7						
8		4.02	0.00	36.98	0.00	0.00
9						
10		6.07	0.00	55.84	0.00	0.00
11	0.35		0.00	3.22	0.00	0.00
	0.00	27.12	0.00	354.84	0.00	0.00

No habitat creation proposed.



Land at Knepp Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		r		Pos	st development/ post intervei	ation habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinction	Condition
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	S	B
1	Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	V.High - V.High	Moderate - Fairly Good	6.74	V.High	Fairly Good
3	Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	V.High - V.High	Moderate - Fairly Good	4.71	V.High	Fairly Good
4	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.34	Medium	Fairly Good
6	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	4.83	Medium	Fairly Good
*	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	4.02	Medium	Fairly Good
10	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	6.07	Medium	Fairly Good
11	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.35	Medium	Fairly Good
								L
		•				27.12		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mult	tiplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/yea	Final difficulty of enhancement	units delivered
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	High	131.18
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	High	91.67
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.78
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	55.46
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	45.59
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	68.84
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.89
				400.43



Land at Little Thakeham Farm, Storrington Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiven	ess	Conditi	on	Strategic sign	ificance			Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier	Suggested action to address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.53	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.82
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.54	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	12.74
4	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.18	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1.66
6	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.1	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	4.83
7	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.07	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.64
9	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.87	Low	2	N/A - A pricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	8.90
10	Urban	Built linear features	0.19	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Compensation Not Required	0.00
11	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.83	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	16.84
13	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.92	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	9.02
15	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	2.56	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	23.55
17	Cropland	Cereal crops	0.96	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	2.21
20	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.86	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat remained	6.58
21	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.13	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1.20
22	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.68	Low	2	N/A -	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	13.06
24	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.14	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1.29
25	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.25	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	11.50
27	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.6	Low	2	N/A - A gricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better	3.68
29	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.15	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1.38
30	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.59	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	3.66
33	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.9	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	13.57
35	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.42	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	10.17



37	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.36	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.43
38						22.4			***			
39	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.91	Low	2	N/A -	1	within area formally identified in local strategy	High strategic	1.15	battle distinctiveness or better	11.29
40	10000000			1960.00	1	Agriconoral	8	Buelegy	orginiteanee		habitat regulieu	1
41	Cropland	Cereal crops	0.45	Low	2	N/A -	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	115	Same distinctiveness or better	1.04
12	1997 (M. 1997) 1	07.007/050	100000	20020		Agricultural	25	strategy	significance	10000	habitat required	
44	and a	A 100 0000		+ 444	1	N/A -	10	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.17	Same distinctiveness or better	12.45
43	Cropland	Cereal crops	08.C	Low	4	Agricultural	- 1 8	strategy	significance	1.15	habitat required	13.48
44	2 27 We was at 10	2. M.C. HWI H 1. Y.K.				27/4	-	TREAD and Frenches Linear East and the desired	TTI-A short-size		Prove distinguished and the state	0
45	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.27	Low	2	Agricultural	1	strategy	significance	1.15	habitat required	2.92
16	Woodland and forest	Other woodland: mixed	117	Madium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher	10.76
	W Obbiano ano Iorest	Office woodland, mixed	1.1.1	140-010m	1	modelate	ati.	strategy	significance	4.44	distinctiveness habitat required	10.10
4/	10000000000000000000000000000000000000		107212		1 22	00000000	20	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	12122	Same broad habitat or a higher	
48	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	2.56	Medium	4.	Moderate	2	strategy	significance	1.15	distinctiveness habitat required	23.55
49									a second and a			1
50	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.79	Low	2	N/A -	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better	8.72
51						Agriconolai	1	suaregy	algittitucative		habitat regulies	
57	Woodland and forest	Other woodland: mixed	1 32	Madium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	115	Same broad habitat or a higher	12.14
52							-	strategy	significance		distinctiveness habitat required	
23	239/26 18 22		2232	222	100	12251	22	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic		Same broad habitat or a higher	1
54	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.29	Medium	4	Moderate	2	strategy	significance	1.15	distinctiveness habitat required	2.67
55	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.59	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher	5.43
56			1100000			1.837578-3577		strategy	significance	1120020	distinctiveness habitat required	
50	Contract		1.60	+		N/A -	-	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	115	Same distinctiveness or better	10.00
21	Cropiano	Cereal crops	4.09	LOW	4	Agricultural	. *: .	strategy	significance	1.15	habitat required	10.79
58	1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	98552776 S	0962058	1919203	1	120000		Within your framelly identified in target	Uish statenis		Complement herbilder and bilder	52220
59	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.37	Medium	4	Moderate	2	strategy	significance	1.15	distinctiveness habitat required	3.40
60	Woodland and forest	Other woodland: mixed	035	Madium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	115	Same broad habitat or a higher	3.22
61	in contains and instant							strategy	significance	1.200	distinctiveness habitat required	
01	12 2 4			2		N/A -	1	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic		Same distinctiveness or better	
02	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.05	Low	1	Agricultural	1. J	strategy	significance	1.15	habitat required	12.72
63	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			100	1	37/5	2 10		TTI-d shares		Press distinguistics	100000
64	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.78	Low	2	N/A - Apricultural	1	within area formally identified in local strategy	significance	1.15	bame distinctiveness or better habitat required	8.69
65						- septemental di		and a rock f	21 Sector Sector S		ANNAL AND A SUBAL SOF	
66	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.55	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher	14.26
67					0		-	strategy	significance		distinctiveness habitat required	
60	Usething and short	Mined - mark	1.5	Madium		Madarate	- 2	Within area formally identified in local	High strategic	115	Same broad habitat or a higher	12.00
03	risatniano ano snfub	MIXED SCIED	1.3	MEGIUM	4	Alogerate	1	strategy	significance	1.15	distinctiveness habitat required	15:00
248												1
240			80.81									316.60
			49.94									010.00



		1	Retention ca	tegory biodiv	ersity value	
Ref	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area lost	Units lost
1			0.00	0.00	2.53	5.82
2 3			0.00	0.00	5.54	12.74
4		0.18	0.00	1.66	0.00	0.00
5	2 C		0.00	0.00	2.10	4.83
7		0.07	0.00	0.64	0.00	0.00
3	9 <u> </u>		0.00	0.00	3.87	8.90
D	0.19		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1		1.83	0.00	16.84	0.00	0.00
3	0 0		0.00	0.00	3.92	9.02
5						
5	<u>.</u>	2.56	0.00	23.55	0.00	0.00
8			0.00	0.00	0.96	2.21
)			0.00	0.00	2.86	6.58
		0.13	0.00	1.20	0.00	0.00
3			0.00	0.00	5.68	13.06
		0.14	0.00	1.29	0.00	0.00
5		1.25	0.00	11.50	0.00	0.00
7			0.00	0.00	1.60	3.68
9		0.15	0.00	1.38	0.00	0.00
0	2 C		0.00	0.00	1.59	3.66
2						17.55
4			0.00	0.00	09.90	13.57
			0.00	0.00	4.42	10.17
0	e		12			



37			0.00	0.00	2.36	5.43
38	0 0					-
39			0.00	0.00	4.91	11.29
40						
41			0.00	0.00	0.45	1.04
42	ş <u>ş</u>		1	100000000		n an
43			0.00	0.00	5.86	13.48
44	<u>k 8</u>		1	NAMES OF		-01.01
45		-	0.00	0.00	1.27	2.92
46		1.17	0.00	10.76	0.00	0.00
47	<u>i</u> 3		2			
48		2.56	0.00	23.55	0.00	0.00
49	2 3		1			-
50			0.00	0.00	3.79	8.72
51	8 8	02000	-			
52		1.32	0.00	12.14	0.00	0.00
53	9 6	500	1			
54		0.29	0.00	2.67	0.00	0.00
55		0.59	0.00	5.43	0.00	0.00
56	3 3			10000		-
57			0.00	0.00	4.69	10.79
58	9 6	10000	1000 V		6	2
59		0.37	0.00	3.40	0.00	0.00
60		0.35	0.00	3.22	0.00	0.00
61	2 2		-	1000		5
62			0.00	0.00	5.53	12.72
63	9 G		6 1975	313		5 5753
64			0.00	0.00	3.78	8.69
05	9 70		0	_		
66		1.55	0.00	14.26	0.00	0.00
07	0 2		5			-
68) e	1.5	0.00	13.80	0.00	0.00
09	0.10	16.01	0.00	147.20	72.61	160.20
	0.19	10.01	0.00	147.29	/5.01	109.50



Land at Little Thakeham Farm, Storrington Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Habitat Creation								
Condense / Show	Columns Condense / Show Rows								
Main Mer	nu Instructions								
					Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			
		1	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Unbited
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.53	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	22.67
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.54	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	49.65
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.1	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	18.82
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.87	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	34.68
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.92	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	35.13
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.96	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	8.60
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.86	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	25.63
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.68	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	50.90
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.6	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	T	Low	14.34
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.59	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	14.25
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.9	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	52.87
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.42	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	39.61
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.36	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	21.15
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.91	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	44.00
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.45	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	4.03
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.86	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	52.52
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.27	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	11.38
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.79	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	33.96
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.59	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	5.29



Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.69	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	42.03
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.5	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	13.44
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	5.53	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	49.56
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.69	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	T	Low	15.15
								ş	
4	Total area	73.61							659.67



Land at Little Thakeham Farm, Storrington Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

			Post development/ post intervention habitats						
	Baseline habitats	Proposed Ha	bitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinctivene	Conditio	
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	ss	h	
4	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.18	Medium	Fairly Good	
7	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.07	Medium	Fairly Good	
12	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.83	Medium	Fairly Good	
16	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	2.56	Medium	Fairly Good	
21	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.13	Medium	Fairly Good	
24	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.14	Medium	Fairly Good	
26	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.25	Medium	Fairly Good	
29	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.15	Medium	Fairly Good	
46	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.17	Medium	Fairly Good	
48	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	2.56	Medium	Fairly Good	
52	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.32	Medium	Fairly Good	
54	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.29	Medium	Fairly Good	
55	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.59	Medium	Fairly Good	
59	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.37	Medium	Fairly Good	
60	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.35	Medium	Fairly Good	
66	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.55	Medium	Fairly Good	
68	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.5	Medium	Fairly Good	
						16.01			



	Conditio	Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	tiplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Baselin e ref	•	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/ye	Final difficulty of enhancement	delivere d
4	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	2.00
7	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.78
12	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	20.36
16	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target	5	Low	28.48
21	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target	5	Low	1.45
24	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target	5	Low	1.56
26	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	13.91
29	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.67
46	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	13.02
48	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	28.48
52	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	14.68
54	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.23
55	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	6.69
59	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	4.20
60	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	3.89
66	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	17.24
68	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	17.01
						178.64



Land at Old Camp Farm, Brighton Road Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas				Strategic significance	Suggested action to address	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (bectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	habitat losses	Total babitat units
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	3.19	Low	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	14.67
2	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	4.8	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	44.15
3	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.11	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	1:01
4	Grassland	Modified grassland	4.19	Low	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	19.27
5								
10			12.29					79.12

Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area lost	Units lost
		0.00	0.00	3.19	14.67
	4.8	0.00	44.16	0.00	0.00
	0.11	0.00	1.01	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	4.19	19.27
0.00	4.91	0.00	45.17	7.38	33.95



Land at Old Camp Farm, Brighton Road Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Hab	itat Creation]							
Condense / Show	w Columns	Condense / Show Rows								
Main Menu Instructions										
					_	Post development/ post int	ervention habitats			_
	d Habitat Proposed habitat (t		Distinctiveness		Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	
Broad Habitat			Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	3.19	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	28.59
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	4.19	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	37.55
L										
			7.00			1				00.14
		Total area	7.38							66.14



Land at Old Camp Farm, Brighton Road Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

				Pos	t development/ post interve	ntion habit	lats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	Area	Distinctivene	Conditio	
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	SS	n
3	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	4.8	Medium	Fairly Good
4	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.11	Medium	Fairly Good
						4.91		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	tiplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/we	Final difficulty of enhancemen	units delivered	
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	53.40	
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Medium	1.17	
				54.57	



Land at the Hermitage, Tower Hill Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.45	Low	Fairly Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	4.79
2	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.07	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.62
3	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	0.03	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.26
4								
5								
			1.55					5.67

	Retention category biodiversity value												
Ārea retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost								
		0.00	0.00	1.45	4.79								
	0.07	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.00								
	0.03	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00								
0.00	0.10	0.00	0.88	1.45	4.79								



Land at the Hermitage, Tower Hill Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation





Land at the Hermitage, Tower Hill Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		1		Pos	t development/ post interve	ntion habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	labitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	Area	Distisctions	Cardinia	
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	SS	n
2	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.07	Medium	Fairly Good
3	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.03	Medium	Fairly Good
						0.10		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	tiplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/ye	enhancemen	units delivered
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.74
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Medium	0.31
l				
ł				
L				4.05
				1.05



Land East of School Lane, Steyning Road, Wiston Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas				Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.06	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	8.93
2								
3								
4								
5								
			4.06					8.93

	Retention category biodiversity value												
Ārea retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	e Baseline units Area los d enhanced		Units lost								
		0.00	0.00	4.06	8.93								
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.06	8.93								



Land East of School Lane, Steyning Road, Wiston Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Habi	itat Creation]							
Condense / Show	r Columns	Condense / Show Rows								
Main Menu Instructions										
						Post development/ post inte	ervention habitats			
	pad Habitat Proposed habitat		I		Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	II-Line
Broad Habitat			Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	4.06	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	34.80
			4.00		I					24.00
		Total area	4.06	J						34.80

No habitat enhancement proposed



Land West of Kingsfold Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance		Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	11.8	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	25.96
2								
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.62	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	3.56
4	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	0.88	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	7.74
5								
6	Cropland	Cereal crops	5.85	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	12.87
7								
8	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	4.35	Medium Moderate Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy Same broad habitated		Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	38.28	
248					8		16	
			24.50					88.42



	Retention category biodiversity value Area retained Area enhance d Baseline units retained Baseline units enhanced Area lost Units lost Image: Area retained d 0.00 0.00 11.80 25.96 Image: Area retained d 0.00 0.00 11.80 25.96 Image: Area retained d 0.00 0.00 11.80 25.96 Image: Area retained d 0.00 0.00 1.62 3.56 Image: Area retained retain									
Ref	Ārea retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost				
1			0.00	0.00	11.80	25.96				
2										
3			0.00	0.00	1.62	3.56				
4		0.88	0.00	7.74	0.00	0.00				
5										
6			0.00	0.00	5.85	12.87				
7										
8	4.35		0.00	38.28	0.00	0.00				
	9 ?		and the second		S	1				
	0.00	5.23	0.00	46.02	19.27	42.39				



Land West of Kingsfold Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Hab	itat Creation								
Condense / Show	w Columns	Condense / Show Rows								
Main Me	enu	Instructions								
						Post development/ post inte	ervention habitats			
				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Habitat
Broad Habitat	Broad Habitat Proposed habitat		Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	11.8	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	101.15
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	1.62	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	13.89
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	5.85	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	50.15
									L	
L									(
L	Total area		19.27							165.18
			10.01							100.10



Land West of Kingsfold Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

_		1		Pos	t development/ post interve	ervention habitats			
_	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	labitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinctions	Cardinia	
Baseli e ref	n Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	55	n	
4	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.88	Medium	Fairly Good	
8	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	4.35	Medium	Fairly Good	
						5.23			

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	tiplier	Difficulty risk	Habitat
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/ye	Final difficulty of enhancemen	units delivered
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	9.36
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	46.29
<u> </u>				
				55.65



Langley Fields Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas	Distinctiveness Condition Strategic significance			Commente di antian ta	Ecological baseline					
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctivenes s	Scor e	Condition	Scor e	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier		Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.18	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	2.60
2												
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	4.8	Low	2	N/A - Agricultural	1	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Medium strategic significance	1.1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	10.56
		5.98			-		·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		13.16	

		Retention category biodiversity value									
	Area retaine d	Area enhance d	e units retaine	units enhance	Area lost	Units lost					
			0.00	0.00	1.18	2.60					
			0.00	0.00	4.80	10.56					
Ľ	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.98	13.16					

Langley Fields Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Hab	itat Creation								
Condense / Shov	v Columns	Condense / Show Rows								
Main Me	Main Menu Instructions									
						Post development/ post into	ervention habitats			
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Habitat	
Broad Habitat		Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	1.18	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	10.11
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	4.8	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	41.15
L										
L		Total area	5 08		1	l				51.26
		Iotal area	0.90	J						01.20

No habitat enhancement proposed



Long House, Long House, Lane, Cowfold Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas	Distinctiveness Condition Strategic significance		Suggested action to	Ecological baseline		
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Woodland and forest	Voodland and forest Other woodland; mixed			Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	6.51
2								
3	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.33	Low	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.85
4								
5	Grassland	1.26	Low	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.54	
			3.33					17.91

	Rete	ntion cate	gory biodi	iversity value	ł
Ārea retained	Ārea enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost
	0.74	0.00	6.51	0.00	0.00
		0.00	0.00	1.33	5.85
		0.00	0.00	1.26	5.54
0.00	0.74	0.00	6.51	2.59	11.40



Long House, Long House, Lane, Cowfold Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Hab	itat Creation]							
Condense / Show	w Columns	Condense / Show Rows								
Main Me	Main Menu Instructions									
						Post development/ post inte	ervention habitats			
				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty	Uchitat
Broad Habitat		Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Difficulty Final time to target Final difficulty condition/years creation 7 Low 7 Low 7 Low 1 1 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Final difficulty of creation	units delivered
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	1.33	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	11.40
Grassland		Other neutral grassland	1.26	Medium	Fairly Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	10.80
L										
L										
1	Total area		2 59		1	1				22.20
	Total area		2.59		1					22.20



Long House, Long House, Lane, Cowfold Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	a developmentr post interve	ncion nabio	Additats					
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	labitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinctivene	Con this
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	SS	n
1	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	lland and forest Other woodland; mixed		Moderate - Fairly Good	0.74	Medium	Fairly Good
						0.74		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	Difficulty risk	Habitat		
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition		Final difficulty of enhancemen	units delivered	
Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	7.87	
L					
				7.87	



Mayes Park North Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Habitats and areas			Distinctiveness	Condition Strategic significance		Commente di antian da	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	2.21	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	5.08
2								
3	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.08	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	7.08
4								
5	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.06	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	7.04
6								
7	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.6	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	3.68
8								
9	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.54	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	3.54
10								
11	Cropland	Cereal crops	1.92	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	4.42
13.41								30.84



	Retention category biodiversity value						
Ref	Area retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost	
1			0.00	0.00	2.21	5.08	
2							
3			0.00	0.00	3.08	7.08	
4							
5			0.00	0.00	3.06	7.04	
6							
7			0.00	0.00	1.60	3.68	
8							
9			0.00	0.00	1.54	3.54	
10							
11			0.00	0.00	1.92	4.42	
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.41	30.84	


Mayes Park North Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	A-2 Site Habitat Creation]							
Condense / Show	v Columns Condense / Show Rows								
Main Me	nu Instructions								
				Post development/ post int	ervention habitats				
Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness Distinctiveness	Condition Condition	Strategic significance Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition/years	Difficulty Final difficulty of creation	Habitat units delivered
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.21	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	19.81
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.08	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	27.60
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	3.06	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	27.42
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.6	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	14.34
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.54	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	13.80
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	1.92	Medium	Fairly Good	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Low	17.21
1	Total area	13.41		I	1				120.18

No habitat enhancement proposed



Mayes Park South Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

		Habitats and areas			Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	19.52	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	44.90
2	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.88	Medium	Moderate	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required.	17.30
3								
4								
5								
			21.40					62.19

	Retention category biodiversity value										
Area retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost						
		0.00	0.00	19.52	44.90						
	1.88	0.00	17.30	0.00	0.00						
0.00	1.88	0.00	17.30	19.52	44.90						



Mayes Park South Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation





Mayes Park South Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Post development/ post interven									
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	labitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	Area		0			
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	SS	n		
2	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	1.88	Medium	Fairly Good		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	Difficulty risk	Habitat	
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/ye	difficulty of enhancemen	units delivered
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	20.91
				20.91



Mount Wood Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

			Habitats and areas		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Suggested action to	Ecological baseline
R	lef	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
	1	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	5.28	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	46.46
	2	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.88
	3	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	0.02	V.High	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Bespoke compensation likely to be required	0.35
	4	Lakes	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	0.1	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.88
Γ	5								
				5.50					48.58

	Retention category biodiversity value										
Area retained	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost						
	5.28	0.00	46.46	0.00	0.00						
	0.1	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.00						
	0.02	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00						
	0.1	0.00	0.88	0.00	0.00						
0.00	5.50	0.00	48.58	0.00	0.00						

No habitat creation proposed



Mount Wood Habitat Enhancement Biodiversity Metric Calculation

				Pos	st development/ post interve	ntion habit	ats	
	Baseline habitats	Proposed H	abitat (Pre-Populated but can be overridden)	Change in distinctiv	eness and condition	Area	Distinctions	Cardinia
Baselin e ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	(hectare s)	55	n
1	Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Voodland and forest	Other woodland; mized	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	5.28	Medium	Fairly Good
2	Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	Mized scrub	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.1	Medium	Fairly Good
3	Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)	Wetland	Fens (upland and lowland)	V.High - V.High	Moderate - Fairly Good	0.02	V.High	Fairly Good
4	Lakes - Ponds (Non- Priority Habitat)	Lakes	Ponds (Priority Habitat)	Medium - High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Fairly Good	0.1	High	Fairly Good
								<u> </u>
								<u> </u>
						5.50		

Strategic significance	Temporal risk mul	Habitat		
Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	target condition/ye	difficulty of enhancemen	units delivered
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	58.74
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	1.13
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	High	0.39
Within area formally identified in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	7	Medium	1.34
				61.60



Theale Farm Habitat Baseline Biodiversity Metric Calculation

	Habitats and areas			Habitats and areas Distinctiveness Condition Strategic significance				Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad habitat	Habitat type	Ārea (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	address habitat losses	Total habitat units
1	Cropland	Cereal crops	3.7	Low	N/A - Agricultural	Within area formally identified in local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	8.51
2								
3								
4								
5								
		3.70						

	Retention category biodiversity value							
Ārea retaine	Area enhance d	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Ārea lost	Units lost			
		0.00	0.00	3.70	8.51			
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.70	8.51			



Theale Farm Habitat Creation Biodiversity Metric Calculation



No habitat enhancement proposed.