Peartree Hill Solar Farm

Environmental Statement

Volume 4

Appendix 7.10: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Revision 2 (tracked)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning

(Applications: Prescribed Forms

and Procedure) Regulations 2009 –

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Application Document Ref: EN010157/APP/6.4

~~August~~ September 2025

Prepared by RSK on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage LTD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This document has been prepared by RSK, on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Ltd, to present the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Design-Stage assessment for the proposed Peartree Hill Solar Farm (hereafter the 'Proposed Development') on land to the east of Beverley, East Riding of Yorkshire (the 'Site'). The Proposed Development comprises a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating and storage facility with an export capacity of up to 320 megawatts (MW) and associated infrastructure.
2. The BNG assessment uses the results of a UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) (Ref. 1) survey undertaken at the Site during August – September 2023, to determine the habitats present on the Site before construction, their ecological condition and to provide each habitat with a biodiversity value using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The biodiversity value of each habitat present on the Site is then totalled to provide an overall biodiversity value of the Site before construction.
3. Proposed habitat changes after construction, based on the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Outline LEMP) [EN010157/APP/7.5]**, provide a biodiversity value using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The biodiversity value for each habitat that will be present on the Site after construction is totalled and then compared against the total biodiversity value of habitats present before construction to provide an indication of the net change in biodiversity value as a result of the Proposed Development.
4. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric measures biodiversity value of habitats in 'biodiversity units' and this BNG assessment follows the methods set out in Statutory Biodiversity Metric user guide. A habitat is assigned a biodiversity unit score by considering its area (or length), distinctiveness, condition and strategic significance.
5. The full biodiversity assessment calculation can be found in the accompanying **Appendix C**, Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculations; however, screenshots of the main results tables are presented here in **Appendix A**, for convenience.
6. The condition assessments for all habitats present before construction are listed in **Appendix B**. This includes any deviation from standard guidance, assumptions and justifications for habitat classification and condition.
7. The Site was found to comprise a total of 59 different area habitats including broad habitats of arable, grassland, scrub, urban, woodland, individual trees, hedgerows and watercourses. This results in a baseline of 2,624.14 area habitat biodiversity units, 378.58 hedgerow biodiversity units and 214.71 watercourse biodiversity units. Irreplaceable habitats are present on-site in the form of veteran *Rural trees*, which are to be protected during construction and retained as part of the Proposed Development.

8. Post-development plans include 58 retained habitats, nine enhanced habitats and 16 newly created habitats, totalling 42456~~0~~.2848~~8~~ area habitat biodiversity units, 5584.9552~~2~~ hedgerow biodiversity units and 26641~~.~~.6855~~5~~ watercourse biodiversity units.
9. This BNG assessment thus concludes that the Proposed Development will result in a net change of 162136~~3~~6.1534~~4~~ area habitat biodiversity units, 164175~~1~~.905~~5~~ hedgerow biodiversity units and 24.376~~.84~~ watercourse biodiversity units. This equates to a 612~~1~~.7836~~8~~% net gain in biodiversity for area habitat units, a 416~~1~~.8548~~5~~% gain for hedgerow units and a 10.0612~~.~~.50~~5~~% gain in watercourse units. The trading rules in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric have been met for all habitats including the assumption set out for *Coastal floodplain grazing marsh* which is included in **Section 2.5**.
10. The **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** outlines the habitat management prescriptions which should be followed in order to achieve the proposed habitat condition.

CONTENTS

TABLES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Document

1.1.1 This document has been prepared by RSK, on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Ltd to present the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Design-Stage assessment for the proposed Peartree Hill Solar Farm (the 'Proposed Development') on land east of Beverley, East Riding of Yorkshire (the 'Site'). The boundary of the Site is hereafter referred to as the 'Order Limits', which set out the maximum extent within which the Proposed Development can be carried out. RSK was commissioned by RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Ltd to carry out UK Habitat Classification and Biodiversity Net Gain Statutory Biodiversity Metric condition assessments and this information has been used to inform **Environmental Statement (ES) Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010157/APP/6.2]**.

1.1.2 The document provides:

- a detailed methodology, including assumptions, for undertaking the BNG assessment;
- the baseline biodiversity value of habitats within the area of the Proposed Development prior to construction;
- the likely biodiversity value of habitats within the Order Limits post-development based on the current design information; and
- the relative biodiversity changes of habitats within the Order Limits after construction compared with before construction, determining whether the Proposed Development has achieved a 10% net gain in biodiversity.

1.2 Development Proposals

1.2.1 The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating and storage facility with an export capacity of up to 320 megawatts (MW) and associated infrastructure, as described within **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010157/APP/6.1]** and **Schedule 1** of the **Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1]**.

1.2.2 The Proposed Development comprises several areas of land (Land Areas B-F) connected by a series of underground cables. The Proposed Development will connect to the National Grid Creyke Beck Substation via underground cables (the 'grid connection cable route'). There are 'interconnecting cable routes' that run between the Land Areas. The Land Areas and underground cable routes are shown on **ES Volume 3, Figure 1.2: Land Areas and Cable Routes Plan with Field Numbering System [EN010157/APP/6.3]**.

1.2.3 Extensive areas within the Order Limits are due to be managed for biodiversity to mitigate the loss of ground-nesting and wintering bird habitat, as well as to ensure the Proposed Development achieves its Biodiversity Net Gain target. Although many of the proposed ecological mitigation areas will be created for ground-nesting and wintering birds, these will also benefit a wide range of species, including bats. As well as ecological mitigation areas, existing habitats will be enhanced through measures such as hedgerow planting and ecologically sensitive habitat management. These measures are outlined in the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**.

1.3 Site Context

1.3.1 The Site encompasses an area of approximately 891 hectares (ha) and is located to the east of the town of Beverley, close to the hamlet of Meaux and villages of Routh and Long Riston.

1.3.2 Each Land Area is made up of number-referenced fields (e.g. Field B1), as shown in **Figure 1**. Most of these areas are arable fields; however, there are also some fields of grazed grassland, and relatively small areas of neutral grassland, broadleaved woodland and scrub. The fields are bordered by a mix of hedgerows, wet ditches and some of the many major named drains and dikes in the area.

1.3.3 The grid connection cable route is *c.* 7 km in length and includes mostly arable fields; however, there are other habitats including modified grassland, hedgerows, tree lines and scattered trees. Figham Pastures Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and numerous watercourses including the River Hull are also within the grid connection cable route, although the cable will be installed using Horizontal Directional Drilling beneath the majority of these areas and habitats. Where this is not possible, such as access routes, minimal culverting of watercourses is to take place.

1.3.4 The interconnecting cable routes comprise mainly arable fields bordered by hedgerows, tree lines and watercourses. The majority of access routes are existing farm tracks bordered by hedgerows, trees and watercourses; however, some cross through arable fields.

1.4 Legislation and Planning Policy Context

1.4.1 The primary aims of the BNG process are for developments to secure a measurable improvement in habitat for biodiversity, to minimise biodiversity losses and to help to restore ecological networks whilst streamlining development processes. BNG does not replace other existing legislation and policy for nature conservation. The legislation and policy below provide the context behind the need to achieve BNG.

The Environment Act

1.4.2 The Environment Act 2021 (Ref. 2) mandates a statutory requirement for developments to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG which became mandatory

from 12 February 2024 for Town and Country Planning Act applications. It is currently anticipated to become mandatory for National Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) whose applications are accepted for examination from November 2025.

Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1)

1.4.3 NPS EN-1 (Ref. 3) sets out the national planning policy for developers of energy NSIPs and sets out the overarching policy for BNG concerning NSIPs through the provisions mandated by the Environment Act 2021.

1.4.4 It states that in England, the applicant should seek opportunities to contribute to and enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity, or the wider environment where possible.

Local Plans

1.4.5 The East Riding of Yorkshire Council Local Plan's (2012 – 2029, adopted 2016) (Ref. 4) Policy ENV4 relates to conserving and enhancing biodiversity. Section E of this policy states: "Proposals should further the aims of the East Riding of Yorkshire Biodiversity Action Plan (ERYBAP) (Ref. 5), designated Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs) (Ref. 6) and other landscape scale biodiversity initiatives. To optimise opportunities to enhance biodiversity, proposals should seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity where possible and will be supported where they:

- Conserve, restore, enhance or recreate biodiversity and geological interests including the Priority Habitats and Species (identified in the ERYBAP) and Local Sites (identified in the Local Sites in the East Riding of Yorkshire).
- Safeguard, enhance, create and connect habitat networks in order to:
  - protect, strengthen and reduce fragmentation of habitats;
  - create a coherent ecological network that is resilient to current and future pressures;
  - conserve and increase populations of species; and
  - promote and enhance green infrastructure."

1.4.6 Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS) are a key component of the Environment Act (2021). A Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is anticipated from East Riding of Yorkshire Council in summer 2025. This document is expected to contain further information on the strategic significance of habitats in a BNG and local context. Until this is made available, the Council advises the use of the following documents to inform strategic significance:

- National Habitats Network Mapping (available on the MAGIC website) (Ref. 14);
- East Riding Local Plan 2016 (which refers to the East Riding of Yorkshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2010) (Ref. 4); and
- East Riding Biodiversity Strategic Areas.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This BNG assessment has been carried out as a desk-based exercise and has been undertaken by a competent person in accordance with best practice[1] (RSK employee reference CR41 MSc PGCE BSc).

2.1.2 The results of UKHab (Ref. 1) surveys carried out within the Order Limits by RSK in August and September 2023 have been used to determine the biodiversity value of habitats within the Order Limits before construction (**Figure 2**).

2.1.3 The results of the Modular River Survey (MoRPh) (Ref. 7) carried out within the Order Limits by RSK in November 2024 have been used to determine the biodiversity value of the watercourses within or directly adjacent to the Order Limits before construction. **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** has been used to determine the biodiversity value of habitats within the Order Limits after construction, with the results presented in UKHab classification (**Figure 3**).

2.1.4 Each area habitat polygon, hedgerow line and watercourse line from the baseline was assigned a unique identifier through the use of ArcGIS (RSK_#), to account for it within the Metric.

2.1.5 The primary documents consulted as part of this assessment include:

- **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]**;
- **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**;
- **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report [EN010157/APP/6.4]**;
- **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plans [EN010157/APP/2.8]**;
- **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.11: Aboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010157/APP/6.4]**; and
- The documents listed in **Section 1.4**.

2.2 Biodiversity Assessment Methods

2.2.1 This assessment was undertaken in line with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2021) (Ref. 8), the British Standard for Biodiversity Net Gain (BS 8683) (British Standard Institute, 2021) (Ref. 9) and industry best practice (CIEEM/CIRIA/IEMA, 2016) (Ref. 10).

[1] A competent person has the knowledge and skills to perform specified tasks to complete and review biodiversity metric calculations. This is obtained through training, qualifications, experience, or a combination of them. Competency is aligned with the British Standard '*Process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain* (BS 8683:202)'.

2.2.2 To calculate the baseline values for the Order Limits, and assess any changes arising from the Proposed Development, this study uses methods set out in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (hereafter 'the Metric') user guide (Defra, 2023) (Ref. 11). The Metric measures biodiversity value for habitats in 'biodiversity units' (BUs)[2].

2.2.3 The Metric is designed to quantify losses and gains of biodiversity as a result of proposed development or land management to inform and improve planning, design, land management and decision-making. The Metric uses habitats as a proxy to describe biodiversity.

2.2.4 The Metric can calculate biodiversity value of:

- Existing habitats;
- Habitat enhancement; and
- Habitat creation.

2.2.5 The Metric can calculate different types of BUs. There are three types of BUs, which are calculated in three separate 'modules' of the Metric. These are:

- Area habitat units (e.g. woodland, grasslands, wetlands);
- Hedgerow units (e.g. hedgerows and lines of trees); and
- Watercourse units (e.g. culverts, canals, wet ditches, rivers and streams).

2.2.6 Consequently, a site can have three BU values, which are assessed using the Metric, but which cannot be summed together or traded between.

2.2.7 The area or length of a habitat is multiplied by several factors in the Metric (called multipliers) that indicate its quality and value (distinctiveness, condition and strategic location), and this provides its BU value.

2.2.8 In addition, for those habitats that are to be created or enhanced, the risk of failure is accounted for by applying multipliers for risk factors (difficulty, time to target condition, and off-site risk).

2.2.9 A brief description of the different multipliers contained within the Metric are detailed below in **Table 1**.

Table 1 – Statutory Biodiversity Metric multipliers and their explanations

Biodiversity Metric multiplier	Explanation
Habitat distinctiveness	A measure based on the type of habitat and its distinguishing features. This includes: • Consideration of species richness and rarity;

[2] 'Biodiversity units' are used to describe relative biodiversity value. There are three types of biodiversity units: area habitat units, hedgerow units and watercourse units. Each of these are calculated in separate 'modules' of the biodiversity metric.

Biodiversity Metric multiplier	Explanation
	• The extent to which the habitat is protected by designations; and • The degree to which a habitat supports species rarely found in other habitats.
Habitat condition	A measure of the habitat against its ecological optimum state. Condition is a way of measuring variation in the quality of patches of the same habitat type.
Strategic significance	Describes the local significance of the habitat based on its location and the habitat type.
Difficulty	A measure which represents the uncertainty in the effectiveness of management techniques used to enhance or create habitat.
Time to target condition	The average time taken between starting creation or enhancement of habitats and that habitat reaching its target condition or distinctiveness.
Spatial risk	Spatial risk represents the relationship between the location of biodiversity loss (on-site) and where the off-site habitat is being delivered. This is applied to off-site interventions only.
Riparian zone encroachment	A measure of any feature or intervention within the riparian zone that reduces the quantity, quality or ecological function of the riparian habitat.
Watercourse encroachment	A measure of any feature that adversely affects the natural function of the watercourse, or results in localised changes in habitat, species and migratory pathways.

2.3 BNG Good Practice Principles for Development

2.3.1 The Metric has been designed as a tool to help inform plans and decisions; however, when undertaking BNG assessments this must be undertaken in accordance with set principles outlined in the user guide (Ref. 11). These are outlined in **Table 2** along with a full justification regarding how each principle has been considered.

Table 2 – Defra metric good practice principles and justification

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
Principle 1: The metric assessment should be completed by a competent person.	The Metric was completed by an ecological consultant with an MSc PGCE BSc (Hons) with considerable experience in BNG assessments and is a Qualifying Member of the

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). This work has been peer reviewed by a Chartered Ecologist and member of CIEEM.
Principle 2: The use of this biodiversity metric does not override existing biodiversity protections, statutory obligations, policy requirements, ecological mitigation hierarchy or any other requirements. This includes consenting or licensing processes, for example woodlands.	The pre-existing levels of protection afforded to protected species and habitats are not affected nor superseded using the Metric. **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010157/APP/6.2]** details the presence of protected and/ or notable species, designated sites (statutory and non-statutory) and habitats. Furthermore, the ES details potential impacts and outlines suitable mitigation to address these.
Principle 3: The biodiversity metric should be used in accordance with established good practice guidance and professional codes.	The mitigation hierarchy has been applied to the design of the Proposed Development. The area of permanent habitat loss has been kept to a minimum without compromising the development. The habitats that will be created and enhanced within the Order Limits will be appropriate, and of the correct distinctiveness, to compensate for the habitats that will be impacted.
Principle 4: The biodiversity metric is not a complex or comprehensive ecological model and is not a substitute for expert ecological advice.	RSK acknowledges that the Defra Metric has been kept deliberately simple to be of practical use. The calculations have been undertaken by specialists and input is underpinned by robust baseline evidence and ecological knowledge and experience.
Principle 5: Biodiversity units are a proxy for biodiversity and should be treated as relative values.	RSK acknowledges that the Defra Metric is the tool to be used as a means of assessing changes in biodiversity value (losses or gains) brought about by the Proposed Development and is a habitat-based approach to determining a proxy

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
	biodiversity value within the Order Limits and the output does not represent absolute values.
Principle 6: This biodiversity metric is designed to inform decisions in conjunction with locally relevant evidence, expert input, or guidance.	Impacts to protected and notable species and habitats have been fully assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment undertaken for the Proposed Development (see **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010157/APP/6.2]**).
Principle 7: Habitat interventions need to be realistic and deliverable within a relevant project timeframe.	The habitats for creation and enhancement have been chosen based on the existing on-site conditions and local context, not purely to achieve the greatest possible BNG result using the Defra Metric. The post-development habitats will be created, enhanced, managed and maintained in accordance with the LEMP (which will be produced pursuant to the DCO as a requirement and will be substantially in accordance with the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**), so that the habitats achieve their target condition.
Principle 8: Created and enhanced habitats should be, where practical and reasonable, local to any impact and deliver strategically important outcomes for nature conservation.	The created and enhanced habitats to achieve the BNG requirements are all being delivered within the Order Limits and are therefore local to the impacts. The landscape plans (see the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** and **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]**) and Figure 3 have been designed to be in keeping with the local character of the area whilst also being in accordance with the Lawton principles (Ref. 12) of 'bigger, better, more and joined up'.
Principle 9: The biodiversity metric does not enforce a minimum habitat size ratio for compensation of losses. Proposals should aim to: • maintain habitat extent - supporting more, bigger, better	Where possible, in the first instance the same habitat type of better condition will be created. If conditions do not allow for the same habitat type to be created, consideration will be given to the creation of different

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
and more joined up ecological networks • ensure that proposed or retained habitat parcels are of sufficient size for ecological function	habitats of the same broad type or higher and of better condition. A buffer of habitat will be either retained, created or enhanced around the perimeter of the Proposed Development which will continue to provide an ecological corridor to the wider landscape.

2.4 Irreplaceable Habitats and Very High Distinctiveness Habitats

2.4.1 Irreplaceable habitats (as provided for in secondary legislation for BNG[3]) do not have a BNG requirement as they are too valuable to be compensated for. As such, any losses to irreplaceable habitats cannot be calculated by the biodiversity metric tool and they are removed from the baseline.

2.4.2 Irreplaceable habitats are present within the Order Limits in the form of *Rural trees* which have sufficient veteran features to be classified as veteran trees. No impacts are anticipated to these trees as they will be protected and retained during the Proposed Development.

2.5 Assumptions and Limitations

2.5.1 The following habitats have been considered in the following modules:

- All area habitats mapped with ArcGIS with a polygon have been assessed in the habitat module;
- All hedgerows and lines of trees are mapped with a line and have been assessed in the hedgerow module;
- All ditches directly adjacent to a hedgerow have been considered in the hedgerow module as *Hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch;*
- All ditches not adjacent to a hedgerow have been considered in the watercourse module; and
- All watercourses that have an area greater than the Minimal Mapping Unit (MMU) have been considered in the area habitat module under *Watercourse footprint* and then entered into the watercourse module as a line centering within the respective polygon.

2.5.2 The assessment assumes that all baseline ponds and woodland are retained.

2.5.3 The area habitats to be created under the solar panels have been entered in the Metric as *Other neutral grassland* in 'Poor' condition to reflect shade from

[3] https://defralanduse.blog.gov.uk/2023/10/05/irreplaceable-habitats-and-bng-what-you-need-to-know/

panels and other factors that may restrict plant growth. These areas are assumed to comprise 75% of the respective field in which the panels are to be installed. A further 20% of the area has been inputted as *Other neutral grassland* in 'Moderate' condition, to reflect management that will allow a higher condition. Finally, 5% of the total areas of the *Other neutral grassland* in "Poor" condition has been entered as *Developed land; sealed surface*. This approach is in line with the Building Research Establishment's (2014) Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments (Ref. 13), which recognizes that, on average, 95% of a site used as a solar farm is still "accessible for plant growth and potentially for wildlife enhancements and complementary agricultural activities such as conservation grazing".

2.5.4 *Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (*CFGM*),* a priority habitat, is present at Figham Pastures Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The Proposed Development at Figham Pastures includes horizontal directional drilling (HDD) drilling under watercourses present as well as trench cutting to lay the grid connection cable. The underlying grassland was species-poor with the turf detailed, in construction measures, being replaced within 48 hours of the trench being dug. Details on turf translocation are included within the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** and the **Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010157/APP/7.8]**, to ensure that the impact is minimal, with the trench width kept to a ~~minimum~~ maximum of ~~(~~1.~~56~~m~~)~~.

2.5.5 A worst-case scenario assumes a 30m working width within Figham Pastures LWS. Where CFGM is concerned, the habitat is therefore assumed to be retained in the Metric, to represent its temporary loss and reinstatement under the measures outlined in 2.5.4. Therefore, a reasonable assumption concludes that the habitat would return to its baseline condition within two years.

2.5.6 5% of the total area of proposed created field margins~~, under *Other neutral grassland (moderate)*~~ is to be re-created as *Arable field margins – game bird seed mix* to account for the creation of seed-rich foraging habitats for birds under the mitigation proposals, and has been entered into the Metric as such. Therefore, providing a winter food source for ground nesting birds, and lack of winter seed source being one factor in their decline.

2.5.7 All hedgerow sections that are to be removed, except for those which are permanently removed for access, are assumed to be reinstated as their enhanced 'species-rich' versions and expected to reach 'Good' condition under management. For example, where *Native hedgerow with trees* is set to be removed, this will be re-created as *Species-rich native hedgerow with trees*. Where the Metric is concerned, this will take longer than two years for them to re-establish to their base condition, thus permanent loss and subsequent creation has been inputted.

2.5.8 5.88km of hedgerows are estimated to be impacted in this assessment within the Order Limits and have been entered as lost habitat in the metric, representing a worst-case scenario. Of this, 5.44km will be recreated whilst 0.44km will be permanently lost due to access requirements. The total figure

of 25.02km for total created hedgerow in this assessment includes the 19.58km of newly created hedgerows post-development for landscape reasons from the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** and the 5.44km of recreated hedgerows from this assessment.

2.5.9 Regarding the hedgerow removal, there are slight discrepancies between the values stated in the **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plans [EN010157/APP/2.8]** (and accompanying information in **Schedule 13** of the **Draft DCO [EN010157/APP/3.1]**) and the values stated in the BNG Assessment. This is due to a number of factors, outlined below:

- Each incidence of hedgerow removal which was less than 10m, as estimated from **Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plans [EN010157/APP/2.8]** and overlayed on survey data captured in GIS, has had to be rounded to 10m because this is the minimal value that the Metric will accept;
- Hedgerow data used in this assessment was drawn by surveyors and in GIS format, as opposed to CAD data used in **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]**. Therefore, geometry errors between CAD and GIS will exist; and
- The data in **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** uses data from arboricultural surveys. Within these, scrub and woody species are marked as groups or individual trees, whereas UKHab guidance stipulates many of these would be hedgerow modules (including lines of trees).

2.5.10 The hedgerow impact is, therefore, a precautionary slight overestimation in line with current BNG guidance (Ref. 11).

2.5.11 Data for watercourse and riparian encroachment was not available for the baseline, thus 'Minor' encroachment was reasonably precautionarily assumed for all baseline watercourses within the Order Limits, given the agricultural nature of the surrounding landscape. A value of 'Minor' encroachment will apply more watercourse units to the baseline than 'Moderate'; thus, this is deemed an appropriate precaution. Watercourses were surveyed during River Condition Assessments (RCAs) at the point where temporary span bridges and culverts are anticipated, totaling around 1% of the total length of watercourses within the Order Limits. These watercourses have been determined using **ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.1: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report [EN010157/APP/6.4]**, the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** and **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]**. Where RCA condition assessments have been undertaken on a watercourse, the RCA has been used for the entire watercourse extent. Given the surrounding habitat, the minimal impacts proposed and limited ecological value of the watercourses surveyed, these survey efforts are considered adequate and proportionate for the Proposed Development.

2.5.12 No RCAs were available for the following watercourses RSK_85, RSK_87, RSK_92 and RSK_98 (see Section 2.1.4 for information on these habitat identifiers). As a precaution, the condition was assumed as 'Good' for baseline calculations, with no impacts anticipated to these watercourses from the Proposed Development.

2.5.13 The final extent of watercourses to be culverted will be determined at the detailed design stage. As a precaution, 10m habitat loss (the smallest value that the Metric will register), was added to each watercourse to be impacted by proposed indicative crossings. This assumes 200m of *Culvert* habitat creation in the post-development watercourse scenario. Where intersections were identified, the highest condition *Ditch* was assumed to be impacted as a precautionary measure.

2.5.14 *Other rivers and streams* in the baseline that do not have RCA data have been recorded as having no watercourse encroachment and minor/minor riparian encroachment. This is considered a precautionary assumption.

2.5.15 *Ditches* in the baseline are recorded as having minor watercourse encroachment due to ongoing routine management by the Internal Drainage Board. This is considered a reasonable assumption, as such management is outside the Applicant's control and is expected to continue.

2.5.16 Those watercourses to be enhanced (≤39% of baseline habitat and condition lengths within the Order Limits for each ditch grouped by habitat type and condition, selected by location) are recorded as having minor/no riparian encroachment in the enhancement tab. This is on the basis that, for watercourses fully within the Order Limits, one or both banks currently adjacent to arable land are expected to become permanent grassland post-development. This is a precautionary assumption as many watercourses lie fully within the Order Limits thus could expect to have no encroachment on both banks; thus, this approach reflects potential ecological improvement but allows for variability in management outcomes.

2.5.17 *Ditches* to be enhanced have remained as their baseline condition. For example, 'Moderate' or 'Good' remain as these, with enhancement coming primarily from a reduction in riparian encroachment. The exception is 'Poor' condition *Ditches* which will be enhanced to 'Moderate' in the post-development scenario through increases in water quality from a reduction in surrounding agricultural chemical inputs and the planting of aquatic marginal vegetation.

~~2.5.12~~2.5.18 Where no condition assessments were available for area habitats, they have been precautionarily entered into the Metric as in 'Good' condition. These habitats are assumed to be retained under the current design.

~~2.5.13~~~~1.1.1 No RCAs were available for the following watercourses RSK_85, RSK_87, RSK_92 and RSK_98 (see Section 2.1.4 for information on these habitat identifiers). As a precaution, the condition was assumed as 'Good' for~~

~~baseline calculations, with no impacts anticipated to these watercourses from the Proposed Development.~~

2.5.19 There was a discrepancy between the Order Limits area (893~~1~~ha) and the area of habitats (excluding *Rural trees*) of 902.50ha. This is likely due to geometry errors, where converting between Computer Aided Design (CAD) for the Order Limits area and GIS-ready file formats for BNG leads to minor differences in geometry. Furthermore, coordinated conversions between web mapping from survey data and desktop-based ArcGIS software produces further error in geometry. However, these errors are not considered significant, as the area from habitat data and the Order Limits has a similarity of 98.73%.

2.5.20 A delay in starting habitat creation of one year has been entered for habitats lost and recreated as a result of the cable route, where **ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [EN010157/APP/6.1]** states construction of the cable route is anticipated to take 10 months.

2.5.21 Area and hedgerow habitats lost and then recreated in the Order Limits have been entered into the Metric as a condition classification down one category from their baseline state. This represents a precautionary approach. The significance of this is recognised for the cable route, given that the applicant will not control long-term management of these habitats.

2.5.22 The ponds recorded within the Order Limits have been assessed against the UK Priority Pond criteria (as set out in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and adopted under UKHab guidance). These features are small, artificial field drainage ponds of limited ecological value; therefore, ponds have been reasonably entered as *Ponds (non-priority)* area habitats within the Metric. Should further evidence from monitoring or additional surveys demonstrate that any pond supports priority species or assemblages, the assessment will be updated, and the feature reclassified accordingly. Ponds are not anticipated to be directly impacted by the Proposed Development and are to be retained in the post-development scenario. Water quality is likely to improve from the reduced agricultural chemical inputs in the surrounding area habitats as arable is converted to permanent grassland. The following reasons are provided for this assessment of ponds as a non-priority status:

- The ponds are not known to support any Annex II species of the Habitats Directive, based on desk study data and survey findings;
- The ponds are not known to support significant assemblages of aquatic plants or invertebrates, nor species of conservation concern; and
- The ponds do not meet other priority pond criteria such as designation (SSSI, SAC) or are likely to have exceptional species richness.

Strategic Significance

~~2.5.14~~2.5.23 The Local Plan for East Riding refers to the Local BAP (Ref. 5) for defining habitats that have importance within the Local Authority boundary within Section 8.69. The Local BAP refers to priority habitats of

particular importance to the area in *Table 7: UK BAP Priority Habitats in the East Riding of Yorkshire.*

~~2.5.15~~2.5.24 This formally mentions the following habitats which have been used to inform the allocation of 'High' strategic significance in this BNG calculation:

- Rivers;
- Ponds (non-priority habitat);
- Temporary ponds and scrapes;
- Arable field margins;
- Hedgerows;
- Lowland mixed deciduous woodland; and
- Coastal and flood plain grazing marsh.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Overview

3.1.1 To calculate the overall biodiversity accounting position for the Proposed Development, the BU values for the existing habitats (pre-development) and the proposed newly created/enhanced habitats (post-development) were calculated.

3.1.2 The results of this assessment are summarised in **Appendix A**, with the habitat condition sheets presented in **Appendix B** (pre-development). **Appendix C** contains the full Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculations and is presented separately.

3.2 Pre-development

3.2.1 The habitats within the Order Limits total 902.50ha, (but see section 2.5.12 above) with the addition of an enhancement area (E16a) under the assumptions laid out in **Section 2.5.** The Site predominantly comprised areas of cropland and grassland of limited ecological value. The cropland included areas of horticulture, cereal crops, non-cereal crops, temporary grass and clover leys and arable field margins. Grassland areas include *Modified grassland* and *Other neutral grassland*. Scrub habitats on-site include *Blackthorn scrub, Bramble scrub, Hawthorn scrub* and *Mixed scrub.* Woodland habitats are present onsite, such as *Other coniferous woodland, Other broadleaved woodland* and, notably, *Lowland mixed deciduous woodland*. These area habitats are bordered by a network of hedgerows, ditches and watercourses throughout the Site, reflective of agricultural land use.

3.2.2 The UKHab Plan (**Figure 2**) has been used to determine all the habitats present within the Site before construction.

Area habitats

3.2.3 The total area of each area habitat recorded within the Order Limits before construction, the condition of each habitat (i.e. its current status) and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 3** below.

Table 3 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each habitat recorded within the Order Limits before construction

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Area (ha)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Annuals horticulture	Condition assessment N/A	24.096	48.19
Arable field margins - cultivated annually	Condition assessment N/A	4.831	22.22
Arable field margins - game bird mix	Condition assessment N/A	1.217	5.60
Arable field margins - pollen and nectar	Condition assessment N/A	3.336	15.35
Arable field margins - tussocky	Condition assessment N/A	0.419	1.93
Blackthorn scrub	Good	0.013	0.16
Bramble scrub	Condition assessment N/A	0.929	3.72
Other cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	399.651	799.3
Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	15.518	0.00
Hawthorn scrub	Moderate	1.891	15.13
Hawthorn scrub	Poor	1.042	4.17
Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Moderate	0.767	10.58
Mixed scrub	Good	0.407	4.88
Mixed scrub	Moderate	2.040	16.32
Mixed scrub	Poor	1.172	4.69
Modified grassland	Good	26.066	156.41

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Area (ha)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Modified grassland	Poor	104.105	208.22
Non-cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	205.691	411.38
Other coniferous woodland	Good	0.127	0.76
Other neutral grassland	Good (assumed)	0.027	0.32
Other neutral grassland	Good	5.083	61.00
Other neutral grassland	Moderate	8.523	68.18
Other neutral grassland	Poor	22.323	89.30
Other neutral grassland (Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh)	Moderate	36.51	503.84
Other woodland; broadleaved	Good	1.991	23.89
Other woodland; broadleaved	Moderate	1.017	8.14
Other woodland; broadleaved	Poor	1.698	6.79
Other woodland; mixed	Moderate	1.197	9.58
Other woodland; mixed	Poor	2.376	9.50
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Good (assumed)	0.827	9.92
Rye-grass and clover ley	Condition assessment N/A	23.979	55.15
Rural tree	Good	3.350	40.20
Rural tree	Moderate	0.370	2.96
Rural tree	Poor	0.070	0.28

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Area (ha)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Rural tree (veteran trees)	Good	0.230	0.00
Rural tree	Good	0.380	4.56
Rural tree	Moderate	0.040	0.32
Vacant or derelict land	Moderate	0.306	1.22
Watercourse footprint	N/A - Other	3.329	0.00
Total	**Area with *Rural trees***	**906.94**	**2,624.14**
	Area without *Rural trees*	**902.50**	**-**

3.2.4 The total area of each existing habitat that will be lost, retained or enhanced within the Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 4** below.

Table 4 – Extent of baseline area habitats being lost, retained and enhanced within the Order Limits along with their associated biodiversity unit values

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Area lost (ha)	Areas retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) lost	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Annuals horticulture	Condition assessment N/A	6.86	17.235	-	13.72	34.47	-
Arable field margins - cultivated annually	Condition assessment N/A	1.94	2.892	-	8.92	13.30	-
Arable field margins - game bird mix	Condition assessment N/A	1.22	-	-	5.60	-	-
Arable field margins - pollen and nectar	Condition assessment N/A	3.33	0.004	-	15.33	0.02	-
Arable field margins - tussocky	Condition assessment N/A	-	0.419	-	-	1.93	-
Blackthorn scrub	Good	-	0.013	-	-	0.16	-
Bramble scrub	Condition assessment N/A	0.29	0.727	-	1.17	2.91	-
Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	2.51	13.386	-	-	-	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Area lost (ha)	Areas retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) lost	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Hawthorn scrub	Moderate	1.89	0.022	-	15.11	0.18	-
Hawthorn scrub	Poor	-	1.042	-	-	4.17	-
Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Moderate	-	0.767	-	-	10.58	-
Mixed scrub	Good	0.18	1.596	-	2.17	19.15	-
Mixed scrub	Moderate	1.98	0.073	-	15.82	0.58	-
Mixed scrub	Poor	0.15	1.057	-	0.58	4.23	-
Modified grassland	Good	3.29	22.44	0.341	19.71	134.64	2.05
Modified grassland	Poor	0.00	29.903	74.20	0.00	59.81	148.40
Non-cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	164.94	40.751	-	329.88	81.50	-
Other cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	387.445	12.206	-	774.89	24.41	-
Other coniferous woodland	Good	-	0.127	-	-	0.76	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Area lost (ha)	Areas retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) lost	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Other neutral grassland	Good (assumed)	-	0.027	-	-	0.32	-
Other neutral grassland	Good	2.71	2.514	-	32.51	30.17	-
Other neutral grassland	Moderate	-	8.75	1.163	-	70.00	9.30
Other neutral grassland	Poor	0.55	13.583	8.366	2.22	54.33	33.47
Other neutral grassland (Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh)	Moderate (assumed)	-	51.44	-	-	709.87	-
Other woodland; broadleaved	Good	-	1.991	-	-	23.89	-
Other woodland; broadleaved	Moderate	-	1.017	-	-	8.14	-
Other woodland; broadleaved	Poor	-	1.698	-	-	6.79	-
Other woodland; mixed	Moderate	-	1.197	-	-	9.58	-
Other woodland; mixed	Poor	-	2.376	-	-	9.50	-
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Good (assumed)	-	1.257	-	-	15.08	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Area lost (ha)	Areas retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) lost	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Rye-grass and clover ley	Condition assessment N/A	22.09	1.886	-	50.81	4.34	-
Rural tree	Good	-	3.35	-	-	40.20	-
Rural tree	Moderate	-	0.37	-	-	2.96	-
Rural tree	Poor	-	0.07	-	-	0.28	-
Rural tree – irreplaceable habitat	Good	-	0.23	-	-	-	-
Rural tree	Good	-	0.38	-	-	4.56	-
Rural tree	Moderate	-	0.04	-	-	0.32	-
Vacant or derelict land	Moderate	-	0.306	-	-	1.22	-
Watercourse footprint	N/A - Other	-	3.329	-	-	-	-
	Total	**601.32**	**221.55**	**84.07**	**1,286.52**	**1,144.40**	**193.22**

Hedgerows

3.2.5 The total length of each hedgerow recorded within the Order Limits before construction, the condition of each habitat (i.e. its current status) and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 5** below.

Table 5 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each hedgerow recorded within Order Limits before construction

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Length (km)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Ecologically valuable line of trees	Moderate	0.571	4.57
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Good	0.476	5.71
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	0.523	4.18
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	0.506	1.01
Native hedgerow	Good	5.138	35.45
Native hedgerow	Moderate	9.050	41.63
Native hedgerow	Poor	0.477	1.10
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Good	4.878	67.32
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	1.081	9.95
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	1.793	8.25
Native hedgerow with trees	Good	1.273	17.57
Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	7.388	67.97
Native hedgerow with trees	Poor	0.923	4.25

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Length (km)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Good	0.523	10.83
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	1.865	25.74
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	0.160	1.10
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	Poor	0.134	0.15
Species-rich native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Good	2.708	56.06
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	2.263	31.23
	Total	41.7339.65	378.58394.05

3.2.6 The total length of each existing hedgerow section that will be lost, retained or enhanced within the Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 6** below:

Table 6 – Extent of baseline hedgerows being lost, retained and enhanced within Order Limits along with their associated biodiversity unit values

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Ecologically valuable line of trees	Moderate	-	0.571	-	-	4.57	-
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Good	0.476	-	-	5.71	-	-
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	-	0.523	-	-	4.18	-
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	-	0.506	-	-	1.01	-
Native hedgerow	Good	1.96	3.18	-	13.51	21.94	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Native hedgerow	Moderate	-	9.05	-	-	41.63	-
Native hedgerow	Poor	0.02	0.454	-	0.05	1.04	-
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Good	1.11	3.772	-	15.26	52.05	-
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	-	1.081	-	-	9.95	-
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	0.45	1.343	-	2.07	6.18	-
Native hedgerow with trees	Good	0.001	1.272	-	0.01	17.55	-
Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	1.48	5.909	-	13.61	54.36	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Native hedgerow with trees	Poor	-	0.923	-	-	4.25	-
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Good	-	0.523	-	-	10.83	-
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	0.36	1.501	-	5.02	20.71	-
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	-	0.16	-	-	1.10	-
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	Poor	-	0.134	-	-	0.15	-

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Species-rich native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	Good	0.50	2.209	-	10.33	45.73	-
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	-	2.263	-	-	31.23	-
Total		**5.88**	**33.77**	**-**	**59.87**	**318.71**	**-**

Watercourses

3.2.7 The total length of each watercourse recorded within the Order Limits before construction, the condition of each habitat (i.e. its current status) and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 7** below.

Table 7 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each watercourse recorded within Order Limits before construction

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Length (km)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Ditches	Good	6.26	51.08
Ditches	Moderate	3.311	18.01
Ditches	Poor	12.107	32.93
Other rivers and streams	Good (assumed)	3.182	~~38.95~~54.41
Other rivers and streams	Moderate	9.036	85.88~~73.73~~
	Total	**33.90**	**242~~14~~.31~~71~~**

3.2.8 The total length of each existing watercourse that will be lost, retained or enhanced within the Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in **Table 8** below.

Table 8 – Extent of baseline watercourse being lost, retained and enhanced within Order Limits along with their associated biodiversity unit values

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Ditches	Good	0.07	4.19	2.00	0.57	34.19	16.32
Ditches	Moderate	0.01	2.01	1.291	0.05	10.93	7.02
Ditches	Poor	0.06	9.05	3.00	0.10	24.61	8.16
Other rivers and streams	Good (assumed)	-	3.18	-	-	38.95	-
Other rivers and streams	Moderate	0.06	8.576	0.40	0.49	79.98	3.26
Total		**0.20**	**27.01**	**6.69**	**1.28**	**178.66**	**34.77**

3.3 Post-development

3.3.1 **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** has been used to identify all the habitats which are proposed to be created, enhanced or retained within the Order Limits after construction. There are no proposed biodiversity offsets off-site for the Proposed Development. A Proposed Development UK Habitat Classification Plan is provided in **Figure 3**.

Area habitats

3.3.2 A breakdown of areas for each proposed area habitat created or enhanced post-development within Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents are presented in **Table 9**.

Table 9 – Post-development area habitat biodiversity unit values within the Order Limits based on the current design

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Retained	Annuals horticulture	Condition assessment N/A	17.235	34.47
	Arable field margins - cultivated annually	Condition assessment N/A	2.892	13.30
	Arable field margins - pollen and nectar	Condition assessment N/A	0.004	0.02
	Arable field margins - tussocky	Condition assessment N/A	0.419	1.93
	Blackthorn scrub	Good	0.013	0.16
	Bramble scrub	Condition assessment N/A	0.637	2.55
	Developed land; sealed surface	Condition assessment N/A	13.006	0.00
	Hawthorn scrub	Moderate	0.002	0.02
	Hawthorn scrub	Poor	1.042	4.17

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Moderate	0.767	10.58
	Mixed scrub	Good	0.407	4.88
	Mixed scrub	Moderate	0.063	0.50
	Mixed scrub	Poor	1.027	4.11
	Modified grassland	Good	22.44	134.64
	Modified grassland	Poor	29.903	59.81
	Non-cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	40.621	81.24
	Other cereal crops	Condition assessment N/A	12.206	24.41
	Other coniferous woodland	Good	0.127	0.76
	Other neutral grassland	Good	2.374	28.49
	Other neutral grassland	Good (assumed)	0.027	0.32
	Other neutral grassland	Moderate	7.36	58.88
	Other neutral grassland	Poor	13.403	53.61
	Other neutral grassland (Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh)	Moderate (assumed)	36.51	503.84
	Other woodland; broadleaved	Good	1.991	23.89
	Other woodland; broadleaved	Moderate	1.017	8.14
	Other woodland; broadleaved	Poor	1.698	6.79
	Other woodland; mixed	Moderate	1.197	9.58

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
	Other woodland; mixed	Poor	2.376	9.50
	Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Good (assumed)	0.827	9.92
	Rye-grass and clover ley	Condition assessment N/A	1.886	4.34
	Rural tree	Good	3.73	44.76
	Rural tree	Moderate	0.41	3.28
	Rural tree	Poor	0.07	0.28
	Rural tree – irreplaceable habitat	Good	0.23	0.00
	Vacant or derelict land	Condition assessment N/A	0.306	1.22
	Watercourse footprint	Condition assessment N/A	3.329	0.00
		Total retained	**221.55**	**1,144.40**
Enhanced	Modified grassland	Good	11.856	93.75
	Modified grassland	Moderate	11.529	71.50
	Modified grassland	Poor	51.158	201.05
	Other neutral grassland	Good	4.565	42.12
	Other neutral grassland	Moderate	4.964	33.76
		Total enhanced	**84.07**	**442.18**
Created	Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	35.993	0.00
	Hawthorn scrub	Moderate	1.889	12.20~~65~~
	Mixed scrub	Moderate	3.494~~0.363~~	23.30~~2.43~~

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
	Other neutral grassland	Good	102.098	857.97
	Other neutral grassland	Moderate	15.62	104.57
	Other neutral grassland	Poor	430.175	1602.36
	Other woodland; mixed	Poor	1.020	3.41
	Arable field margins game bird mix	Condition Assessment N/A	1.243	4.80
	Arable field margins pollen and nectar	Condition Assessment N/A	7.000	27.02
	Ponds (non-priority)~~Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)~~[4]	~~Good~~Moderate	2.790	2332.0738
		Total created	**601.32**	**265873.7090**

3.3.3 A breakdown of the total areas and BU values of retained area habitats within Order Limits are detailed in Table 9.

3.3.4 The post-development biodiversity accounting calculations for area habitats have been undertaken based off **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** and the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**.

3.3.5 The planting schedules and seed mixes for each newly created and enhanced area habitat are detailed in and secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**.

Hedgerows

3.3.6 A breakdown of lengths for each proposed hedgerow created or enhanced post-development within Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents are presented in **Table 10**.

Table 10 – Post-development hedgerow biodiversity unit values within the Order Limits based on the current design

[4] This refers to scrapes that will be created as part of the mitigation for wintering birds.

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Retained	Ecologically valuable line of trees	Moderate	0.571	4.57
	Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	0.523	4.18
	Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Poor	0.506	1.01
	Native hedgerow	Good	3.180	21.94
	Native hedgerow	Moderate	9.05	41.63
	Native hedgerow	Poor	0.454	1.04
	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	Good	3.772	52.05
	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	1.081	9.95
	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	Poor	1.343	6.18
	Native hedgerow with trees	Good	1.272	17.55
	Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	5.909	54.36
	Native hedgerow with trees	Poor	0.923	4.25
	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	Good	0.523	10.83
	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	1.501	20.71

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	Poor	0.16	1.10
	Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	Poor	0.134	0.15
	Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	Good	2.209	45.73
	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	2.263	31.23
		Total retained	**~~33.77~~35.85**	**~~318.71~~334.18**
Created	Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	Moderate	0.476	1.80
	Species-rich native hedgerow	Good	19.580~~21.561~~	17~~694~~.2~~103~~
		Moderate	1.981	14.72
	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	~~Good~~Moderate	1.480	18.40~~20.03~~
	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	~~Good~~Moderate	1.479	13.79~~5.01~~
	Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	~~Good~~Moderate	0.499	~~6.74~~5.56
		Total created	**25.5002**	**230.48~~35.81~~**

3.3.7 The total lengths and BU values of retained hedgerows within the Order Limits are detailed in **Table 10**.

3.3.8 The post-development biodiversity accounting calculations for hedgerows have been undertaken using the following assumptions based off **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** and the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]**:

- The Enhanced hedgerows will be subject to relaxed management (reducing the extent and frequency of flailing) and additional planting with native trees and shrubs to change them from *Native hedgerows* to *Native hedgerows with trees* with an increased condition score.
- New hedgerows will be planted with species-rich native stock including disease resistant elm and buckthorn and managed in according with the enhanced hedgerows. Based on the species that will be planted, the onsite conditions and the management prescriptions, these have been entered into the Defra Metric as *Species-rich native hedgerow* in 'Good' condition.

3.3.9 The full details are included in and secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** for the retained, created and enhanced habitats within the post-development Order Limits.

Watercourses

3.3.10 A breakdown of lengths for each proposed watercourse created or enhanced post-development within the Order Limits and a summary of the BUs this represents are presented in **Table 11**.

Table 11 – Post-development watercourse biodiversity unit values within the Order Limits based on the current design

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Retained	Ditches	Good	4.19	34.19
	Ditches	Moderate	2.01	10.93
	Ditches	Poor	9.047	24.61
	Other rivers and streams	Good (assumed)	3.182	~~38.95~~54.41
	Other rivers and streams	Moderate	8.576	~~69.98~~82.06
Total retained			**27.01**	**~~206.20~~178.66**
Enhanced	Ditches	Good	3.291	36.87
	Ditches	Moderate	3.00	21.29

Habitat type		Forecast habitat condition	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
	Other rivers and streams	Moderate	0.40	4.56
Total enhanced			**6.69**	**62.71**
Created	Culvert	Poor	0.20	0.18
Total created			**0.20**	**0.18**

3.3.11 The total lengths and BU values of retained watercourses within the Order Limits are detailed in **Table 11**.

3.3.12 The post-development biodiversity accounting calculations for watercourses have been undertaken using the **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** and the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** as well as **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.3: Indicative HDD Crossing Points [EN010157/APP/6.3]** and **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.6 Indicative Culvert Crossing Points [EN010157/APP/6.3]**.

3.3.13 Enhancements will come from the reduction in riparian encroachment in the post-development scenario, as well as planting of aquatic marginal vegetation where appropriate.

3.3.14 The full details are detailed in and secured by the **Outline LEMP [EN010157/APP/7.5]** for the retained, created and enhanced habitats within the Order Limits.

3.4 Change in Biodiversity Value

3.4.1 The habitat creation and enhancement proposals as per **ES Volume 3, Figure 3.4: Indicative Environmental Masterplan [EN010157/APP/6.3]** are anticipated to result in a net increase of area habitat, hedgerow and watercourse BUs, and is presented in **Figure 3**. This is summarised in **Table 12**.

Table 12 – Change in biodiversity units because of the Proposed Development

Post-development area habitat biodiversity units (BU)		Baseline area habitat area biodiversity units (BU)		Change in area habitat biodiversity units (BU)	Percentage change (%)
42456~~0~~.284~~8~~	-	2624.14	=	16213~~6~~.153~~4~~	61~~2~~.783~~6~~

Post-development hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)		Baseline hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)		Change in hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)	Percentage change (%)
558.954.52	-	394.05578.58	=	164.9075.95	41.856.48
Post-development watercourse biodiversity units (BU)		**Baseline watercourse biodiversity units (BU)**		**Change in watercourse biodiversity units (BU)**	**Percentage change (%)**
266.6841.55	-	242.3114.71	=	24.376.84	10.062.50

3.4.2 The change in biodiversity value for the Proposed Development, as set out in **Table 12**, indicates that post-development:

- there would be an increase of **16213615334** area habitat BUs which equates to an **61.782.36%** net gain in area habitats. The trading rules associated with the Metric have been met for area habitats, under the assumptions outlined in **Section 2.5**.
- there would also be an increase of **164.9075.95** hedgerow BUs which equates to an **4168.8548%** net gain in hedgerows. The trading rules associated with the Metric have been met for hedgerows as a result of the Proposed Development.
- there would also be an increase of **24.37 6.84** watercourse BUs which equates to a **10.0612.50%** net gain in watercourses. The trading rules associated with the Metric have been met for watercourses as a result of the Proposed Development.

REFERENCES

Ref. 1 - Butcher, B. et al (2023) *UK Habitat Classification v2.01* Available: https://ukhab.org/.

Ref. 2 –The Environment Act (2021). Available online: Environment Act 2021.

Ref. 3 – Overarching National Policy Statement of Energy (EN-1) available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1

Ref. 4 - East Riding of Yorkshire Council (2012) *East Riding Local Plan 2012 – 2029, Strategy Document, Adopted 2016.* Available: https://www.eastriding.gov.uk/planning-permission-and-building-control/biodiversity-net-gain-bng/ [Accessed 05 September 2024].

Ref. 5 - East Riding of Yorkshire Council (2010*) East Riding of Yorkshire BAP Strategy*. Available: Microsoft Word - 10-07-12 ERYBAP Intro Strat_3.0_DR.doc. [Accessed 05 September 2024].

Ref. 6 - Nature Improvement Areas outlined on the Defra: 'Magic' Interactive Map. Available: Magic Map Application.

Ref. 7 - Gurnell, A., England, J., Scott, S. and Shuker, L., (2022). *A Guide to Assessing River Condition Part of the Rivers and Streams Component of the Biodiversity Net Gain Metric.*

Ref. 8 - CIEEM (2021) *Biodiversity Net Gain Report & Audit Templates* Available*:* CIEEM-BNG-Report-and-Audit-templates2.pdf.

Ref. 9 - British Standard Institute (2021) *BS 8683: Process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain – Specification* Available: https://www.bsigroup.com/en-GB/our-services/events/webinars/2021/bs-8683-process-for-designing-and-implementing-biodiversity-net-gain/

Ref. 10 - CIEEM/CIRIA/IEMA (2016) *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good practice principles for development* Available: Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf (cieem.net).

Ref. 11 - Defra (2023) *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric* Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides.

Ref. 12 - Lawton, J. et al (2010) *'Making space for nature': a review of England's wildlife sites published today* Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/making-space-for-nature-a-review-of-englands-wildlife-sites-published-today.

Ref. 13 - Building Research Establishment (BRE) (2014). *Biodiversity Guidance for Solar Developments*.

Ref. 14 - Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside Interactive mapping tool run by Natural England. Available at: https://magic.defra.gov.uk/

FIGURES

APPENDIX A – BNG ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Please note that the full, detailed BNG calculations are provided within **Appendix C** – Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculations.

Peartree Hill Solar Farm			
Headline Results	Return to results menu		
Scroll down for final results ⚠			
On-site baseline	*Habitat units*	2624.14	
	Hedgerow units	378.58	
	Watercourse units	214.71	
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	4260.48	
	Hedgerow units	554.52	
	Watercourse units	241.55	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	*Habitat units*	1636.34	62.36%
	Hedgerow units	175.95	46.48%
	Watercourse units	26.84	12.50%
Off-site baseline	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	*Habitat units*	0.00	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Combined net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	1636.34	
	Hedgerow units	175.95	
	Watercourse units	26.84	
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
FINAL RESULTS			
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	1636.34	
	Hedgerow units	175.95	
	Watercourse units	26.84	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	62.36%	
	Hedgerow units	46.48%	
	Watercourse units	12.50%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓		

Pre-construction calculations

Area Habitats

Project Name: Peartree Hill Solar Farm Map Reference: Please see A-1 On-Site Habitat Baseline

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	1635.59
Total Net % Change	62.33%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Please ensure the watercourse details for any watercourse footprints recorded are included in the watercourse tabs ⚠

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
1	Cropland	Horticulture	No	24.096	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	48.19	17.235		34.47	0.00	6.86	13.72
2	Cropland	Arable field margins cultivated annually	No	4.831	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	22.22	2.892		13.30	0.00	1.94	8.92
3	Cropland	Arable field margins game bird mix	No	1.217	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	5.60			0.00	0.00	1.22	5.60
4	Cropland	Arable field margins pollen and nectar	No	3.336	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	15.35	0.004		0.02	0.00	3.33	15.33
5	Cropland	Arable field margins tussocky	No	0.419	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	1.93	0.419		1.93	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	Heathland and shrub	Blackthorn scrub	No	0.013	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	0.16	0.013		0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Heathland and shrub	Bramble scrub	No	0.323	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (>)	3.72	0.637		2.55	0.00	0.29	1.17
8	Cropland	Cereal crops	No	392.812	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	785.62	12.206		24.41	0.00	380.61	761.21

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
9	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	No	15.518	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	13.006		0.00	0.00	2.51	0.00
10	Heathland and shrub	Hawthorn scrub	No	1.891	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 (≥)	15.13	0.002		0.02	0.00	1.89	15.11
11	Heathland and shrub	Hawthorn scrub	No	1.042	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 required (≥)	4.17	1.042		4.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
12	Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	No	0.767	High	6	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same habitat required =	10.58	0.767		10.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	No	0.407	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	4.88	0.407		4.88	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	No	2.04	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 (≥)	16.32	0.063		0.50	0.00	1.38	15.82
15	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	No	1.172	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 required (≥)	4.69	1.027		4.11	0.00	0.15	0.58
16	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	0.341	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	2.05		0.341	0.00	2.05	0.00	0.00
17	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	0.211	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	1.27			0.00	0.00	0.21	1.27
18	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	2.913	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	17.48			0.00	0.00	2.91	17.48
19	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	22.601	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	135.61	22.44		134.64	0.00	0.16	0.97

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
20	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	11.515	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	23.03		11.515	0.00	23.03	0.00	0.00
21	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	11.529	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	23.06		11.529	0.00	23.06	0.00	0.00
22	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	51.158	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	102.32		51.158	0.00	102.32	0.00	0.00
23	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	0.213	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.43	0.213		0.43	0.00	0.00	0.00

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
24	Cropland	Non-cereal crops	No	205.691	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	411.38	40.621		81.24	0.00	165.07	330.14
25	Woodland and forest	Other coniferous woodland	No	0.127	Low	2	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.76	0.127		0.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
26	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	5.083	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	61.00	2.374		28.43	0.00	2.71	32.51
27	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	0.027	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.32	0.027		0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
28	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	8.523	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 (≥)	68.18	7.36	1.163	58.88	9.30	0.00	0.00
29	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	3.402	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 required (≥)	13.61		3.402	0.00	13.61	0.00	0.00
30	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	4.964	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 required (≥)	19.86		4.964	0.00	19.86	0.00	0.00

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
31	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	No	13.957	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 required (≥)	55.83	13.403		53.61	0.00	0.55	2.22
32	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	No	1.991	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	23.89	1.991		23.89	0.00	0.00	0.00
33	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	No	1.017	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 (≥)	8.14	1.017		8.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
34	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	No	1.698	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 required (≥)	6.79	1.698		6.79	0.00	0.00	0.00
35	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	No	1.197	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 (≥)	9.58	1.197		9.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
36	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	No	2.376	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 required (≥)	9.50	2.376		9.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
37	Lakes	Ponds (non-priority habitat)	No	0.827	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	9.92	0.827		9.92	0.00	0.00	0.00
38	Cropland	Temporary grass and clover leys	No	23.373	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	55.15	1.886		4.34	0.00	22.09	50.81
39	Urban	Vacant or derelict land	No	0.306	Low	2	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	1.22	0.306		1.22	0.00	0.00	0.00
40	Cropland	Cereal crops	No	6.833	Low	2	Condition	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic	1	Same distinctiveness or better	13.68			0.00	0.00	6.84	13.68
41	Individual trees	Rural tree	Yes	0.23	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Bespoke compensation likely to be required	0.00	0.23		Irreplaceable habitat - no units generated ⚠	0.00	0.00	0.00
42	Individual trees	Rural tree	No	0.38	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	4.56	0.38		4.56	0.00	0.00	0.00
43	Individual trees	Rural tree	No	0.04	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 (≥)	0.32	0.04		0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
44	Individual trees	Rural tree	No	3.35	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	40.20	3.35		40.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
45	Individual trees	Rural tree	No	0.37	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 (≥)	2.96	0.37		2.96	0.00	0.00	0.00
46	Individual trees	Rural tree	No	0.07	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 required (≥)	0.28	0.07		0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost
47	Grassland	Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM	No	36.51	High	6	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same habitat required =	503.84	36.51		503.84	0.00	0.00	0.00
48	Watercourse footprint	Watercourse footprint	No	3.329	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	3.329		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
49	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	29.69	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	59.38	29.69		59.38	0.00	0.00	0.00
50																			
51																			
52																			
53																			
54																			
			Total habitat area	306.34									2624.14	221.55	84.07	1144.40	133.22	601.32	1286.52
			Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard	302.50															

Total area lost (excluding area of individual trees, green walls and intertidal hard structures)	601.32

Hedgerows

ɬree Hill Solar Farm Map Reference: Please see Figures relatin

B-1 On-Site Hedge Baseline

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Hedgerow summary	
Total Net Unit Change	175.95
Total Net % Change	46.48%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

	Existing hedgerow habitats			Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Hedge number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier		Total hedgerow units	Length retained	Length enhanced	Units retained	Units enhanced	Length lost	Units lost
1	RSK_04	Native hedgerow	5.138	Low	2	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	35.45	3.18		21.94	0.00	1.96	13.51
2	RSK_03	Native hedgerow	9.05	Low	2	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	41.63	9.05		41.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	RSK_06	Native hedgerow	0.477	Low	2	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.10	0.454		1.04	0.00	0.02	0.05
4	RSK_23	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	4.878	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	67.32	3.772		52.05	0.00	1.11	15.26
5	RSK_22	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	1.081	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	9.95	1.081		9.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	RSK_24, RSK_11	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	1.793	Medium	4	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	8.25	1.343		6.18	0.00	0.45	2.07
7	RSK_18	Native hedgerow with trees	1.273	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	17.57	1.272		17.55	0.00	0.00	0.01
8	RSK_17	Native hedgerow with trees	7.388	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	67.97	5.909		54.36	0.00	1.48	13.61
9	RSK_19	Native hedgerow with trees	0.923	Medium	4	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	4.25	0.923		4.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	RSK_27	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.523	High	6	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Like for like or better	10.83	0.523		10.83	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	RSK_26	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	1.865	High	6	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Like for like or better	25.74	1.501		20.71	0.00	0.36	5.02
12	RSK_29	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.16	High	6	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Like for like or better	1.10	0.16		1.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
13	RSK_13	Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.134	V.Low	1	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.15	0.134		0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00
14	RSK_09, RSK_14	Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	2.708	High	6	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Like for like or better	56.06	2.209		45.73	0.00	0.50	10.33
15	RSK_20	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	2.263	High	6	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Like for like or better	31.23	2.263		31.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
16																		
17																		
18																		
			39.65									378.58	33.77	0.00	318.71	0.00	5.88	59.87

Watercourses

Project Name: Map Reference:

C-1 On-Site WaterC' Baseline

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Watercourse summary	
Total Net Unit Change	26.84
Total Net % Change	12.50%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

	Existing watercourse type		Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Watercourse encroachment		Riparian encroachment		Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline						
Ref	Watercourse type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Extent of encroachment	Multiplier	Extent of encroachment for both banks	Multiplier		Total watercourse units	Length retained	Length enhanced	Units retained	Units enhanced	Length Lost	Units Lost
5	Other rivers and streams	1.739	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	14.19	1.729		14.11	0.00	0.01	0.08
6	Other rivers and streams	0.96	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	7.83	0.96		7.83	0.00	0.00	0.00
7	Other rivers and streams	0.708	High	6	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	8.67	0.708		8.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	Other rivers and streams	3.748	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	30.58	3.728		30.42	0.00	0.02	0.16
9	Other rivers and streams	0.943	High	6	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	11.54	0.943		11.54	0.00	0.00	0.00
10	Other rivers and streams	0.182	High	6	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	2.23	0.182		2.23	0.00	0.00	0.00
11	Other rivers and streams	1.349	High	6	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Minor	0.8	Moderate/ Moderate	0.85	Same habitat required =	16.51	1.349		16.51	0.00	0.00	0.00
12																					
13																					
14																					
15																					
16																					
		33.30													214.71	27.01	6.63	178.66	34.77	0.20	1.28

Post development calculations

Area Habitats

ct Name: Peartree Hill Solar Farm Map Reference: Please see Figures relating to Appendi

A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	1636.34
Total Net % Change	62.36%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓
Area Check	Area Acceptable ✓

				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Post intervention habitats: Temporal multiplier						Difficulty multipliers				
Ref	Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard time to target condition (years)	Habitat created in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat creation (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Habitat units delivered
1	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	16.049	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	0	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	0	1.000	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.00
2	Heathland and shrub	Hawthorn scrub	1.889	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	5	0.837	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	12.65
3	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.391	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	0.700	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	3.29
4	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.363	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	5	0.837	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	2.43
5	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	97.618	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	0.700	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	820.32
6	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	15.62	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	5	0.837	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	104.57
7	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	430.175	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	2	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	2	0.931	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	1602.36
8	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	19.944	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	0	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	0	1.000	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.00
9	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	4.48	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	0.700	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	37.63
10	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	2.74	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	0.700	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	23.03

ct Name: Peartree Hill Solar Farm Map Reference: Please see Figures relating to Appendi

A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	1636.34
Total Net % Change	62.36%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓
Area Check	Area Acceptable ✓

				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Post intervention habitats										
											Temporal multiplier						Difficulty multipliers				
Ref	Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard time to target condition (years)	Habitat created in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat creation (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Habitat units delivered
11	Cropland	Arable field margins game bird mix	1.243	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	4.80
12	Cropland	Arable field margins pollen and nectar	7	Medium	4	Condition Assessment N/A	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	27.02
13	Lakes	Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)	2.79	High	6	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	5	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	5	0.837	Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	32.38
14	Woodland and forest	Other woodland; mixed	1.02	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	5	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	5	0.837	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	3.41
15																					
16																					
17																					
18																					
19																					
		Total habitat area	601.32																	Total Units	2673.90

Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard structures)	601.32

M² to hectares conversion tool:	Select a unit	Hectares	M²

	Baseline habitats									Proposed Habitat (Broad habitat pre-populated but can be overridden)	
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Total habitat area (hectares)	Baseline distinctiveness band	Baseline distinctiveness score	Baseline condition category	Baseline condition score	Baseline strategic significance category	Baseline strategic significance score	Baseline habitat units	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat
16	Grassland - Modified grassland	0.341	Low	2	Good	3	Low Strategic Significance	1	2.05	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
20	Grassland - Modified grassland	11.515	Low	2	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	23.03	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
21	Grassland - Modified grassland	11.529	Low	2	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	23.06	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
22	Grassland - Modified grassland	51.158	Low	2	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	102.32	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
28	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	8.523	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Low Strategic Significance	1	68.18	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
29	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	3.402	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	13.61	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	Grassland	Other neutral grassland
30	Grassland - Other neutral grassland	4.964	Medium	4	Poor	1	Low Strategic Significance	1	19.86	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	Grassland	Other neutral grassland

Post intervention habitats														
Change in distinctiveness and condition							Strategic significance			Temporal risk multiplier				
Distinctiveness change	Condition change	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard time to target condition (years)	Habitat enhanced in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat enhancement (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier
Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.341	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	15	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	15	
Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	11.515	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	15	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	15	
Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Moderate	11.589	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	
Low - Medium	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Poor	51.158	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	
Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	1.163	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	
Medium - Medium	Poor - Good	3.402	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	15	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	15	
Medium - Medium	Poor - Moderate	4.964	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	10	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	10	
	Total habitat area	84.07													

Difficulty risk multipliers				Habitat units delivered
Standard difficulty of enhancement	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of enhancement	Difficulty multiplier applied	
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	3.24
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	90.51
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	71.50
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	201.05
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	12.56
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	29.56
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	33.76
				442.18

Hedgerows

ne: Peartree Hill Solar Farm Map Reference: Please see Figures relating to Ap

B-2 On-Site Hedge Creation

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Hedgerow summary	
Total Net Unit Change	175.95
Total Net % Change	46.48%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

		Proposed habitats		Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Temporal multiplier					
Ref	New hedge number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard Time to target condition (years)	Habitat created in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat creation (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier
1	RSK_04	Species-rich native hedgerow	1.958	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	12	0.652
2	RSK_06	Species-rich native hedgerow	0.023	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	12	0.652
3	RSK_23	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	1.106	V.High	8	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	20	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	20	0.490
4	RSK_24	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.01	V.High	8	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	20	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	20	0.490
5	RSK_17	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	1.479	High	6	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	20	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	20	0.490
6	RSK_26	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.364	V.High	8	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	20	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	20	0.490
7	RSK_09, RSK_14	Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.499	High	6	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	12	0.652
8	New proposed hedgerows within the solar scheme	Species-rich native hedgerow	19.58	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	12	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	12	0.652
9																
10																
11																
12																
13																
			25.02													

Difficulty risk multipliers				Hedge units delivered
Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	17.62
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.21
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	14.97
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.14
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	15.01
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	4.93
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	6.74
Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	176.21
				235.81

Watercourses

Project Name: Map Reference:

C-2 On-Site WaterC' Creation

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Watercourse summary	
Total Net Unit Change	26.84
Total Net % Change	12.50%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

	Proposed habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Temporal multiplier					
Ref	Watercourse type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard Time to target condition (years)	Habitat created in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat creation (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final Time to target multiplier
1	Culvert	0.2	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965
2															
3															
4															
5															
6		0.20													

Difficulty multipliers				Watercourse encroachment		Riparian encroachment		Watercourse units delivered
Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Extent of encroachment	Multiplier	Extent of encroachment for both banks	Multiplier	
Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	N/A - Culvert	0.68	N/A - Culvert	1	0.18
								0.18

Project Name: Map Reference:

C-3 On-Site WaterC' Enhancement

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

	Baseline habitats										
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Length (km)	Baseline distinctiveness band	Baseline distinctiveness score	Baseline condition category	Baseline condition score	Baseline strategic significance category	Strategic significance	Baseline strategic significance Score	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Baseline habitat units
1	Ditches	6.26	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same habitat required =	51.0816
2	Ditches	3.311	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same habitat required =	18.01184
3	Ditches	12.107	Medium	4	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same habitat required =	32.93104
4	Other rivers and streams	2.589	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same habitat required =	21.12624

Watercourse summary	
Total Net Unit Change	26.84
Total Net % Change	12.50%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Post in

Proposed habitat	Change in distinctiveness and condition		Length (km)	Habitat distinctiveness		Habitat condition		Strategic significance		
	Distinctiveness movement	Condition movement		Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier
Ditches	Medium - Medium	Good - Good	2	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1
Ditches	Medium - Medium	Moderate - Good	1.291	Medium	4	Good	3	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1
Ditches	Medium - Medium	Poor - Moderate	3	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1
Other rivers and streams	High - High	Moderate - Moderate	0.4	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1
			6.69							

tervention habitats

Temporal multiplier						Difficulty multipliers				Watercourse encroachment		Riparian encroachment		Watercourse units delivered
Standard Time to target condition (years)	Habitat enhanced in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat enhancement (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final Time to target multiplier	Standard difficulty of enhancement	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of enhancement	Difficulty multiplier applied	Extent of encroachment	Multiplier	Extent of encroachment for both banks	Multiplier	
1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	No Encroachment	1	Minor/ Minor	0.95	22.80
4	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	4	0.867	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	No Encroachment	1	Minor/ Minor	0.95	14.07
4	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	4	0.867	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	No Encroachment	1	Minor/ Minor	0.95	21.29
1	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	1	0.965	Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	No Encroachment	1	Minor/ Minor	0.95	4.56
														62.71

APPENDIX B – PRE-DEVELOPMENT HABITAT CONDITION ASSESSMENTS

Modified Grassland

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: 6-8 species per m² including at least 2 forbs (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Scrub < 20%	Criteria D: Physical damage <5%	Criteria E: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria F: Bracken <20%	Criteria G: Invasive Non-native plant species absent
RSK_013	B	2.043	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_014	B	0.992	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_015	B	0.551	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_016	B	0.341	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_017	B	0.568	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_018	B	0.074	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_019	B	0.764	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_020	B, C	4.616	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_021	D	2.107	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_022	D	0.837	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_023	D	9.703	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_024	D	1.076	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_025	D	0.494	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_026	D, E	4.476	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_027	D, E	0.705	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_028	D	0.049	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_029	E	0.155	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_030	E	0.687	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: 6-8 species per m² including at least 2 forbs (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Scrub < 20%	Criteria D: Physical damage <5%	Criteria E: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria F: Bracken <20%	Criteria G: Invasive Non-native plant species absent
RSK_031	D	0.226	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_032	C	0.859	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_033	D	1.038	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_034	E, F	6.586	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_035	C	0.159	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_036	C	7.278	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_037	D	-7	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_038	C	0.236	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_039	E	7.597	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_040	Grid Connection, E	16.518	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_041	F	0.520	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_042	Grid Connection	30.231	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_043	Grid Connection	37.285	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_044	F	14.071	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_045	F	0.137	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_046	F	0.033	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_047	Grid Connection	0.013	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_048	Grid Connection	5.796	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_049	Grid Connection	0.205	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_251	B	0.185	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: 6-8 species per m² including at least 2 forbs (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Scrub < 20%	Criteria D: Physical damage <5%	Criteria E: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria F: Bracken <20%	Criteria G: Invasive Non-native plant species absent
RSK_252	D	0.073	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_253	C	3.536	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_254	E, F	1.738	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_255	F	-4	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_256	Grid Connection	0.351	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_257	Grid Connection	3.412	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_258	Grid Connection	16.768	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Other neutral grassland

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: Represent a good example of habitat with high proportion of indicators (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria D: Bracken <20% and scrub <5%	Criteria E: Sub optimal species cover and damaged ground <5%	Criteria F: >10 species per m² (essential for achieving good)
RSK_009	D	0.027	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_079	B	0.276	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_080	B	0.141	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_081	B	0.147	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_082	B	0.518	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_083	B, C	0.550	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_084	D	0.234	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_085	D	1.112	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_086	C	0.309	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_087	D	2.977	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_088	D	0.448	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_089	C	0.181	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_090	C	0.089	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_091	F	0.313	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_092	F	0.271	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_093	Grid Connection	0.079	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_094	Grid Connection	1.838	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_095	Grid Connection	0.221	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_096	Grid Connection	17.708	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: Represent a good example of habitat with high proportion of indicators (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria D: Bracken <20% and scrub <5%	Criteria E: Sub optimal species cover and damaged ground <5%	Criteria F: >10 species per m² (essential for achieving good)
RSK_097	Grid Connection	0.115	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_098	Grid Connection	0.038	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_140	B, D	3.952	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_141	D	2.234	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_142	D	0.557	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_143	C	1.458	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_144	D	0.464	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_145	D	0.091	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_146	D	0.027	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_147	E	0.703	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_148	D	0.137	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_149	D	0.030	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_150	C	1.027	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_151	D, E	0.101	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_152	D	0.050	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_153	D	1.093	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_154	E	0.271	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_155	D	0.667	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_156	E	0.260	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_157	C	0.218	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_158	C	-3	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_159	C	0.356	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_160	C	2.443	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_161	C	0.285	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: Represent a good example of habitat with high proportion of indicators (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria D: Bracken <20% and scrub <5%	Criteria E: Sub optimal species cover and damaged ground <5%	Criteria F: >10 species per m² (essential for achieving good)
RSK_162	F	0.131	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_163	F	3.136	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_164	Grid Connection, E	0.239	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_165	F	1.061	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_166	F	0.118	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_167	Grid Connection	0.122	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_168	Grid Connection	0.056	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_169	F	0.276	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_170	F	0.061	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_171	F	0.159	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_172	Grid Connection	-8	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_173	F	0.133	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_174	F	0.096	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_175	F	0.435	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_176	F	0.012	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_177	Grid Connection	0.075	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_178	Grid Connection	0.058	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_179	Grid Connection	0.020	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_180	Grid Connection	0.038	Poor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: Represent a good example of habitat with high proportion of indicators (essential for achieving good/moderate)	Criteria B: Sward height is varied	Criteria C: Bare ground 1-10%	Criteria D: Bracken <20% and scrub <5%	Criteria E: Sub optimal species cover and damaged ground <5%	Criteria F: >10 species per m^2 (essential for achieving good)
RSK_236	B	0.056	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_237	B	0.072	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_238	D	0.660	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_239	B	1.046	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_240	C	0.357	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_241	D	0.136	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_242	D	0.025	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_243	Grid Connection	0.142	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_244	F	0.165	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_245	Grid Connection	0.110	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_246	Grid Connection	1.925	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_247	Grid Connection	0.102	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_248	Grid Connection	0.164	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_249	Grid Connection	0.062	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_250	Grid Connection	0.249	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Mixed Scrub

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: The scrub is a good representation of the habitat type	Criteria B: Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present	Criteria C: Invasive non-native plant species absent, sub-optimal species <5%	Criteria D: The scrub has a well-developed edge	Criteria E: There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub
RSK_004	Grid Connection	0.878	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_067	C	0.027	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_068	C	0.014	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_069	C	0.055	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_070	C	0.036	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_071	C	0.035	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_072	F	0.060	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_073	F	0.064	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_074	F	0.209	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_075	E, F	0.265	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_076	E, F	0.018	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_077	F	0.406	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_078	Grid Connection	0.014	Poor	N	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_181	D	0.063	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_182	F	0.035	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_183	F	0.549	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_184	Grid Connection	0.052	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_185	F	0.958	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_186	Grid Connection	0.177	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_187	Grid Connection	0.167	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_188	F	0.044	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: The scrub is a good representation of the habitat type	Criteria B: Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present	Criteria C: Invasive non-native plant species absent, sub-optimal species <5%	Criteria D: The scrub has a well-developed edge	Criteria E: There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub
RSK_189	Grid Connection	-6	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	N	N
RSK_301	Grid Connection	0.289	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_302	Grid Connection	0.181	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_303	Grid Connection	0.276	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_304	Grid Connection	0.154	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Hawthorn scrub

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: The scrub is a good representation of the habitat type	Criteria B: Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present	Criteria C: Invasive non-native plant species absent, sub-optimal species <5%	Criteria D: The scrub has a well-developed edge	Criteria E: There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub
RSK_190	C	-7	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_191	Grid Connection	0.119	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_192	Grid Connection	0.012	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_193	Grid Connection	0.018	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_194	Grid Connection	0.223	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_195	Grid Connection	0.602	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_196	Grid Connection	0.051	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_197	Grid Connection	-9	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	N
RSK_222	Grid Connection	0.022	Moderate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_223	Grid Connection	1.779	Moderate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_224	Grid Connection	0.084	Moderate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_225	Grid Connection	0.025	Moderate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Blackthorn scrub

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: The scrub is a good representation of the habitat type	Criteria B: Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present	Criteria C: Invasive non-native plant species absent, sub-optimal species <5%	Criteria D: The scrub has a well-developed edge	Criteria E: There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub
RSK_001	Grid Connection	0.013	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-

Pond (non-priority habitat)

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity)	Criteria B: There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) surrounding the pond	Criteria C: <10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed or algae	Criteria D: No artificial connection to other waterbodies	Criteria E: Water levels can fluctuate naturally	Criteria F: Invasive non-native plant and animal species absent	Criteria G: Pond is not artificially stocked with fish
RSK_007	F	-5	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_012	D	-4	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_233	C	0.023	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_234	Grid Connection	0.790	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_235	Grid Connection	0.434	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Vacant or Derelict Land

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Criteria A: Varied vegetation structure	Criteria B: Contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife	Criteria C: Invasive non-native plant species absent <5%	Criteria D: Complete Invasive non-native plant species absence
RSK_002	Grid Connection	0.306	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y

Lowland mixed deciduous woodland

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Condition Criteria Score													Total woodland condition score
				A – Age distribution	B – Herbivore damage	C -INNS	D – No. native trees	E – Cover of native trees and shrubs	F – Open space	G - Regeneration	H - Health	I – Ground flora	J - Structure	K – Veteran trees	L - Deadwood	M - Distribution	
RSK_299	D	0.609	Moderate	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	30
RSK_300	Grid Connection	0.157	Moderate	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	30

Other woodland; broadleaved

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Condition Criteria Score													Total woodland condition score
				A – Age distribution	B – Herbivore damage	C -iNNS	D – No. native trees	E – Cover of native trees and shrubs	F – Open space	G - Regeneration	H - Health	I – Ground flora	J - Structure	K – Veteran trees	L - Deadwood	M - Distribution	
RSK_137	D	0.166	Moderate	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	28
RSK_138	Grid Connection	0.445	Moderate	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	28
RSK_139	Grid Connection	0.406	Moderate	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	28
RSK_259	E	0.101	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_260	C	1.061	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_261	Grid Connection	0.422	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_262	Grid Connection	0.293	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_263	Grid Connection	0.045	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_264	Grid Connection	0.280	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_265	Grid Connection	0.210	Good	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	39
RSK_307	B	0.450	Poor	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	24
RSK_308	D	1.142	Poor	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	24
RSK_309	C	0.106	Poor	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	24

Other woodland; mixed

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Condition Criteria Score												Total woodland condition score
				A – Age distribution	B – Herbivore damage	C -INNS	D – No. native trees	E – Cover of native trees and shrubs	F – Open space	G - Regeneration	H - Health	I – Ground flora	J - Structure	K – Veteran trees	L - Deadwood	M - Distribution	
RSK_010	D, E	1.197	Moderate	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	28
RSK_011	D	2.376	Poor	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	21

Other coniferous woodland

Feature ID	Area Reference	Area (ha)	Condition	Condition Criteria Score												Total woodland condition score
				A – Age distribution	B – Herbivore damage	C -INNS	D – No. native trees	E – Cover of native trees and shrubs	F – Open space	G - Regeneration	H - Health	I – Ground flora	J - Structure	K – Veteran trees	L - Deadwood	M - Distribution	
RSK_006	Grid Connection	0.127	Good	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	34

Native hedgerow

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_03	0.965	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.589	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.584	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.514	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.446	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.386	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.377	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.333	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.330	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.318	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.294	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.289	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.280	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.271	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.249	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.246	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.230	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.226	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.171	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.162	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.137	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_03	0.136	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.124	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.121	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.115	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.112	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.105	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.100	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.099	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.098	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.094	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.091	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.086	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.086	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.079	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.074	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.057	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.055	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	0.018	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_03	-3	Moderate	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.552	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.429	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.390	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.353	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_04	0.287	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.249	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.238	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.236	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.233	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.233	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.219	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.211	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.209	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.181	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.173	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.171	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.160	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.131	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.115	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.111	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.082	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.075	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.065	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_04	0.035	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_06	0.477	Poor	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y

Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_11	0.451	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
RSK_22	1.081	Moderate	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
RSK_23	0.599	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.494	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.400	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.386	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.328	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.264	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.262	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.261	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.229	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.227	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.217	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.217	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.213	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.196	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.177	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.161	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.090	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.082	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_23	0.074	Good	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_24	0.892	Poor	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y

Native hedgerow with trees

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage	Criteria E1: >1 tree age class	Criteria E2: 95% trees healthy
RSK_17	0.799	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.713	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.507	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.453	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.453	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.417	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.407	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.398	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.388	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.349	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.308	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.265	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.257	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.240	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.232	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.218	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.193	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.180	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.127	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.122	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.110	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage	Criteria E1: >1 tree age class	Criteria E2: 95% trees healthy
RSK_17	0.101	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.062	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.053	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_17	0.036	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_18	1.273	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_19	0.923	Poor	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage	Criteria E1: >1 tree age class	Criteria E2: 95% trees healthy
RSK_26	0.365	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.325	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.292	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.274	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.265	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.169	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.106	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_26	0.070	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_27	0.523	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_29	0.160	Poor	N	N	1	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage
RSK_09	0.391	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_14	0.421	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.367	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.346	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.289	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.202	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.197	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.184	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.104	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.077	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.069	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
RSK_14	0.060	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Species-rich native hedgerow with trees

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A1: Height >1.5m	Criteria A2: Width >1.5m	Criteria B1: Gap– hedge base <0.5m	Criteria B2: Gaps <10% of length	Criteria C1: >1m undisturbed ground	Criteria C2: Nutrient enriched vegetation <20%	Criteria D1: INNS <10%	Criteria D2: <10% damage	Criteria E1: >1 tree age class	Criteria E2: 95% trees healthy
RSK_20	2.263	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Ditches

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A: Good water quality	Criteria B: >10 plant species present	Criteria C: <10% cover of algae or Duckweed	Criteria D: >75% aquatic marginal vegetation	Criteria E: <5% physical damage	Criteria F: Sufficient water level	Criteria G: <10% ditch heavily shaded	Criteria F: No INNS
RSK_02	0.144	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_15	0.073	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_16	0.263	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_30	0.019	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_31	0.014	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_32	0.078	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_33	0.075	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_34	0.130	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_35	0.332	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_36	0.208	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_37	0.055	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_38	0.707	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_39	0.019	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_40	0.348	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_41	0.433	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_42	0.288	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_43	0.266	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_44	0.148	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_45	0.095	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_46	0.102	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_47	0.012	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_48	0.049	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_49	0.181	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_50	0.007	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_51	0.133	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_52	0.226	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A: Good water quality	Criteria B: >10 plant species present	Criteria C: <10% cover of algae or Duckweed	Criteria D: >75% aquatic marginal vegetation	Criteria E: <5% physical damage	Criteria F: Sufficient water level	Criteria G: <10% ditch heavily shaded	Criteria F: No INNS
RSK_53	0.042	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_54	0.737	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_55	0.002	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_56	0.232	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_57	0.000	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_58	0.110	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_59	0.203	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_60	0.682	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_61	0.098	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_62	0.281	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_63	0.243	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_64	0.105	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_65	0.315	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_66	1.157	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_67	0.035	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_68	0.490	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_69	0.307	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_70	0.138	Poor	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_71	0.211	Poor	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
RSK_72	0.108	Poor	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_73	0.191	Poor	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_74	0.051	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_75	0.177	Poor	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_76	0.266	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_77	0.177	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_78	0.119	Poor	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_82	0.159	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A: Good water quality	Criteria B: >10 plant species present	Criteria C: <10% cover of algae or Duckweed	Criteria D: >75% aquatic marginal vegetation	Criteria E: <5% physical damage	Criteria F: Sufficient water level	Criteria G: <10% ditch heavily shaded	Criteria F: No INNS
RSK_84	0.120	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_88	0.092	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_89	0.136	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_90	0.259	Poor	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_96	0.003	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_97	0.067	Moderate	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_99	0.065	Poor	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RSK_100	0.223	Moderate	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_101	0.207	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_102	0.276	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_103	0.080	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_104	0.300	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_105	0.021	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_106	0.232	Poor	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_107	0.229	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_108	0.078	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_109	0.000	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_110	0.544	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_111	0.293	Poor	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
RSK_112	0.579	Poor	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_113	0.383	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_114	0.772	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_115	0.087	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_116	0.752	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_117	0.417	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_118	0.029	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_119	1.066	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_120	0.461	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Criteria A: Good water quality	Criteria B: >10 plant species present	Criteria C: <10% cover of algae or Duckweed	Criteria D: >75% aquatic marginal vegetation	Criteria E: <5% physical damage	Criteria F: Sufficient water level	Criteria G: <10% ditch heavily shaded	Criteria F: No INNS
RSK_121	0.094	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_122	0.124	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_123	0.038	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_124	0.516	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_125	0.201	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_126	0.544	Good	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RSK_127	0.371	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_128	0.406	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_129	0.418	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_130	0.248	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
RSK_131	0.082	Moderate	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y

Other rivers and streams [5]

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Condition Criteria										Preliminary condition score
			A1: Braiding index	A2: Sinuosity index	A3: Anabranching index	A4: Level of Confinement	A5: Reach valley gradient	A6: Bedrock sub-reach	A7: Coarsest bed material	A8: Average alluvial bed material size class	Shape Index	River type	
RSK_01	2.589	Moderate	1	1.036	1	Unconfined	0.00018	No	SA	SI	0.727	K - Straight/sinuous, coarsest SA, average SI	0.445
RSK_79	1.739	Moderate	1	1.01	1	Unconfined	0.0001	No	SA	SI	0.909	K - Straight/sinuous, coarsest SA, average SI	0.676
RSK_80	0.96	Moderate	1	1.01	1	Unconfined	0.0001	No	SA	SI	0.909	K - Straight/sinuous, coarsest SA, average SI	0.676
RSK_85	0.708	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_86	3.748	Moderate	1	1.012	1	Unconfined	0.00024	No	SA	SI	0.909	K - Straight/sinuous, coarsest SA, average SI	0.47
RSK_87	0.943	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RSK_92	0.182	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[5] The river condition assessment (RCA) methodology followed Gurnell et. al (2022) guidance.

Feature ID	Length (km)	Condition	Condition Criteria										Preliminary condition score
			A1: Braiding index	A2: Sinuosity index	A3: Anabranching index	A4: Level of Confinement	A5: Reach valley gradient	A6: Bedrock sub-reach	A7: Coarsest bed material	A8: Average alluvial bed material size class	Shape Index	River type	
RSK_98	1.349	Good (assumed)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX C – STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC CALCULATIONS

Please note that the full, detailed BNG calculations are provided as a separate document named **Appendix C** – Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculations.

RWE Renewables UK Limited
Windmill Hill Business Park,
Whitehill Way,
Swindon,
Wiltshire,
England,
SN5 6PB
www.rwe.com