

Green Hill Solar Farm EN010170

Environmental Statement Appendix 9.2: Habitat Surveys

Revision A (Tracked)

Prepared by: Clarkson & Woods Ltd

Date: November May 2025

Document Reference: EX1APP/GH6.3.9.2 A

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



Appendix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys

Schedule of Changes

Revision	<u>Date</u>	Section Reference	Description of Changes	Reason for Revision
Examinati	Examination	Throughout	Updates to document references.	As required for submission at Deadline 1.
A	Deadline 1 – November 2025	Throughout	Updated to include additional baseline survey results from Cable Route Corridor in Spring/Summer 2025.	As required for submission at Deadline 1.



Appendix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys (Revision A)

Contents

<u>Apper</u>	ndix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys (Revision A)	<u>3</u>
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Methodology	4
1.3	Results	7
1.4	References	25



Appendix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys (Revision A)

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This appendix provides detail of the methodologies and findings of habitat surveys conducted across the Scheme to date.
- 1.1.2 Habitat surveys were undertaken to classify the habitats within both the Sites and the Cable Route Corridor, both to assess their value in and of themselves, and to inform the likelihood of their supporting protected or notable species.
- 1.1.3 Alongside categorisation of the habitats in line with the latest guidance, the condition of each habitat parcel was also assessed to inform a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment. This considers various criteria against which the condition of the habitat can be evaluated.
- 1.1.4 The methods and results of these assessments are provided in this report and should be cross referenced with **Appendix 9.13: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment** [EN010170/APPRevision A [EX1/GH6.3.9.13_A].
- 1.1.5 This appendix is supported by the following Figures at the end of this document:
 - Figure 9.2.1: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill A)
 - Figure 9.2.2: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill A.2)
 - Figure 9.2.3: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill B)
 - Figure 9.2.4: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill C)
 - Figure 9.2.5: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill D)
 - Figure 9.2.6: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill E) (1 of 2)
 - Figure 9.2.7: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill E) (2 of 2)
 - Figure 9.2.8: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill BESS)
 - Figure 9.2.9: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill F) (1 of 3)
 - Figure 9.2.10: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill F) (2 of 3)
 - Figure 9.2.11: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill F) (3 of 3)
 - Figure 9.2.12: UKHab Survey Results (Green Hill G)
 - Figure 9.2.13: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 1 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.14: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 2 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.15: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 3 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.16: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 4 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.17: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 5 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.18: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 6 of 11) Revision A
 - Figure 9.2.19: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 7 of 11) Revision A



- Figure 9.2.20: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 8 of 11) Revision A
- Figure 9.2.21: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 9 of 11) Revision A
- Figure 9.2.22: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 10 of 11) Revision A
- Figure 9.2.23: UKHab Survey Results (Cable Route 11 of 11) Revision A
- 1.1.6 This appendix is supported by the following Tables:
 - Table 1: Habitat Types within the Sites and their Extent and Importance.
 - Table 2: Habitat Types within the Cable Route Corridor and their Extent and Importance.

1.2 Methodology

Habitat Survey

Green Hill A-G, plus BESS

- 1.2.1 A baseline Extended UKHab Walkover Survey was carried out at each Site, between 2023 and 2024, with the survey area encompassing the entirety of each Site.
- 1.2.2 During the walkover survey, all habitats were classified using the UKHab criteria (Ref.1). This assigns each habitat a specific category. Alongside the UKHab categorisation, habitat condition assessments of each habitat were conducted (where applicable) as per the methodology set out in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric guidance (Ref.2), to allow for the completion of Biodiversity Net Gain assessments at a later date. A Standard size Minimum Mappable Unit (MMU) was used (in line with the UKHab survey methodology), whereby generally only habitats larger than 400m² were mapped. However, where an ecologically valuable habitat was present (such as a pond or field margin) which was smaller than these, these features were still mapped.
- 1.2.3 Where the initial walkover surveys were constrained due to being undertaken outside of the optimal botanical survey season (which is May August inclusive), a further visit was conducted within this optimal survey period to ensure that accurate habitat characterisation and condition assessments were completed. This additional visit was only relevant for some habitats, such as areas of permanent grasslands, grassy field margins and ditches.
- 1.2.4 Target notes were also recorded for particular features of interest; this included habitats and features with suitability to support protected or notable species, field signs and other incidental observations.
- 1.2.5 A qualitative assessment of habitat suitability for several protected and notable species/groups was undertaken at the same time as the Extended UKHab Walkover Survey to identify those which may be at risk from being impacted by the Scheme, to inform future survey needs. Detailed survey methodologies undertaken for each of these species are provided in the relevant technical appendices (where required).



Cable Route Corridor

- 1.2.6 A thorough Extended UKHab Walkover Survey of all accessible land within the Cable Route Survey Area was completed between January March September 2025, and where accessible and relevant up to 30m beyond this, to collect baseline habitat inventory and condition information. The survey paid close attention to any Habitats of Principal Importance or local priorities, including hedgerows.
- 1.2.7 Given the time of year that the initial Cable Route walkover surveys were completed (Winter 2024/25 Spring 2025), it was not possible to fully characterise all of the habitats present within the Cable Route Corridor during this initial survey. In particular, the species diversity and general ecological value of grassland habitats are often under-represented outside of the optimal survey window. As a result, it is intended for all permanent grasslandsuch, these habitats within the Cable Route Corridor to be were revisited (where access permission was provided) within the optimal survey window of May August 2025 inclusive in order to acquire accurate habitat classification and condition assessment information. Following the completion of the outstanding survey work and the submission of the DCO Application, an updated version of this Technical Appendix informed by the full scope of ecological survey work will be submitted, with all changes tracked.
- 1.2.8 A full ecological baseline was collected for all habitats within the Cable Route

 Corridor, excluding some small sections where access permission to collect
 baseline survey information could not be obtained, or where it was considered
 unsafe to do so (such as in the central reservation of busy roads along the Cable
 Route Corridor).

Survey Dates

Green Hill A-G, plus BESS

- 4.2.8 1.2.9 Habitat walkover surveys across the Scheme were conducted at different times of year, as some Sites were brought into the Scheme at a later date. Additionally, follow-up visits were completed for particular habitats where the initial walkover surveys were constrained due to being undertaken outside of the optimal botanical survey season.
- 1.2.91.2.10 Surveys were conducted on the following dates:
 - Initial baseline walkover surveys were completed at Green Hill A, B, C, D, E and BESS between 14/08/2023 and 23/08/2023.
 - Additional habitat surveys were completed on 05/10/2023 for Green Hill A and E.
 - Initial baseline walkover surveys were completed at Green Hill F between 08/01/2024 and 11/01/2024.
 - Initial baseline walkover surveys were completed at Green Hill G between 15/04/2024 and 18/04/2024.



- Initial baseline walkover surveys were completed at Green Hill A.2 on 29/07/2024.
- Condition assessments for various habitats across Green Hill A-G were completed between 29/07/2024 and 02/08/2024.
- Additional habitat data were gathered between 19/08/2024 and 22/08/2024 at Green Hill A, C, E, BESS and F, following minor adjustments to the Scheme boundary.

Cable Route Corridor

- 1.2.101.2.11 Surveys of the Cable Route Survey Area were conducted between 20/01/2025 and 28/03/09/2025.
- 1.2.11 Follow up detailed surveys and condition assessments of specific habitat types (such as permanent grasslands) are scheduled for May 2025.

Personnel

- 1.2.12 Surveyors assisting with the UKHab walkover surveys are listed below. All surveyors were members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and were assessed under the Clarkson and Woods QA processes as competent to complete the survey.
 - Harry Fox BSc MCIEEM

 Principal Ecologist;
 - Andrew Ross MSc MCIEEM Principal Ecologist;
 - Chris Poole MSc ACIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Mike Hockey BSc MCIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Adèle Remazeilles MSc ACIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Bex Sandey MSc ACIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Heather Parris MSc ACIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Joel Wright MSc MCIEEM Senior Ecologist;
 - Molly Brown MSc (Qualifying member of CIEEM) Ecologist;
 - Miranda Jones BSc (Qualifying member of CIEEM) Ecologist;
 - Sarah Richards MSc (Qualifying member of CIEEM) Ecologist;
 - Richard Anderton MSc MCIEEM (Anderton Associates (Ecology & Arboriculture) Ltd.); and
 - James Gilbert MSc CEnv MCIEEM (JPG Ecology Ltd.).

Data Interpretation

1.2.13 Following the walkover survey, all habitats and their relevant conditions were digitised using QGIS (v3.28 or later).



1.3 Results

- 1.3.1 The figures at the end of this document display the amalgamated results of the habitat walkover surveys.
- 1.3.2 The habitats recorded within the Sites are detailed in **Table 1** below. This table details the extent of each habitat and its proportion of the total area of the Sites (excluding the Cable Route Corridor and Grendon Substation), as well as a summary of the BNG condition assessments for each habitat type. Furthermore, it provides a justification of each habitat's importance, based on its rarity, extent and legislative/policy status.
- Habitats recorded within the Cable Route Corridor are detailed in **Table 2** below. Where it has not been possible to fully characterise habitats due to within the suboptimal time of year that the survey was completed (for example, in the case of permanent grasslands), or where access permission could not be secured to survey a particular area Cable Route Corridor have not been accessible, an assumption has been made with regard to of the likely habitats present, has been made. Assumptions have been based on a review of satellite imagery, the analysis of open-source datasets such as the Priority Habitat Inventory, and the context of other habitats which have been surveyed in the local area. Where local contextual information has been limited, habitats have been assigned categories and conditions on a precautionary basis, taking into account the highest value habitat and condition which are considered likely to occur. Assumed habitats and their respective assumed conditions have been highlighted in separate rows (coloured grey) in **Table 2**.



Table 1: Habitat Types within the Sites and their Extent and Importance

Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Cropland	1031.4	87.7					
Cereal crops	690.6	58.8	A.2, A, BESS, D, E, F, G	N/A	No	Site	As they are of negligible botanical interest, the arable
Non-cereal crops	115.5	9.8	A, C, D, E	N/A	No	Site	fields are considered to be
Temporary grass and clover leys	114.6	9.8	A, E, G	N/A	No	Site	of Site Importance.
Winter stubble	73.3	6.2	C, E	N/A	No	Site	
Arable field margins game bird mix	8.3	0.7	A,C, E, F	N/A	Arable field margins are a Habitat of	Local	Given their status as Habitats of Principal
Arable field margins pollen and nectar	14.5	1.2	A, B, C, E, F	N/A	Principal Importance and listed on the	Local	Importance and Local BAP habitats, arable margins are considered to be of Local Importance.
Arable field margins tussocky	14.5	1.2	A, B, C, D, E, F	N/A	Northamptonshire BAP.	Local	
Grassland	115.2	9.8					
Modified grassland	94.1	8.0	A, B, C, D, E, F, G	Good – 23.2% Moderate – 19.0% Poor – 57.7%	No	Site	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Other neutral grassland	21.1	1.8	A, C, E, F, G	Good – 1.8% Moderate – 76.2% Poor – 22.0%	No	Local	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of elevated ecological value.
Heathland and shrub	6.5	0.6					
Blackthorn scrub	1.2	0.1	Е	Poor	No	Site	
Bramble scrub	3.4	0.3	D, E, F	N/A	No	Site	Not a Habitat of Principal
Mixed scrub	1.9	0.2	A, B, C, E	Good – 8.9% Moderate – 91.1%	No	Site	Importance, and of limited ecological value given small extent.
Willow scrub	0.05	0.004	А	Moderate	No	Site	
Woodland and forest	5.9	0.5					
Other woodland; broadleaved	3.4	0.3	A, BESS, C, E, F, G	Good – 7.0% Moderate – 73.5% Poor – 19.4%	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland is a Habitat of	Local	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of significant ecological value.



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Other woodland; mixed	2.5	0.2	A, C, E	Moderate – 24.0% Poor – 76.0%	Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP, however none of the woodland on site qualified as this habitat type.	Local	
Lakes	0.3	0.03					
Ponds (priority habitat)	0.3	0.03	A, B, E, F, G	Moderate – 57.4% Poor – 42.6%	Ponds are a Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP.	District	Ponds qualify as being a priority habitat if they support species of high conservation importance, including UKBAP species. All on-site ponds have therefore been assumed to constitute priority habitat given the likelihood that toads and other amphibians (including great crested newts) may be present. Ponds are therefore considered to be of District Importance.



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Sparsely vegetated land	6.4	0.5					
Ruderal/ephemeral	6.1	0.5	A, C, D, E, F	Good – 40.5% Moderate – 27.8% Poor – 31.7%	No	Site	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited
Tall forbs	0.2	0.02	C, E, F	Good – 78.4% Moderate – 21.6%	No	Site	ecological value.
Urban	8.8	0.7					
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.9	0.1	A, E, F	N/A	No	Negligible	
Bare ground	0.6	0.1	A.2, E	Good – 15.4% Poor – 84.6%	No	Negligible	Of negligible ecological value
Developed land; sealed surface	7.3	0.6	A, B, C, F, G, BESS	N/A	No	Negligible	
Individual Trees	92 no.	-					
Individual Trees – Very large	27 no.	-	A.2, A, B, C, E, F, G, BESS	Good	Yes	Ancient and Veteran	Ancient and Veteran trees are Irreplaceable habitats,



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Individual Trees - Large	34 no.	-	A.2, A, B, C, D, E, F, G	Good – 76.5% Moderate – 23.5%	Yes	Trees – District	and all trees are of significant ecological value.
Individual Trees – Medium	26 no.	-	A.2, A, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 61.5% Moderate – 38.5%	Yes	Other Trees - Local	
Individual Trees - Small	5 no.	-	E, G	Moderate	Yes		
Hedgerows	84.2	-					
Native hedgerow	25.9	-	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 57.7% Moderate – 35.8% Poor – 6.5%	Hedgerows are a	Local	Given their status as
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	12.0	-	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 72.7% Moderate – 25.9% Poor – 1.4%	Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire	Local	Habitats of Principal Importance and BAP habitats, all hedgerow types are considered to be of
Native hedgerow with trees	11.9	-	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 71.1% Moderate – 22.2% Poor – 6.7%	BAP.	Local	Local Importance.



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	9.0	-	A.2, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 70.4% Moderate – 26.6% Poor – 3.0%		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow	4.2	-	A.2, A, C, D, E, F, G	Good – 87.4% Moderate – 12.6%		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	4.8	-	A, A.2, B, F, G	Good – 76.2% Moderate – 13.7% Poor – 10.0%		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	7.4	-	A.2, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, BESS	Good – 49.9% Moderate – 40.2% Poor – 9.9%		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	9.0	-	A.2, A, B, C, D, G	Good – 90.1% Moderate – 9.9%		Local	
Lines of trees	11.1						
Line of trees	8.7	-	A, B, C, E, F, BESS	Good – 21.8% Moderate – 62.9% Poor – 15.3%	Lines of trees are a separate habitat type to hedgerows,	Local	Given their equivalent standing to hedgerows, which are Habitats of Principal Importance and



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	2.2	-	A, E, G	Moderate – 67.4% Poor – 32.6%	although fall under the broad umbrella of linear, wooded boundary features. Hedgerows are a Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP. For the purposes of the assessment of 'notable' habitat, lines of trees are considered equivalent to hedgerows.		BAP habitats, all line of tree types are considered to be of Local Importance.
Ecologically valuable line of trees	0.1	-	F	Moderate			
Watercourses	21.8						
Ditches	6.9	-	A, B, C, G, G, BESS	Good – 15.9% Moderate – 9.7% Poor – 74.4%	No	Local	Although the ditch network is relatively extensive, most ditches supported low botanical diversity. The ditches on Site can be attributed a Local Importance.



Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Order Limits	Sites Where Recorded	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Other rivers and streams	14.7	-	A, B, C, D, E, F	Moderate – 4.6% Fairly Poor – 81.9% Poor – 13.5%	Rivers are a Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP.	District	These habitats are rarer in the local landscape and have elevated ecological value. This, combined with their Habitats of Principal Importance and BAP status, leads to an ascription of District importance.
Culvert	0.2	-	F	N/A - Poor	No	Negligible	



Table 2: Habitat Types within the Cable Route Corridor and their Extent and Importance

Habitat	Area (ha) / length (km)	% of Cable Route Corridor and Construction Compound Areas	Condition Assessment Score	Notable Habitat?	Ecological Importance	Rationale
Cropland	130. <mark>24</mark>	70.2 69.1				
Cereal crops	73.1	39.4 <u>38.7</u>	N/A	No	Site	
Cereal crops (assumed)	2.0	1.4 <u>0</u>	N/A	No	Site	As they are of negligible
Non-cereal crops	20.5	11.0 10.9	N/A	No	Site	botanical interest, the arable fields are considered to be of Site Importance.
Temporary grass and clover leys	13.7	7.4 <u>3</u>	N/A	No	Site	
Winter stubble	19.0	10. <mark>3</mark> 1	N/A	No	Site	
Arable field margins game bird mix	0.4	0.2	N/A	Arable field margins are a	Local	Given their status as Habitats of Principal Importance and Local BAP habitats, arable
Arable field margins cultivated annually	0.1	0.1	N/A	Importance and	Local	
Arable field margins tussocky	1.4	0. <mark>8</mark> 7	N/A		Local	margins are considered to be of Local Importance.
Arable field margins pollen and nectar	0.1	0.03	N/A			or Local Importance.
Grassland	41.7 <u>43.9</u>	22.5 23.2				



Modified grassland (assumed)	37.9 <u>28.2</u>	20.4 15.0	Good (assumed) _ 28.8% Moderate - 15.5% Poor - 55.8%	No	Site	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.
Modified grassland (assumed)	0.3	0.2	Good (assumed)	<u>No</u>	<u>Site</u>	
Other neutral grassland	<u>15.</u> 3 .8	2.0 8.1	Good – 1.7% Moderate – 77.476.7% Poor – 22.6%21.4%	No	Local	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of elevated ecological value.
Heathland and shrub	0.6 2.1	0.3 1.1				
Bramble scrub	0. <u>44</u>	0.4 <u>2</u>	N/A	No	Site	
Mixed scrub	0.5 1.7	0. <u>39</u>	Good – 49.815.3% Moderate – 31.978.6% Poor – 18.45.7%	No	Site	Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value given small extent.
Woodland and forest	2.0	1.1				
Other woodland; broadleaved	0.7	0.4	Moderate – 68. 2 8%	Lowland mixed deciduous	Local	



Other woodland; broadleaved (assumed) Other coniferous woodland Other woodland; mixed	1.4 <u>0</u> 0.1	0.6 <u>5</u> 0.04 0.1	Poor – 31.832.0% Good (assumed) Poor	woodland is a Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP, however none of the woodland on site qualified as this habitat type.		Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of significant ecological value.
Lakes	1.4 <u>5.5</u>	0.82.9				
Ponds (priority habitat)	0.1 2.8	0. 1 <u>.4</u>	Moderate – 32.8 97.3% Poor – 67. 2.7%	Ponds are a Habitat of Principal		Ponds qualify as being a priority habitat if they support species of high conservation importance, including UKBAP species. All on-site ponds have therefore been
Ponds (priority habitat) (assumed)Temporary lakes ponds and pools	1.3 2.7	0.7 1.5	Good (assumed)Poor	Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP.	District	assumed to constitute priority habitat given the likelihood that toads and other amphibians (including great crested newts) may be present. Ponds are therefore considered to be of District Importance.
Sparsely vegetated land	6. 0 <u>.8</u>	3.2 0.4				
Other inland rock and scree (assumed)Ruderal/Ephemeral	6. 0 <u>.2</u>	3.2 <u>0.1</u>	Good (assumed)_ 89.1%	-See Rationale No	SiteLocal District	This habitat has been used as a proxy for an area of quarry within the Cable



			Moderate – 10.9%			Route Corridor where access permission for ecological baseline survey work was not possible to obtain. It is possible that this area is of significantly higher ecological value than the Other Inland Rock and Scree assumption allows for (particularly given that recent aerial images from March 2025 suggests that some of this area may have been subject to recent habitat restoration work), but in the absence of survey information, the Other Inland Rock and Scree habitat type has been applied. Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.
Ruderal/Ephemeral (assumed)	0.4	0.2	Poor	<u>No</u>	<u>Site</u>	
Tall forbs	0. 03 2	0. 02 1	Good – 81.1% Moderate <u>–</u> 18.9%	No	Site	-Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.
Urban	2.7 3.3	1.5 <u>8</u>				
Developed land; sealed surface	2.7 3.1	1. 5 7	N/A	No	Negligible	- Of negligible ecological value



Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface	0.2	0.1	N/A	No	<u>Negligible</u>	
Watercourse Footprint	0.9	0.5	N/A			-See Watercourses section below.
Individual Trees	44 <u>49</u> no.					
Individual Trees – Very large	4no 6no.	-	Good	Yes	Ancient and	
Individual Trees - Large	20 22 no.	_	Good – 95 98%	Yes	Veteran Trees –	Ancient and Veteran trees
marviada 11000 Largo	2022 110.		Poor – <u>52</u> %	100	District	are Irreplaceable habitats, and all trees are of significant
Individual Trees – Medium	15 16 no.	-	Good	Yes	Other Trees – Local	ecological value.
Individual Trees - Small	5 no.	-	Good	Yes		
Hedgerows	31.4 <u>25.8</u>	-				
Native hedgerow	10.7 <u>8.3</u>	-	Good – 55.953.5% Moderate – 34.537.7% Poor – 9.78.8%	Hedgerows are a	Local	Given their status as Habitats
Native hedgerow (assumed)	0. <u>61</u>	-	Good (assumed)	Principal Importance and listed on the	Local	of Principal Importance and BAP habitats, all hedgerow types are considered to be of
Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	4.3 <u>.9</u>	-	Good – 8176.5% Moderate – 11.015.4% Poor – 7.48.1%	Northamptonshire BAP.	Local	Local Importance-



Native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch (assumed)	0.3	-	Good (assumed)		Local	
Native hedgerow with trees	2. <u>63</u>	-	Good – 48.643.4% Moderate – 46.751.4% Poor – 4.75.2%		Local	
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	4 <u>3</u> .2	-	Good – 61.751.2% Moderate – 38.348.8%		Local	
Native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch (assumed)	0.6	_	Good (assumed) – 67.3% Moderate (assumed) – 32.7%		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow	0. <u>98</u>	-	Good – <u>80.778.9</u> % Moderate – <u>19.321.1</u> %		Local	
Species-rich native hedgerow – associated with bank or ditch	1.4 <u>3</u>	-	Good – 4745.4% Moderate – 25.826.7%		Local	



Species-rich native hedgerow with trees Species-rich native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch	2. <mark>2</mark> 7 3. 7 1	-	Poor – 26.827.9% Good – 54.069.7% Moderate – 46.030.3% Good		Local	
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.08	=	Poor			
Lines of trees	0. 75 <u>55</u>	-				
Line of trees	0. 58 <u>48</u>	-	Moderate – 37.224.1% Poor – 62.875.9%	Lines of trees are a separate habitat type to hedgerows, although fall	Local	Given their equivalent
Line of trees (assumed)	0.1	-	Moderate (assumed)	under the broad umbrella of linear,	Local	standing to hedgerows, which are Habitats of
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch	0.07	-	Moderate – 51.5% Poor – 48.5%	wooded boundary features. Hedgerows are a Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire	Local	Principal Importance and BAP habitats, all line of tree types are considered to be of Local Importance.



				BAP. For the purposes of the assessment of 'notable' habitat, lines of trees are considered equivalent to hedgerows.		
Watercourses	5.8 <u>6</u>	-				
Ditches	3. <u>25</u>	-	Moderate – 13.312.2% Poor – 86.787.8%	No	Local	Although the ditch network is relatively extensive, most ditches supported low botanical diversity. The ditches on Site can be attributed a Local Importance.
Ditches (assumed)	0.5	-	Good (assumed)			
Other rivers and streams	-1.6	-	Fairly Poor – 40.3% Poor – 59.7%	Rivers are a Habitat of		These habitats are rarer in the local landscape and have elevated ecological value. This, combined with their Habitats of Principal
Other rivers and streams (assumed)	0.04	-	Good (assumed)	Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP.	District	
Priority Habitat	0.3	-	Fairly Poor			Importance and BAP status, leads to an ascription of
Priority Habitat (assumed)	0.1	-	Good (assumed)			District importance.
Culvert	0.04	-	N/A - Poor	No	Negligible	Of negligible ecological value





Appendix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys (Revision A)

1.4 References

Ref.1 UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at www.ukhab.org)

Ref.2 Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (2024) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides













































