

# Green Hill Solar Farm EN010170

# Environmental Statement Appendix 9.2: Habitat Surveys Revision A

Prepared by: Clarkson & Woods Ltd

Date: November 2025

Document Reference: EX1/GH6.3.9.2\_A

APFP Regulation 5(2)(a)



# Schedule of Changes

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





## Contents

| <b>Appen</b> | ndix 9.2 – Habitat Surveys (Revision A) | 3  |
|--------------|---|----|
| 1.1          | Introduction                            | 3  |
| 1.2          | Methodology                             | 4  |
| 1.3          | Results                                 | 6  |
| 1.4          | References                              | 23 |



### 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 Revision 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 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 such, these habitats 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 information.
- 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**

- 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.
- 1.2.10 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**

1.2.11 Surveys of the Cable Route Survey Area were conducted between 20/01/2025 and 03/09/2025.

### **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.

1.3.3 Habitats recorded within the Cable Route Corridor are detailed in **Table 2** below. Where habitats within the Cable Route Corridor have not been accessible, an assumption 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)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded     | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score                 | Notable<br>Habitat?                          | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale   |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| Cropland                                 | 1031.4                        | 87.7                    |                                |  |  |                          |   |
| Cereal crops                             | 690.6                         | 58.8                    | A.2, A,<br>BESS, D,<br>E, F, G | N/A  | No   |                          | 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   |                          | of Site Importance.   |
| Winter stubble                           | 73.3                          | 6.2                     | C, E                           | N/A  | No   |                          |   |
| Arable field<br>margins game bird<br>mix | 8.3                           | 0.7                     | A,C, E, F                      | N/A  | Arable field<br>margins are a<br>Habitat of  |                          | Given their status as Habitats of Principal Importance and Local BAP habitats, arable margins are considered to be of Local Importance. |
| Arable field margins pollen and nectar   | 14.5                          | 1.2                     | A, B, C, E,<br>F               | N/A  | Principal<br>Importance and<br>listed on the | Local                    |   |
| Arable field margins tussocky            | 14.5                          | 1.2                     | A, B, C, D,<br>E, F            | N/A  | Northamptonshire BAP.                        |                          |   |
| Grassland                                | 115.2                         | 9.8                     |                                |  |  |                          |   |
| Modified grassland                       | 94.1                          | 8.0                     | A, B, C, D,<br>E, F, G         | Good – 23.2%<br>Moderate – 19.0%<br>Poor – 57.7% | No   | Site                     | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.   |



| Habitat                        | Area (ha)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score                | Notable<br>Habitat?                              | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| Other neutral grassland        | 21.1                          | 1.8                     | A, C, E, F,<br>G           | Good – 1.8%<br>Moderate – 76.2%<br>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   |                          |  |
| Bramble scrub                  | 3.4                           | 0.3                     | D, E, F                    | N/A   | No   |                          | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value given small extent. |
| Mixed scrub                    | 1.9                           | 0.2                     | A, B, C, E                 | Good – 8.9%<br>Moderate – 91.1%                 | No   | Site                     |  |
| Willow scrub                   | 0.05                          | 0.004                   | Α                          | Moderate  | No   |                          |  |
| Woodland and forest            | 5.9                           | 0.5                     |                            |   |  |                          |  |
| Other woodland;<br>broadleaved | 3.4                           | 0.3                     | A, BESS,<br>C, E, F, G     | Good – 7.0%<br>Moderate – 73.5%<br>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)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score | Notable<br>Habitat?   | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| Other woodland;<br>mixed | 2.5                           | 0.2                     | A, C, E                    | Moderate – 24.0%<br>Poor – 76.0% | Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP, however none of the woodland on site qualified as this habitat type. |                          |  |
| Lakes                    | 0.3                           | 0.03                    |                            |                                  |   |                          |  |
| Ponds (priority habitat) | 0.3                           | 0.03                    | A, B, E, F,<br>G           | Moderate – 57.4%<br>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)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded        | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score                 | Notable<br>Habitat? | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale   |  |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Sparsely vegetated land                  | 6.4                           | 0.5                     |                                   |  |                     |                          |   |  |
| Ruderal/ephemeral                        | 6.1                           | 0.5                     | A, C, D, E,<br>F                  | Good – 40.5%<br>Moderate – 27.8%<br>Poor – 31.7% | No                  | Site                     | Not a Habitat of Principal<br>Importance, and of limited<br>ecological value. |  |
| Tall forbs                               | 0.2                           | 0.02                    | C, E, F                           | Good – 78.4%<br>Moderate – 21.6%                 | No                  |                          |   |  |
| Urban                                    | 8.8                           | 0.7                     |                                   |  |                     |                          |   |  |
| Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface | 0.9                           | 0.1                     | A, E, F                           | N/A  | No                  |                          |   |  |
| Bare ground                              | 0.6                           | 0.1                     | A.2, E                            | Good – 15.4%<br>Poor – 84.6%                     | No                  | Negligible               | Of negligible ecological value  |  |
| Developed land; sealed surface           | 7.3                           | 0.6                     | A, B, C, F,<br>G, BESS            | N/A  | No                  |                          |   |  |
| Individual Trees                         | 92 no.                        | -                       |                                   |  |                     |                          |   |  |
| Individual Trees –<br>Very large         | 27 no.                        | -                       | A.2, A, B,<br>C, E, F, G,<br>BESS | Good   | Yes                 | Ancient and<br>Veteran   | Ancient and Veteran trees are Irreplaceable habitats,                         |  |



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



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



| Habitat   | Area (ha)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score                | Notable<br>Habitat?   | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale   |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|---|
| Line of trees –<br>associated with<br>bank or ditch | 2.2                           | -                       | A, E, G                    | Moderate – 67.4%<br>Poor – 32.6%                | although fall under<br>the broad<br>umbrella of linear,   |                          | BAP habitats, all line of tree types are considered to be of Local Importance.  |
| Ecologically<br>valuable line of<br>trees           | 0.1                           | -                       | F                          | Moderate  | 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. |                          |   |
| Watercourses  | 21.8                          |                         |                            |   |   |                          |   |
| Ditches   | 6.9                           | -                       | A, B, C, G,<br>G, BESS     | Good – 15.9%<br>Moderate – 9.7%<br>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)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of<br>Order<br>Limits | Sites<br>Where<br>Recorded | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score                          | Notable<br>Habitat?  | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale   |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| Other rivers and streams | 14.7                          | -                       | A, B, C, D,<br>E, F        | Moderate – 4.6%<br>Fairly Poor –<br>81.9%<br>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)<br>/ length<br>(km) | % of Cable<br>Route<br>Corridor and<br>Construction<br>Compound<br>Areas | Condition<br>Assessment<br>Score | Notable<br>Habitat?                           | Ecological<br>Importance | Rationale   |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Cropland                                 | 130.4                         | 69.1   |                                  |   |                          |   |  |  |
| Cereal crops                             | 73.1                          | 38.7   | N/A                              | No  |                          |   |  |  |
| Cereal crops (assumed)                   | 2.0                           | 1.0  | N/A                              | No  |                          | As they are of negligible botanical   |  |  |
| Non-cereal crops                         | 20.5                          | 10.9   | N/A                              | No  | Site                     | interest, the arable fields are   |  |  |
| Temporary grass and clover leys          | 13.7                          | 7.3  | N/A                              | No  | One                      | considered to be of Site Importance.  |  |  |
| Winter stubble                           | 19.0                          | 10.1   | N/A                              | No  |                          |   |  |  |
| Arable field margins game bird mix       | 0.4                           | 0.2  | N/A                              | Arable field<br>margins are a                 |                          |   |  |  |
| Arable field margins cultivated annually | 0.1                           | 0.1  | N/A                              | Habitat of<br>Principal                       | Local                    | Given their status as Habitats of Principal Importance and Local BAP habitats, arable margins are |  |  |
| Arable field margins tussocky            | 1.4                           | 0.7  | N/A                              | Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire | Local                    | considered to be of Local Importance.   |  |  |
| Arable field margins pollen and nectar   | 0.1                           | 0.03   | N/A                              | BAP.  |                          |   |  |  |
| Grassland                                | 43.9                          | 23.2   |                                  |   |                          |   |  |  |
| Modified grassland                       | 28.2                          | 15.0   | Good – 28.8%                     | No  | Site                     |   |  |  |



| Modified grassland (assumed)             | 0.3  | 0.2  | Moderate –<br>15.5%<br>Poor – 55.8%<br>Good<br>(assumed) | No   | Site  | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.                    |  |
|--|------|------|--|--|-------|--|--|
| Other neutral grassland                  | 15.3 | 8.1  | Good – 1.7%<br>Moderate –<br>76.7%<br>Poor – 21.4%       | No   | Local | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of elevated ecological value.                   |  |
| Heathland and shrub                      | 2.1  | 1.1  |  |  |       |  |  |
| Bramble scrub                            | 0.4  | 0.2  | N/A  | No   |       |  |  |
| Mixed scrub                              | 1.7  | 0.9  | Good – 15.3%<br>Moderate –<br>78.6%<br>Poor – 5.7%       | 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;<br>broadleaved           | 0.7  | 0.4  | Moderate –<br>68.8%<br>Poor – 32.0%                      | Lowland mixed deciduous woodland is a Habitat of |       |  |  |
| Other woodland;<br>broadleaved (assumed) | 1.0  | 0.5  | Good<br>(assumed)  | Principal Importance and                         | Local | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, but of significant ecological value.                |  |
| Other coniferous woodland                | 0.1  | 0.04 | Poor   | listed on the Northamptonshire BAP, however      |       |  |  |
| Other woodland; mixed                    | 0.1  | 0.1  | Poor   | none of the                                      |       |  |  |



|                                 |     |     |                                     | woodland on site qualified as this habitat type.                        |          |   |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|---|----------|---|
| Lakes                           | 5.5 | 2.9 |                                     |   |          |   |
| Ponds (priority habitat)        | 2.8 | 1.4 | Moderate –<br>97.3%<br>Poor – 2.7%  | Ponds are a   |          | Ponds qualify as being a priority habitat if they support species of high conservation importance, including UKBAP species. All onsite 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. |
| Temporary lakes ponds and pools | 2.7 | 1.5 | Poor                                | Habitat of Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP. | District |   |
| Sparsely vegetated land         | 0.8 | 0.4 |                                     |   |          |   |
| Ruderal/Ephemeral               | 0.2 | 0.1 | Good – 89.1%<br>Moderate –<br>10.9% | No  | Site     | Not a Habitat of Principal<br>Importance, and of limited<br>ecological value.   |
| Ruderal/Ephemeral (assumed)     | 0.4 | 0.2 | Poor                                | No  | Site     |   |
| Tall forbs                      | 0.2 | 0.1 | Good – 81.1%<br>Moderate –<br>18.9% | No  | Site     | Not a Habitat of Principal Importance, and of limited ecological value.   |
| Urban                           | 3.3 | 1.8 |                                     |   |          |   |



| Developed land; sealed surface                        | 3.1    | 1.7 | N/A  | No  | Negligible   | Of negligible ecological value   |
|---|--------|-----|--|---|--|--|
| Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface              | 0.2    | 0.1 | N/A  | No  | Negligible   |  |
| Watercourse<br>Footprint                              | 0.9    | 0.5 | N/A  |   |  | See Watercourses section below.  |
| Individual Trees                                      | 49 no. |     |  |   |  |  |
| Individual Trees – Very<br>large                      | 6no.   | -   | Good   | Yes   | Ancient and Veteran Trees – District Other Trees – Local | Ancient and Veteran trees are Irreplaceable habitats, and all trees are of significant ecological value.   |
| Individual Trees - Large                              | 22 no. | -   | Good – 98%<br>Poor – 2%                            | Yes   |  |  |
| Individual Trees –<br>Medium                          | 16 no. | -   | Good   | Yes   |  |  |
| Individual Trees - Small                              | 5 no.  | -   | Good   | Yes   |  |  |
| Hedgerows   | 25.8   | -   |  |   |  |  |
| Native hedgerow                                       | 8.3    | -   | Good – 53.5%<br>Moderate –<br>37.7%<br>Poor – 8.8% | Hedgerows are a<br>Habitat of<br>Principal    | Local  | Given their status as Habitats of<br>Principal Importance and BAP<br>habitats, all hedgerow types are<br>considered to be of Local<br>Importance |
| Native hedgerow (assumed)                             | 0.1    | -   | Good<br>(assumed)                                  | Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire |  |  |
| Native hedgerow –<br>associated with bank or<br>ditch | 3.9    | -   | Good – 76.5%<br>Moderate –<br>15.4%                | BAP.  |  |  |



|  |      |   | Poor – 8.1%         |
|--|------|---|---------------------|
|  |      |   | Good – 43.4%        |
| Native hedgerow with trees   | 2.3  | - | Moderate – 51.4%    |
|  |      |   | Poor – 5.2%         |
| Native hedgerow with   |      |   | Good – 51.2%        |
| trees – associated with bank or ditch  | 3.2  | - | Moderate –<br>48.8% |
| Charles with mating  |      |   | Good – 78.9%        |
| Species-rich native hedgerow   | 0.8  | - | Moderate – 21.1%    |
|  |      |   | Good – 45.4%        |
| Species-rich native<br>hedgerow – associated<br>with bank or ditch               | 1.3  | - | Moderate – 26.7%    |
| with barint or altern  |      |   | Poor – 27.9%        |
| Species-rich native  |      |   | Good – 69.7%        |
| hedgerow with trees  | 2.7  | - | Moderate – 30.3%    |
| Species-rich native<br>hedgerow with trees –<br>associated with bank or<br>ditch | 3.1  | - | Good                |
| Non-native and ornamental hedgerow   | 0.08 | - | Poor                |



| Lines of trees                                      | 0.55 | - |                                     |  |       |   |
|---|------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------|---|
| Line of trees                                       | 0.48 | - | Moderate –<br>24.1%<br>Poor – 75.9% | Lines of trees are a separate habitat type to hedgerows, 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. |       |   |
| Line of trees –<br>associated with bank or<br>ditch | 0.07 | - | Moderate –<br>51.5%<br>Poor – 48.5% |  | Local | Given their equivalent standing to hedgerows, which are Habitats of Principal Importance and BAP habitats, all line of tree types are considered to be of Local Importance. |
| Watercourses  | 5.6  | - |                                     |  |       |   |



| Ditches                            | 3.5  | - | Moderate –<br>12.2%<br>Poor – 87.8%    | 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. |
|------------------------------------|------|---|--|--|------------|---|
| Other rivers and streams           | 1.6  | - | Fairly Poor –<br>40.3%<br>Poor – 59.7% | Rivers are a<br>Habitat of                                   |            | These habitats are rarer in the local landscape and have elevated   |
| Other rivers and streams (assumed) | 0.04 | - | Good<br>(assumed)                      | Principal Importance and listed on the Northamptonshire BAP. | District   | ecological value. This, combined with their Habitats of Principal Importance and BAP status, leads to an ascription of District importance.                   |
| Priority Habitat                   | 0.3  | - | Fairly Poor                            |  |            |   |
| Priority Habitat (assumed)         | 0.1  | - | Good<br>(assumed)                      |  |            |   |
| Culvert                            | 0.04 | - | N/A - Poor                             | No   | Negligible | Of negligible ecological value  |



### 1.4 References

Ref.1 UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at <a href="www.ukhab.org">www.ukhab.org</a>)

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













































