Web Links: Lincolnshire County Council is not responsible for any content displayed via external web links

NICHOLSONS

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Client Name:	Naylor Farms
Site:	AD Plant, Surfleet
Date:	August 2024
Version:	1
Author:	Sam Reynolds
Position:	Senior Ecological Consultant

Head Office
The Park
North Aston
Oxfordshire
OX25 6HL
01869 340342

Northamptonshire Office
7-8 Melbourne House
Corbygate Business Park
Weldon
Northamptonshire
NN17 5JG
01536 408 840

contact@nicholsonsgb.com

www.nicholsonsgb.com

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4

2. INTRODUCTION 5

3. METHODOLOGY 7

4. PLANNING POLICY 10

5. BASELINE 12

6. POST-INTERVENTION 15

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 19

8. APPENDICES 20

NICHOLSONS

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET – ECOLOGICAL TEAM

NAME	TITLE
Kate Rooney BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM	Principal Ecological Consultant
Rachel Jackson BSc (Hons)	Senior Ecological Consultant
Elliot Williams BSc (Hons) ACIEEM	Senior Ecological Consultant
Natasha Hannah-Lyons BSc (Hons) ACIEEM	Senior Ecological Consultant
Sam Reynolds BSc (Hons) MSc	Senior Ecological Consultant
Sebastian Ellis BSc (Hons)	Ecological Consultant
Octavia Lugo BSc (Hons)	Ecological Consultant
Rachel Crapper BSc (Hons) MSc	Assistant Ecological Consultant
Eleanor Dring BSc (Hons)	Assistant Ecological Consultant
Charlotte Quigley BSc (Hons)	Assistant Ecological Consultant
Marie Allcoat	Project Administrator

REVISION HISTORY

REV	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE	DATE	INTIALS
Supersedes	NaylorFarms Factory2Surfleet BNGA v3 SR 220424	25.07.2024	SR
1	Original Report	19.08.2024	SR
	Quality review	20.08.2024	ED
	Finalised for issue	20.08.2024	SR

COPYRIGHT ©

The copyright of this document remains with Nicholsons. Its contents must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose without the written consent of Nicholsons.

DISCLAIMER

It should be noted that the information above provides details of the Site's current ecological situation. In the event that the proposed development does not commence within 12 months of the date of this report, further advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist as to whether the information provided requires updating in light of changing ecological conditions.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has been carried out in relation to a proposed development of an Anaerobic Digestate Plant on land adjacent to Surfleet Bank, Surfleet.

1.2. The proposed development will result in a net gain in habitat biodiversity of +13.14% (+1.93 habitat units), a net gain in hedgerow biodiversity of +0.12 hedgerow units (zero baseline, no percentage available), and a net gain in watercourse biodiversity of +15.29% (+0.22 watercourse units).

1.3. The Proposed Development does not violate any trading rules within the Metric.

1.4. The change in biodiversity value, as assessed here, is dependent upon the implementation of an appropriate habitat management plan within the Site upon completion of the proposed development.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Nicholsons was commissioned by Naylor Farms to carry out a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) in relation to a proposed development of an Anaerobic Digestate Plant ("the Proposed Development") on land adjacent to Surfleet Bank, Surfleet (Grid reference: TF 27632 30580), hereafter referred to as "the Site". The location of the Site is provided by Figure 1.

2.2. A baseline habitat survey of the Site was conducted by Nicholsons in February 2024 as part of an Ecological Impact Assessment ("the EcIA")[1], which included condition assessment relevant to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The EcIA should be considered a supporting document for this BNGA.

2.3. At the time of the assessment, the Site comprised agricultural land cultivated with cabbage (Cropland: Horticulture), bordered by wet ditches (Watercourse: Ditches) on the eastern and southern boundaries. Trees were present along the western boundary, and there was a large mature tree present on the eastern boundary (Individual trees: Rural tree).

2.4. Habitats and linear features in the wider landscape, which may be important for ecological connectivity of the Site, included wet ditches and hedgerows, which bordered and radiated from the Site.

2.5. There were 13 non-designated sites and no designated sites in close proximity to the Site (2km radius). The site is within the Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for the Wash SPA, Ramsar, NNR, and SSSI, the Wash & North Norfolk Coast SAC, both 6.7km east of the site, as well as the Surfleet Lows SSSI which is 2.7km to the south-west.

2.6. Assumptions have been made on the potential for habitats and their conditions post-intervention, which may include small changes to soft landscaping (e.g., the addition of a small number of trees) or habitat management effort compared to the original landscaping plan, in order to achieve the mandatory +10% Biodiversity Net Gain. Small changes and/or proposed management efforts applied have been agreed with the applicant and are reported later in this document. Any agreed changes are reflected in our post-intervention habitat map, Figure 3, and within this report, and it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure these are reflected in the final landscaping plan accompanying this assessment to the applicants decisionary body.

2.7. We have provided ecological justification for feasible habitat creation and management post-intervention, but it remains the applicant's responsibility to ensure that these activities are correctly informed and applied. A failure to create and manage habitats in line with this assessment may mean a failure to maintain habitats over a 30-year period from creation.

2.8. The Proposed Development has been assessed based on the supplied landscaping plan[2]. The landscaping plan used for this assessment is provided by Appendix 4.

2.9. The purpose of this report is to assess the net gain or loss of habitats in terms of the DEFRA Statutory Metric ("the Metric") for the Proposed Development.

[1] Nicholsons (2024) NaylorFarmsFactory2Surfleet – EcIA – Revision: 1 – Dated 22/03/2024

[2] Portess and Richardson Limited (2023) Proposed Site Plan – Drawing no. P01 – Revision: D – Dated Dec 2023

Figure 1: Site Location

Ref: CUST-001137-1-NE.100-Site Location (AD Plant) v1 SR 190824

526000
527000
528000
529000
331000
330000

Lampson's Clough
GOSBERTON BANK
Risegate Eau
PEAKIRK LANE
COUNTESS CAUSEWAY
PETER'S ABBEY LANE
A16
SURFLEET BANK
COKEY CAUSEWAY
NEWALDS ROAD
SCOTTNEY LANE
GOULBEACH LANE EAST
GOULBEACH LANE NORTH
THORP LANE
Surfleet Bank
RESERVOIR ROAD
Riversend
River Welland
MARSH DROVE
MAIN

LEGEND

Site boundary

N

0 130 260 390 520 m

NICHOLSONS

TITLE:	Site Location
PROJECT/SITE:	AD Plant, Surfleet
CLIENT:	Naylor Farms
MAP REF:	CUST-001137-1-NE.100
VERSION:	v1
DATE:	19/08/2024
SCALE:	1:10,000 @ A3
APPROVED BY:	SF
PRODUCED BY:	SR

Reproduced with the permission of The Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office Crown Copyright 2024 (c) Licence number: 100015654. Nicholsons, The Park, North Aston, Oxfordshire OX25 6HL. For identification purposes only. Not to be reproduced without the permission of Nicholsons.

The Park
North Aston
Oxfordshire
OX25 6HL
01869 340342

7 - 8 Melbourne House
Corbygate Business Park
Weldon, Corby
Northamptonshire NN17 5JG
01536 408840

www.nicholsonsgb.com

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. This BNG Assessment has been completed based upon baseline habitat survey data ("Baseline", e.g., pre-development) and post-intervention interpretations of the landscaping plan ("Post-intervention", e.g., post-development).

Baseline habitat survey

3.2. A UKHab habitat survey[3] was completed in order to report on the habitats present at the Site and determine the need for further ecological assessment. Habitats are classified by their type, and where applicable, their vegetative structure and botanical value. As part of the UKHab habitat survey, DEFRA Statutory Condition Assessment Sheets ("the condition assessment sheets") were used to assess the condition of the habitats on-site as they relate to BNG.

3.3. The survey was conducted in dry and bright conditions with no access restrictions, outside of the optimal period for botanical assessment, however due to the habitats found on site it is considered that a robust assessment was undertaken. Watercourse habitats were appropriately assessed using River Condition Assessment (RCA) by a suitably qualified person (MoRPh).

3.4. Following on from the baseline habitat survey, habitats are referred to and reported using BNG habitat classification, as converted from UKHab habitat classification. Do note that while these are similar, and UKHab forms the foundational classification system for BNG, there are subtle differences between the two.

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

3.5. The Metric measures, compares, and accounts for the change in biodiversity, i.e., the losses and gains of habitat types and their value, resulting from intervention.

3.6. In addition to the Metric, the DEFRA Statutory User Guide (as relevant to either the Statutory Metric or Statutory Small Sites Metric) ("the User Guide"), must be used. It is important to note that the Metric, the User Guide, and the condition assessment sheets are all legal implements in relation to BNG.

3.7. For the purposes of the Metric, area habitats, linear habitat features (e.g., hedgerows, lines of trees), and watercourse habitats (e.g., rivers, streams, ditches), are all assessed separately. To confirm, the gain or loss of linear feature units does not affect the gain or loss of habitat units. Within the Metric itself, area habitats are assessed within the 'Habitats' tabs, linear habitat features are assessed within the 'Hedgerows' tabs, and watercourse habitats are assessed in the 'Watercourses' tabs. The latter requires a bespoke river assessment process.

[3] Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. and Treweeek, J. (2023) The UK Habitat Classification Manual Version 2.01.

3.8. All area habitats, linear habitat features, and watercourse habitats are given a predetermined distinctiveness score by the Metric. The distinctiveness score reflects the ecological and conservation importance of the habitat across England. Distinctiveness scores range from 'Very Low' (0) to 'Very High' (8).

3.9. The condition of area habitats and linear habitat features are assessed using the condition assessment sheets, which provide a set of criteria and a scoring system against which differing habitats are assessed. The river assessment process has a separate process, but the result is the same. Depending on how many of the criteria the habitat passes, the condition can then be classified on a scale ranging from 'Poor' (1) to 'Good' (3). Certain habitats with little ecological value have 'N/a' (0) or a default score.

3.10. Strategic significance is the evidence of or justification of the significance of a habitat in relation to the local area, or local and national policy. Additional value, i.e., 'Locally ecologically desirable but not in local strategy', is afforded to habitats if they are ecologically meaningful, or are identified within local or national policy (e.g., Local Biodiversity Strategy, Local Biodiversity Action Plan), particularly where they contribute significantly to important landscape-scale habitat (e.g., buffer a riverine valley; provide habitat connectivity within the landscape). The highest significance, 'Formally identified in local strategy' is reserved for habitats linked to Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS), and where these have not been published for the area in question, these need to be significant aspect of local or national policy.

3.11. Once the baseline value of area habitats, linear habitat features, and watercourse habitats have been established, a comparison can be made against what habitats will be retained, enhanced, and created within the Site post-intervention.

3.12. The difference in value between the baseline and post-intervention habitats are compared to provide an assessment of overall net loss or gain in biodiversity within the Site.

3.13. In addition to habitat and hedgerow value (e.g., +10%), interventions as a result of the Proposed Development must not violate trading rules within the Metric or User Guide. The basic trading rule violation occurs when there is an overall loss in biodiversity (e.g., <10%). Trading rule violations also occur where the loss of higher distinctiveness habitats is not appropriately replaced, or there is a loss of irreplaceable habitats. Trading rules can be specific to distinctiveness (i.e., no net loss of medium or higher distinctiveness habitats) or habitat types (e.g., no net loss of Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland).

3.14. For habitats to be created or enhanced, an additional multiplier is applied based upon estimated time to target condition and difficulty of creation. In practice, this means that very high distinctiveness habitats may yield a lower net gain in biodiversity than lower distinctiveness habitats. Depending on the project and its aims, it may be reasonable to request a consultation for bespoke habitat creation with the relevant planning authority.

3.15. Both on-site and off-site habitats can be assessed within the Metric. On-site refers specifically to areas of land intended for intervention and should match the boundary of any associated planning application or works (e.g., redline boundary). Off-site land can include any other owned land and can be used to offset the losses incurred through on-site intervention and should usually be directly adjacent or close to the Site (e.g., blue land). The inclusion of off-site land within an

assessment requires the baseline survey of that land and its inclusion in the BNGA in question. Off-site land receives a penalty to the value of intervention when compared to on-site intervention, and so local off-site intervention is more effective for improving on BNG than the intervention of off-site land further afield. If units are being purchased or traded from another project, these units must be legally agreed (and purchased if applicable), prior to their inclusion in a BNGA, and the Metric must include habitat reference numbers relating to that site's registry on the biodiversity gain site register.

3.16. This assessment utilises the Good Practice Principles for Development (2016)[4]. This document sets out ten principles which have been applied and referred to throughout this report.

1. Apply the mitigation hierarchy.
2. Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere.
3. Be inclusive and equitable.
4. Address risks.
5. Make a measurable Net Gain contribution.
6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity.
7. Be additional.
8. Create a Net Gain legacy.
9. Optimise sustainability.
10. Be transparent.

3.17. In addition to this guidance, we apply the newer Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy (as set out in Article 30A of the Development Management Procedure Order), and actively seek to apply the latest and best practice in the BNG industry.

3.18. Developers and other practitioners of Biodiversity Net Gain should adhere to best practice guidance in order to realise meaningful benefits to the environment, society, and the economy, in line with international and national commitments by the UK Government to halt the loss of biodiversity. Critically, thoughtful application of this guidance provides a way for industry to evidence their projects have followed best practice.

3.19. Examples of application of best practice in relation to BNG may include: 1. Thoughtfully designed landscaping which serves both biodiversity as well as human recreation and aesthetics; 2. Measured ecological enhancements in response to local or national themes (e.g., provision of bat/bird boxes even when not required by other ecological recommendation); 3. Active engagement with local knowledge and monitoring groups (e.g., Wildlife Trusts) to ensure the integration of a Proposed Development into the local area, particularly where higher distinctiveness and high condition habitats are proposed (e.g., Other Neutral Grassland in Good condition; woodlands).

[4] Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development © CIEEM, CIRIA, IEMA, 2016.

4. PLANNING POLICY

National Policy

4.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) December 2023 (as amended) state the following in relation to biodiversity:

- 180: "Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity … (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of … trees and woodland; c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving access to it where appropriate; d) minimising the impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; … ; f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate."
- 181: "Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value … (and) take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries."
- 185: "To protect and enhance biodiversity … , plans should: a) identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation; and; b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity."
- 186: "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. … ; c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused … ; development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around development should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Local policy

4.2. The Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Greater Lincolnshire is in development as of March 2024 and is currently unpublished.

4.3. The Local Biodiversity Plan for South East Lincolnshire (South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036) states the following in relation to biodiversity:

- Policy 2: "Proposals requiring planning permissions for development will be permitted provided that sustainable development considerations are met, specifically in relation to: 1. Size, scale, layout, density and impact on the amenity, trees, character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development and land uses. … 8. Impact or enhancement for areas of natural habitats … ".
- Policy 3: " … Development proposals will demonstrate how the following issues, where they are relevant to the proposal, will be secured: … 14. The incorporation of existing hedgerows and trees and the provision of appropriate new landscaping to enhance biodiversity, green infrastructure … ".
- Policy 28: "A high quality, comprehensive ecological network of interconnected designated sites, sites of nature conservation importance and wildlife-friendly greenspace will be achieved by protecting, enhancing and managing natural assets: … 3. Addressing gaps in the ecological network: a. by ensuring that all development proposals shall provide an overall net gain in biodiversity, by: i. protecting the biodiversity value of land, buildings and trees (including veteran trees) minimising the fragmentation of habitats; ii. maximising the opportunities for restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats and species of principle importance; iii. incorporating beneficial biodiversity conservation features on buildings, where appropriate; and maximising opportunities to enhance green infrastructure and ecological corridors, including water space; and iv. conserving or enhancing biodiversity … conservation features that will provide new habitat and help wildlife to adapt to climate change, and if the development is within a Nature Improvement Area (NIA), contributing to the aims and objectives of the NIA.".

5. BASELINE

5.1. The baseline habitats present within the Site are reported below, including brief descriptions for each habitat, the relevant condition assessment criteria, and areas and Metric values.

5.2. A map to show the habitats present within the baseline is shown in **Figure 2**.

Habitats

5.3. The baseline habitat survey confirmed the following habitats to be present within the Site:

- **Cropland: Horticulture –** Agricultural land characterised by cabbage crop production. This habitat has a default condition (1) within the Metric and is low distinctiveness (2).
- **Individual trees: Rural tree –** The trees on site were mapped and assessed based on approximate location and number. Species comprised Blackthorn *Prunus spinosa*, Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*, and Horse Chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*. Tree ID's match those presented within the EcIA. Five medium size trees succeeded 3 out of 6 criteria, and one large tree succeeded 5 out of 6 criteria, within the 'individual trees' condition assessment and were assessed as being in moderate and good condition respectively. The medium trees were assessed as failing criteria D and E, while the large tree failed criteria D.
- **Watercourses: Ditches –** Wet ditches were present on the eastern and southern boundaries of the Site. Ditches were assessed through RCA as being in moderate condition.

5.4. Ditches located on the boundary of the Site have been included in this calculation, as they may be impacted by the changes to the surrounding habitat and it is important to reflect their location to the Site, regardless of land ownership at the boundary.

5.5. The majority of habitats within the Site have been classified as having low strategic significance, e.g., the Site is an 'Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy' as these habitats do not have appropriate relevance to a LNRS, or local or national policy. Some habitats of higher ecological value within the Site, such as existing trees and wet ditches, as well as proposed woodland, SuDS, and species-rich grassland, have been identified in local policy, and are therefore justified as 'Locally ecologically desirable but not in local strategy'. The LNRS for Lincolnshire was not yet available, and so justification for 'Formally identified in local plan' was not possible.

Baseline habitat assessment

5.6. An assessment of the baseline habitats present within the Site is provided by **Table 1** and **Table 2**. A map to show the baseline habitats and their conditions within the Site is provided by **Figure 2**. The full baseline condition assessments are provided by **Appendix 2**.

5.7. The baseline habitat value for the Site was assessed as 14.71 habitat units, no hedgerow units, and 1.42 watercourse units.

Table 1: Baseline area habitats

Habitat	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Biodiversity Units
Cropland: Horticulture	Low (2)	N/a (1)	6.754	13.51
Individual trees: Rural tree	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.118	1.20
Totals (area not including trees)			6.754	14.71

Please note that areas and units have been rounded for ease of reading and may not match the Metric.

Table 2: Baseline watercourse habitats

Habitat	Distinctiveness	Condition	Length (km)	Biodiversity Units
Ditches (D1)	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.185	1.39
Ditches (D2)	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.005	0.04
Totals			0.190	1.42

Please note that areas and units have been rounded for ease of reading and may not match the Metric.

Figure 2: Baseline habitat map

Ref: CUST-001137-1-NE.102-Baseline Habitat Map (AD Plant) v1 SR 190824

527400 527500 527600 527700 527800 527900

330800 330700 330600 330500 330400

SURFLEET BANK

SURFLEET BANK

A16

5m

D1

T3

T10

T9

T8

T7

T6

D2

Drain

Drain

3m

LEGEND

N

- Site boundary
- Cropland: Horticulture, N/a
- Ditches (River metric), Moderate condition
- Individual trees: Rural tree, Large size, Good condition (n = 1)
- Individual trees: Rural tree, Medium size, Moderate condition (n = 5)

0 20 40 60 80 m

NICHOLSONS

TITLE:
Baseline Habitat Map

PROJECT/SITE:
AD Plant, Surfleet

CLIENT:
Naylor Farms

MAP REF:
CUST-001137-1-NE.102

VERSION:
v1

DATE:
19/08/2024

SCALE:
1:1,800 @ A3

APPROVED BY:
SF

PRODUCED BY:
SR

Reproduced with the permission of The Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office Crown Copyright 2024 (c) Licence number: 100015654. Nicholsons, The Park, North Aston, Oxfordshire OX25 6HL. For identification purposes only. Not to be reproduced without the permission of Nicholsons.

The Park
North Aston
Oxfordshire
OX25 6HL
01869 340342

7 - 8 Melbourne House
Corbygate Business Park
Weldon, Corby
Northamptonshire NN17 5JG
01536 408840

www.nicholsonsgb.com

6. POST-INTERVENTION

6.1. The habitats proposed to be present within the Site post-intervention are reported below, including brief descriptions for each habitat, a feasible example of the relevant condition assessment criteria to be targeted, any justification required, and areas and Metric values.

6.2. Post-intervention habitats have been interpreted from the supplied landscaping plan, and where applicable, discussed and agreed with the applicant.

6.3. Relevant guidance, ecological expertise, and professional judgement have been used to assign achievable habitat creation, enhancement, and management targets. Our suggestions for achieving feasible conditions, as well as broad suggestions for management are detailed below. These should be used or superseded by further bespoke advice to achieve the same condition and implemented through a habitat management and monitoring plan (HMMP).

6.4. A post-intervention habitat map is provided by Figure 3, which shows the habitats that will be retained, enhanced, and created by the Proposed Development.

Habitat retention

- Individual trees: Rural tree – All existing trees (5 medium, 1 large) will be retained in their current extent and condition.

Habitat enhancement

- Watercourses: Ditches – Existing ditches will be retained in their current extent, and their condition improved through changes to encroachment, specifically through the proposed woodland/grassland creation and the seeding of an appropriate wet/riparian species-mix (e.g., Emorsgate EP1) on the banks and bank tops of the ditches (as they border the Site). Common Reed *Phragmites australis* is likely to colonise, and is locally appropriate, however the amount of reed should be managed to 25% of the ditch extent over the 30-year period.

Habitat creation

- Urban: Developed land, sealed surface – Areas of built environment, hardstanding, and buildings. This habitat has a default condition (0) within the Metric and is very low distinctiveness (0).
- Urban: Sustainable drainage system – A large attenuation basin is proposed within the western greenspace area. Through appropriate marginal and aquatic planting (e.g., Emorsgate EP1, hand planting), as well as ongoing management to attain condition (i.e., algae control), this habitat can offer significant value to biodiversity in the local area. This habitat can feasibly achieve 5 out of 5 criteria within the 'urban' condition assessment sheet and was assessed as targeting good condition. It is suggested that management targets criteria E1 and E2.

- Grassland: Modified grassland – Small areas of grassland verge around the Site which are in proximity to buildings or significant likely disturbance. These should be seeded with a native grass and wildflower mix (e.g., Emorsgate EL1), and may be mown regularly. This habitat can feasibly achieve 5 out of 7 criteria within the 'grassland (low)' condition assessment and was assessed as targeting moderate condition. It is suggested that management targets criteria A.
- Grassland: Other neutral grassland – Areas of grassland adjacent to proposed woodland away from the main infrastructure of the Site, to be seeded with a species-rich native grass and wildflower mix. A seed mix must be chosen which will be compatible with the soil type (e.g., Emorsgate EM4 (for clay soils) or EM5 (for loamy soils), as ascertained by the Land Information System (LandIS), Cranfield Environment Centre (CEC)). Management should include two cuts per year, after flowering grasses and wildflowers have set seed, with one cut to be carried out in late July-August and one in September. An additional cut may be required in Spring (latest early-April) of the first year to reduce overcrowding and allow wildflower establishment. Arisings should be removed from the grassland after each cut. It may be appropriate to cut the grassland in sections over time to create a varied sward height. Recreational use should be limited to mown pathways to limit disturbance through the grassland, and to target high conditions, signs, guide ropes or fencing should be implemented. This habitat can feasibly achieve 4 out of the 6 criteria within the 'grassland (medium, high, very high)' condition assessment and was assessed as targeting moderate condition. It is suggested that management targets criteria A and B.
- Woodland and forest: Other woodland, broadleaved – Woodland creation is proposed across the Site, particularly through a large arm along the western boundary and as screening for the AD Plant. New woodlands should be comprised of three or more native tree species, of which Alder *Alnus glutinosa* and Silver Birch *Betula pendula* are locally appropriate, and Pedunculate Oak *Quercus robur* and Beech *Fagus sylvatica* may serve as a likely third and fourth. The ground layer should be seeded with an appropriate shade tolerant/woodland native grass and wildflower mix (e.g., Emorsgate EW1) These habitats can feasibly achieve a score of 26 out of 39 within the 'woodland' condition assessment and were assessed as targeting moderate condition. It is suggested that management targets criteria D, E, F, G, I, and L.

Post-intervention habitat assessment

6.5. An assessment of the post-intervention habitats present within the Site are provided by Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5. A map to show the post-intervention habitats and their targeted conditions within the Site is provided by Figure 3. The post-intervention condition assessments are provided by Appendix 3.

6.6. The post-intervention habitat value for the Site was assessed as being 16.64 habitat units, 0.12 hedgerow units, and 1.64 watercourse units.

Table 3: Post-intervention area habitats

Habitat	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Biodiversity Units
Retained Habitats				
Individual trees: Rural tree	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.118	1.20
New Habitats				
Urban: Developed land, sealed surface	Very Low (0)	N/a (0)	3.474	0.00
Urban: Sustainable drainage system	Low (2)	Good (3)	0.958	3.55
Grassland: Modified grassland	Low (2)	Moderate (2)	0.437	1.52
Grassland: Other neutral grassland	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.299	2.20
Woodland and forest: Other woodland, broadleaved	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	1.585	8.18
Totals (area not including trees)			6.754	16.64

Please note that areas and units have been rounded for ease of reading and may not match the Metric.

Table 4: Post-intervention linear habitats (not including watercourse habitats)

Habitat	Distinctiveness	Condition	Length (km)	Biodiversity Units
New Habitats				
Line of trees (LoT1)	Low (2)	Moderate (2)	0.061	0.12
Totals			0.061	0.12

Please note that areas and units have been rounded for ease of reading and may not match the Metric.

Table 5: Post-intervention watercourse habitats

Habitat	Distinctiveness	Condition	Length (km)	Biodiversity Units
Enhanced Habitats				
Watercourses: Ditches (D1)	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.185	1.60
Watercourses: Ditches (D2)	Medium (4)	Moderate (2)	0.005	0.04
Totals			0.190	1.64

Please note that areas and units have been rounded for ease of reading and may not match the Metric.

Figure 3: Post-intervention habitat map

Ref: CUST-001137-1-NE.103-Post-intervention Habitat Map (AD Plant) v1 SR 190824

527400 527500 527600 527700 527800 527900

330800 330700 330600 330500 330400

A16 SURFLEET BANK WEST SURFLEET BANK Ponds 5m Pond Concrete Hard standing Car Park Secure Gate Factory Drain D1 T3 T10 T9 T8 T7 T6 LOT1 D2 Drain Woad Farm Drain Drain Weighbridge 3m 3.0m

LEGEND

N

- Site boundary
- New, Urban: Developed land, sealed surface, N/A
- New, Grassland: Modified grassland, Moderate condition
- New, Urban: Sustainable drainage system, Good condition
- New, Grassland: Other neutral grassland, Moderate condition
- New, Woodland and forest: Other woodland, broadleaved, Moderate condition
- New, Line of trees, Moderate condition
- Enhanced, Ditches (River metric), Moderate condition
- Retained, Individual trees: Rural tree, Large size, Good condition (n = 1)
- Retained, Individual trees: Rural tree, Medium size, Moderate condition (n = 5)

0 20 40 60 80 m

NICHOLSONS

TITLE: Post-intervention Habitat Map

PROJECT/SITE: AD Plant, Surfleet

CLIENT: Naylor Farms

MAP REF: CUST-001137-1-NE.103

VERSION: v1

DATE: 19/08/2024

SCALE: 1:1,800 @ A3

APPROVED BY: SF

PRODUCED BY: SR

Reproduced with the permission of The Controller of His Majesty's Stationery Office Crown Copyright 2024 (c) Licence number: 100015654. Nicholsons, The Park, North Aston, Oxfordshire OX25 6HL. For identification purposes only. Not to be reproduced without the permission of Nicholsons.

The Park
North Aston
Oxfordshire
OX25 6HL
01869 340342

7 - 8 Melbourne House
Corbygate Business Park
Weldon, Corby
Northamptonshire NN17 5JG
01536 408840

www.nicholsonsgb.com

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. The proposed development will result in a net gain in habitat biodiversity of +13.14% (+1.93 habitat units), a net gain in hedgerow biodiversity of +0.12 hedgerow units (zero baseline, no percentage available), and a net gain in watercourse biodiversity of +15.29% (+0.22 watercourse units).

7.2. In line with this assessment, the Proposed Development will achieve the mandatory +10% net gain in biodiversity for area habitats, linear habitat features, and watercourse habitats, as assessed separately.

7.3. A print of the headline results of the Metric calculator is provided by Appendix 1.

7.4. The Proposed Development does not violate any trading rules within the Metric.

7.5. There are no irreplaceable habitats within the Site.

7.6. The habitat areas and conditions established by this assessment are to be maintained for the next 30 years from creation, as defined as the point of creation of each habitat prior to time to condition.

8. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: A print of the Metric Results

Ref: AD Plant Surfleet MetricPrint v1 SR 190824

AD Plant, Surfleet

Headline Results

Return to results menu

Scroll down for final results ⚠

On-site baseline	*Habitat units*	14.71		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	1.42		
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	16.64		
	Hedgerow units	0.12		
	Watercourse units	1.64		
On-site net change (units & percentage)	*Habitat units*	1.93	13.14%	
	Hedgerow units	0.12	N/A	Zero baseline units - % cannot be calculated
	Watercourse units	0.22	15.29%	
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*	1.93		
	Hedgerow units	0.12		
	Watercourse units	0.22		
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*	1.93	
	Hedgerow units	0.12	
	Watercourse units	0.22	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	13.14%	
	Hedgerow units	N/A	0 baseline units - % cannot be calculated
	Watercourse units	15.29%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓		

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	14.71	16.18	0.00	No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
Watercourse units	10.00%	1.42	1.57	0.00	No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Appendix 2: Baseline condition assessment sheets

Ref: AD Plant Surfleet Baseline Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_Condition_Assessments v1 SR 190824

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Individual trees – Urban trees
Individual trees – Rural trees
Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.

Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

Individual trees: Rural tree

Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment):
Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.

Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):
Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**									
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)									
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**									
		T3	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10				
		Grid reference									
		Good	Mod	Mod	Mod	Mod	Mod				

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	Yes	No	No	No	No	No					
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	No	No	No	No	No	No					
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No					
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
	Number of criteria passed	5	3	3	3	3	3					

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**									
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	x									
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		x	x	x	x	x				
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)										

Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.							
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]							

Appendix 3: Post-intervention condition assessment sheets

Ref: AD Plant Surfleet Post-intervention Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_Condition_Assessments v1 SR 190824

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Modified grassland			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	
Habitat Description			
Grassland: Modified grassland			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2 present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.** Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m^2 (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	Yes	
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	No	
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Yes	
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	No	
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].	Yes	
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).	Yes	
	Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		Yes
	Number of criteria passed		5

Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)		

Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	x	
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* , spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* , curled dock *Rumex crispus* , broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* , common nettle *Urtica dioica* , creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* , greater plantain *Plantago major* , white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* .

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland
Grassland - Lowland meadows
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland
Grassland - Other neutral grassland
Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430) [Not to be confused with the Tall forbs secondary code – see UKHab guidance for details.]
Grassland - Upland acid grassland
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Upland hay meadows
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

Grassland: Other neutral grassland

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type (and relative to Footnote 3 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description).[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**	Yes	
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	Yes	
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens[2].	Yes	
D	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) is less than 5%.	Yes	
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.	No	

Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types			
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m^2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 3 and 5 cannot contribute towards this count). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**	No	
	Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)	No	
	Number of criteria passed	4	

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Acid grassland types (Result out of 5 criteria)		
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Non-acid grassland types (Result out of 6 criteria)		
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F.	Good (3)	
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A.	Moderate (2)	x
Passes 2 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Notes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing for plant colonisation, or localised patches not exceeding 5% cover.

Footnote 3 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* , spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* , curled dock *Rumex crispus* , broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* , common nettle *Urtica dioica* , creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* , greater plantain *Plantago major* , white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* . There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Individual trees – Urban trees
Individual trees – Rural trees
Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.

Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

Retained, Individual trees: Rural tree

Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment):
Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.

Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):
Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**										
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)										
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**										
		T3	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10					
		Grid reference										
Condition Assessment Criteria		Good	Mod	Mod	Mod	Mod	Mod					
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	Yes	No	No	No	No	No					
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	No	No	No	No	No	No					
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes	No	No	No	No	No					
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					
	Number of criteria passed	5	3	3	3	3	3					

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**										
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	x										
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		x	x	x	x	x					
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.							
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]							

Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral **Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs** **Urban - Allotments** **Urban - Biodiverse green roof** **Urban - Bioswale** **Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards** **Urban - Facade-bound green wall** **Urban - Ground based green wall** **Urban - Intensive green roof** **Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land** **Urban - Rain garden** **Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)** **Urban - Vacant or derelict land** **Urban - Bare ground**			
Habitat Description			
Urban: Sustainable drainage system			
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats:			UKHab – UK Habitat Classification
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**	**Notes (such as justification)**
Core Criteria - must be assessed for **all urban habitat types**:			
A	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.	Yes	
B	The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year.	Yes	
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[1]) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement)[2] cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area[3]. **Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).**	Yes	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** only:			
D	The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS: - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i); Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.		
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for **Bioswale and SuDS** habitat types only:			
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife[4].	Yes	
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.	Yes	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Intensive green roofs** only:			

F	The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Biodiverse green roofs** only:			
G	The roof has a varied depth of 80 – 150 mm; at least 50% is at 150 mm and is planted and seeded with wildflowers and sedums or is pre-prepared with sedums and wildflowers. **Note – to achieve Good condition some additional habitat, such as sand piles, stones, logs etc. are present.**		
Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No)			Yes
Number of criteria passed			5

Condition Assessment Result	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**
Results for habitats requiring assessment of **3 core criteria** only **(all listed urban habitats except Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land, Bioswale, SuDS and Green roofs)**:		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Good (3)	
• Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria.	Poor (1)	
Results for **Green roofs** and **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** (requiring assessment of **4 criteria** only - core criteria plus additional criterion specified for habitat type):		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes additional criterion relevant to specific habitat type (D, F or G).	Good (3)	
• Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria.	Poor (1)	
Results for **Bioswale or SuDS** (requiring assessment of **5 criteria** - core criteria plus additional criteria specified for habitat type):		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E)	Good (3)	x
• Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR • Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland
Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland

Habitat Description

Woodland and forest: Other woodland, broadleaved

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

This condition sheet is based on the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG) Woodland Condition Survey Method, available here:

Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)

IMPORTANT: This biodiversity metric woodland condition assessment must be used to assess woodland being input into the biodiversity metric. The outputs of this condition assessment are not equivalent to, nor are they comparable with the scores from the EWBG condition assessment, because the EWBG assessment has been adapted for the biodiversity metric, including the removal of EWBG Indicator 7 (Proportion of favourable land cover around woodland) and Indicator 14 (Size of woodland), and minor changes to other indicators.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
A	**Age distribution of trees**	Three age-classes[1] present.	Two age-classes[1] present.	One age-class[1] present.	2	
B	**Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage**	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in less than 40% of whole woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland[2].	1	
C	**Invasive plant species**	No invasive species[3] present in woodland.	Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* or cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* not present, and other invasive species[3] <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species[3] ≥10% cover.	3	
D	**Number of native tree species**	Five or more native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species[4] across woodland parcel.	2	
E	**Cover of native tree and shrub species**	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native[5].	3	

F	**Open space within woodland**	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted[7].	21 - 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6].	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category[7].	2	
G	**Woodland regeneration**	All three classes present in woodland[8]; trees 4 - 7 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth.	One or two classes only present in woodland[8].	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland[8].	2	
H	**Tree health**	Tree mortality 10% or less, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback[9].	11% to 25% tree mortality and or crown dieback or low-risk pest or disease present[9].	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high-risk pest or disease present[9].	2	
I	**Vegetation and ground flora**	Recognisable NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.	2	
J	**Woodland vertical structure**	Three or more storeys across all survey plots, or a complex woodland[11].	Two storeys across all survey plots[11].	One or less storey across all survey plots[11].	2	
K	**Veteran trees**	Two or more veteran trees[12] per hectare.	One veteran tree[12] per hectare.	No veteran trees[12] present in woodland.	1	
L	**Amount of deadwood**	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	3	
M	**Woodland disturbance**	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident[14].	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area, and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground[14].	1 hectare or more of nutrient enrichment, and or 20% or more of woodland area has damaged ground[14].	1	
				Total Score (out of a possible 39)	26	

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Result Achieved
Total score >32 (33 to 39)	Good (3)	
Total score 26 to 32	Moderate (2)	
Total score <26 (13 to 25)	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Appendix 4: Landscaping plan

Ref: 3952 PO1 REV D PROPOSED SITE PLAN - SURFLEET

NOTES

This drawing has been issued in support of a planning application and must NOT be used for construction purposes.

This drawing is copyright and may not be altered, traced, copied, photographed or used for any purpose other than that for which it is issued without written permission from the copyright holder.

Weighbridge

3.0m

SURFLEET BANK

Ponds

A16

Fern Lea

The Gables

4.3m

Access for proposed ODOW Scheme

ODOW Planting Scheme

Pond

Swale

Car Park

Attenuation Pond

Drain

Factory

Secretary Treasurer

Storage Warehouse

Wild Flower/Woodland Roundabout

Concrete Hard standing

Wild Flower Meadow

Thin Fraction Storage

Secondary Digester

Pasteurisation Tanks

Prestorage Tank

Primary Digester

Buffer Tanks

Flare

Decanter

Grid Entry Unit

Cycle stores

Secure gate

40 Space Car Park

Digestate Processing (80x62m) 1.2 Acres

Weigh Bridge

Natural gas Off take

Boiler House

Gas Engines

Gas Upgrading Plant

Acoustic Fence

Storage Tanks

Waste Transfer (60x40m)

Odour Control System

Foreman's Flat

Woad Farm

Drain

D
09/08/24 REVISED RED LINE BOUNDARY
C
11/06/24 GENERAL CHNAGES
B
13/03/24 REVISED RED LINE BOUNDARY
A
16/01/24 REVISED SITE ACCESS

Red Line Boundary - 67,535sqm
AD Plant (Inside bund) - 33,135sqm
AD Plant (Including Bund) - 41,804sqm

0 50 100

SCALE 1:1000

Project
PROPOSED AD PLANT

Address
LAND ADJACENT A16
SURFLEET
LINCOLNSHIRE

Client
NAYLOR FARMS

Drawing
PROPOSED
SITE PLAN

Date	Scale	
DEC 2023	1:1000 @ A1 - 1:2000 @ A3	
Project No. 3952	Drawing No. P01	Revision D

P&R ARCHITECTS
Portess and Richardson Limited
193 Lincoln Road, Peterborough PE1 2PL
T. 01733 568116. E. p-r@portessarchitect.com
www.portessarchitect.com