



Leigh Ecology Ltd

Office 01606892032 Mobile 07815711678 8 Hall Drive, Marston, Northwich, Cheshire CW9 6DT

Biodiversity Net Gain Report

Former Park Pub,
153 Moorcroft Road,
Wythenshawe.

On Behalf of Watson Homes Ltd.

Supporting BNG Metric REV4

Contents

1.	Submission Details.....	3
2.	Consultancy Details.....	4
3.	Methodology.....	5
4.	Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy.....	6
5.	Irreplaceable Habitats.....	9
6.	On-site Baseline Habitats.....	10
7.	Trading Summary.....	17
8.	References.....	18

1. Submission details

1.1 Date

30/01/26

1.2 Planning application reference number

Unknown

1.3 Local planning authority (LPA)

Manchester

1.4 Development site Address

Former Park Pub,
153 Moorcroft Road,
Wythenshawe,
Manchester

1.5 Brief description of the development

This Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) report has been prepared in support of a planning application for a proposed residential development comprising an apartment complex, with associated hard standing and landscaping. The existing site is a derelict pub building with associated parking area and small sections of differing grassland.

2. Consultancy Details

2.1 Name of Responsible Person

Christian Leigh

2.2 Company name

Leigh Ecology Ltd.

2.3 Address

8 Hall Drive
Marston
Northwich
Cheshire
CW9 6DT

2.4 Contact number

01606 892032

3. Methodology

3.1 Biodiversity Net Gain was calculated using The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation tool.

- The onsite habitat baseline calculations are measured on MapInfo GIS software using the Phase 1 Habitat map.
- The Phase 1 habitat classifications are translated to UK Habitat Regulations using the translation tool in the Biodiversity Metric.
- All habitat conditions are based on the condition assessments listed in the habitat condition sheets excel document.
- The strategic significance is determined by deciding if the habitat is desirable within the location and seeing if it is identified within a local strategy.
- The areas to be retained or enhanced habitats are calculated using the Proposed Landscaping Masterplan.
- The proposed off-setting site habitat baseline calculations are measured on MapInfo GIS software using a Phase 1 Habitat map.
- The site proposed habitats and associated scores are calculated using measurements and habitat information provided by DEP Landscape Architecture Ltd, as well as over-laying site plans onto the MapInfo GIS software and taking area measurements.

3.2 The change in biodiversity is calculated by subtracting the baseline unit values from the post-development values of the broad habitat types. This is combined with any off-site gains or losses to give a final Biodiversity Unit Value for the scheme.

4. Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy

4.1 How will the proposal minimise impacts to habitats?

The site is set within dense urban environment, comprising an ongoing managed modified grassland, sections of ONG which have been unmanaged since the closure of the pub and hard standing, actively used parking area. The habitats of medium distinctiveness value to be lost is exclusively other neutral grassland of poor condition.

4.2 Is the net gain percentage being achieved On-site, Off-site or Both?

Both

4.3 How many biodiversity units are required to meet the 10% net gain requirement?

Habitat Units 0.15
Hedgerow Units 0.02

4.4 Is there a habitat management and monitoring plan?

Yes, supplied upon planning approval

4.5 Has the statutory biodiversity metric tool been used?

Yes – The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool

4.6 Reference Number of pre-development habitat survey report and map

Park Pub – PEA, PRA and Bat Activity
Survey Report REV2



4.7 Pre-development habitat map (On-site)



4.8 Post-development Landscape Plan (On-site) –DEP



5. Irreplaceable Habitats

5.1 Does the development impact any irreplaceable habitats?

No

6. On-site Baseline Habitats

6.1 Survey Date

19/09/2025

6.2 Survey Constraints (access issues, weather etc.)

In September, outside of prime botanical season.

6.3 Total pre-development biodiversity value

Number of area **habitat** biodiversity units

0.13

Number of **hedgerow** biodiversity units

0.02

Number of **watercourse** biodiversity units

0.00

6.4 On – Site Habitat Condition Assessments

Habitat

G4 Modified Grassland

Score

5 (excluding criterion A)

Condition

Poor

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			
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.		Regularly mowed and maintained sections, featuring ryegrass, dandelion and clover exclusively.
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.		Sward all below 7cm.
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.		No scrub present within sections of modified grassland.
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.	y	
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	y	No bare ground present
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	y	No Bracken present
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	y	No invasive noted
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			
Number of criteria passed			
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)		

Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	y	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Footnotes			
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i>, spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i>, curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i>, broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>, common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i>, creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i>, greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i>, white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>. 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).			

6.5 On – Site Habitat Condition Assessments

Habitat

G3C Other Neutral Grassland

Score

4 (excluding criterion A and F)

Condition

Poor

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

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

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											
Condition Assessment Criteria		Grid reference											
		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.												Exclusively forb species and yorkshire fog, curled dock, butterweed, stinging nettle.
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.	y											Varied sward consistently across ONG
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens ² .	y											bare ground in several spaces, beyond 5%.
D	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.	y											No bracken present. And scrub just below 20% threshold.
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.	y											damage is present at front of site.
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.												doesn't reach 10 species threshold.
Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)													
Number of criteria passed													
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√											
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)												
Passes 2 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)	y											
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score													

6.6 Description of proposed habitat creation/enhancements

Proposal plans include the addition of an apartment block, associated hard standing, vegetated garden lawn areas and areas of POS, notably small sections of modified grassland and introduced shrub. 11 small native trees are to be planted across site also. Sections of ornamental hedgerow are proposed also.

6.7 Total post-development biodiversity value

Number of area habitat biodiversity units

0.28

Number of hedgerow biodiversity units

0.23

Number of watercourse biodiversity units

0.00

6.8 Total net change in biodiversity units

Number of area habitat biodiversity units

0.14

+108.38 %

Number of hedgerow biodiversity units

0.21

+1163.36%

Number of watercourse biodiversity units

0.00

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.14		
	Hedgerow units	0.21		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	108.38%		
	Hedgerow units	1163.36%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	0.13	0.15	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.02	0.02	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

7. Trading Summary

7.1 Have the trading rules been satisfied?

NO

Habitat Trading Summary

Trading Summary		
Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Satisfied?
Very High	Same habitat required - bespoke compensation option 8	Yes ✓
High	Same habitat required =	Yes ✓
Medium	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	No ▲
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Yes ✓

Hedgerow Trading Summary

Trading Summary		
Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Satisfied?
Very High	Same habitat required =	Yes ✓
High	Like for like or better	Yes ✓
Medium	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓
Very Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓

Medium Distinctiveness					
Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change	Cumulative broad habitat change
Cropland - Arable field margins cultivated annually	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Arable field margins game bird mix	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Cropland - Arable field margins pollen and nectar	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Cropland - Arable field margins tussocky	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	-0.07	0.00	-0.07	-0.07 8
Grassland - Upland acid grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Willow scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lakes - Reservoirs	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Biodiverse green roof	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Individual trees - Urban tree	Individual trees	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10 ✓
Individual trees - Rural tree	Individual trees	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Littoral sand	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)	Intertidal hard structures	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		0.04	0.00	0.04	

The habitat trading rules have not been satisfied, this is due to the deficit of Other Neutral Grassland habitat, currently at a -0.07 cumulative broad habitat change. Therefore, to satisfy the trading rules, an off-site provider must be sought to purchase 0.07 Other Neutral Grassland units.

8. References

JNCC. Phase 1 Habitat Survey – a technique for environmental audit. JNCC, Updated 2010.

The UK Habitat Classification Working Group 2014-2018 were: W.G. Butcher, P.D. Carey, R.A.C. Edmonds, L.R. Norton & J.R. Treweek.

MAGIC mapping: Defra, London

QGIS- Google Satellite, OS Maps. Contains OS Data © Crown copyright and database right (2024)

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019). Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government