

LAND AT 21-27 VALE STREET MANCHESTER

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

November 2025



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Land at 21-27 Vale Street, Manchester
Project Reference: CW20-3618
Report Title: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Report Reference: CW20-3618 BNG 001
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

<i>Rev</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Prepared</i>	<i>Reviewed</i>	<i>Approved</i>
/	07/11/2025	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	SB	KB	KB
//	11/11/2025	Final version sent to Client.	SB	KB	KB

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Conway Architectural Design/ David Trudgeon and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Conway Architectural Design/ David Trudgeon and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Conway Architectural Design/ David Trudgeon and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1	SCOPE & PURPOSE	4
1.2	LOCATION	4
1.3	OBJECTIVES	4
1.4	PLANNING CONTEXT	5
2	METHODS.....	6
2.1	EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE).....	6
2.2	PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)	6
2.3	STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC.....	6
2.4	HABITAT SCORING	6
2.5	LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT	7
		7
		7
3	BASELINE CONDITIONS - HABITATS	8
3.1.	STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE.....	8
3.2.	HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT	8
3.3.	LOST HABITATS	8
3.4.	PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE	8
4	HABITAT CREATION	10
5	SUMMARY	11
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY	12

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Conway Architectural Design/ David Trudgeon to prepare a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the proposed works at the Land at 21 -27 Vale Street, Manchester. This report has been prepared to inform the planning application of the erection of two new dwellings with associated gardens and driveways.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Shona Bancroft Ecological Project Manager at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. This report has been overseen by Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM, Associate Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Katie is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.

1.1.3. This report has been written broadly following the Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates (CIEEM, 2023).

1.2. LOCATION

1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location. The site is located within a predominantly urban area within the city of Manchester. (Grid reference: SJ 88214 98861)



Figure 1.1 Site Location

1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The report has been produced to document the methods, results and conclusions of a BNG Assessment undertaken based on the proposed development for the site to fulfil the following:

- Ensure that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied;
- Identify the baseline habitats present and provide a condition assessment;
- Identify the post development habitats on site, assess the possible target condition and provide an indication of the likely importance of those habitats;
- Calculate the overall change in biodiversity score from pre- post development
- Provide design recommendations to maximise potential net gain achievable

- Provide an indication of likely outcomes and indicative cost as required.

1.4 PLANNING CONTEXT

- 1.4.1 The Government 25-year Environment Plan states that government will “embed environmental net gain principle for development.”
- 1.4.2 National policy already sets out that planning should provide Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) where possible. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 174(d), 179(b) and 180(d) refer to this policy requirement and the Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further explanation on how this should be done.
- 1.4.3 Under the Environment Act 2021, all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) except for small sites will have to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain from January 2024. BNG will be required for small sites from April 2024. BNG will be measured using Defra’s biodiversity metric and habitats will need to be secured for at least 30 years. Key points regarding BNG are listed below:
- Minimum 10% gain required calculated using Biodiversity Metric & approval of net gain plan.
 - Habitat secured for at least 30 years via obligations/ conservation covenant.
 - Habitat can be delivered on-site, off-site or via statutory biodiversity units.
 - There will be a national register for net gain delivery sites.
 - The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation, and compensation for biodiversity loss.
 - Will also apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs)
 - Does not apply to marine development.
 - Does not change existing legal environmental and wildlife protections.
- 1.4.4 Developers are required to undertake an assessment (using the nationally set BNG metric tool) of the current biodiversity value of their site both prior to and post the development proposal. In the event that the value of the site post-development is less than 10% better than it was prior to development then the developer will have an obligation to provide additional off-site BNG units to achieve the mandatory 10% net gain.

2 METHODS

2.1 EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE)

- 2.1.1. A walkover of the site was undertaken by Shona Bancroft BSc (Hons) Ecological Project Manager at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. The survey was undertaken on the 21st October 2025. The weather was overcast (6/8 oktas), with no precipitation, wind speed 2 and 11°C. The methods were based on the standard methodology as detailed by UKHab classifications (The UK Habitat Classification Working Group, May 2023) using the UK Habitat Classification V2 guidance tool.

2.2 PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)

- 2.2.1 The red line boundary and Landscape Plan was provided by Conway Architectural Design (reference: 1006-03)

2.3 STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC

- 2.3.1 The BNG calculation was undertaken utilising The Statutory Biodiversity Metric from DEFRA, the site's UK Habitat map and the Site Plan. The calculation was performed by a technically competent and experienced ecologist as detailed in British Standard BS8683 – Suitably qualified person – definition in BS8683:2020.
- 2.3.2 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric uses habitat features as a proxy measure for capturing the value and importance of nature. The metric considers the size, ecological condition, location and proximity to nearby 'connecting' features. The metric enables assessments to be made of the present and forecast future biodiversity value of a site.

2.4 HABITAT SCORING

- 2.4.1 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric supplies reference documents and user guides in which to accurately evaluate and assess the different habitats on site. The methodology for the baseline and post development calculations are demonstrated in the following sections.

Baseline Units

- 2.4.2 To assess the quality of a habitat and therefore calculate the units scored the Statutory Biodiversity Metric utilises three scoring factors as detailed below.

Condition

- 2.4.3 The condition of a habitat is assessed utilising the Condition Sheets provided for each habitat type. These list positive indicators for each habitat and indicate how many of these indicators need to be present to meet certain thresholds of condition. These condition sheets can be found in The Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets with instructions tool Technical (Natural England Joint Publication, 2023).

Distinctiveness

- 2.4.4 The distinctiveness of each habitat (area and linear) is automatically assigned by the tool, based upon national records of the occurrence and rarity of each habitat (The Statutory Biodiversity metric).

Strategic Significance

- 2.4.5 The idea of strategic significance works at a landscape scale. It gives additional unit value to habitats that are in preferred locations for biodiversity and other environmental objectives. Strategic significance utilises published local plans and objectives to identify local priorities for targeting biodiversity and nature improvement, such as Nature Recovery Areas, local biodiversity plans, National Character Area objectives and green infrastructure strategies.

Post Development Units

- 2.4.6 Additional factors are implemented when assessing post development habitats.

- Difficulty of Creation/Enhancement
- Temporal Risk "Time to target condition"
- Spatial Risk (when offsite mitigation is necessary)

2.5 LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT

2.5.1 Whilst every effort has been made to provide a comprehensive description of the site, no investigation could ensure the complete characterisation and prediction of the natural environment. The conclusions and recommendations detailed in this report are based upon the site redline boundary and the development proposals as outlined by the client at the time of writing. Should there be any changes to the site redline boundary or development proposals at a later stage, this assessment should be reviewed to determine whether any amendments or additional survey work is required.

2.5.2 Habitat areas (predevelopment) have been measured using online mapping and therefore will not be completely accurate. Post development areas have been provided by the client.

Table 2.1 Limitations Review

Limitation	Analysis
Competence of surveyor	Condition Assessment was undertaken by Shona Bancroft and overseen and reviewed by Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM Associate Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd who has over 10 years professional experience in ecological consultancy and holds key experience undertaking BNG assessments and providing advice on habitat creation, management and enhancements for both developers and habitat banks.
Competence of ecologist completing the metric	The metric was completed by Shona Bancroft and overseen by Katie Bird, as outlined above.
Age of survey data	The condition assessment was undertaken in October 2025 and is therefore less than 12 months old. There is no constraint to the age of survey data and this falls within best practice guidance.
Timing of survey	The survey was undertaken in October which is a sub-optimal time of year to undertake condition assessments due to the lack of vegetation and inability to assess presence of invasive non-native species accurately.
Departure from best practice guidance	Suboptimal survey season

3 BASELINE CONDITIONS - HABITATS

3.1. STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

3.1.1. Following the Local nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) provided by Greater Manchester, the site has been assessed as “Area/compensation not in local strategy” as the derelict site comprises poor quality modified grassland and tall forbs within a disturbed urban environment and is not included as an area to target within the strategy.

3.1.2. The individual tree on site has been identified as “*Formally identified within the local strategy*”.

3.2. HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT

3.2.1. Table 3.1 summarises the baseline habitats and condition assessment. Please refer to the Appendix 1 for the Condition Assessment Sheets for each habitat.

3.2.2. Quadrats were collected at the site to aid in the habitat assessment.

Table 3.1 Habitat Type and Condition Assessment (pre-development)

Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Condition	Description
G4 - Modified Grassland	0.0153	Poor	The modified grassland on site was left relatively unmanaged with a varied sward height throughout. Species diversity was, however, limited with common species occurring throughout the parcel, including perennial ryegrass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>), Yorkshire fog (<i>Holcus lanatus</i>), ribwort plantain (<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>), creeping buttercup (<i>Ranunculus repens</i>), dandelion (<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>), white clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>), nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), creeping thistle (<i>Cirsium arvense</i>), and common ragwort (<i>Jacobaea vulgaris</i>).
H16 - Tall Forbs	0.0071	Moderate	The section of tall forbs was isolated to the rear of the site and had become quite overgrown, with a varied sward height observed across the parcel. The parcel was mostly dominated by common nettle and broad-leaved dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), with bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus agg.</i>) interwoven throughout.
G200 - Individual Trees	0.0041	Poor	The singular small tree with a DBH of 30cm. The tree was located at the rear of the site within the tall forbs and was identified as an immature hawthorn tree (<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>) in poor condition.;

3.3. LOST HABITATS

3.3.1. All habitats within the red line boundary are to be lost to development.

3.4. PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE

3.4.1. Please refer to Table 3.2 summarising the Habitat Baseline for the calculation, demonstrating habitats to be retained, enhance and/or lost.

Table 3.2 Habitat Baseline

	<i>On site Baseline</i>	<i>Retained</i>	<i>Enhanced</i>	<i>Lost</i>
<i>Habitat (Area) Units</i>	0.08	-	-	0.08

4 HABITAT CREATION

4.1.1. Please refer to the Proposed Site Plan created by Conway Architectural Design (reference: 1006-03) for the proposed development.

4.1.2. Please refer to the Appendix for details of the condition criteria targeted for each habitat group (where appropriate).

Table 4.1 Post Development Habitats, area sizes and target conditions

Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness		Condition		Habitat Units Delivered
		Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	
Developed land; sealed surface	0.023	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	0.00
Vegetated garden	0.0055	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	0.01

5 SUMMARY

5.1.1. This report and the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric submitted have demonstrated that the proposed habitat creation create a net loss of biodiversity within the site of -86.37% Habitat Units. **The trading rules have not been satisfied due to a loss in medium distinctiveness habitats (individual trees) and low distinctiveness habitats (modified grassland and tall forbs).**

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)		Area habitat units	-0.07	
		Hedgerow units	0.00	
		Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)		Area habitat units	-86.37%	
		Hedgerow units	0.00%	
		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%	0.08	0.09	0.08
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

Figure 5.1 On site net %

5.1.2. Given the net loss achieved on site relating to the Habitat Units, and the lack of opportunity within the current scheme to provide sufficient habitat quality to achieve a net gain, offsetting will be required in order to meet policy requirements. It is calculated that 0.08 Habitat Units are required for the scheme to achieve the minimum 10% net gain.

5.1.3. Off-site compensation options can be explored as an alternative. This may include the purchase of biodiversity units from a third-party habitat bank provider, where the developer financially supports local biodiversity improvement schemes or conservation projects that deliver equivalent ecological benefits. Where neither on-site nor off-site solutions can address the deficit, the purchase of statutory biodiversity credits may be required as a last resort. This ensures the development can still deliver a net positive contribution to biodiversity in line with legislative requirements.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CIEEM (2021) Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates.
- DEFRA (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity
- DEFRA (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity. Condition Assessment Sheets (Excel Format)
- Collington Winter Environmental (2024) Preliminary Ecological Appraisal; Travellers Rest

APPENDIX 1 – QUADRATS

Species	Quadrat 1	Quadrat 2	Quadrat 3	Quadrat 4
Perennial rye grass	Y	Y		Y
Yorkshire fog	Y	Y	Y	Y
Ribwort plantain		Y		Y
Common nettle				Y
Creeping buttercup	Y			
Creeping thistle				
White clover	Y			
Common ragwort		Y	Y	
Common dandelion				
Sour dock		Y	Y	
Red clover	Y			

APPENDIX II – BASELINE CONDITION SHEETS

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.			
<i>Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of <u>rural</u> trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in <u>rural</u> locations.</i>			
Habitat Description			
Hawthorn 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	21/10/2025 - Shona Bancroft
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)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	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).	No	
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) ¹ .	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.	Yes	
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	No	
Number of criteria passed		2	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/✓	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	1	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.			
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score²			

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			
Tall forbs			
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	21/10/2025 - Shona Bancroft
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.	No	
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 .		
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.		
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			2
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√
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):			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes all 3 core criteria; AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C. 		Good (3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C. 		Moderate (2)	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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):			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes all 3 core criteria; AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes additional criterion relevant to specific habitat type (D, F or G). 		Good (3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C. 		Moderate (2)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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):			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes all 3 core criteria; AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E) 		Good (3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C. 		Moderate (2)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria. 		Poor (1)	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Footnotes			

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	21/10/2025 - Shona Bancroft
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	<p>There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m² 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.</p> <p>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 m² (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.</p>	No	
B	<p>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.</p>	Yes	
C	<p>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).</p> <p>Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.</p>	Yes	
D	<p>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.</p>	Yes	
E	<p>Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)².</p>	No	
F	<p>Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.</p>	Yes	
G	<p>There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA⁴).</p>	Yes	
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			no
Number of criteria passed			5
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)	1	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Footnotes			
<p>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> .</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).</p>			

APPENDIX III – BASELINE UKHAB MAP



Land at 21-27 Vale Street

Red Line Boundary Area: 0.023 ha

Total Area (of visible polygons): 0.023 ha

-  Redline boundary
-  **g4** Modified grassland
-  **h** Heathland and shrub
-  Trees

Collington Winter Environmen...

Project ref: 20-3618

Drawn by: N/A

Survey date: 21/10/25

Map ID: N/A

Version: 1

Version Date: 07/11/25

Reviewer: Katie Bird

No Notes



APPENDIX III – SITE PHOTOS

Habitat Type	Photo
Modified grassland	

Tall forbs



Individual tree



THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

