



## Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE

### Macar Living (City House) Ltd

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	1	Jeremy Grout BSc (Hons) Consultant Ecologist	28/11/2023
Final	2	Jeremy Grout BSc (Hons) Consultant Ecologist	15/02/2024

#### Arbtech Consultant's Contact Details:

Jeremy Grout BSc (Hons)  
Consultant Ecologist  
Tel: 07512 329530 Email: [Jeremygrout@arbtech.co.uk](mailto:Jeremygrout@arbtech.co.uk)  
<https://arbtech.co.uk>

**Limitations and Copyright**

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

## Industry Guidelines and Standards

This report has been written with due consideration to:

- British Standard 42020 (2013). Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Version 1.1. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2020). Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Construction Industry Research and Information Association & Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (2019). Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principles for Development.

## Proportionality

The work involved in preparing and implementing all ecological surveys, impact assessments and measures for avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement should be proportionate to the predicted degree of risk to biodiversity and to the nature and scale of the proposed development. Consequently, the decision-maker should only request supporting information and conservation measures that are relevant, necessary and material to the application in question. Similarly, the decision-maker and their consultees should ensure that any comments and advice made over an application are also proportionate.

The desk studies and field surveys undertaken to provide a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) might in some cases be all that is necessary.

(BS 42020, 2013)

## Executive Summary

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Macar Living (City House) Ltd to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment at City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The assessment was required to inform a planning application for the demolition of the existing building and erection of a block of flats with associated infrastructure and landscaping (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”).

The current proposed plan results in a **59.67% net gain** in habitat units and a **100% net gain in hedgerow units**. The proposed development is therefore anticipated to surpass the minimum target of 10% biodiversity net gain and is thus compliant with legislation (Environment Act 2021) and planning policy (National: NPPF 2023; Sutton Local Plan 2016 -2031). It is noted that watercourses are not part of this assessment.

**Contents**

**1.0 Introduction and Context ..... 6**

    1.1 Background ..... 6

    1.2 Site Location, Geology and Landscape Context ..... 6

    1.3 BNG Informative ..... 6

**2.0 Methodology ..... 7**

    2.1 Baseline Biodiversity Value ..... 7

    2.2 Post Development Biodiversity Value ..... 7

    2.3 Limitations ..... 8

**3.0 Results ..... 9**

    3.1 Baseline Habitats ..... 9

    3.2 Post Development Habitats ..... 10

    3.3 Change in Biodiversity Value of the Site ..... 12

**4.0 Recommendations to Deliver BNG ..... 13**

    4.1 Discussion ..... 13

**5.0 Bibliography ..... 14**

    Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan ..... 15

    Appendix 2: Site Location Plan ..... 17

    Appendix 3: Baseline Habitat Plan ..... 18

    Appendix 4: Post Development Habitat Plan ..... 19

    Appendix 5a: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Baseline ..... 20

    Appendix 5b: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Proposed ..... 21

## 1.0 Introduction and Context

### 1.1 Background

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Macar Living (City House) Ltd to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment at City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The assessment was required to inform a planning application for the demolition of the existing building and erection of a block of flats with associated infrastructure and landscaping (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”). A plan showing the proposed development is provided in Appendix 1.

This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- The Statutory Metric pertaining to the site (Arbtech Consulting Ltd. 2024);
- The Ecological Impact Assessment pertaining to the site; and
- The Arboricultural Impact Assessment pertaining to the site.

### 1.2 Site Location, Geology and Landscape Context

The site is located at National Grid Reference TQ25776398 and has an area of approximately 0.18ha comprising mainly hardstanding (developed land; sealed surface), which includes the building, along with modified grassland, areas of introduced shrub and scattered trees. The site is surrounded by all aspects by existing urban development along with a major road bordering the north and western boundary (A232). The wider landscape comprises further urban development with areas of amenity grassland used for recreational purposes. A site location plan is provided in Appendix 2.

### 1.3 BNG Informative

BNG is a specific, measurable outcome of project activities that deliver demonstrable and quantifiable benefits to biodiversity compared to the baseline condition. In order to achieve BNG, a project must be able to demonstrate that it has followed all 10 of the Principles of Biodiversity Net Gain. The recently legalised Environment Act (2021) requires developments in England to demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity and sets a target of a minimum of 10% BNG for all developments. It also stipulates that a management plan with a minimum 30-year term, should be adopted to ensure biodiversity net gain can be delivered. The requirement for biodiversity net gain is also enshrined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Statutory Metric is the widely accepted tool used to calculate BNG. It enables the calculation of habitat value pre- and post-development in order to determine the overall change in biodiversity value as a result of the proposed development. The Statutory Metric has separate BNG assessments for areas of habitat, hedgerows and watercourses.

The biodiversity value of a site should be maximised. However, it may not always be possible to achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain within a site and therefore the Statutory Metric can also account for offsite habitat creation, where land is available. Alternatively, developers can seek to provide an agreed financial contribution to an appropriate third party (such as the Local Authority, the UK Government, or another landowner) to deliver the required biodiversity net gain elsewhere on their behalf.

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 *Baseline Biodiversity Value*

The baseline BNG Calculation was informed by an Ecological Impact Assessment pertaining to the site (Darwin Ecology, 2023). A baseline habitat plan is provided in **Appendix 3**.

#### **Habitat Classification**

The Ecological Impact Assessment classified the habitats on site according to the methodology set out in Phase 1 Habitat Survey Methodology (JNCC, 2010). For purposes of this BNG Calculation, identified habitats were translated to their equivalents in the UK Habitat Classification. This was achieved using a combination of The UK Habitat Classification Habitat Definitions Version 2.0 (The UK Habitat Classification Working Group, July 2023) and the Phase 1 Translation Tool included in the Statutory Metric spreadsheet.

#### **Habitat Area/Length**

The area or length of each habitat was calculated using qGIS software. In calculating the area or length of each habitat, habitats which occur as two or more isolated parcels across the site were combined, where they were deemed to be of a similar composition and condition. Distinctions were made between habitats to be retained (i.e. left as found in baseline), enhanced (i.e. improved condition) or lost (i.e. destroyed by proposed development). As with the statutory metric, the presence of urban trees has been included as an area.

#### **Habitat Condition**

Habitat condition was assessed using the relevant condition assessment found in the Statutory Metric condition assessment sheets. The habitat condition assessments were based on the information provided within the Ecological Impact Assessment report, including the habitat descriptions, species lists, and site photographs.

### 2.2 *Post Development Biodiversity Value*

The post development BNG Calculation was informed by City House, Sutton Landscape GA plan which is included in Appendix 1. A post development habitat plan is provided in **Appendix 4**.

#### **Habitat Classification**

Proposed habitats were translated to their equivalents in the UK Habitat Classification using The UK Habitat Classification Habitat Definitions Version 2.0 when it came to designating a condition to the habitat (The UK Habitat Classification Working Group, July 2023) and the information provided within the City House, Sutton Landscape GA plan.

### **Habitat Area/Length**

The area or length of each proposed habitat was calculated using qGIS software. In calculating the area or length of each habitat, habitats which occur as two or more isolated parcels across the site were combined, where they were deemed to be of similar composition and condition. Distinctions were made between habitats to be retained (i.e. left as found in baseline), enhanced (i.e. improved condition) or newly created.

### **Habitat Condition**

Target habitat condition for each proposed habitat was determined using relevant condition assessment sheets found in the Statutory Metric Condition Assessment sheets and the Temporal Multipliers Tab included in the Statutory Metric spreadsheet. This is based on the assumption that a 30-year management plan will be adopted for the site in accordance with The Environment Act (2021).

### ***2.3 Limitations***

There are no specific limitations associated with this assessment.



### 3.0 Results

#### 3.1 Baseline Habitats

Table 1 details the baseline habitats present within the site along with their area/length, condition and strategic significance. For ease of interpreting the area/lengths have been rounded to three decimal places. A full condition assessment for each habitat (where relevant) is provided in Appendix 5a.

Table 1: Baseline Biodiversity Value

Habitat	Area / Length	Description	Condition Assessment	Areas Retained or Enhanced
<b>Urban:</b> Developed land; sealed surface	0.13ha	Developed land; sealed surface makes up the majority of the site in the form of the building, paved car parking and a concrete slab walkway around the building.	Habitat condition is predetermined as N/A as detailed within the Statutory Metric user guide.	0ha
<b>Urban:</b> Introduced Shrub	0.023ha	Designated planting beds were located throughout the site featuring species such as holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> , rose <i>Rosa spp.</i> , privet <i>Ligustrum spp.</i> , common fig <i>Ficus carica</i> , lavender <i>Lavandula spp.</i> , <i>Fuchsia spp.</i> , English ivy <i>Hedera helix</i> and hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i> .	Habitat condition is predetermined as N/A as detailed within the Statutory Metric user guide.	0ha
<b>Grassland Low Distinctiveness:</b> Modified Grassland	0.03ha	Amenity grassland was present in the northern end of the site. The sward height was between 5-10cm in length and appeared to be under regular management. Species recorded included ribwort plantain <i>Plantago lanceolata</i> , selfheal <i>Prunella vulgaris</i> , common daisy <i>Bellis perennis</i> , dandelion <i>Taraxacum spp.</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> , and various mosses.	The areas of amenity grassland were assessed against the grassland (low distinctiveness) habitat type condition sheet as detailed within the Statutory metric condition assessment. It is considered that this habitat should be classified as poor condition.	0ha

<b>Individual Tree:</b> Urban Tree (Medium Sized)	0.049ha	Three medium trees are present within the application boundary. Species present include Sycamore, False acacia and Judas tree. The DBH of the tree was acquired from the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.	The condition of urban trees were assessed against the individual tree Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment sheets. This habitat has been assigned as moderate condition.	0.049ha
<b>Individual Tree:</b> Urban Tree (Small Sized)	0.004ha	One small sized tree is present within the application boundary, this includes Norway Maple. The DBH of the tree was acquired from the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.	The condition of urban trees were assessed against the individual tree Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment sheets. This habitat has been assigned as moderate condition.	0.004ha

### 3.2 Post Development Habitats

Table 2 details the post development habitats present within the site along with their area/length, condition and strategic significance. An assessment of the anticipated condition for each habitat (where relevant) is provided in Appendix 5b, which is based on the assumption that a 30 year management plan will be implemented for the site. The proposed development will result in the loss of existing areas of hardstanding, patches of mixed scrub and amenity grassland, as well as a single tree.

Table 2: Post Development Biodiversity Value

Habitat	Area / Length	Description	Target Condition
<b>Urban:</b> Developed land; sealed surface	0.115ha	Areas of hardstanding and building are to be created as part of the development proposals.	Habitat condition is predetermined as N/A as detailed within the Statutory Metric user guide.
<b>Urban:</b> Introduced Shrub	0.034ha	Areas of introduced shrub are proposed around the site as part of the development proposals.	Habitat condition is predetermined as N/A as detailed within the Statutory Metric user guide.

<b>Grassland Low Distinctiveness:</b> Modified Grassland	0.028ha	Areas of turf are to be laid around the site as part of the development proposals. This also takes into account the area of grass Crete proposed within the site.	The areas of amenity grassland were assessed against the grassland (low distinctiveness) habitat type condition sheet as detailed within the Statutory metric condition assessment. It is considered that this habitat can only achieve poor condition due to species content and management regime.
<b>Grassland:</b> Other Neutral Grassland	0.006ha	Areas of wildflower grassland are to be implemented as part of the development proposals.	The areas of Other Neutral Grassland were assessed against the grassland (medium, high and very high distinctiveness) habitat type condition sheet as detailed within the statutory metric condition assessment. It is considered that this habitat can achieve moderate condition.
<b>Individual Tree:</b> Urban tree (small sized)	0.086ha	A total of 21 scattered trees are to be implemented as part of the development proposals. All assigned small condition as per the guidance in the statutory metric user guide.	The condition of urban trees were assessed against the individual tree Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment sheets. This habitat has been assigned as moderate condition.
<b>Hedgerow:</b> Ornamental Hedge	0.085km	Hedgerows are being created around the site as part of the development proposals. The hedgerows contain ornamental species.	The hedgerows were assessed against the hedgerows habitat type condition sheet as detailed within the statutory metric condition assessment. It is considered that this habitat can be classified as poor condition.

### ***3.3 Change in Biodiversity Value of the Site***

Full details are provided in the Statutory Metric. The headline results are presented in Appendix 6.

#### **Areas of Habitat**

The baseline habitat value of the site is 0.53 units, comprising 0.00 units of hardstanding/building, 0.05 units of introduced shrub, 0.06 units of modified grassland, 0.39 units of medium sized urban trees and 0.03 units of small sized urban trees.

The post development habitat value of the site is 0.85 units, comprising 0.00 units of hardstanding/building, 0.07 units of introduced shrub, 0.05 units of modified grassland, 0.04 units of other neutral grassland and 0.26 units of small sized urban trees.

This results in a net change in biodiversity of **59.67% net gain**.

#### **Hedgerows**

The hedgerows section within the Statutory Metric shows 'Zero baseline units - % cannot be calculated'. However, as there are no baseline units with hedgerows and approximately 85m of hedgerow is being implemented as part of the development proposals. It is considered that a **100% net gain in hedgerow units** is being achieved.

## 4.0 Recommendations to Deliver BNG

### 4.1 Discussion

The current proposed plan results in a **59.67% net gain** in habitat units and a **100% net gain** in hedgerow units. The proposed development is therefore anticipated to surpass the minimum target of 10% biodiversity net gain and is thus compliant with legislation (Environment Act 2021) and planning policy (National: NPPF 2023; Sutton Local Plan 2016 -2031).

A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Management Plan must be produced for the site. This should include recommendations for the implementation, management and monitoring of the site for at least 30 years to ensure that biodiversity net gain is delivered.

## 5.0 Bibliography

- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Darwin Ecology Ltd. (2023). Ecological Impact Assessment. City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE.
- Marcus Foster Arboricultural Design & Consultancy. (2024). Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement Report. City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE.
- London Borough of Sutton Local Plan. (2018). Sutton Local Plan 2016-2013.
- CIEEM-CIRIA-IEMA (2019) Biodiversity Net Gain – Good Practice Principles for Development.
- Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey a technique for environmental audit.  
[http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/PDF/pub10\\_handbookforphase1habitatsurvey.pdf](http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/PDF/pub10_handbookforphase1habitatsurvey.pdf)
- Natural England (2024). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation tool.
- Natural England (2024). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: user guide.
- Natural England (2024). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment.
- The UK Habitat Classification Habitat Definitions Version 2.0 (The UK Habitat Classification Working Group, July 2023)

### Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan









### Appendix 2: Site Location Plan





Appendix 3: Baseline Habitat Plan



Appendix 4: Post Development Habitat Plan





Appendix 5a: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Baseline

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	City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE	Survey date and Surveyor name	15/02/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	TQ25776398	Habitat parcel reference	Application Boundary
Habitat Description			
Habitat - UK Habitat Classification			
Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)	
A There are 5-8 vascular plant species per m <sup>2</sup> 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.	N		
A 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 <sup>2</sup> (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.			
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.	N		
C Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> spp. may be present).	Y		
C Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.			
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)?	Y		
F Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium equinum</i> is less than 20%.	Y		
G There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species <sup>2</sup> (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA <sup>3</sup> ).	Y		
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			
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)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria, OR Passes 4 - 5 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Poor Condition Achieved - does not pass essential criterion A	
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).			

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Type			
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 (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	City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE	Survey date and Surveyor name	15/02/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	TQ25776398	Habitat parcel reference	Application Boundary
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).	N		
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).	Y		
C The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) <sup>1</sup> .	N		
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.	Y		
E Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	N		
F More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Y		
Number of criteria passed 3			
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved +/-	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	Moderate Condition Achieved	
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 <sup>2</sup>			

### Appendix 5b: Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets - Proposed

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	City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE	Survey date and Surveyor name	15/02/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	TQ25776398	Habitat parcel reference	Application Boundary
Habitat Description			
Condition Assessment Criteria			
Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)	
A There are 5-8 vascular plant species per m <sup>2</sup> 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.	Y		
A 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 <sup>2</sup> (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 classified as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	N		
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.	N		
C Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> spp. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Y		
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 <sup>2</sup> ).	Y		
F Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Y		
G There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species <sup>3</sup> (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA <sup>4</sup> ).	Y		
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			
			No
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)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria, OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Poor Condition Achieved - does not pass essential criterion A	
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>Pulsanulus 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).			

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 <u>Line of trees condition sheet</u> for a line of <u>rural</u> trees. You should only use the <u>Line of trees condition assessment</u> and record that <u>habitat type</u> in <u>rural</u> locations.			
Habitat Description			
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	City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE	Survey date and Surveyor name	15/02/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	TQ25776398	Habitat parcel reference	Application Boundary
Condition Assessment Criteria			
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).	N		
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).	Y		
C The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) <sup>1</sup> .	N		
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.	Y		
E Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	N		
F More than 20% of the tree canopy area is overhanging vegetation beneath.	Y		
Number of criteria passed			3
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved %/	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	Moderate Condition Achieved	
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 <sup>2</sup>			

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UK06b) Habitat Type			
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 (H43E) (not to be confused with the Tall fests secondary code - see UK06b guidance for details) Grassland - Upland acid grassland Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland Grassland - Upland hay meadows Sparsely vegetated land - Colaminiferan grassland			
Grids or off-site, site name and location	City House, Sutton Park Road, Sutton, SM1 2AE	Survey date and Surveyor name	15/02/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	TQ2577696	Habitat parcel reference	Application Boundary
Habitat Description			
UK06b - 10. Habitat Classification			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
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 UK06b description). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.		Y	
Steward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7cm and at least 20% is more than 7cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.		N	
Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens*.		Y	
Cover of bracken ( <i>Pteridium equilinum</i> ) is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.		Y	
Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition <sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>2</sup> (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA <sup>3</sup> ) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.		Y	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types			
There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m <sup>2</sup> present, including those 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.		N	
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 (N/A)	
Acid grassland types (Result out of 6 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)	Moderate Condition Achieved	
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			
None			
Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UK06b 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 <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>Paniceum repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . 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 site relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.			
Footnote 5 - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).			