MOTT MACDONALD

RMF Salisbury

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

December 2021

Mott MacDonald
Spring Bank House
33 Stamford Street
Altrincham WA14 1ES
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)161 926 4000
mottmac.com

RMF Salisbury

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

December 2021

Mott MacDonald Limited. Registered in England and Wales no. 1243967.
Registered office: Mott MacDonald House, 8-10 Sydenham Road, Croydon CR0 2EE, United Kingdom

Issue and Revision Record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
01	09/12/21	L. Atherton	P. Bointon	R. Purslow	First Issue

Document reference: SLSB | MMD-XX-XX-RP-EC | 0002

Information class: Standard

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

Contents

Executive summary 1

1 Introduction 2
1.1 Background 2
1.2 Aims and Objectives 2
1.3 Legislation and Policy 2

2 Methodology 4
2.1 Guidance 4
2.2 The Mitigation Hierarchy 4
2.3 Data Collection 4
2.3.1 Pre-development 4
2.3.2 Post-development 5
2.4 Calculations of BU 6
2.5 Assumptions and Limitations 7

3 Results 8
3.1 Applying the Mitigation Hierarchy 8
3.1.1 Avoid and Minimise 8
3.1.2 Remediate 8
3.1.3 Compensate 8
3.2 Strategic Significance 8
3.3 Pre-development Habitats 8
3.4 Site Baseline BU 9
3.5 Post-development Habitats 9
3.5.1 Created Habitats 9
3.5.2 Enhanced Habitats 9
3.6 Post-development BU 10

4 Conclusions 12
4.1 Additional Enhancement Recommendations 12

5 References 14

A. Condition Assessments 15

B. Figures 22

Tables

Table 2-1: Pre-development Data Collection 4
Table 2-2: Biodiversity Metric 3.0 Data Input Requirements 5
Table 3.1: Habitat Classification and Distinctiveness 9
Table 3.2: Baseline Habitat Areas and BU Summary 9
Table 3.3: Post-development Habitats Area and BU Summary 10
Table 4.1: Summary of BU 12

Figures

Figure 3.1: Biodiversity Metric 3.0 BNG Results 11

Tables - Appendices

Table A.1: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 15
Table A.2: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 16
Table A.3: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 17
Table A.4: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 18
Table A.5: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 19
Table A.6: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland 20
Table A.7: Condition Assessment Other Coniferous Woodland 21

Figures - Appendices

Figure B.1: Phase 1 Habitat and Vegetation Map 23
Figure B.2: Pre-development Baseline UK Habitat Classification Map 24
Figure B.3: Post Development Proposed UK Habitat Classification Map 25

Executive summary

Mott MacDonald Limited (MM) has been commissioned by Royal Mail to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment of Detached Goods Vehicle Testing (DGVT) Site situated in Churchfields Industrial Estate, Salisbury, to inform future development at the proposed Site.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) was undertaken at the Site by Mott MacDonald Limited in September 2021 (Document reference: SLSB-MMD-XX-XX-RP-EC-0001), which included details of existing habitats present within the Site including the completion of Condition Assessments which have been used to complete the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment.

The site covers approximately 0.77ha and consists of the following broad habitat types which have been extrapolated from the Phase 1 definitions into UKHab definitions as is required for the Defra metric calculator:

- Grassland – Other neutral grassland 0.17ha
- Woodland – Other coniferous woodland 0.05ha
- Urban – Developed land; sealed surface 0.55ha
- Urban – Street Tree 0.03ha

The BNG calculations were informed by the principles and guidance published by Baker (2016) and Baker *et al*. (2019). This process entails calculating Biodiversity Units (BU):

- For the impacted area before the proposed development.
- For the impacted area post-construction, following rehabilitation and/or on-site enhancement; and
- Any additional off-site habitat creation/enhancement required to achieve BNG.

The Biodiversity Metric 3.0 (NE, 2021) was used to perform the calculations in this report. This metric has been developed by Natural England (NE) to provide a robust and consistent tool to quantify biodiversity and demonstrate net biodiversity gains or losses.

The development proposals for the Site require the loss of 0.16ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland and in accordance with the proposals plan will create 0.03ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland. The BNG assessment of the Site recommends the enhancement of the Woodland – Other coniferous woodland of Poor condition to Woodland – Other mixed woodland of Good condition and the enhancement of the created Grassland – Other neutral grassland of Fairly good and Moderate condition to Grassland – Lowland meadows of Good condition.

As the proposed development fails to achieve a 10% net gain for biodiversity it is recommended that a proposed off-site location is selected to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG. If this is not possible then other options include paying a commuted sum to the council to improve or create equivalent nature conservation features elsewhere in the Wiltshire Borough, purchasing biodiversity credits from third party brokers, or a combination of these options. The alternatives should be considered only if the suggested enhancements of the off-site location are not feasible.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Mott MacDonald Limited (MM) has been commissioned by Royal Mail to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment of Detached Goods Vehicle Testing (DGVT) Site situated in Churchfields Industrial Estate, Salisbury, to inform future development at the proposed Site.

The Site is approximately 0.77ha, located to the west of Salisbury town centre in an industrial estate (OS grid reference SU 13004 30014) and is currently a DGVT station. Within the outlined planning application, Royal Mail propose to demolish existing buildings on site to create a new delivery office, jet wash and an extension to the current hardstanding. The new delivery office will cover 1891m^2 and the hardstanding extended to allow a capacity of 80 van spaces. Development will involve removal and replacement of significant sections of the habitat areas on the Site.

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) was undertaken at the Site by Mott MacDonald Limited in September 2021 (Document reference: SLSB-MMD-XX-XX-RP-EC-0001), which included details of existing habitats present within the Site including the completion of Condition Assessments which have been used to complete the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment.

The site covers approximately 0.87ha and consists of the following broad habitat types which have been extrapolated from the Phase 1 definitions into UKHab definitions as is required for the Defra metric calculator:

- Grassland – Other neutral grassland 0.17ha
- Woodland – Other coniferous woodland 0.05ha
- Urban – Developed land; sealed surface 0.55ha
- Urban – Street Tree 0.03ha

1.2 Aims and Objectives

The aim of this report is to provide the findings on the BNG calculation undertaken in support of the project.

Biodiversity Units (BU) have been calculated using the Biodiversity Metric Calculation 3.0 (NE, 2021).

The objectives are to:

- Calculate the baseline BU for the Site, using the Phase 1 Habitat Survey results;
- Calculate the BU retained on the Site based on the Proposed Site Plan;
- Calculate the change in BU from the habitat enhancement and creation methods outlined in the Landscape Master Plan, ensuring a significant biodiversity net gain of at least a 10%.
- Advise on additional measures that could be incorporated to provide further ecological enhancements.

1.3 Legislation and Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2021) states that "*planning policies and decisions should…identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiver*sity" although no definition of significant gain is provided.

The Environment Bill which reached Royal Assent on 9 November 2021, and is expected to be set in statute by 2023, will mandate achieving a 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) for most developments. This will legally require developers to ensure sites are improved for biodiversity, with a 10% increase in habitat value for wildlife compared with the pre-development baseline. This BNG can be achieved through habitat creation or enhancements to existing habitats. All biodiversity enhancements will be expected to be maintained for a minimum of 30 years (DEFRA, 2019).

2 Methodology

2.1 Guidance

The BNG calculations were undertaken using the following best practice guidance documents:

- Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development (Baker, 2016)
- Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development. A practical guide (Baker *et al*. 2019).
- Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development Case studies CIRIA (2019).
- CIEEM (2021). Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester, UK.

For a broad understanding of BNG in developments, these guidance documents should be read in conjunction with this report.

2.2 The Mitigation Hierarchy

The Mitigation Hierarchy is central to the BNG process. This hierarchy prioritises avoiding damage to habitat. Where avoidance is not possible, the next action would be to mitigate by reducing the impact. Where possible restoration of habitats affected should also be undertaken. The final action, as a last resort, should other actions not be possible, is to compensate for loss of habitat. These stages are summarised as:

1. Avoid
2. Minimise
3. Restore/Remediate
4. Offset/Compensate

This process is detailed in this report and is required to have been undertaken to achieve BNG.

2.3 Data Collection

A PEA was undertaken at the Site in September 2021 to collect the required information to complete the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 BNG calculations.

2.3.1 Pre-development

BU for ‘pre-development’ represent existing baseline conditions prior to construction. Baseline habitat types and conditions for both the application site and the proposed off-site location used the following information:

Table 2-1: Pre-development Data Collection

Data Type	Baseline
Habitat type	• Pre-development data is captured in the metrics A-1 Site Habitat Baseline tab. The baseline habitats are those present within the application site red line boundary before development works; divided into appropriate habitat parcels. Habitat types and descriptions were identified in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEAR) (Mott Macdonald, 2021). • The extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey which is part of the PEAR was provided as a PDF (Refer to Appendix B for the 2021 Extended Phase 1 Habitat map). The habitat map, which is part of the Habitat Condition Assessment Report, was created in QGIS (Refer to Appendix A for the habitat condition assessment summary).
Habitat area/length	• Area (ha)/length (km) of each baseline habitat parcel (captured in the metrics A-1 tab). • The retained and lost area (ha) of each habitat and length (km) of each linear feature are also input into the metrics A-1 tab.

Data Type	Baseline
	• Digital mapping (QGIS) using aerial imagery was used to calculate each parcels area (ha) and each linear feature length (km). • For Urban – Street trees an average canopy radius (age 30 years) was identified using the urban street tree tool in the 2.0 metric: – 0.0005ha for small fastigiate trees – 0.0041ha for medium trees – 0.0113ha for large trees
Habitat distinctiveness	• A score based on the type of habitat present (automatically assigned within the metric) of 'Very low', 'Low', 'Moderate' 'High' or 'Very high' (captured in the metrics A-1 tab). • Data collection not required, linked to UK habitat classification type (automatically assigned in the metric).
Habitat condition	• A score based on the quality of the baseline habitat of 'Good', 'Moderate' or 'Poor'. The metric also allows for "fairly" in between these categories (captured in the metrics A-1 tab). • This is an assessment based on condition criteria set out in the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 3.0 Technical Supplement (Panks *et al*, 2021) • Information on the condition of each habitat; the habitat condition assessment (MM 2021).
Strategic significance description	• The drop-down selection for Strategic Significance allows the following options: – Within area formally identified in local strategy – Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy – Area / compensation not in local strategy / no local strategy • The selection is based the following sources: – Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy (2015)
Additional input	• Identify whether the area of each habitat parcel and length of each linear feature is to be: – Retained (i.e. no impact); or – Enhanced

2.3.2 Post-development

BU for 'post-development' represent the completed works within the application site. Post-development habitat types and conditions for the application site used the following information:

Table 2-2: Biodiversity Metric 3.0 Data Input Requirements

Data Type	Post-development
Habitat type	• Post-development data is captured in the metrics A-2 Site Habitat Creation tab the A-3 Site Habitat Enhancement tab. The proposed habitats which are to be retained/enhanced or created were identified within the proposed construction plan (refer to Appendix B). These were then divided into appropriate habitat parcels. The proposed construction plan drawing was provided as a PDF and then drawn in QGIS. • UK Habitat Classification types are used to classify the proposed habitat types for use in the metric.
Habitat area	• The proposed created/retained/enhanced habitat areas were drawn in QGIS (refer to Appendix B for the Proposed Post-development Habitats Map). • Area/length of the proposed post-development habitats, for both the application site and the proposed off-site, were calculated using QGIS and input into the metrics A-2, A-3 and A-4 tabs. • For Urban – Street trees an average canopy radius (age 30 years) was identified using the urban street tree tool in the 3.0 metric: – 0.0005ha for small fastigiate trees – 0.0041ha for medium trees – 0.0113ha for large trees
Habitat distinctiveness	• A score based on the type of habitat present (automatically assigned within the metric) of 'Very low', 'Low', 'Moderate' 'High' or 'Very high' (captured in metrics the A-2 and D-3 tabs)) • Data collection not required, linked to UK habitat classification type (automatically assigned in the metric).
Habitat condition	• A score based on the target condition of each post-development habitat parcel and linear feature for both the application site (captured in metrics the A-2, A-3 and A-4 tabs).

Data Type	Post-development
	• The condition of a habitat was assigned as either, 'Good' 'Moderate' or 'Poor' based on the following assumptions: • Habitats created/enhanced within a heavily managed urban setting or primarily created/enhanced for a screening/amenity purpose were assigned a condition score of 'poor or moderate'. • Habitats created/enhanced for biodiversity benefit and that have a HMP assigned as 'Moderate' or 'Good' depending on the time it takes to achieve the target condition over a 30-year timeframe.
Strategic significance description	Same as baseline
Additional input	None

2.4 Calculations of BU

The BNG calculations were informed by the principles and guidance published by Baker (2016) and Baker *et al*. (2019). This process entails calculating BU:

- For the impacted area before the proposed development.
- For the impacted area post-construction, following rehabilitation and/or on-site enhancement; and
- Any additional off-site habitat creation/enhancement required to achieve BNG.

The Biodiversity Metric 3.0 (NE, 2021) was used to perform the calculations in this report. This metric has been developed by Natural England (NE) to provide a robust and consistent tool to quantify biodiversity and demonstrate net biodiversity gains or losses.

The calculation uses a simplified set of key ecological attributes and assessment characteristics to provide an appropriate degree of consistency and comparability. The methodology requires the calculation of BU for 'linear' (such as hedgerows), 'river' and 'area-based' habitats within the project footprint and the proposed off-site location for pre- and post-development. The calculation used the existing ecological baseline, as reported in the PEA, the habitat condition assessment and the proposed construction plan for the post-development calculations.

The methodology is based on three main attributes:

- The area (hectares) or length of habitats (dependent on their type);
- Their condition; and
- Their distinctiveness.

These attributes are assigned numerical values to allow BU to be calculated for each habitat type. The number of BU can then be compared before and after the development to determine a change and so give an indication of the change in overall ecological value. Post-development BUs are calculated to reflect whether the change is as a result of a habitat being created or enhanced. Habitat creation consists of the removal or the loss of any present habitat(s) in the action of creating the new one or creating habitat where none was previously present. Habitat enhancement means to improve its distinctiveness and / or condition of the existing habitat.

In addition to the above attributes, 'risk factors' (also known as multipliers) are applied which take account of the likely scale of impact and the potential for success or failure of a post-development habitat to be established over time. The Post-development BU calculation should consider the risks and account for them, as they can influence the overall outcome. The risk factors do not cover all eventualities but provide a numerical value for the main risks to delivering biodiversity gains. The risk factors considered within the BNG calculations are:

- Distance of the newly created habitats from the location of those habitats ‘lost’ to the development (spatial risk);
- Difficulty to create or enhance these habitats (difficulty risk); and
- Time required for the newly created or enhanced habitats to establish (temporal risk).

The pre and post-development BUs are then used to give the change in BU, which quantifies the project’s biodiversity outcome. An increase indicates a BNG.

Full details on the criteria for biodiversity unit calculations can be found within the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 - User Guide (Panks *et al*, 2021).

2.5 Assumptions and Limitations

It has been assumed that the habitats within the proposed post-intervention scenarios are to be maintained for at least 30 years post development, as this is what is required to satisfy the conditions for BNG in the best practice guidelines (CIRIA 2019). A Habitat Management Plan (HMP) will be implemented by the appointed contractor to ensure that all on and/or off-site BNG is delivered to the required condition. This HMP will include the following details; aftercare maintenance and long-term habitat management and monitoring of created and enhanced features; how management will be implemented for a minimum period of 30 years; and what monitoring will be implemented during and after construction. Other biodiversity enhancements such as installation of bat and bird boxes are not considered as part of the metric but are to be incorporated in the HMP.

3 Results

3.1 Applying the Mitigation Hierarchy

3.1.1 Avoid and Minimise

The project is unable to avoid the permanent removal of 0.16ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland present within the site. The coniferous woodland at the eastern site boundary will be retained, protected and enhanced.

3.1.2 Remediate

Remediation or restoration of lost habitats within the Site will not be possible based on the current proposals plan (SAL-HLM-01-00-DR-A-0003, August 2021).

3.1.3 Compensate

To compensate for the loss of habitats due to the development, the creation of habitats within the site is proposed. If the proposals for habitat creation within the site are not feasible, then the following alternatives should be considered; allocating land off-site to provide a 10% net gain; paying a commuted sum to the council to improve or create equivalent nature conservation features elsewhere in the Wiltshire borough; purchasing biodiversity credits from third party brokers, or a combination of these options. These alternatives should be considered only if the suggested enhancements on-site are not feasible or do not provide a 10% net gain.

3.2 Strategic Significance

In the metric, the drop-down selection for Strategic Significance (area habitats) allows the following options;

- Within area formally identified in local strategy;
- Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy, and
- Area / compensation not in local strategy / no local strategy.

The Site is located within the CP43 – Affordable housing Zone, CP2 Strategic Site Allocations: Churchfields and Engine sheds and CP1 – Settlement Framework Boundary: Salisbury in accordance with the Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Interactive Map (Wiltshire Council, 2015).

For the purpose of this assessment the strategic significance has been assessed as being:

- Area / compensation not in local strategy / no local strategy.

3.3 Pre-development Habitats

Four area based habitats were identified within the Site

- Grassland – Other neutral grassland;
- Woodland – Other coniferous woodland;
- Urban – Developed land; sealed surface, and
- Urban – Street Tree

There are no statutory or non-statutory designated sites within the Site area. A more detailed description of the baseline habitats can be found within the PEA which was undertaken for the Site in September 2021. A summary of the Site baseline habitat conditions can be found in Appendix A.

The broad UK Habitat Classification habitat types present at the Site are shown in Table 3.1, together with the Distinctiveness scores of the habitats (as assigned by Natural England).

Table 3.1: Habitat Classification and Distinctiveness

UK Habitats Classification	Distinctiveness
Grassland – Other neutral grassland	Medium
Woodland – Other coniferous woodland	Very low
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	Low
Urban – Street Tree	Medium

3.4 Site Baseline BU

Pre-development BU were calculated using the Site baseline tab in the metric, a summary of the habitat type, area and associated BU is provided in Table 3.2, below.

Table 3.2: Baseline Habitat Areas and BU Summary

UK Habitats Classification	Area (ha)	Area BU
Grassland – Other neutral grassland	0.17	1.42
Woodland – Other coniferous woodland	0.05	0.10
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	0.55	0.00
Urban – Street Tree	0.03	0.12

3.5 Post-development Habitats

A map of the proposed post development habitats is appended at Appendix B. The development proposals require the loss of 0.16ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland and 0.03ha of Urban – Street tree. The proposals will retain two of the ten street trees present on the Site, however within the metric this area is too small (0.008ha) to include within the metric.

3.5.1 Created Habitats

Habitats proposed to be created as part of the development include:

- **Grassland – Lowland Meadows (Good condition)**

  0.03ha of Grassland – Lowland meadows will be created and managed to achieve a condition of Good. This would be achieved through methods such as:

  – Overseeding with an appropriate species rich seed mix.
  – Bi-annual mowing and removal of cuttings.
  – Undertaking more frequent cuttings in areas where undesirable species are present. Undesirable species include, but are not limited to, creeping thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), common nettle (*Urtica dioica*), and bramble (*Rubus spp*.).

3.5.2 Enhanced Habitats

Habitat proposed to be enhanced to a better condition include:

- **Woodland – Other coniferous woodland (Poor) to Woodland – Other woodland; mixed (Good)**

  0.05ha of Woodland ‐ Other coniferous woodland of Poor condition will be enhanced Woodland – Other mixed woodland of Good condition.

  This will be achieved by methods such as:

- Management prescriptions to ensure there is an absence of invasive non-native species and undesirable species present.
- Supplementary planting to ensure five or more native tree or shrub species are present.
- Monitoring to ensure no pests, diseases or crown dieback are prevalent.
- Supplementary planting of ancient woodland indicator species

- **Grassland – Other neutral grassland (Fairly Good and Moderate condition)**

  0.013ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland of Fairly Good condition (0.01ha) and Moderate condition (0.003ha) will be enhanced to Grassland – Lowland meadows of Good condition.

  This would be achieved through methods such as:

  - Overseeding with an appropriate species rich seed mix.
  - Bi-annual mowing and removal of cuttings.
  - Undertaking more frequent cuttings in areas where undesirable species are present. Undesirable species include, but are not limited to, creeping thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), common nettle (*Urtica dioica*), and bramble (*Rubus spp*.).

3.6 Post-development BU

The post-development site BU were calculated using the baseline and habitat creation and enhancement tabs in the metric, a summary of habitat type and area and length changes with the resulting change in BU from the 'baseline' are provided in Table 3.3, below.

Table 3.3: Post-development Habitats Area and BU Summary

Post-development Habitats	Area (ha)	BU
Retained		
Urban, Developed Land, sealed surface	0.55	0
Enhanced to different habitat		
Woodland – Other coniferous woodland - Woodland – Other mixed woodland	0.05	0.30
Grassland – Other neutral grassland - Grassland – Lowland Meadows	0.01	0.15
Grassland – Other neutral grassland - Grassland – Lowland Meadows	0.003	0.04
Created		
Grassland – Lowland Meadows	0.03	0.14
Urban, Developed land, sealed surface	0.23	0
Site Post-development Total BU		**0.63**
Site % change from baseline		**-61.61%**

A screenshot of the Biodiversity Metric 3.0 calculations is provided in Figure 3.1, below.

Figure 3.1: Biodiversity Metric 3.0 BNG Results

On-site baseline	*Habitat units*	1.64
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	0.63
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
On-site net % change (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	-61.61%
	Hedgerow units	0.00%
	River units	0.00%
Off-site baseline	*Habitat units*	0.00
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	0.00
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Total net unit change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	-1.01
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Total on-site net % change plus off-site surplus (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	-61.61%
	Hedgerow units	0.00%
	River units	0.00%

4 Conclusions

Without the compensation the proposals will result in a 90.17% loss for biodiversity post-development. The loss is attributed to the removal of Grassland – Other neutral grassland, a habitat of medium distinctiveness. While the ideal scenario would be to avoid the loss of this habitat, this is not possible due to the end use of the proposed development and the area available for development.

Through enhancement and habitat creation it has been possible to reduce the loss for biodiversity post-development to -61.61%. The BU are summarised in Table 4.1, below.

Table 4.1: Summary of BU

Baseline BU	BU lost for the Scheme	BU retained	BU gained through enhancement	BU gained through proposed habitat creation	Total future BU for the Site	Change in BU	Percentage change in biodiversity
1.64	**1.00**	**0.00**	**0.50**	**0.14**	**0.63**	**-1.01**	**-61.61%**

This assessment assumes the protection of retained and enhanced habitats in the Site, as well as appropriate planting and management of newly created habitats by the Client, or by a management company of their appointment. A landscape and ecology creation and management plan covering at least the first 30 years post development for site habitat creation and enhancement measures will be required to ensure the establishment, development and survival of new habitats so that they achieve their predicted biodiversity values over time.

The development proposals for the Site require the loss of 0.16ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland and in accordance with the proposals plan will create 0.03ha of Grassland – Other neutral grassland. The BNG assessment of the Site recommends the enhancement of the Woodland – Other coniferous woodland of Poor condition to Woodland – Other mixed woodland of Good condition and the enhancement of the created Grassland – Other neutral grassland of Fairly good and Moderate condition to Grassland – Lowland meadows of Good condition.

As the proposed development fails to achieve a 10% net gain for biodiversity, it is recommended that a proposed off-site location is selected to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG. If this is not possible then other options include paying a commuted sum to the council to improve or create equivalent nature conservation features elsewhere in the Wiltshire Borough, purchasing biodiversity credits from third party brokers, or a combination of these options. The alternatives should be considered only if the suggested enhancements of the off-site location are not feasible.

4.1 Additional Enhancement Recommendations

In addition to the above, a number of additional enhancement measures should also be considered to encourage ecological diversity on site:

- Replacement of the ornamental planting with a native species-rich planting scheme;
- Planting of floral species beneficial to pollinators in the amenity grassland verges within the compound;
- Installation of a bird feeding stations;
- Installation of bird boxes on appropriate mature trees;

- Creation of log piles for the creation of dead wood habitat and refugia for invertebrates and other faunal groups such as amphibians and small mammals; and
- If appropriate, incorporation of bat roost boxes into the new detention block, or onto suitable mature trees.

Biodiversity unit calculations should be repeated following any changes in the design of the Scheme based on the contractors requirements and following the completion of the works to ensure biodiversity net gain is still achieved for the Scheme.

5 References

Baker, J. (2016). Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development. Available at: https://cieem.net/resource/biodiversity-net-gain-good-practice-principles-for-development/

Baker, J.; Hoskin, R. and Butterworth, T. (2019) Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development. A practical guide. CIEEM, IEMA, CIRIA Available at: https://cieem.net/resource/biodiversity-net-gain-good-practice-principles-for-development-a-practical-guide/

CIEEM (2021). Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester, UK.

CIRIA (2019) Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development Case studies. London, UK. https://www.iema.net/assets/newbuild/documents/Biodiversity%20Net%20Gain-%20Good%20Practice%20Principles%20for%20Development.%20Case%20Studies.pdf

Natural England (NE) (2021). The Biodiversity Metric 3.0 (JP039). Available at: The Biodiversity Metric 3.0 - JP039 (naturalengland.org.uk)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, MHCGL, 2021) Available at: Policy paper overview: National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Panks S., White N., Newsome A., Potter J., Heydon M., Mayhew E., Alvarez M., Russell T., Scott S., Heaver M., Scott S., Treweek J., Butcher B., and Stone D., (2021). Biodiversity metric 3.0: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity – User Guide. Natural England.

UK Parliament (2021). Environment Act 2021. Available at: Environment Act 2021 - Parliamentary Bills - UK Parliament

Wiltshire Council (2015). Wiltshire Core Strategy adopted 2015. Available at: Wiltshire Core Strategy - Wiltshire Council

A. Condition Assessments

Table A.1: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Grassland below atlas cedar trees. Evidence of rabbits, ivy dominating some areas, with occasional ragwort. A range of occasional wildflower species. Some rabbit scrapes, but only small amount of bare ground.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria. For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.														
Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	F	F	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3
Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?							Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):			**Moderate**				

Table A.2: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Southern strip of grassland at the edge of hardstanding. Evidence of rabbits, good range of herbaceous species. Some rabbit scrapes, but only small amount of bare ground. The site has been abandoned for a year and so grassland has been allowed to establish well with the release from mowing. Species include dandelion, yarrow, speedwell, ribwort plantain, hemp agrimony, meadow foxtail, common bent, red valerian, perennial ryegrass, common mallow and herb robert. Some encroachment of buddleia, bramble and ivy.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria. For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.														
Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	F	P	P	P	F	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	**Moderate**

Table A.3: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Islands of grassland within the hardstanding along with some trees in the grassland. Evidence of rabbits, large range of wildflowers. Some rabbit scrapes, but only small amount of bare ground. The site has been abandoned for a year and so grassland has been allowed to establish well with the release from mowing. No encroaching scrub species, additional grass wildflower species include red clover, selfheal, oxeye daisy, birds foot trefoil, clover, wild carrot, st johns wort and cocksfoot

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria.
For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.

Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	P	P	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	**Good**

Table A.4: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description

Islands of grassland within the hardstanding along with some trees in the grassland. Same conditions and species as previous grass island with trees.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria. For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.														
Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	P	P	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5
Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?							Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):			**Good**				

Table A.5: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Islands of Grassland next to entrance gates, no sward height diversity, frequent wildflower species. Some rabbit evidence, small amount of bare ground but not exceeding 5%, some encroaching bramble on one side.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria. For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.														
Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	P	F	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	**Moderate**

Table A.6: Condition Assessment Other Neutral Grassland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Other neutral grassland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Grassland Habitat Type (Medium, high and very high distinctiveness)
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Northern strip of grassland along northern periphery. Same general species composition as other grass sites, with the addition of hawkbit sp. Some encroaching scrub of buddleia, bramble, ivy and hawthorn from the fence but not excessive and rabbit evidence once more.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria. For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.														
Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	P	P	P	P	P	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	**Good**

Table A.7: Condition Assessment Other Coniferous Woodland

Project / development name	Salisbury DGVTS	Metric 3.0 habitat type	Coniferous woodland
Site name or location	Salisbury DGVTS	Condition assessment required? (y/n)	Y
Onsite or offsite?	Onsite	Condition sheet used	Woodland and forest
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description
Along the east border, there is a stretch of 25-35 cypress trees (Cupressus sp.), all of the same age. There were single dogwood (Cornus sanguinea) and hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna) shrubs in the understory. A large mature white willow (Salix alba) was the only other native tree species present. Very few plants other than ivy (Hedera helix) occupied the ground beneath the cypress trees.

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria.
For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.

Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	**TOTAL**
Result	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	14

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	**Poor**
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			

B. Figures

Figure B.1: Phase 1 Habitat and Vegetation Map

Figure B.2: Pre-development Baseline UK Habitat Classification Map

Figure B.3: Post Development Proposed UK Habitat Classification Map



mottmac.com