



BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN (BNG)

Land to the rear of no 1. Pye Corner.



DOCUMENT PRODUCTION RECORD	
AUTHOR:	James Mansfield BA (Hons), MCIEEM
REVIEWER COMPETENCY SUMMARY:	The Biodiversity Net Gain Survey Assessment and results were undertaken, assessed and reviewed by James Mansfield BA (Hons), a Full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). James has over 7 years' experience undertaking ecological surveys and is a holder of a Class 2 (CL18) survey licence for bats (ref: 2020-44740-CLS-CLS); (CL29) for barns owls (ref: 2023-11377-CL19-OWL); and a Bat (Possession) Licence holder (ref: 2020-47163-SCI-SCI). James is also the former Principal (County) Ecologist for Somerset Council.
SURVEYOR COMPETENCY SUMMARY:	The Biodiversity Net Gain Survey was undertaken by William Rees, an Associate member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). William has over 9 years' experience undertaking ecological surveys and is a holder of a Class 2 (CL18) survey licence for bats (ref: 2024-11986-CL18-BA); and holder of a Class 1 (CL08) for great crested newts (ref: 2017-29717-CLS-CLS). William Reese is also FISC Level 3 Certified.
APPROVED BY:	James Mansfield MCIEEM.
COMPANY DETAILS:	BN Ecology Ltd, Programme, The Pithay, Bristol, BS1 2NB
ISSUED TO:	David Diclaudio
REPORT REFENCE:	2500112WTBNG – December 2025
DOCUMENT STATUS:	First Issue

DOCUMENT REVISION RECORD			
Issue	Date	Author	Revision Details
1.1	N/A	N/A	N/A

Confidentiality and Reproduction Restrictions
<i>This report is not issued to and cannot be relied upon by any other business, person or entity for any other grounds without the prior permission of BN Ecology Ltd. BN Ecology Ltd will not accept liability or responsibility for the use of this report or its findings (permitted or not) except for the aforementioned project, being the reason it was initially drafted and compiled. In the production of this report, BN Ecology Ltd relied upon information obtained and provided by others. The accuracy and completeness of this information cannot be guaranteed by BN Ecology Ltd; however all reasonable measures have been implemented to ensure that the data/information is accurate and that the observations made regarding the information are precise. This being said, BN Ecology Ltd cannot be made liable for any omissions or errors or for any losses/consequential losses following decisions made based on this report's findings.</i>

Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
Site Summary – Redline Boundary Baseline Habitat Plan (UKHab) Pre-Degradation Activities (Figure 1)	6
Site Summary – Redline Boundary Baseline Habitat Plan (UKHab) Post-Degradation Activities (Figure 2)	7
Site Summary – Redline Boundary Post-Intervention Habitat Plan (UKHab) (Figure 3)	8
2. Methodology	9
3. Key Information Checklist Requirements	13
BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)	15
POST-INTERVENTION BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)	15
4. BNG Strategy	17
4.1 On-site Proposals	19
4.2 Off-site Proposals	28
Statutory Credit Proposals	29
Phased Development Approach	29
Irreplaceable Habitats Approach	30
Habitat Regulations Assessment	30
5. Conclusion	31
Appendix A: Figures	32
Site Photos	32
Appendix B: Metric rules, assessment and strategic significance	34
Appendix C: Project Implementation Prescriptions	37
Appendix D: Pre-development Baseline Imagery	41
Appendix E: Latin names	42
Appendix F: References	45
Websites (all accessed in December, 2025)	46



1.Executive Summary

This report has been compiled to support the proposals comprising the erection of a polytunnel and wooden storage shed for horticultural purposes and associated landscaped open space on land to the rear of no. 1 Pye Corner, Box, SN13 8ED (The grid reference for the proposal is ST 82556830, totalling 0.1259 ha). It can be confirmed that if planning permission is granted, the proposed development would be subject to the Biodiversity Net Gain Condition.

This Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal¹ (the latter is outlined in a separate report, produced by BN Ecology, which should be read in conjunction with the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment) shows how both the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy and the Mitigation Hierarchy have been followed. This report also illustrates how the development proposals will secure 10% biodiversity net gain in accordance with the Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021).

As indicated above, this assessment should be read in conjunction with the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, as well as Statutory Metric and completed Habitat Condition Sheets, which have been prepared by BN Ecology.

This report demonstrates that the development will achieve a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) through on-site measures, it is proposed this will be through the following intervention proposals:

Retention proposals:

- TN3, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0063ha

Creation proposals:

- 32 – Individual Trees – Rural Trees targeting 'poor' condition, 17 in total (created one year in advance, see 'additional notes' section).
- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition, 0.0369ha

Enhancement proposals:

- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland enhance from 'moderate' to 'good' condition, 0.04392ha
- h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub enhance from 'poor' to 'good' condition, 0.01ha

Therefore, it is deemed that enough information has been provided to the Local Planning Authority to establish with sufficient certainty that, if planning permission was granted, the applicant is capable of discharging the biodiversity gain condition and thus achieving their biodiversity gain objective.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

¹ Mansfield, J (12/12/2025). Land to the rear of no. 1 Pye Corner, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA). BN Ecology, Bristol.



SITE NAME AND LOCATION	Land to the rear of no. 1 Pye Corner, Box, SN13 8ED
OS GRID REFERENCE & SCALE	Grid reference: ST 82556830 Please refer to Standalone Plans for Scale
Local Authority	Wiltshire Council 

Site Summary – Redline Boundary Baseline Habitat Plan (UKHab) Pre-Degradation Activities (Figure 1)



Site Summary – Redline Boundary Baseline Habitat Plan (UKHab) Post-Degradation Activities (Figure 2)



Site Summary – Redline Boundary Post-Intervention Habitat Plan (UKHab) (Figure 3)



2. Methodology

HABITAT CLASSIFICATION AND CONDITION ASSESSMENT	During the survey, UK Habitat Classification survey techniques (UKHab Ltd, 2023) were utilised by the surveyor when mapping all habitat types within the Site. A condition assessment of the habitats was undertaken by the surveyor where appropriate. The condition assessment was undertaken and supported by the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment sheet (DEFRA, July 2025) for each respective habitat type(s) that were present within the Site boundary.
BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN CALCULATIONS APPROACH	The latest version of the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric (DEFRA, July 2025) has been used to calculate the pre-development biodiversity unit baseline of the Site and the post-development value. The baseline habitat values are assessed in accordance with the above classification system. The report then assessed the baseline score value for the Site against that of the post-development score, the result of which shows (when compared) the overall change in biodiversity units for the development (displayed as a net positive, neutral, or negative figure).
HABITAT UNIT TYPES	The Statutory Biodiversity Metric displays and assesses the pre-development and post-development types based on three separate types of habitat, calculated as separate 'modules' in the calculations. The inclusion of these habitats is only recorded within the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment report, where they exist within the pre-development baseline or are proposed as part of the Biodiversity Net Gain strategy to achieve 10% net gain post-development. The three separate modules are as follows: • Area Habitat Units – these are measured in hectares (ha), some examples of which include grassland, woodland, ponds, and scrub. • Linear Hedgerow Units – These are measured in kilometres (km), some examples of which include treelines, hedgerows, and hedgerows with associated ditches. • Linear Watercourse Units – these are measured in kilometres (km), some examples of which include rivers, streams, and ditches.

Additional Notes and Limitations	Please note: Statutory Biodiversity Metric Table F of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric summarises common issues and any actions required to resolve these. One of the most commonly occurring issues is the metric assigns a unit value to the closest two decimal places, which can result in a 0.01 unit discrepancy, as the 'true' unit values are used to calculate the end values and then rounded to the two decimal places. It should also be noted that whilst biodiversity measures that provide species specific enhancements are not measurable in unit value in the metric calculations, the proposals also incorporate bird and bat boxes within the adjacent blueline land; the incorporation of log piles for the benefit of reptiles and amphibians; and ensuring that any new fencing incorporates accessible hedgehog holes. Please note: Redline Boundary Priority Habitat Status The site is listed on MAGIC as priority habitat, namely Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchard. However, the land parcel concerning the redline boundary which the proposals are subject to comprises predominately of a clearing present in the northeastern portion of the clients land ownership which defines the redline boundary, which can be seen on satellite imagery as far back as 2002 (See Appendix E for evidence). Although some Damsoms fruit trees were noted within the south-west portion of the site outside of the redline boundary, there is a general lack of regularly spaced fruit trees to support the historical land use of Traditional Orchard. The proposals are to be sited within the clearing area; therefore no priority habitat is expected to be affected. Full details are provided in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal² which was also undertaken by BN Ecology and should be read in conjunction with this document. Please note: Habitat Condition Assessments With the exception of TN3 (mixed scrub which has not been degraded), all habitats have been assessed in accordance with All Ecology's UKHab Habitat Condition Assessments which were previously completed for the site in April 2022, in support of a former refused planning application for a single dwelling (REF: PL/2021/06688), which form the basis of the Site's Habitat Baseline Value due to habitat degradation activities which have since occurred past this date.
--	--

² Mansfield. J (December, 2025). *Land to the rear of 1 Pye Corner, Box, SN13 8ED. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)*. Bristol.

Please note: Creation of Other Neutral Grassland (TN10)

The assessor will note, in accordance with Schedule 7A, Part 1, Point 6, TN1 in the baseline is referred to as 'Other Neutral Grassland' in moderate condition, in accordance with All Ecology's Habitat Condition Assessment undertaken on the same Site in 2022 which forms part of their Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report which supported a former application for the Site which was refused (REF:PL/2021/06688). In reality, retrospective works have resulted in 0.0447ha of this habitat being lost, which is now Artificial Unvegetated Unsealed Surface (an access track). Therefore, it should not be confused that TN10 is 'enhancing' TN1, as it will be in fact reverting 0.025ha of the current access track to Other Neutral Grassland, targeting 'good' condition.

Please note: Enhancing Mixed Scrub (TN4)

It should be noted that whilst this habitat has been largely cleared to incorporate recent hedgerow whips, areas of the former scrub regrowth are still present, and therefore habitat enhancement of TN4 rather than creation has been selected as the appropriate action for re-establishing this habitat.

Please note: Habitats created in advance (TN5)

For the purposes of Biodiversity net gain, the client has planted 17 no. individual rural tree's (fruiting tree's). These trees has been recorded in the creation 'in advance' function by one year (see Appendix E for evidence), which is reflective of this scenario and thus accords with 'Rule 4' pertaining to the Statutory Metric Guidance User Guide. The criterion as set out in the User Guide has been followed:

- Page 61 'Only use 'creation in advance' where trees are planted in advance of the development (for example, as screening or as structural landscaping).' – Trees have been planted in advance as a landscaping feature
- Page 61 'Do not factor in the age of nursery stock when assessing 'creation in advance'. – This has not been factored into the calculations.
- 'the number of years inputted into the 'habitats created in advance function' should not exceed the time it takes to reach a poor condition' – The number of years it takes for individual rural tree's to achieve 'poor' condition in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculator is nine years, and the years in advance being recorded is only one year.

Please note: Defining part of the Other Neutral Grassland (TN2)

Section 3.7 of All Ecology's 2022 Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report defines a portion of TN2 as 'Sparsely vegetated

land – Ruderal/ephemeral'. This portion of the Site has since developed and has a higher value habitat compared to the former 2022 value, therefore, it has been redefined as Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition

Please note: extended redline boundary

In this assessment, two small areas (see Appendix E for details) were not covered in the previous 2022 PEA's redline boundary and thus subject to a habitat condition assessment. However, Aerial imagery provided in All Ecology's 2022 Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report clearly shows these two areas as grassland. Therefore, based on this in combination with the updated field survey, professional judgement has been applied and these areas (which have been recently cleared to facilitate the retrospective access track) have been determined to be a continuation of TN2 (Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition).

3. Key Information Checklist Requirements

CONFIRMATION THAT THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO BNG.	Yes, the development proposal should be subject to Biodiversity Net Gain.
CONFIRMATION THAT THE APPROPRIATE METRIC VERSION HAS BEEN USED.	Statutory Biodiversity Metric (July 2025).
IS AN ALTERNATIVE DATE BEING USED TO CALCULATE THE BIODIVERSITY BASELINE VALUE OF THE SITE?	Yes, an alternative date is being used due to habitat degradation. The date being used is April 2022 when the previous Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report³ was undertaken. Please note; this report notes an area of Sparsely Vegetated – Ruderal/Ephemeral in the centre of the site, this has been classified as Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition to mirror its current condition. Please note: the redline of the 2022 BNG extended further north and as such these habitats are not included within this report. Habitats 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7 roughly reflect the areas within this reports redline, however, the extent of scrub has increased since 2022 which is reflected within our mapped areas. A limitation to note is All Ecology did not produce corresponding habitat maps, meaning exact locations and extents could not be determined, however, mapping in this assessment has been accurately reflected and best judgement in relation to historic locations of habitat which has since been degraded have been determined as accurately as possible.
HAS THERE BEEN ANY UNAUTHORISED HABITAT DEGRADATION SINCE THE 30 th OF JANUARY 2020?	Yes, habitat degradation has occurred since 30th of January 2020. Part of the site has been degraded from Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition to Urban – Artificial Unvegetated Unsealed Surface due to being topsoil stripped and having type 1 surfacing deposited to create a formal access track from the western portion of the site to the south-east corner. Another area of formally Other Neutral Grassland has also been topsoil stripped and re-sown with a meadow mixture. Additionally, an area of Mixed Scrub (TN4) has recently been partially cleared, and hedgerow whips have been planted in their place, however due to their immature nature it is not appropriate to class this as a functional linear feature. The previous baseline of Mixed Scrub has been chosen due to its higher value over the recently planted hedgerow whips, which as stated, do not currently warrant a definition as a linear hedgerow feature. Although the whips will be retained as part

³ All Ecology, Land at Devizes Road, Box, SN13 8EF, April 2022, Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report, All Ecology, Gloucestershire

	of the proposal, these have not been included in the post-interventions as the priority is to reinstate the scrub (partially) within that area.
IS THERE ANY ON-SITE IRREPLACEABLE HABITAT	No, no Irreplaceable habitat was recorded on-site.

PRE-DEVELOPMENT BASELINE ON-SITE BIODIVERSITY VALUE

The habitats recorded within the Site are described in detail below with the appropriate condition assessment results justifying their condition classifications. A DAFOR (Dominant, abundant, frequent, occasional and rare) scale has been applied to the species recorded in each habitat type.

Only habitats which fall under the 'Area Unit' categories are present within the Site. No habitats which fall under the 'Linear Hedgerow Units' or 'Watercourse Units' categories are present, and subsequently, an assessment of these features was not required.

The habitats areas within the Site comprise of the following habitat types;

- o Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland (g3c6 16)
- o Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub (847)

g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland, 0.0447ha (TN1), Moderate Condition, Medium Distinctiveness

| An area previously identified within the 2021 PEA as '*short poor semi-improved grassland with low diversity*' (in UKHab terms previously defined by All Ecology as Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition) has been topsoil stripped and type 1 surfacing deposited to create a formal access track from the western portion of the site to the south-east corner where the area proposed for the new shed has been reprofiled.

Please note: this area is now Artificial Unvegetated; Unsealed Surface but has been classified as degradation and the previous habitat is being accounted for.

g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland, 0.0530ha (TN2), Moderate Condition, Medium Distinctiveness

| The central portion of the site, identified within the 2021 PEA as '*short poor semi-improved grassland with low diversity*' (in UKHab terms Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition), has been recently topsoil stripped and re-sown with a meadow mixture. At the time of the walkover the grassland was dominated by white clover with approximately 30% grass cover including cock's foot, sheep's fescue, red fescue and perennial rye grass. Other forbs frequently noted included common comfrey, crimson clover, cleavers, yarrow. Occasional species included cow parsley, common sorrel, creeping buttercup.

Please note: As this has been recently sown, and given the time of year, it is not possible to undertake a condition assessment. It is considered most appropriate to consider this habitat as "degraded" relative to the 2022 baseline of g3c – Other Neutral Grassland in Moderate Condition and therefore is proposed to be enhanced 'good' condition.

h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Shrub, 0.0063ha (TN3) Poor Condition | The mixed scrub identified previously within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal remains but is now under regular sensitive management, which was evident at the time of the survey, with the overall condition unchanged (i.e. 'poor' condition as previously recorded). Areas were prominent along the southern boundary of the remaining grassland and comprised young hawthorn, dogwood, blackthorn, hazel, goat willow with

scattered holly and bramble. The understorey comprises dominant common ivy with scattered stinking iris, false broom and wood melic.

h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Shrub, 0.0219ha (TN4) Poor Condition | Along the northern boundary of the grassland the scrub has been partially cleared and, in its place, mixed native hedge whips have been planted.

Please note: this area has been classified as degraded and the previous habitat is being accounted for.

BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)

BASELINE ON-SITE AREA UNITS	0.91 Area Units
BASELINE ON-SITE AREA HABITAT	Habitat onsite comprises; - TN1, g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland ('moderate' condition), 0.0447ha, 0.36 units - TN2, g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland ('moderate' condition), 0.053ha, 0.42 units - TN3, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0063ha, 0.03 units - TN4, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0219ha, 0.1 units
BASELINE ON-SITE HEDGEROW HABITAT	N/A
BASELINE ON-SITE WATERCOURSE	N/A

POST-INTERVENTION BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)

POST-INTERVENTION ON-SITE AREA UNITS	1.12 Area Units
POST-INTERVENTION ON-SITE AREA HABITAT	Retention proposals: - TN3, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0063ha, 0.03 units Creation proposals: - TN1 u1c Artificial Unvegetated; Unsealed Surface 0.0197 ha comprising the access track, 0.0 units - TN7 u1b5 (buildings) – Developed land; sealed surface 0.0071 ha comprising the poly tunnel, 0.0 units. - TN8 u1b5 (buildings) – Developed land; sealed surface 0.00198 ha comprising the shed, 0.0 units - TN5, 32 – Individual Trees – Rural Trees targeting 'poor' condition, 0.0692ha, 0.20 units (created one year in advance, see 'additional notes' section). 17 no. young, newly planted trees have been planted comprising a mixture of pear, apple and plum cultivars.

	- TN9 & TN10 g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition 0.0369ha 0.31 units Enhancement proposals: - TN2, g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland enhance from 'moderate' to 'good' condition, 0.04392ha, 0.47 units - TN4, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub enhance from 'poor' to 'good' condition, 0.01ha, 0.11 units Habitat losses as a result of the proposals: 0.0197ha of TN1 – Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition (historically, as in reality this has already become u1c- Artificial Unvegetated; Unsealed Surface, hence why TN1 as a target note reference remains the same for the Post-Intervention Baseline Proposals) lost to facilitate the access track; 0.00198 of TN1 – Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition lost to facilitate TN8; 0.0071 of TN2 – Other Neutral Grassland in 'moderate' condition lost to facilitate TN7; and 0.0119ha of TN4 – Mixed Scrub in 'poor' condition lost to facilitate the creation of TN9 – Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition. The remaining habitats are either being retained or enhanced as part of the landscaped open space proposals.
POST-INTERVENTION ON-SITE LINEAR HEDGEROW HABITAT	N/A
POST-INTERVENTION ON-SITE WATERCOURSE	N/A
Gain/Loss	+ 23.42 % (+0.21 Area Units).

4. BNG Strategy

Planning policy	Planning policy makes it clear that any proposed development duly considers and applies the below Mitigation Hierarchy when considering impacts to ecological species and habitats: • Avoidance: every attempt should be made to avoid creating impacts on features from the outset; • Minimisation: where avoidance cannot be wholly achieved, measures by design, suitably designed methods of working or other actions to minimise impacts (otherwise known as mitigation) should be employed; • Compensation/restoration: if avoidance and minimisation cannot be wholly achieved, significant impacts on features should be compensated in such a way to restore an area to its original ecosystem or any other ecological functions/services that existed prior to impacts relating to the development. The hierarchy requires that avoidance is applied where possible. When it is not feasible to avoid such impacts, rationale for minimisation/compensation/restoration should be sufficiently detailed, showing the measures are feasible to implement. The ecological constraints associated with the development have been assessed in accordance with the Mitigation Hierarchy, with due consideration to apply, as much as possible, actions to avoid impacts on ecological features. In addition to the above, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 states that <i>'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'</i> as well as <i>'Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'</i>.
HOW HAVE THE PROPOSALS MINIMISED BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS	All potential ecological constraints in relation to the developments proposals have been thoroughly considered in the separate Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, undertaken by BN Ecology. Opportunities to deliver ecological enhancement in accordance with local and national planning policy have also been considered and are outlined in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.

Steps proposed to minimise adverse impacts and to deliver net gain include:

- Allocating over 77 % of the Sites redline boundary for on-site habitat enhancement & creation (see above for details).
- Recommending incorporating hedgerows that are species rich native hedgerow (h2a5) and comprise of the following: hazel, blackthorn, hawthorn, field maple and elder.
- Recommending that any new shrubs be high nectar producing to encourage invertebrates to the Site, as well as providing continued foraging for bats. The Royal Horticultural Society guide, "RHS Perfect for Pollinators, www.rhs.org.uk/perfectforpollinators" provides a well-suited plants list of both native and non-native species. In addition, it's been recommended that and more trees planted on site should be from local, native stock, such as fruiting pear, apple and plum.
- Ensuring that habitats proposed to be lost are mainly limited to 'Medium' distinctiveness habitats that are poor examples of a 'medium' distinctiveness habitat, as they are currently in 'poor' condition (though, the historic condition (moderate) in relation to grassland for the purposes of habitat degradation has been considered for the purposes of this report, as outlined above), meaning the loss can be easily compensated for, as demonstrated in this report.

It should be noted that the landowner, since taking ownership of the site earlier this year, has installed both bat and bird boxes onto suitable trees within the adjacent off-site woodland, and created deadwood piles to benefit local fauna populations and enhance the woodlands condition. These offsite enhancement measures have not been considered in this assessment.

It should also be noted that the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal also delineated considerations for the following protected species or notable features:

- Above ground nesting birds
- Bats (as well as sensitive lighting design recommendations if necessary)
- Terrestrial badger activity
- Terrestrial habitat potential for hedgehog
- Root Protection Zones for retained habitats

It should be highlighted that biodiversity measures that provide species specific enhancements are not a measure that can be considered in the metric calculations.

WHAT IS THE PROPOSED STRATEGY TO FULFIL THE BIODIVERSITY GAIN OBJECTIVE?	The BNG Strategy does not require the purchase of offsite units or statutory credits. To offset, compensate and achieve mandatory 10% Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021), on-site creation and enhancement of habitat within the redline boundary is proposed. A Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be prepared, which shall delineate a suitable approach to manage, maintain and monitor the habitats created on-site.
--	---

4.1 On-site Proposals

PROPOSED ON-SITE APPROACH	Please refer to section 'BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)' for the existing on-site Area Habitats that will accommodate the proposed created habitats and 'POST-INTERVENTION BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (ON-SITE)' for the areas pertaining to habitat creation, enhancement and retention. The proposals comprise (habitat enhancement & creation proposals only): The enhancement of; • g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland enhance from 'moderate' to 'good' condition • h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub enhance from 'poor' to 'good' condition The creation of; • g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition • 32 – Individual Trees – Rural Trees targeting 'poor' condition (planted one year in advance) Please note: BN Ecology has noted that The Wiltshire Local Plan Review includes a requirement for 20% Biodiversity Net Gain for all impacted developments, which exceeds the national minimum of 10%. In simple terms, this means that development proposals in Wiltshire would be required to demonstrate a 20% improvement in biodiversity value compared to the pre-development state. The plan emphasises delivering BNG through a hierarchy of onsite, offsite, and as a last resort, through the purchase of national biodiversity units/credits. At the time of writing (December 2025), the Wiltshire Local Plan Review was in the Independent Examination stage. The plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, communities and Local Government on the 28th of November 2024 for this examination. It is anticipated that the new Local Plan will be adopted in late 2025 or early 2026. Therefore, the requirement of the national mandatory 10% net gain is the targeted gain objective, however, the proposals result in a 23.42% net gain.
---	--

Please note: The following have been taken into consideration and prescriptions proposed (full prescriptions can be found in Appendix).

Enhancing and creation of Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition.

Soilscape 9:

Lime-rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage

Texture:

Clayey, some loamy

Coverage:

England: 5.3%, Wales: 0.0%, England & Wales: 4.5%

Drainage:

Slightly impeded drainage



Fertility:

High



Soilscape (LandIS) indicates that the Site sits within an area of Lime-rich loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage and high fertility. Therefore, the following grassland on-site seed mixes have been considered:

- **EM5 Meadow Mixture for Loamy Soils.** This seed mix comprises of species that are adapted to growing on soils which have clayey and lime content with a significant chalk or limestone composition. The supplier of this mix is Emorsgate Seeds.

Taking the above into consideration, a locally sourced seed mix such as EM5 (all supplied by Emorsgate Seeds) are examples of possible seed mixtures that could be incorporated. These seed mixes are suited to soils compositions as indicated by Soilscape, making them favourable choices for the

on-site proposals for landscaped open space.

Some human intervention (especially in the first few years) may be required to over-seed the areas where bare ground is increasing, with locally sourced, species rich seed mix to assist and aid the growth and species diversity.

Enhancing of 17 no. tree's targeting 'poor' condition

Examples of species being considered which are tolerant of the indicated soil conditions (see below) include field maple, oak, hornbeam, wild cherry and small-leaved lime, as well as fruiting trees (which the landowner has planted) including pear, plum and apple.

Some human intervention (especially in the first few years) may be required to prune and water the tree, especially in periods of excessively dry weather.

Enhancing Mixed Scrub targeting 'good' condition

This can be completed by the planting of suitable species in relation to the soil composition and by ensuring that a suitable habitat management regime is put in place for at least 30 years. The key objective will be to create mixed scrub comprising bramble, hazel, goat willow and hawthorn. All of these species are already known to grow within the site and hazel is a species that is well adapted to tolerate the soil conditions onsite.

The above methods represent an example of how contributing to achieve Biodiversity Net can be achieved, in part, on-site. The Landscape Ecological Management Plan or Habitat Maintenance and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will provide

the particular details required in relation to the necessary management activities relating to duration, inspection practices, timings of activities and whom will be the competent responsible personnel. It is anticipated this will be secured by way of a planning obligation, such as a Condition or Section 106 agreement.

Table 5. Discussion points on how Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles have been applied to enable the project's biodiversity incorporation and lifespan.

BNG Principle	Indicators	Project comments
Principle 1. Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy	Measures to avoid and minimise biodiversity loss and to rehabilitate/restore biodiversity affected by the project are: 1) Specified and recorded, 2) Implemented and monitored, 3) Managed for the longevity of the project and to mitigate impacts of losses impacts.	Where losses of 'medium' distinctiveness habitats are being lost, these are limited as far as possible concerning g3c – Other Neutral Grassland which is in 'poor' condition and a poor example of a 'medium' distinctiveness habitat (though, the historic condition (moderate) in relation to grassland for the purposes of habitat degradation has been considered for the purposes of this report, as outlined above). This is similar in relation to mixed scrub, though, the condition is still 'poor', which is the same as its historical condition recorded by All Ecology. Due to the size of the scheme, an option consideration report is not considered appropriate. A separate Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been undertaken by BN Ecology. Mitigation and compensatory measures are recommended to be incorporated into the proposed Site Plan in accordance with the survey findings. However, these are not expected to change the on-site proposals pertaining to achieving & fulfilling the Biodiversity Gain Objective. On-site species-specific enhancements, in accordance with the National Planning

			Policy Framework (Section 193d), have been incorporated.
	Principle 2. Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere	This part discusses impacts on irreplaceable habitats and other vulnerable biodiversity resources. These are habitats where their losses cannot be replaced within a reasonable timescale and therefore require bespoke compensatory measures.	There are no habitat losses on-site that cannot be readily offset and compensated on-site, which shall be achieved through the proposals pertaining to habitat enhancement and creation.
	Principle 3. Be inclusive and equitable	This principle discusses how stakeholders should be engaged with early in the project, and if feasible involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Biodiversity Net Gain. Achieving this in partnership with stakeholders is advised to be done where possible.	Wiltshire Council will be consulted, and engagement with the Local Planning Authority in relation to advice and guidance shall be sought. Additionally, The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has also considered Wiltshire Councils Local Biodiversity Action Plan and Policy 50 & 69 of Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015).
	Principle 4. Address risks	Here it should be considered how Biodiversity Net Gain is being achieved concerning the project. If there is any uncertainty in the implementation or design these should be documented. If there are any risks associated with the project within the 30-year timeframe, particularly in relation to management, these should be highlighted and contingencies put in place.	This report outlines how BNG will be achieved on-site. A Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will outline risks and associated timescales, which will, in turn, inform any contingency measures that may need to be in place.
	Principle 5. Make a measurable net gain	It is described that a suitable metric calculator is used so that all habitat impacts are quantified in relation to the pre-development baseline	It is recommended that the Statutory Metric and supporting Condition Assessment Sheets are read conjunction with this report.

		and post-development baseline. Any gains associated with the post-development baseline are also quantified in relation to the anticipated condition compared to what the condition of such habitats would otherwise be without any creation, enhancement or management activities.	
	Principle 6. Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity	This discusses ways in which evidence should be presented on how Biodiversity Net Gain commitments contribute (both now as well as in the future) to regional or national conservation goals. Evidence should be provided where it is possible to contribute to priority species populations.	The project will result in the loss of low quality and poorly managed habitats that are commonly found in similar settings across England with little ecological interest. Species specific enhancements are incorporated on-site and below considers the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy Order.
	Principle 7. Be additional	Evidence is provided that conservation gains were a causation by the project specifically and would otherwise not have resulted in the same outcomes without such interventions.	Under the proposed scheme for on-site habitat enhancement and creation, the interventions, that will be fully delineated in a Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP), will demonstrate how objectives and targets will be achieved as a result of the proposals.
	Principle 8. Create a Net Gain legacy	The provision of evidence should be shown that those who are responsible for implementing the project have the necessary and required technical knowledge and capacity to undertake the specific roles.	The Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will expand on the roles and responsibilities for the project. It is anticipated that the client will employ a suitably qualified person to undertake these activities (though, creation and enhancement proposals are of 'low' difficulty to create and enhance, and it is reasonable to

			assume that the client can manage them), therefore there is no reason to believe that the client will not have the technical resource and capacity to perform the necessary activities.	
	Principle 9. Optimise sustainability	Evidence provided that the project takes BNG targets and priority objectives into consideration. It also aims to seeks opportunities for gains for the wider environment, the community and the economy.	Given the scale of the project, it is not proportionate to focus these proposals on how the project will achieve gains for the wider environment. However, evidence is demonstrated in the Biodiversity Net Gain report that the Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles, the Mitigation Hierarchy and the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy have been thoroughly considered, as well as the targets & objectives within those respective frameworks.	
	Principle 10. Be transparent	The developer has made their commitments to Biodiversity Net Gain clear in a publicly available document. Results of project audits are publicly available where claims of BNG are made at relevant project stages, including project closure and any deviations from original design specifications are clearly stated. Evidence that the best available scientific knowledge and methods have been used in BNG design and implementation, and knowledge is transferred back to the scientific community.	A suitably worded Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will be available to the Local Planning Authority. This report shows how Biodiversity Net Gain can be achieved and can be upheld to support the transparency required to fulfil Principle 10.	
It should also be noted that whilst biodiversity measures that provide species specific enhancements are not measurable in unit value in the metric calculations, the proposals also recommend more general wildlife rich landscape planting including				

	species rich hedgerow and native tree planting and off-site management prescriptions to enhance adjacent Priority Habitat deciduous woodland. + 23.42 % (+ 0.21 Area Units).
REASONING FOR ON-SITE APPROACH Justification, as to how this responds to the Somerset BNG Principles (see page 61 of BNG guidance here) and also page 70 here for strategic Significance criteria.	Strategic Significance considerations and how this has been applied and embedded within the proposals: - The habitats to be lost as a result of the proposals are largely medium distinctiveness habitats (g3c – Other neutral grassland & h3h – Mixed Scrub). Whilst these habitats have been assigned their historic condition to address habitat degradation which has taken place since January 30th 2020, in reality they are in ‘poor’ condition, poorly managed and of little biodiversity value as existing, and therefore the habitats to be lost are low value and easily compensated. At the time of writing, Wiltshire Council had not published their Local Nature Recovery Strategy, meaning Strategic Significance is being assessed in accordance with Table 4, and thoroughly considers local policies and action plans in relation to biodiversity and ecological networks. Therefore, as the Site is located within Wiltshire Council’s Local Planning Authority Area, The Wiltshire’s Local Biodiversity Action Plan (2008) has been referenced and is highlighted as a relevant Local Biodiversity Action Plan. The Wiltshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2008 prioritises the following listed habitat types and networks: Woodland: This includes ancient woodland and wood-pasture/parkland Arable Farmland: This focuses on specific needs of arable fields for biodiversity Wet Habitats: Broadly, this comprises of reedbeds, fen and marsh, and wet grassland Hedgerows: Hedgerows of varying types are included, with action plans specifically addressing the conservation and management of these Scrub: Action plans to protect and manage scrub habitats Acid and Calcareous Grassland: This addresses these particular grassland types Open Water: Broadly, includes lakes, reservoirs, and other water bodies Field Margins, Churchyards, Gardens: Often overlooked, the plan focuses on these Lowland Heathland: Action plans are delineated for this specific type of habitat Other Semi-Natural Habitats: The Plan Recognises the importance of various semi-natural habitats for biodiversity Mixed scrub sits within the redline boundary. Therefore, in accordance with the Statutory Metric User Guide, this habitat has been defined as ‘High’ strategic significance in the calculations. All other habitats on-site are not listed within the local strategy; therefore, these have not been considered as strategically significant.

ARE PROPOSED HABITATS DEFINED AS SIGNIFICANT ON-SITE ENHANCEMENTS	Habitats categorised as 'u1b/u1b5 - Urban developed land; sealed surface' and 'u1c – Artificial unvegetated – unsealed surface' are considered to be 'very low' distinctiveness and do not require a condition assessment due to their perceived low value as a biodiversity proxy. Wiltshire Council does not delineate a local definition of 'significant' on-site habitat gains. Therefore, for the purposes of this assessment, the government definition of on-site significant habitat gains has been used, which is defined as follows: <i>'Significant enhancements are areas of habitat enhancement which contribute significantly to the proposed development's BNG, relative to the biodiversity value before development.'</i> <i>Retention of existing habitat does not count as an on-site enhancement. What counts as a significant enhancement will vary depending on the scale of development and existing habitat, but these would normally be:</i> - habitats of medium or higher distinctiveness in the biodiversity metric - <i>habitats of low distinctiveness which create a large number of biodiversity units relative to the biodiversity value of the site before development</i> - <i>habitat creation or enhancement where distinctiveness is increased relative to the distinctiveness of the habitat before development</i> - <i>areas of habitat creation or enhancement which are significant in area relative to the size of the development</i> - enhancements to habitat condition, for example from poor or moderate to 'good' As can be seen above, government definitions align with the proposals, concerning on-site proposals in relation to habitat creation and enhancement on-site of 'medium' distinctiveness habitats, and should be defined as 'significant' on-site gains. Government guidance states that such gains concerning <i>'the maintenance of these significant enhancements must be secured with a legal agreement (planning obligation or conservation covenant) or planning condition for 30 years in the same way as off-site gains. LPAs will consider the most appropriate mechanism and this will need to be agreed at the planning permission stage.'</i> Therefore, the Local Planning Authority will determine the best securing mechanism.
REASONING FOR ON-SITE APPROACH	Please refer to BN Ecology's justification presented above in response to the listed principles. All of the area units delivered on-site will be delivered as a result of; Retention proposals: • h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0063ha

Creation proposals:

- 32 – Individual Trees – Rural Trees targeting ‘poor’ condition, 0.0692ha (created one year in advance, see ‘additional notes’ section).
- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland targeting ‘good’ condition, 0.0369ha

Enhancement proposals:

- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland enhance from ‘moderate’ to ‘good’ condition, 0.04392ha
- h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub enhance from ‘poor’ to ‘good’ condition, 0.01ha

Over 77% of land within the redline boundary is being allocated as landscaped open space, and over 42% of the ‘medium’ distinctiveness habitats on-site are being enhanced as part of the proposals.

The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2025 has brought in the concept of the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy. This is complimentary and supplements the wider mitigation hierarchy and applies specifically to the application of Biodiversity Net Gain. The below table provides justification for the on-site approach:

Table 7: Discussion points on how Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy Order has been applied to enable the project’s biodiversity incorporation and lifespan.

Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy Order	Comment
1) <u>AVOID</u> adverse effects to onsite habitat	Due to the scale of the proposals and extent of the redline boundary, avoidance of adverse effects to on-site habitat is not fully possible. However, adverse effects are limited as far as possible. Where ‘medium’ distinctiveness habitats are being lost, these are limited in reality to habitats that are poorly managed. Retention, enhancement and creation proposals amount to over 77% of the site being allocated as landscaped open space.
2) <u>MITIGATE</u> any adverse effects to habitat which cannot be avoided	This primarily relates to mitigating impacts on habitat losses where their distinctiveness score is four or higher. This report demonstrates how this can be achieved through retention, creation and enhancement of mixed scrub, other neutral grassland and individual rural tree's, the latter of which has been planted in the last year which reduces the risk of targeted condition (poor) not being achieved.

	3) <u>ENHANCE OR CREATE on-site habitat where any on-site habitat is adversely affected by the development</u>	As delineated in detail above, all on-site losses have been offset as far as possible, with over 77% of the total redline boundary allocated as landscaped open space which comprises broadly speaking of habitat enhancement and creation proposals. Over 42% of the retained 'medium' distinctiveness habitats are being enhanced.
	4) <u>ENHANCE OR CREATE off-site habitat where on-site habitat gains are either in part or not at all possible.</u>	Not applicable
	5) <u>SECURE REGISTERED OFF-SITE GAINS</u>	Not applicable.
	6) <u>PURCHASE STATUTORY CREDITS</u>	Not applicable.

4.2 Off-site Proposals

OFF-SITE UNITS LIKELY TO BE REQUIRED	N/A
OFF-SITE APPROACH	N/A
OFF-SITE JUSTIFICATION	N/A

BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (OFF-SITE)	
BASELINE OFF-SITE AREA HABITAT	N/A
BASELINE OFF-SITE HEDGEROW HABITAT	N/A
BASELINE OFF-SITE WATERCOURSE	N/A

POST-INTERVENTION BASELINE BIODIVERSITY VALUE (OFF-SITE)	
POST-INTERVENTION OFF-SITE AREA HABITAT	N/A



POST-INTERVENTION OFF-SITE HEDGEROW HABITAT	N/A
POST-INTERVENTION OFF-SITE WATERCOURSE	N/A

HABITAT SUMMARY	
TOTAL NET UNIT CHANGE	+ 0.21 Area Unit
TOTAL COMBINED NET % CHANGE	+ 23.42 %
TRADING RULES SATISFIED	Yes.

Statutory Credit Proposals

STATUTORY CREDITS LIKELY TO BE REQUIRED	N/A
STATUTORY CREDIT JUSTIFICATION	N/A

Phased Development Approach

HOW IS 10% BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN BEING ACHIEVED BROADLY ACROSS THE ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT	N/A
HOW IS IT ANTICIPATED THAT BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN WILL BE TRACKED AND ACHIEVED PHASE-BY-PHASE, AND WHAT TARGET PERCENTAGE GAINS ARE ANTICIPATED FOR EACH PHASE	N/A
PROPOSED CONTINGENCY IF SUBSEQUENT PHASES DO NOT PROCEED OR FAIL	N/A
PRECAUTIONARY APPROACH	N/A



Irreplaceable Habitats Approach

ON-SITE IRREPLACEABLE HABITAT	N/A
Has there been any previous engagement with responsible and/or statutory organisations?	N/A
Environmental Record Centre Consultation	N/A

Habitat Regulations Assessment

Relationship with HRA Requirements	N/A
------------------------------------	-----

5. Conclusion

As can be seen in this report, the biodiversity value associated with the development has been extensively considered, along with on-site measures in accordance with the Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles, The Mitigation Hierarchy and the Biodiversity Net Gain Hierarchy. The applicant shall achieve Biodiversity Net Gain through on-site measures, briefly comprising of:

Retention proposals:

- TN3, h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub ('poor' condition), 0.0063ha

Creation proposals:

- 32 – Individual Trees – Rural Trees targeting 'poor' condition, 17 no. in total (created one year in advance, see 'additional notes' section).
- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland targeting 'good' condition, 0.0369ha

Enhancement proposals:

- g3c – Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland enhance from 'moderate' to 'good' condition, 0.04392ha
- h3h – Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub enhance from 'poor' to 'good' condition, 0.01ha

Therefore, it is deemed that enough information has been provided to the Local Planning Authority to establish with sufficient certainty that, if planning permission was granted, the applicant is capable of discharging the biodiversity gain condition and thus achieving their biodiversity gain objective.



Appendix A: Figures

For convenience – press “Alt + Left Arrow” to return to the section of the report



Site Photos

Figure A: Photo showing TN1



Figure B: Photo showing TN2 and newly planted trees



Figure C: Photo showing TN3



Figure D: Photo showing TN4 and newly planted hedgerow whips



Figure E: Photo showing TN5 newly planted fruit trees



Figure F (Blueline boundary): Photo showing TN6



Figure G (Blueline boundary): Photo showing TN6. A newly installed bat and bird boxes in adjacent woodland



Appendix B: Metric rules, assessment and strategic significance

BIODIVERSITY METRIC RULES

As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (DEFRA, July 2025), the following rules must be followed:

Table 1: Statutory Biodiversity Metric Rules (The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide, July 2025)

Rule	Rule detail
Rule 1	The trading rules of this biodiversity metric must be followed.
Rule 2	Biodiversity unit outputs, for each type of unit, must not be summed, traded, or converted between types. The requirement to deliver at least a 10% net gain applies to each type of unit.
Rule 3	To accurately apply the biodiversity metric formula, you must use the statutory biodiversity metric calculation tool or small sites biodiversity metric tool (SSM) for small sites. The tools remove the need for a user to manually calculate the change in biodiversity value. The tool will summarise the results of the calculation and inform a user whether the biodiversity net gain objective has been met.
Rule 4	In exceptional ecological circumstances, deviation from this biodiversity metric methodology may be permitted by the relevant planning authority. See more about applying rule 4

ASSESSMENT METHODS FOR INDIVIDUAL TREE'S

'Individual trees' is defined as a broad habitat type in the metric, if present. For a habitat to meet this classification criterion, the tree (or group of individual trees) must have a diameter at breast height (DBH, measured in cm) greater than 7.5cm. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide provides clear guidelines on this, which are delineated below in Table 2:

Table 2: Tree classes and the equivalent area (ha) that they represent (The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide, July 2025)

Size class	Diameter at breast height (cm)	Biodiversity metric area equivalent (ha)
Small	greater than 7.5cm and less than or equal to 30cm	0.0041
Medium	greater than 30cm and less than or equal to 60cm	0.0163
Large	greater than 60cm and less than or equal to 90cm	0.0366
Very large	greater than 90cm	0.0765

Strategic Significance

The Statutory Biodiversity Metric puts consideration into the Strategic Significance of on-site habitat(s). Strategic Significance relates to a habitat's local significance in relation to its location and relationship with other local habitat features and/or species. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric allows the assessor to apply a Strategic Significance 'multiplier' on pre-development and post-development habitat baselines in accordance with criterion that must be met. This is delineated in Table 3.

Table 3: Statutory Biodiversity Metric Strategic Significance Categories, with appropriate descriptions and criteria where a Local Natural Recovery Strategy has been published (DEFRA, July 2025):

Category	Score	Description
High (Formally identified in local strategy)	1.15	This category can only be applied to post development interventions when: - the location of the habitat parcel has been mapped in the Local Habitat Map⁴ as an area where a potential measure has been proposed to help deliver the priorities of that LNRS; and - the proposed intervention is consistent⁵ with the mapped potential measure in the LNRS for the habitat parcel You should record that you have applied the published LNRS in your gain plan.
Medium (Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy)	1.10	This category cannot be applied.
Low (Area / compensation not in local strategy)	1	Where the definitions for high strategic significance are not met. Even if your project is in an area mapped with a potential measure, if the proposed intervention is not consistent with a potential measure proposed by the LNRS for that location, you should record strategic significance as low.

The assessment has utilised data sources and resources to inform the Strategic Significance of the Site and its habitats within. The following resources have been utilised:

- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC)
- Relevant published Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), where available
- Environmental Local Record Centre data sources, if appropriate to obtain such data
- The Natural England^[1] and Joint Nature Conservancy Council^[2] websites were visited to obtain citation details of the statutory designated sites
- Ordnance Survey maps and aerial images, including google maps

Table 4: Statutory Biodiversity Metric Strategic Significance Categories, with appropriate descriptions and criteria where a Local Natural Recovery Strategy has not been published (DEFRA, July 2025):

Category	Score	Description
High (Formally identified in local strategy)	1.15	The habitat type is mapped and described as locally ecologically important within a specific location, within documents specified by the relevant planning authority. If your project delivers the mapped habitat creation or enhancement actions set out within specified alternative documents, or enhances an existing habitat identified within specified alternative documents as locally ecologically important, strategic significance can be recorded as high in the post-intervention sheets. If the specified alternative documents identify existing habitat as locally ecologically important within a specified location, strategic significance may be recorded as high in the baseline. You should record the name of the plan the relevant planning authority has specified in the user comments and record that you have used the specified document in your gain plan.
Medium (Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy)	1.10	This category can be applied when the LPA has not identified a suitable document for assessing strategic significance. Users should: • explain how the habitat type is ecologically important within a specific location • demonstrate the importance of that habitat in providing ecological linkage to other strategically significant locations • use professional judgement When the above criteria are met, strategic significance may be recorded as medium in the baseline and post-intervention sheets.
Low (Area / compensation not in local strategy)	1	Where the definitions for high or medium strategic significance are not met.



Appendix C: Project Implementation Prescriptions

Individual Rural tree planting creation

It is proposed that a realistic expectation to achieve the targeted condition can be fulfilled by targeting the following criterion:

- The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).
- 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).
- 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. A relaxed infrequent regime pertaining to pruning should be followed which does not infringe on canopy spread.
- Regular maintenance concerning weeding, watering and monitoring for common tree pests will be performed. Checking and, if necessary, replacing tree guards should also be undertaken.
- When trees establish (usually after year 10), tree guards should be removed.
- Replacing failed stock as necessary.
- While not essential, sensitive pruning is important to encourage upward growth to create a diverse canopy structure.
- Coppicing newly planted trees at the base will encourage new growth. It will also allow more light to reach the floor, thus encouraging a flowering understorey.
- If necessary, stock fencing to provide an exclusion area should be established to prevent access which may compromise this condition criterion being met in the 30-year time period.

Other Neutral Grassland enhancement and creation

This can be realistically achieved by increasing the species diversity within the existing sward and allowing the areas that have been damaged by the horse grazing practices time to recover. The objective will be to create a more diverse species-rich grassland.

The Defra Metric Habitat guidance states that other neutral grassland needs to be able to demonstrate a minimum of 10 native plant species (grasses, wildflowers, sedges) per square metre on average. Activities to implement and achieve this may include:

- Sowing a species-rich, native grassland seed mix with wildflowers, such as the EM5, EM4F or EM6 mix as delineated

above. Alternatively, spreading appropriately selected seeds, provided by a local donor site, could be considered;

- Ensuring there is less than 5% scrub and less than 20% bracken cover;
- Ensuring there is less than 30% of grassland covered by perennial ryegrass and white clover combined;
- Managing the habitat in such a way to ensure that wildflowers (and if appropriate sedge species) grow over at least 20% of the habitat area;
- Protecting the habitat to ensure bare ground and other signs of damage (e.g. excessive littering, poaching etc) covers less than 5% of the total area;
- No invasive non-native plant species as listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) present;
- Ensuring cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition and physical damage (e.g. excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% and;
- Ensuring that sward height has a wider variation (at least 20% of the sward less than 7cm and at least 20% more than 7cm).

The parcel of land proposed to create other neutral grassland should be stock fenced, if necessary, to prevent grazing from cattle (such as horses). Such preventative measures will allow young seedlings to germinate, flower, produce seeds and repeat the process year on year, thus increasing the concentration, abundance and diversity of the habitat. Some human intervention (especially in the first few years) may be required to over-seed the area of modified grassland with the locally sourced, species rich seed mix to assist and aid the growth and species diversity.

Mixed Scrub enhancement and creation

The Defra Metric Habitat guide provides a series of criteria which this habitat has to meet in order to be identified as targeted condition. In this instance, criterion that has to be met in no less than 30 years includes:

- There are at least three native woody species; No single species comprises more than 75% of the cover (except hazel, common juniper *Juniperus communis*, sea buckthorn *hippophae rhamnoides* (only in its restricted native range), or box *Buxus sempervirens*, which can be up to 100% cover). The proposals include native species (goat willow, hazel, hawthorn and bramble), all species of which are already proven to grow onsite.
- There is an absence of invasive, non-native plant species (as listed in Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover. Regular checks in accordance with an agreed frequency (which shall be set out in the Habitat, Maintenance and Monitoring Plan) will be committed to, to ensure this

criterion is met. An invasive species control and removal strategy shall also form part of the approved Landscape Ecological & Environmental Management Plan or Habitat Management & Monitoring Plan (HMMP).

- Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present. Clearings within this parcel will be allocated to ensure seedlings, saplings and young shrubs can be accommodated within the timescale. Moreover, planted scrub shall reach maturity within the 30-year timeframe.
- This habitat required little in the way of management and should be allowed to flourish to a height of up to 5m.
- Two of the proposed species are already known to grow onsite. Therefore, some of the creation could be undertaken through the encouragement of natural regeneration through the action of seed collecting.
- Planting should take place between November and March and nursery-grown stock is the easiest method, and due to the small-scale of this site will be relatively inexpensive.
- Plants should be purchased from Plant Healthy certified nurseries to ensure they are free from pests and diseases.
- Planting should not be performed in rows, due to the small-scale risks of 'wind tunnels' being created as a result.
- Fertilising soil is not recommended, due to this encroaching nutrient rich 'hardy' species which may result in the detriment of the scrub quality and underlying grassland/forb networks.
- Soil testing may be required to check habitat will be conducive with some of the proposed species.
- Exclusion fencing should be erected to prevent access from residents or visitors.
- Ground preparation is core to the success of this habitat, as it will allow better soil contact with planted shrubs and collected seedlings, thus increasing germination success.
- Areas of bare ground will also need to be considered to create microhabitats for the deposits of dead wood (which will become more prevalent during the latter stages of the habitat creation during the 30 year plan).
- Management of grassland should be undertaken as part of a standard meadow regime, including a summer hay cut (July/August). Once cut, seedlings should be given time to shed over a period no shorter than seven days. Once this time has passed cuttings should be removed from the site. A further cut should be undertaken in autumn and potentially also in the early spring to enhance the species rich 'grass' chance of not being out competed by early growth grasses such as ryegrass *Lolium perenne*.
- Applying management in accordance with the Mitigation Hierarchy should also be followed. Therefore, works should be timed to avoid the impact during the breeding bird season (March - September). Reptiles should also be considered during these regimes e.g.

in January, reptiles can be found basking in sunny areas in a sheltered spot, and so avoidance of cutting actions near potential hibernation sites should be considered.

- Some of the cuttings should be piled as deadwood to enhance microhabitat networks, particularly when considering small mammals and common invertebrates which likely utilise the site.



Appendix D: Pre-development Baseline Imagery

Google Earth Imagery, taken in April 2025 showing recent tree planting (note, the northern section of the access track had not been created).



Image taken from All Ecology's Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment of the Site in 2022 in support of refused planning application REF: PL/2021/06688, which forms the basis of the pre-degradation habitat baseline for this assessment. The two areas in blue were not covered/assessed in the former Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.



Google Earth Imagery, taken in December 2022 showing the redline boundary still as a clearing, and not priority habitat deciduous woodland or traditional orchard.



Appendix E: Latin names

Floral species	
Species	Latin name
Annual meadow grass	<i>Poa annua</i>
Barren brome	<i>Bromus sterilis</i>
Bird's-foot trefoil	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>
Bittersweet	<i>Solanum dulcamara</i>
Bluebells	<i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i>
Broad-leaved dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>
Bulbous buttercup	<i>Ranunculus bulbosus</i>
Carnation sedge	<i>Carex panicea</i>
Chickweed	<i>Stellaria media</i>
Cleavers	<i>Galium aparine</i>
Comfrey	<i>Symphytum officinale</i>
Common bent	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i>
Common bindweed	<i>Calystegia sepium</i>
Common dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>
Common fleabane	<i>Pulicaria dysenterica</i>
Common nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>
Common ragwort	<i>Jacobaea vulgaris</i>
Common reed	<i>Phragmites australis</i>
Common sorrel	<i>Rumex acetosa</i>
Common thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>
Cocks-foot	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>
Cows parsley	<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>
Cranesbill	<i>Geranium dissectum</i>
Creeping bent	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>
Creeping buttercup	<i>Ranunculus repens</i>
Creeping cinquefoil	<i>Potentilla reptans</i>
Crested dogs-tail	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i>
Cut-leaved cranesbill	<i>Geranium dissectum</i>
Dandelion	<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>
Devil's-bit scabious	<i>Succisa pratensis</i>
Dog's mercury	<i>Mercurialis perennis</i>
Dyer's greenweed	<i>Genista tinctoria</i>
False oat grass	<i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i>
Field bindweed	<i>Convolvulus arvensis</i>
Floating sweet-grass	<i>Glyceria fluitans</i>
Garlic mustard	<i>Alliaria petiolata</i>
Great mullein	<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>
Ground ivy	<i>Glechoma hederacea</i>
Hairy sedge	<i>Carex hirta</i>
Hawksbeard	<i>Crepis</i>
Heath spotted-orchid	<i>Dactylorhiza maculata</i>
Hedge bedstraw	<i>Galium mollugo</i>
Hedge woodruff	<i>Galium odoratum</i>
Hedge woundwort	<i>Stachys sylvatica</i>
Hemlock	<i>Conium maculatum</i>



Herb-Robert	<i>Geranium robertianum</i>
Hogweed	<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>
Hop	<i>Humulus lupulus</i>
Horse parsley	<i>Smyrniolus olusatrum</i>
Horsetail	<i>Equisetum arvense</i>
Honeysuckle	<i>Lonicera periclymenum</i>
Lilac	<i>Syringa vulgaris</i>
Lady's bedstraw	<i>Galium verum</i>
Lords and ladies	<i>Arum maculatum</i>
Meadow barley	<i>Hordeum secalinum</i>
Meadow buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>
Meadow foxtail	<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i>
Meadow thistle	<i>Cirsium dissectum</i>
Meadow vetchling	<i>Lathyrus pratensis</i>
Morning glory	<i>Ipomoea purpurea</i>
Oval sedge	<i>Carex ovalis</i>
Oxeye daisy	<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i>
Ragwort	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>
Red campion	<i>Silene dioica</i>
Red clover	<i>Trifolium pratense</i>
Red fescue	<i>Festuca rubra</i>
Ribwort plantain	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>
Rosebay willowherb	<i>Chamerion angustifolium</i>
Rosemary beetle	<i>Chrysolina americana</i>
Roses	<i>Rosa</i> spp.
Rough hawksbeard	<i>Crepis biennis</i>
Rough meadow grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>
Pendulous sedge	<i>Carex pendula</i>
Pepper-saxifrage	<i>Silene silaus</i>
Perennial rye grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>
Saw-wort	<i>Serratula</i>
Self-heal	<i>Prunella vulgaris</i>
Sharp-flowered rush	<i>Juncus acutiflorus</i>
Shepherd's purse	<i>Capsella bursa pastoris</i>
Silverweed	<i>Potentilla anserina</i>
Smooth meadow-grass	<i>Poa pratensis</i>
Smooth hawksbeard	<i>Crepis capillaris</i>
Snowberry	<i>Symphoricarpos albus</i>
Soft brome	<i>Bromus hordeaceus</i>
Soft rush	<i>Juncus effusus</i>
Spear thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>
Spiked sedge	<i>Carex spicata</i>
Stitchwort	<i>Stellaria holostea</i>
Sweet vernal grass	<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i>
Timothy grass	<i>Phleum pratense</i>
Virginia creeper	<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>
Wall barley	<i>Hordeum murinum</i>
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>
White dead nettle	<i>Lamium album</i>



Wild onion	<i>Allium vineale</i>
Wild privet	<i>Ligustrum vulgare</i>
Wood avens	<i>Geum urbanum</i>
Wood speedwell	<i>Veronica montana</i>
Yarrow	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>
Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>

Tree species	
Species	Latin name
Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>
Beech	<i>Fagus sylvatica</i>
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus agg</i>
Buddleia	<i>Buddleja davidii</i>
Canadian poplar	<i>Populus × canadensis</i>
Common buckthorn	<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>
Conifer	
Dog rose	<i>Rosa canina</i>
Dogwood	<i>Cornus sanguinea</i>
Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>
Elm	<i>Ulmus procera</i>
Field maple	<i>Acer campestre</i>
Garden privet	<i>Ligustrum ovalifolium</i>
Goat willow	<i>Salix caprea</i>
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>
Hazel	<i>Corylus avellana</i>
Highbush cranberry	<i>Viburnum trilobum</i>
Holly	<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>
Hornbeam	<i>Carpinus betulus</i>
Horse chestnut	<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>
Oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>
Rowan	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>
Scot pine	<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>
Silver birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>
Spindle	<i>Euonymus europaeus</i>
Sweet chestnut	<i>Cryphonectria parasitica</i>
Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>
Wayfaring tree	<i>Viburnum lantana</i>



Appendix F: References

All Ecology, *Land at Devizes Road, Box, SN13 8EF, April 2022, Biodiversity Net Gain Preliminary Design Stage Report*, All Ecology, Gloucestershire

Mansfield, J (December, 2025). *Land to the rear of 1 Pye Corner, Box, SN13 8ED. Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)*. Bristol.

CIEEM, CIRIA, IEMA, 2019. Biodiversity net gain. Good practice principles for development. A practical guide. CIRIA C776a. London, 2019

The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide dated July 2025

BSI (2021) Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain. British Standards Institution, London

CIEEM, CIRIA, IEMA, 2024. Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain in England: Technical Guide. London, 2024.

Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. and Treweek, J. (2020). UK Habitat Classification – Habitat Definitions.

CIEEM (2017). Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing. CIEEM, CIRIA, IEMA, Winchester, UK.

DEFRA – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>. Accessed: March 2025

DEFRA – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>. Accessed: April 2025

DEFRA – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2024). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric. User Guide*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>. Accessed: April 2025.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2024). *National Planning Policy Framework*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

Panks, S., White, N., Newsome, A., Potter, J., Heydon, M., Mayhew, E., Alvarez, M., Russell, T., Scott, S. J., Heaver, M., Scott, S. H., Butcher, B., & Stone, D. (2023) *Biodiversity metric 4.0: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity – User Guide*. Natural England.

UKHab Ltd (2023). *UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0*. Available at: <https://www.ukhab.org>



<https://wildseed.co.uk/product/mixtures/complete-mixtures/meadow-mixtures-for-specific-soils/meadow-mixture-for-chalk-and-limestone-soils/>

<https://earth.google.com/web/>

<https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/>

<https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/8029/Overview>

https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/88c3030c2e864645aaec7dc3e0ac4cb6/page/Page#data_s=id%3AdataSource_3-196a4bd989f-layer-31-0-7%3A1&widget_22=search_status:%7B%22text%22%3A%2226%2C%20WHITE%20STREET%2C%20EASTERTON%2C%20DEVIZES%2C%20SN10%204NZ%22%2C%22status%22%3A%22%7B%5C%22configId%5C%22%3A%5C%22config_0%5C%22%2C%5C%22magicKey%5C%22%3A%5C%22MTAwMTlwOTkyMzE2OjpEUUE6OkVO%5C%22%7D%22%7D





Copyright BN Ecology Ltd ©
2025