



Field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower
South Wraxall

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

23rd January 2026

Document Control Sheet

Client	KANN Architecture
Project	Field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall
Report title	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Report reference	P149-1r
Version	1.3
Date issued	23 rd January 2026
Lead surveyor	Joseph Wilkie, Ecologist, BSc (Hons), ACIEEM

Role	Version	Name	Date
Author	1.0	Joseph Wilkie, Ecologist, BSc (Hons), ACIEEM	13/01/2026
Reviewed	1.1	Lewis Hillier, Director and Principal Ecologist, BSc (Hons), ACIEEM	21/01/2026
Amended	1.2	Joseph Wilkie, Ecologist, BSc (Hons), ACIEEM	22/01/2026
Authorised	1.3	Lewis Hillier, Director and Principal Ecologist, BSc (Hons), ACIEEM	23/01/2026

Copyright Noctua Ecology Ltd 2026 – all rights reserved. Email: info@noctua-ecology.co.uk.

*This report is solely for use by **KANN Architecture and Wiltshire Council**. No part of this document may be copied or reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of Noctua Ecology Ltd. The survey(s) and subsequent report have been prepared with all reasonable skill, care, and diligence, taking into account the resources devoted to it by agreement with the client. Information reported herein is based on the interpretation of data collected and has been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid. No liability is accepted by Noctua Ecology Ltd for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Information presented within this document does not constitute professional legal advice. Interpretation of UK legislation is provided to the best of the authors abilities; however, we recommend that specialist legal advice is sought if required. The authors disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the work.*

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1.0 Introduction	5
1.1 Site location	5
1.2 Background to the activity	5
1.3 Objectives	5
2.0 Legislation	6
2.1 Wildlife legislation	6
2.2 Planning policy	7
3.0 Methodology	8
3.1 Site survey	8
3.2 Biodiversity Net Gain assessment	8
3.3 Constraints	9
4.0 Results	10
4.1 Site context	10
4.2 Habitat descriptions	10
5.0 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment	12
5.1 Summary of current and proposed land use	12
5.2 Biodiversity Net Gain calculation	12
6.0 Discussion	13
6.1 Biodiversity Net Gain	13
7.0 Recommendations	14
7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain	14
7.2 Survey updates	14
8.0 References	15
8.1 Publications	15
8.2 Websites	15
9.0 Figures	16
Appendix A. Biodiversity Net Gain Condition Assessments	20
Appendix B. Statutory Biodiversity Metric Headline Results	22

Executive Summary

KANN Architecture are the acting agent seeking planning permission for the erection of an agricultural barn for rare breed sheep within the field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall, Wiltshire, BA15 2RY, centred on national grid reference ST 83027 64259. The site includes a section of a grassland field, bound by a hedgerow and a stone wall.

Noctua Ecology Ltd were commissioned by KANN Architecture to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment of the site to determine whether the site can achieve BNG.

The site supports a total of two UKHab classifications. None of the habitats were considered to be UK Priority Habitat, or listed within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).

The results of the Biodiversity Metric calculation show that the proposed development will result in a total Biodiversity Net Gain of 0.12 habitat units (11.55% net gain) and 0.31 hedgerow units (10.89% net gain). This is more than the standard target of 10% and considered to be appropriate for the size and type of development.

The proposed habitat creation and enhancements include enhancing the modified grassland from moderate to good condition; enhancing the hedgerow H1 from moderate to good condition; and creating five new rural trees. This is considered to provide an overall enhancement to the site and have a positive impact at the local level with enhanced suitability for a range of species and connectivity to habitats in the local area.

A suitable Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) should be produced for the site to secure the BNG proposals.

Further advice from an ecologist should be sought if the scope of the proposed work changes, or if the works are delayed by more than 18 months from the date of the most recent survey.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Site location

- 1.1.1 The site includes a section of a grassland field, bounded by a hedgerow and a stone wall within the field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall, Wiltshire, BA15 2RY, centred on national grid reference ST 83027 64259 (Figure 1).

1.2 Background to the activity

- 1.2.1 It is proposed to erect an agricultural barn within the north-eastern part of the field to provide shelter and amenities for rare breed sheep.
- 1.2.2 Noctua Ecology Ltd were commissioned to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment of the site to determine whether the proposed development can achieve Biodiversity Net Gain.
- 1.2.3 At the time of writing the report, the Biodiversity Net Gain assessment was based on the following proposals produced by KANN Architecture:
- *Field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall, BA15 2RY – Site Location Plan* (Drawing number: AA 01); and
 - *Field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall, BA15 2RY – Proposed Plans* (Drawing number: AA 02).

1.3 Objectives

- 1.3.1 The objectives of the assessment were as follows:
- Broadly categorise habitat types within the site in accordance with standard UKHab habitats;
 - Categorise habitats in relation to the Statutory Biodiversity Metric; and
 - Undertake calculations using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric to determine if the development can achieve Biodiversity Net Gain.

2.0 Legislation

2.1 Wildlife legislation

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

2.1.1 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) is the main legislation enacted to implement the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (Birds Directive). This is supplemented by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006. As such, the following actions are considered an offence:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or their eggs or nests (some exceptions) and disturb any bird species listed under Schedule 1 of the Act, or its dependent young while it is nesting;
- Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild animal listed under Schedule 5 of the Act;
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct any place used for shelter or protection by any wild animal listed under Schedule 5 of the Act;
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb some Schedule 5 animal species while they occupy a place used for shelter or protection;
- Intentionally or recklessly picking, uprooting, damaging or selling plant species listed under Schedule 8 of the act; or
- Cause or allow the spread of any invasive non-native species that is listed on Schedule 9 of the Act.

2.1.2 Species listed within Schedule 5 include, but are not limited to, bats (all species), great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*), hazel dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*), reptiles, otter (*Lutra lutra*), and water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*).

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

2.1.3 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) transpose the Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (Habitats Directive) into English law. This makes it illegal to deliberately capture, kill or disturb wild animals listed under Schedule 2 of the Regulations. This includes the damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place of those species. The breeding/resting site is protected even when no animal is present at the time. The Habitats Regulations 2017 will continue to implement the Habitats Directive and certain elements of the Birds Directives in England. The Habitats Regulations are likely to remain in place for some time now that the UK has exited the EU.

Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006

2.1.4 The NERC Act 2006 places a duty of regard on authorities for biodiversity and nature conservation during their operations. Section 41 of the Act refers to a requirement for authorities to publish a list of species and habitats which are of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

Protection of Badgers Act 1992

- 2.1.5 The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 protects badgers (*Meles meles*) and their setts. It is an offence under the act to kill, injure, or take badgers. It is also an offence to destroy, damage or obstruct an active badger sett, or to disturb badgers while they are using their sett.

2.2 Planning policy

- 2.2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DLUHC, 2023) sets out the UK Government's planning policies for England and explains how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF specifies that, when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should refuse applications that would cause significant harm to biodiversity if the project does not provide adequate mitigation or compensation.
- 2.2.2 The Wiltshire Council's local policy framework comprises several elements, the most relevant to this assessment being:
- The Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2015-2026); and
 - The Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan (Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, 2008).
- 2.2.3 The Core Strategy refers to biodiversity, habitats and species. The policies most pertinent to this development include:
- Core Policy 50: Sites, Species and Habitats; and
 - Core Policy 52: Green infrastructure.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Site survey

- 3.1.1 The survey was completed in accordance with the following best practice guidance:
- Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L., and Treweek, J. (2020). *UK Habitat Classification User Manual Version 1.1* at <http://www.ukhab.org/>; and
 - UKHab Ltd (2023). *UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0* (at <http://www.ukhab.org/>).
- 3.1.2 The survey was undertaken on the 19th December 2025 by Joseph Wilkie, Bachelor of Science (BSc) with Honours (Hons) and Associate member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (ACIEEM). The weather conditions were recorded with a temperature of 10°C, 10% cloud cover, low wind, bright and dry.
- 3.1.3 A walk-over survey of the site was undertaken. The vegetation was described, photographed and mapped. The habitats were classified using the UK Habitat Classification system (Butcher *et al.*, 2020). Dominant, notable, and invasive non-native plant species were recorded.

3.2 Biodiversity Net Gain assessment

- 3.2.1 The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment was completed in accordance with the following best practice guidance:
- Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L and Treweek J. (2020). *UK Habitat Classification – Habitat Definitions V1.1* at <http://ukhab.org/>;
 - Defra (2024). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*. Defra, UK; and
 - UKHab Ltd (2023). *UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0* (at <http://www.ukhab.org/>).
- 3.2.2 The existing baseline habitats identified during the site visit were mapped using QGIS as accurately as possible to create a baseline habitat plan. Then, the proposed site plan was georeferenced and used to draw the proposed site habitat plan as accurately as possible. QGIS was used to calculate the habitat areas and lengths, which were inputted into the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool (hereafter referred as the “Biodiversity Metric”).
- 3.2.3 The Biodiversity Metric was used to calculate an estimated Biodiversity Net Gain based on the proposed development. This version of the metric was released on 3rd July 2025.
- 3.2.4 The Biodiversity Metric enables the number of biodiversity units, both before and after proposed land-use changes, to be calculated, based on habitat type, condition and strategic positioning. The Biodiversity Metric treats area habitats (such as grassland and woodland), linear habitats (such as hedgerows), and river habitats separately. Units from these three main habitat categories cannot be summed or exchanged with each other.
- 3.2.5 The strategic positioning score was based on whether the habitat parcel is located within a Focus Area for Nature Recovery as detailed within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Wiltshire and Swindon. In line with the current guidance, all baseline habitats were classified as having low strategic significance. A habitat parcel was categorised with high strategic significance if the interventions proposed within the habitat parcel are consistent with a potential measure detailed within the LNRS. Otherwise, if the proposed intervention

within the habitat parcel was not consistent with a potential measure proposed by the LNRS, the strategic significance was recorded as low.

- 3.2.6 For full transparency, copies of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool with comments, was supplied electronically with this report.

3.3 Constraints

- 3.3.1 The site surveys were not intended to identify all species present within the site. The survey objective was to broadly identify habitats.
- 3.3.2 The survey was undertaken outside of the optimal survey period for botanical survey. However, based on the existing management of the site and indicator species present, it was considered that broad habitat types could be identified with confidence.
- 3.3.3 Mapping of areas and lengths of habitats was determined from aerial photographs, using approximate mapping with QGIS software, and are not precisely accurate.

4.0 Results

4.1 Site context

- 4.1.1 The site is in a rural location at the western extent of the small village of Lower South Wraxall, approximately 5km to the east of Bath (Figure 1). The site forms the north-eastern section of a pasture field in active agricultural use for grazing, livestock care and seasonal management. The east of the site is bounded by a mature hedgerow with trees and the north is bounded by a stone wall fronting the adjacent road.
- 4.1.2 In the immediate local landscape, further pasture fields can be found adjacent to the east, south, and west of the site and beyond a minor road to the north. The fields to the north-east and east of the site are identified as wood pasture and parkland priority habitat. Small areas of traditional orchard are interspersed through the wood pasture and parkland habitat. In the local landscape, a large arable field can be found further to the south and west and a small village of rural dwellings is located further to the east. Scattered areas of broadleaved woodland are present within the wider landscape which is otherwise comprised of farmland and low density rural development. Several small waterbodies and streams are situated in close proximity to the site.

4.2 Habitat descriptions

- 4.2.1 The survey identified two Biodiversity Metric Habitat classifications within the site boundary (Figure 2). The habitats were described below. The total area of the site was mapped as 0.250ha for the purpose of this report.

Modified grassland

Parcel 1

- 4.2.2 The site comprised the north-eastern section of a grassland field used for rotational grazing (Photos 1-2, Figure 2). No livestock were present during the survey and the sward was of a medium height (approximately 10-15cm). Grass species were dominant and included cock's-foot (*Dactylis glomerata*), perennial rye grass (*Lolium perenne*), red fescue (*Festuca rubra*) and Yorkshire fog (*Holcus lanatus*). Forb species present included white clover (*Trifolium repens*), red clover (*Trifolium pratense*), creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*), cut-leaved crane's-bill (*Geranium dissectum*), vetch species (*Vicia* sp.), common ragwort (*Jacobaea vulgaris*), dandelion (*Taraxacum* agg.) and geranium species (*Geranium* sp.). Botanical quadrat surveys undertaken across a transect identified between 6-8 species present per 1m².
- 4.2.3 This area was therefore categorised as modified grassland for the purposes of the Biodiversity Metric, and a total of 0.250ha was inputted into the Biodiversity Metric. A condition assessment recorded a moderate condition (Appendix A).



Photo 1. Parcel 1 - View to the north-east.



Photo 2. Parcel 1 – View to the south-east.

Species-rich native hedgerow with trees

Hedgerow H1

- 4.2.4 A wide double hedgerow with trees bounded the east of the site (Photo 3, Figure 2). The hedgerow was approximately 3-5m tall and shrubby at the base with no signs of recent management. Several mature trees were present along the length including field maple (*Acer campestre*), hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), willow species (*Salix* sp.), ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) and beech (*Fagus sylvatica*). Woody species recorded in the shrub layer included elder (*Sambucus nigra*), hazel (*Corylus avellana*), honeysuckle (*Lonicera periclymenum*), spindle (*Euonymus europaeus*), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*) and rose (*Rosa* sp.) with bramble (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.) and ivy (*Helix hedera*) throughout. The ground flora was sparse and included ivy, bramble, common nettle (*Urtica dioica*) and cleavers (*Galium aparine*).
- 4.2.5 The habitat was categorised as a species-rich native hedgerow with trees, and a total of 0.060km was inputted into the Biodiversity Metric. A condition assessment recorded a moderate condition (Appendix A).



Photo 3. Hedgerow H1 – View to the north.

5.0 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

5.1 Summary of current and proposed land use

- 5.1.1 The site currently consists of a section of modified grassland field bounded by a mature hedgerow to the east and a stone wall to the north (Figure 2).
- 5.1.2 The proposed development involves the erection of an agricultural barn and crushed stone track. This will require the removal of an area of modified grassland (Figure 3, Table 1).
- 5.1.3 In order to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain, the remaining modified grassland (Parcel 1) and hedgerow H1 will be enhanced from moderate to good condition, and five new rural trees will be created (Table 1, Figure 3). Existing and proposed habitats are not listed within the local LNRS and therefore, all baseline and proposed habitats were given a low strategic significance within the Biodiversity Metric.

Table 1. Summary of proposed changes to the on-site land.

Parcel reference	Area/length	Metric classification	Condition	Proposed changes
Existing habitats lost, retained or enhanced (Figure 2)				
1	0.250ha	Modified grassland	<u>Moderate</u>	0.195ha to be <u>enhanced</u> to good condition modified grassland. 0.055ha to be <u>lost</u> .
H1	0.060km	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	<u>Moderate</u>	All habitat to be <u>enhanced</u> to a good condition.
Proposed habitats (Figure 3)				
2	0.032ha	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	<u>N/A</u>	New crushed stone track to be <u>created</u> .
3	0.023ha	Developed land; sealed surface	<u>N/A</u>	New barn to be <u>created</u> .
-	0.0204ha	Rural trees	<u>Moderate</u>	Five trees to be <u>created</u> .

5.2 Biodiversity Net Gain calculation

Habitat units

- 5.2.1 The data from the proposed land use changes indicated above were inputted into the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool. The calculation determined that if the proposed habitat changes are undertaken, a total Biodiversity Net Gain of 0.12 in habitat units (11.55% net gain) can be achieved within the site (Figure 3, Appendix B).

Hedgerow units

- 5.2.2 The calculation determined that if the proposed habitat changes are undertaken, a total Biodiversity Net Gain of 0.31 in hedgerow units (10.89% net gain) can be achieved within the site (Figure 3, Appendix B).

6.0 Discussion

6.1 Biodiversity Net Gain

Habitat units

- 6.1.1 The results of the Biodiversity Metric calculation shows that the proposed development will result in a total Biodiversity Net Gain of 0.12 habitat units (11.55% net gain). This is more than the standard target of 10% and considered to be appropriate for the size and type of development.
- 6.1.2 The proposed habitat creation and enhancements include enhancing the modified grassland from moderate to good condition; and creating five new rural trees. This is considered to provide an overall enhancement to the site and have a positive impact at the local level with enhanced suitability for a range of species.

Hedgerow units

- 6.1.3 The results of the Biodiversity Metric calculation show that the proposed development will result in a total Biodiversity Net Gain of 0.31 hedgerow units (10.89% net gain). This is more than the standard target of 10% and considered to be appropriate for the size and type of development.
- 6.1.4 The proposed hedgerow enhancement measures include enhancing the hedgerow H1 from moderate to good condition. This is considered to provide an overall enhancement to the site and have a positive impact at the local level with enhanced connectivity to habitats in the local area.
- 6.1.5 When using the data provided in this report, it is important to note:
- The measures of area and lengths were approximate only and mapped from aerial photography using QGIS software;
 - The three types of Biodiversity Units (habitat, hedges, and rivers) are unique and cannot be summed, traded, or converted. They cannot be summed to give an overall Biodiversity Unit value;
 - The Biodiversity Metric uses habitats as a proxy for biodiversity. Although this is a rational means of measuring biodiversity value, it is a simplification of the 'real world'. The metric and its outputs should therefore be interpreted with care, and with wider ecological advice;
 - Biodiversity Unit values generated by the Biodiversity Metric cannot be compared to unit outputs from other metric versions; and
 - The good practice principles should be understood and followed.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Biodiversity Net Gain

- 7.1.1 A long-term Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) should be devised by an ecologist in order to ensure the retained, enhanced, and new habitats are managed appropriately. The HMMP should detail how the habitats will reach the target conditions for Biodiversity Net Gain. Furthermore, it should include ongoing management costs, monitoring of progress, and the facility to adapt management if necessary.
- 7.1.2 The HMMP should include details on grassland enhancement and management. This should include a grazing and/or cutting regime that encourages a mixed height sward.
- 7.1.3 The HMMP should include details on hedgerow enhancement and management. This should include leaving a buffer of 1m of undisturbed ground from the edge of the hedgerow.
- 7.1.4 The HMMP should include details on the creation and management of 5 new scattered trees.

7.2 Survey updates

- 7.2.1 This report is valid for 18 months from the date of the survey. Further advice from an ecologist should be sought if the scope of the proposed works changes, or if the works are delayed by more than 18 months.

8.0 References

8.1 Publications

- 8.1.1 Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L and Treweek J. (2020). *UK habitat classification – Habitat Definitions V1.1* at <http://ukhab.org>.
- 8.1.2 Defra (2023). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*. Defra, UK.
- 8.1.3 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) (2025). *National Planning Policy Framework*. DLUHC, London.
- 8.1.4 UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at <http://www.ukhab.org/>).
- 8.1.5 Wiltshire Council (2025). *Local Nature Recover Strategy for Wiltshire and Swindon*. Wiltshire Council, Trowbridge.
- 8.1.6 Wiltshire Council (2015). *The Wiltshire Core Strategy Development Plan (2015-2026)*. Adopted January 2015. Wiltshire Council, Trowbridge.
- 8.1.7 Wiltshire Wildlife Trust (2008). *The Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan*. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, Devizes.

8.2 Websites

- 8.2.1 earth.google.com
- 8.2.2 www.magic.defra.gov.uk

9.0 Figures

Figure 1	Site location plan (p.17)
Figure 2	Baseline habitats plan (p.18)
Figure 3	Proposed habitats plan (p.19)



REFERENCE

Figure 1

TITLE

Site location plan

LEGEND

 Site location

DRAWING INFORMATION

Project: Field opposite South
Wraxall House, Lower South
Wraxall

Project reference: P149

Date drawn: 07/01/2026

Drawn by: Joseph Wilkie

Version: 1.0

Scale: 1:25000 @ A4

Notes: Locations, distances and
scale are approximate only. Base
map provided by Google Maps.



NOCTUA
ECOLOGY

© Noctua Ecology Ltd 2026



REFERENCE

Figure 2

TITLE

Baseline habitats plan

LEGEND

-  Site boundary
-  Modified grassland
-  Species-rich native hedgerow with trees

DRAWING INFORMATION

Project: Field opposite South
Wraxall House, Lower South
Wraxall

Project reference: P149

Date drawn: 07/01/2026

Drawn by: Joseph Wilkie

Version: 1.0

Scale: 1:500 @ A4

Notes: Locations, distances and
scale are approximate only. Base
map provided by Google Maps.



NOCTUA
ECOLOGY

© Noctua Ecology Ltd 2026



REFERENCE

Figure 3

TITLE

Proposed habitats plan

LEGEND

- Site boundary
- Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Modified grassland
- Species-rich native hedgerow with trees
- Rural tree - small

DRAWING INFORMATION

Project: Field opposite South Wraxall House, Lower South Wraxall

Project reference: P149

Date drawn: 07/01/2026

Drawn by: Joseph Wilkie

Version: 1.0

Scale: 1:500 @ A4

Notes: Locations, distances and scale are approximate only. Base map provided by Google Maps.



NOCTUA
ECOLOGY

© Noctua Ecology Ltd 2026

Appendix A. Biodiversity Net Gain Condition Assessments

Modified grassland (g4)

Table 2. Condition assessment of the modified grassland located in Parcel 1.

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)			
Criterion		Parcel 1	
		Outcome	Notes
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs. Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.	Pass	6 species per m ²
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	Fail	Approximately 10% of grass was over 7cm high
C	Some scattered scrub (including bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) may be present, but scrub accounts for less than 20% of total grassland area.	Pass	No scrub present
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area.	Pass	Little damage evident
E	Cover of bare ground between 1% and 10%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.	Fail	No bare ground present
F	Cover of bracken less than 20%.	Pass	No bracken present
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA).	Pass	No invasive non-native species identified
Condition assessment score		Moderate	

Hedgerows

Table 3. Condition assessment of the hedgerow H1 located within the site (table continues).

Condition Sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Type				
Criterion			H1	
			Outcome	Notes
A1.	Height	> 1.5 m average along length	Pass	-
A2.	Width	> 1.5 m average along length	Pass	-
B1.	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length (unless 'line of trees')	Pass	-
B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length and No canopy gaps > 5 m	Pass	-

Condition Sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Type				
Criterion			H1	
			Outcome	Notes
C1.	Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	> 1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	Fail	No undisturbed ground from the outer edge of hedgerow
C2.	Undesirable perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground	Fail	Common nettle and cleavers accounted for more than 20% of ground flora cover
D1.	Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and neophyte species	Pass	-
D2.	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	Pass	-
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only				
E1.	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	Pass	-
E2.	Tree health	At least 95% of hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	Pass	-
Condition Assessment Score			2	
Condition Assessment Key			Good = 3, Moderate = 2, Poor = 1	

Appendix B. Statutory Biodiversity Metric Headline Results

Field opposite Wraxall House, Lower South W		Return to results menu	
Headline Results			
Scroll down for final results ▲			
On-site baseline	Area habitat units	1.00	
	Hedgerow units	2.87	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site post-intervention (including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	1.12	
	Hedgerow units	3.18	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	0.12	11.55%
	Hedgerow units	0.31	10.89%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Off-site baseline	Area habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention (including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	0.00	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Combined net unit change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.12	
	Hedgerow units	0.31	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Area habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
FINAL RESULTS			
Total net unit change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.12	
	Hedgerow units	0.31	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	11.55%	
	Hedgerow units	10.89%	
	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓		
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required
Area habitat units	10.00%	1.00	1.10
Hedgerow units	10.00%	2.87	3.15
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00
		Unit Deficit	
			No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓
			No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
			No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓