

Reporting template for ecology assessment issues in BREEAM

Scope

This guidance note applies to:

Scheme	Version
BREEAM International New Construction	V7
BREEAM UK New Construction	V7

Please refer to the most up to date version of the relevant technical manual to ensure that this guidance note can be used.

Introduction

The purpose of this guidance note is to help BREEAM Assessors relate the information generated during the project to the BREEAM ecology assessment issues. The guidance in this document has been produced to support the assessment of these issues and should not be interpreted as criteria. This guidance note should be read alongside the technical manual to ensure all criteria are met and the methodology section has been followed.

Use of this document as a template is optional. If the Assessor chooses to use the template provided within this guidance note as evidence, all relevant sections must be completed.

The completed document can be used by the Assessor along with all relevant project documentation to demonstrate compliance with the BREEAM criteria.

Supporting notes

1. There are four core assessment issues which relate to ecology:
 - Ecological risks and opportunities (Lue 02)
 - Managing impacts on ecology (Lue 03)
 - Ecological change and enhancement (Lue 04)
 - Long term ecological management (Lue 05)
2. Only the appointed qualified and licensed Assessor can confirm if a credit, or equivalent, is met for a BREEAM assessment.
3. The Assessor should assist in the completion of this document, and the project team member (for Foundation route) or the ecologist (for Comprehensive route) must complete and sign the Signature of Validation to confirm the contents that they are responsible for are accurate.
4. In some instances, this guidance note refers to actions that have already been taken. However, for design stage assessments, some of these actions may not have been taken yet (e.g. mitigation measures before construction has started). Where this is the

case, answers should reflect what will happen based on commitments and plans in place, with evidence submitted to support this as referred to in the evidence section of the relevant technical manual.

Schedule of changes

Version	Release date	Description of change
0.0	Jul 2025	First issue.

View and download the latest version of this guidance note at:
kb.breeam.com/knowledgebase/gn41

Contents

Scope 1

Introduction 1

Supporting notes 1

Schedule of changes 2

Contents 3

Section A: Assessment details 4

 A1: Project details 4

 A2: Contact details 4

 A3: Assessment route 5

Section B: Foundation route assessments 6

 B1: Recognised local ecological expertise 6

 B2: Criteria checklist for Foundation route assessments 6

 a. Ecological risks and opportunities (Lue 02) 6

 b. Managing impacts on ecology (Lue 03) 10

 c. Ecological change and enhancement (Lue 04) 11

 d. Long term ecological management (Lue 05) 13

 B3: Signature of validation 14

Section C: Comprehensive route assessments 15

 C1: Ecologist's qualifications 15

 C2: Criteria checklist for Comprehensive route assessments 16

 a. Ecological risks and opportunities (Lue 02) 16

 b. Managing impacts on ecology (Lue 03) 21

 c. Ecological change and enhancement (Lue 04) 24

 d. Long term ecology management (Lue 05) 30

 C3: Signature of validation 31

Section A: Assessment details

A1: Project details

1. Please enter the full name of the scheme being assessed against, including the version and issue number
(e.g. BREEAM UK New Construction V7, 7.0.0)

BREEAM UK New Construction, V7

2. Please add the project details

BRE project reference number (if known):

Development name: Project Spitfire

Development address: Unit 19 The Bluestone Centre Sun Rise Way Amesbury SALI

A2: Contact details

Project team member details (Foundation route) or Ecologist details (Comprehensive route)

Company name: Pro Vision

Company address: The Lodge Highcroft Rd, Winchester SO22 5GU

Contact name:

Project team member or ecology report reference (where applicable): 9034

Developer or client details

Company name: Spitfire Enterprises

Company address: Unit 19 The Bluestone Centre Sun Rise Way Amesbury SALI

Contact name: Susie Kniver

Roles and responsibilities – Concept design (Stage 2)

Please fill in the roles and responsibilities of the project in the table below:

Role	Name	Contact details
Project Manager		
Site Manager		
Principal Contractor		
Landscape Architect		
Architect		
Engineer		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		

Roles and responsibilities – Technical design (Stage 4)

Please fill in the roles and responsibilities of the project in the table below:

Role	Name	Contact details
Project Manager		
Site Manager		
Principal Contractor		
Landscape Architect		
Architect		
Engineer		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		
Other (please specify)		

A3: Assessment route

Which assessment route is being used for the project or development?

- ☐ Foundation route (Project team member) – GO TO SECTION B
- ☒ Comprehensive route (Ecologist) – GO TO SECTION C

Section B: Foundation route assessments

This section asks for information to support the assessment of the ecology issues using the Foundation route (Project team member).

B1: Recognised local ecological expertise

B1.Q1: Please list the names and websites of the organisations who provided recommendations, specialist input or guidance which supported the assessment of the site:

Evidence reference for B1.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2: Criteria checklist for Foundation route assessments

a. Ecological risks and opportunities (Lue 02)

Survey and evaluation

Criterion 1 (Lue 02)

B2a.Q1: Has the 'Ecology risk evaluation checklist for BREEAM and HQM' (GN34) been completed?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2a.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q2: Was the site evaluated using the 'Ecology risk evaluation checklist for BREEAM and HQM' (GN34) prior to the project preparation and brief?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Evidence reference for B2a.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Determining ecological outcomes

B2a.Q3: During Concept Design, did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Evidence reference for B2a.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q4: What optimal ecological outcomes were identified for the site?

--

Evidence reference for B2a.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q5: What measures to meet the optimal ecological outcomes for the site have been identified?

Please provide a brief statement for each measure explaining how each point in the hierarchy was achieved:

Hierarchy of actions	Measure and how this was done	Evidence reference
Avoid		

Hierarchy of actions	Measure and how this was done	Evidence reference
Protect		

B2a.Q6: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2a.Q6 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q7: If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Survey and evaluation

Section or item from GN34	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Determining ecological outcomes

Section or item	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Identifying and agreeing measures

Section or item	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Evidence reference for B2a.Q7 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Wider site sustainability (exemplary level criteria)

Criteria 11 and 12 (Lue 02)

B2a.Q8: Were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcomes for the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Evidence reference for B2a.Q8 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q9: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence reference for B2a.Q9 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2a.Q10: Has one measure that demonstrates an ecosystem service related benefit been incorporated into the design?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining what the measure is and what benefit it provides:

Evidence reference for B2a.Q10 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

b. Managing impacts on ecology (Lue 03)

Prerequisite: Ecological risks and opportunities

Criterion 1 (Lue 03)

B2b.Q1: Has the relevant criterion for 'Ecological risks and opportunities' been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Implementation of measures on site

Criteria 2-3 (Lue 03)

B2b.Q2: Please describe what actions will be taken during handover to ensure that planned ecological measures are communicated, understood and adhered to during construction:

Evidence reference for B2b.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2b.Q3: What measures will be implemented to achieve optimal ecological outcomes during the site preparation and construction processes?

Please describe how these will be measured and monitored throughout construction and handover:

Evidence reference for B2b.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2b.Q4: Has the Contractor nominated a Biodiversity Champion with authority to influence site activities and to ensure the necessary measures are implemented?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe their role and how they will ensure the necessary measures are implemented:

Evidence reference for B2b.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

c. Ecological change and enhancement (Lue 04)

B2c.Q1: Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats:

Evidence reference for B2c.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Prerequisite: Managing negative impacts on ecology

Criterion 1 (Lue 04)

B2c.Q2: Have the relevant criteria for 'Managing negative impacts on ecology' been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2c.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Ecological enhancement

Criterion 2 (Lue 04)

B2c.Q3: Did the project team, liaising and collaborating with representative stakeholders and taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement locally relevant measures/actions to enhance the site?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2c.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2c.Q4: Were the measures/actions adopted based on recommendations from recognised 'local' ecological expertise and specialist input and guidance?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please briefly summarise the recommendations made and measures/actions implemented:

--

Evidence reference for B2c.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

d. Long term ecological management (Lue 05)

Prerequisite: Ecological change and enhancement

Criterion 1 (Lue 05)

B2d.Q1: Have the relevant criteria for 'Ecological change and enhancement' been met?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2d.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Handover to building owner or tenant

Criterion 2 (Lue 05)

B2d.Q2: As part of the tenant or building owner information supplied, has a section been included on Ecology and Biodiversity to inform the owner or occupant of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements?

--

Evidence reference for B2d.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Landscape and ecology management plan

Criteria 3-4 (Lue 05)

B2d.Q3: Has a landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, been developed covering as a minimum the first five years after project completion?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for B2d.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B2d.Q4: Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence reference for B2d.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

B3: Signature of validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of project team member: _____

Signature of project team member: _____

Date: _____

Section C: Comprehensive route assessments

This section asks for information to support the assessment of the ecology issues using the Comprehensive route (Suitably Qualified Ecologist).

General note: When completing this section of the document, the level of detail and information provided should be appropriate to the scale, size and type of project undergoing the assessment.

Completing text fields in ‘Justification / Explanatory / Why’ boxes: Where the information is available within an existing document, simply reference the relevant section of that document (including page number, section and clause, as applicable). There is no need to repeat the content if this already exists elsewhere.

C1: Ecologist’s qualifications

C1.Q1: Do you hold a degree (or equivalent qualification, e.g. N/SVQ level 5) in ecology or a related subject?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details:

BSc Environmental Biology
Full member of CIEEM

Note: The following degrees might be considered relevant: Ecology, Biological Sciences, Zoology, Botany, Countryside Management, Environmental Sciences, Marine and Freshwater Management, Earth Sciences, Agriculture, Forestry, Geography, Landscape Management.

C1.Q2: Are you a practicing ecologist with a minimum of 3 years relevant experience within the last 5 years?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details:

I have been a practicing ecologist since 2015 and have worked on a range of projects from minor housing alterations to large residential developments. The work has involved working with multiple stakeholders including homeowners, developers, architects, planners, Natural England and LPA ecologists. Projects I have worked on include residential, highways and research projects on behalf of Natural England.

Note: Relevant experience must clearly demonstrate a practical understanding of factors affecting ecology in relation to construction and the built environment; including, acting in an advisory capacity to provide recommendations for ecological protection, enhancement and mitigation measures. Examples of relevant experience are ecological impact assessments; Preliminary Ecological Appraisals (PEA); Phase 2 habitat and fauna surveys; and habitat creation.

C1.Q3: Are you bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review*?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide details including which organisation you are a full member of:

I am a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management

*Note: For UK ecologists only, a full member of one of the following organisations is bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review: Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM); Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM); Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA); Landscape Institute (LI); Institute of Environmental Sciences (IES); Royal Society of Biology; Institute of Environmental Sciences.

Peer review is defined as the process employed by a professional body to demonstrate that potential or current full members maintain a standard of knowledge and experience required to ensure compliance with a code of conduct and professional ethics.

If 'no' has been answered for any question in this section (C1), the requirements for carrying out an assessment using the comprehensive route have not been met and no credits or points can be awarded for any ecology assessment issues under the comprehensive route.

C2: Criteria checklist for Comprehensive route assessments

a. Ecological risks and opportunities (Lue 02)

Survey and evaluation

Criteria 2-3 (Lue 02)

C2a.Q1: Was an appropriate individual(s) appointed at a project stage that ensured early involvement in site configuration and, where necessary, could influence strategic planning decisions?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, briefly describe the role and relevance of the individual(s) to the project and project stage in meeting the above point:

Pro Vision were appointed prior to any planning application on the site to identify any ecological constraints present within the boundary of the site. These baseline surveys were completed early in the project and before any development proposals on this site. The site is within an important area for ground nesting birds, in particular Stone- Curlew, this was established before the designs were finalised and after an appropriate mitigation strategy had been agreed with the RSPB.

Evidence reference for C2a.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2a.Q2: Was the survey and evaluation of the site carried out early enough to influence the planning of the project/site ensuring maximum ecological outcomes specified in the relevant technical manual?

- ☒ Yes, and before project preparation and brief
☐ Yes, but not before project preparation and brief
☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site was undertaken to identify the current ecological baseline of the site based on the findings of the ecological assessment. Recommendations were provided to avoid impacts which were reflected in the development design and where impacts cannot be avoided a suitable mitigation strategy was provided.

Evidence reference for C2a.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal - Pro Vision 2026

Note: if 'yes but not before project preparation and brief', please refer to Timing of Ecological survey/report (KBCN0292) on the BREEAM Knowledge Base for further guidance.

C2a.Q3: Was there an appropriate level of survey and evaluation carried out to determine the ecological baseline of site considering the zone of influence to establish:

- a. Current and potential ecological value and condition of the site, and related areas within the zone of influence.
b. Direct and indirect risks to current ecological value.
c. Capacity and feasibility for enhancement of the ecological value of the site and, where relevant, areas within the zone of influence.
- ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Yes, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site was undertaken to identify the current ecological baseline of the site based on the findings of the ecological assessment.

Evidence reference for C2a.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal - Pro Vision 2026

Determining ecological outcomes

Criteria 6-9 (Lue 02)

C2a.Q4: Have the 'Survey and evaluation' criteria been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

C2a.Q5: Did the ecologist collaborate with appropriate project team members, sharing relevant information and recommendations from the survey and evaluation to influence the project design as well as decisions regarding site preparation and construction work?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The ecological baseline surveys form a part of the planning application outlining the ecological requirements for future development. These were established prior to any site preparation, design or construction works.

C2a.Q6: Did the ecologist collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project early enough to influence key planning considerations?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Yes, collaborated with RSPB, Atlas Planning and the architects to decide the appropriate layout and enhancement measures.

Evidence reference for C2a.Q6 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2a.Q7: What optimal ecological outcomes and measures to implement these have been identified for the site?

Describe how they are achieved in line with the collaborations and the mitigation hierarchy:

Hierarchy of actions	What was done?	Evidence reference
Avoid	The site is of limited ecological value and will avoid impacts on the majority of protected species due to the unsuitability of the site to support them.	
Protect	The grassland, hedgerows and tree lines are of ecological value and are due to be retained and protected within the development.	

Hierarchy of actions	What was done?	Evidence reference
Reduce/limit negative impacts	Whilst the proposed development is of limited ecological value. There is potential for the proposed development to impact Stone Curlew. The most appropriate mitigation strategy is to mitigate at a	
On-site compensation	The proposed development will ensure no net loss of habitat and hedgerow units on site.	
Enhancement	The proposed development will provide 36.47% net gain in habitat and 80.18% net gain in hedgerow units.	

C2a.Q8: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to Q7 above deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Survey and evaluation

Section or item	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Determining ecological outcomes

Section or item	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Identifying and agreeing measures

Section or item	Why not appropriate	Evidence reference

Wider site sustainability

Criteria 10-11 (Lue 02)

C2a.Q9: Were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcome for the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The inclusion of additional trees and areas of grassland will provide ecological corridors and provide feeding resources for native invertebrate and mammals. There will also be mitigation secured for Stone- Curlew increasing nesting opportunites within the wider landscape

Evidence reference for C2a.Q9 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Section 5.0 - Project Spitfire Ecological Appraisal (Pro Vision 2026)

C2a.Q10: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence reference for C2a.Q10 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2a.Q11: Which measure was chosen as an ecosystem service-related benefit? Please demonstrate what benefit it provides.

Mitigation for Stone-Curlew increasing breeding habitat sites within the wider landscape

Evidence reference for C2a.Q11 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Section 5.0 - Project Spitfire Ecological Appraisal (Pro Vision 2026)

b. Managing impacts on ecology (Lue 03)

Prerequisite: Ecological risks and opportunities

Criterion 1 (Lue 03)

C2b.Q1: Have the 'Survey and evaluation' and 'Determining ecological outcomes' criteria in Lue 02 been met for the project or site?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Implementation of measures on-site

Criteria 2-3 (Lue 03)

C2b.Q2: Please describe what actions will be taken during handover to ensure that planned ecological measures are communicated, understood and adhered to during construction:

A CEMP will be created to ensure that all the measures outlined are met during the construction process.
--

Evidence reference for C2b.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2b.Q3: Were site preparation and construction works planned for and implemented at an early project stage to optimise benefits and outputs?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

No works have been undertaken on site until an ecological baseline was obtained.
--

Evidence reference for C2b.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2b.Q4: What measures will be implemented to achieve optimal ecological outcomes during the site preparation and construction processes?

Please describe how these will be measured and monitored throughout construction and handover:

Works will be scheduled to avoid peak bird nesting season (1st March to 31st August, although this will vary between species and local conditions) to avoid contravention of protected species legislation; unless inspection by an ecologist concludes that there are no nesting birds present immediately prior to the commencement of works.

If the project involves bare ground creation, this might inadvertently provide suitable nesting habitat for

Evidence reference for C2b.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Section 5.0 - Project Spitfire Ecological Appraisal (Pro Vision 2026)

C2b.Q5: Has an ecological clerk of works been appointed by the contractor to monitor and advise on the protection of site ecology as agreed?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe their role and how they will ensure the necessary measures are implemented:

An ecological clerk of works been appointed to ensure the Construction Environmental Management Plan and nesting bird avoidance measures are implemented.

Evidence reference for C2b.Q5 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2b.Q6: If the ecologist requires the input of an additional ecological specialist at any point (for example, an expert on a particular form of wildlife) will the contractor provide for such services as required?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2b.Q6 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Specialist advice has already been obtained from the RSPB to inform an appropriate mitigation Strategy. See RSPB Advice Note 23.02.2026

No net loss (UK only)

Criterion 5 (Lue 03, UK NC)

C2b.Q7: Were negative impacts from site preparation and construction works managed so that no overall loss of ecological value has occurred?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The development has been designed to deliver 36.47% net gain in habitat and 80.18% net gain in hedgerow units. This will be achieved through the planting of large areas of modified grassland in good condition in the proposed solar panel field areas. Further areas of modified grassland in both moderate and good condition will be created in the eastern section of the site along with 70 small native trees. A 270m long native hedgerow will be created along the eastern boundary of the southern solar field and will achieve good condition.

Evidence reference for C2b.Q7 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2b.Q8: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence reference for C2b.Q8 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

c. Ecological change and enhancement (Lue 04)**Project/site overview**

C2c.Q1: Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats. Please also describe if any offsite areas (including zone of influence) are being used for habitat enhancement/creation/compensation and which criteria this is relates to:

The site is comprised of area habitats including arable crop, small areas of modified grassland and developed land; sealed surface. Linear habitats included a native hedgerow, line of trees and non-native ornamental hedegrow. The habitats of higher distinctivness are due to be retained within the development. Cropland will be lost and replaced with a habitat of higher distinctivness.

Evidence reference for C2c.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Section 5.0 - Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision 2026)

Prerequisite: Managing negative impacts on ecology

Criterion 1 (Lue 04)

C2c.Q2: Have the relevant criteria for 'Managing negative impacts on ecology' been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Ecological enhancement

Criteria 3-4 (Lue 04)

C2c.Q3: Did the project team implement the ecological enhancement measures/actions in the following order:

- On site, and where this is not feasible,
- Off site within the zone of influence?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

A BNG Assessment was undertaken which maximised the number of habitat units that could fesibly be delivered within the site, and enhanced habitats within the wider site boundary to deliver 36.47% net gain in habitat and 80.18% net gain in hedgerow units overall.

Please indicate what was pursued:

☒ On site enhancement
☐ Off-site enhancement

C2c.Q4: Has relevant data been offered to the local environmental records centres nearest to, or relevant for, the site?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

If not applicable, please explain why:

Evidence reference for C2c.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Quantifying change in ecological value | UK NC V7

Criteria 5-6 (Lue 04)

C2c.Q5: Does your site have a baseline of 0.1 biodiversity units (BUs) or lower?

☐ Yes (please answer Q6 to Q8) ☒ No (please answer Q9 to Q14)

C2c.Q6: Which version of the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool have you used?

☒ Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM)
☐ Small Sites Metric (SSM)

C2c.Q7: How many BUs have been implemented per hectare for the site post-development?

32.92 habitat units / 11.28 hectares = 2.92 BU/hectare

C2c.Q8: Has the SBM or SSM calculation of BU/ha and site plans been submitted as evidence?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please reference the sources of data used in the calculation of BNG (C2c.Q5-Q8)

Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)
3553-005-D - Proposed Masterplan Overview (CSA Architects, 2026)

C2c.Q9: Which version of the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool have you used?

☒ Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM)
☐ Small Sites Metric (SSM)

C2c.Q10: Which habitat types were on your site pre-development?

☒ Area
☒ Hedgerow
☐ Watercourse

C2c.Q11: Which habitat types are on your site post-development?

- ☒ Area
- ☒ Hedgerow
- ☐ Watercourse

C2c.Q12: Which habitat had the lowest percentage in biodiversity net gain (BNG)?

- ☒ Area
- ☐ Hedgerow
- ☐ Watercourse

C2c.Q13: What is the percentage of the lowest percentage in biodiversity net gain?

36.47% net gain in habitat units

C2c.Q14: Has the SBM or SSM and site plans been submitted as evidence?

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please reference the sources of data used in the calculation of BNG (C2c.Q9-Q13)

Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)
3553-005-D - Proposed Masterplan Overview (CSA Architects, 2026)

In addition to completion of the calculation tool please confirm the following:

C2c.Q14a: Habitat losses and gains relating to legally protected species are included in the calculations and have been clearly identified.

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q14a (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

The development results in a net gain in both habitat and hedgerow units and therefore there is no overall loss of habitat suitable for protected species.
(Section 5.0, Project Spitfire BNG Assessment, Pro Vision 2026)

C2c.Q14b: Linear and area biodiversity units have been calculated separately and losses and gains calculated for the pre-development and post-development scenarios are reported separately, i.e. per habitat type.

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q14b (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Section 5.0, Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

C2c.Q14c: All site survey information and the data associated with the calculations are included within evidence provided. This may include date stamped photographs and GIS layers containing data on the habitat types.

- ☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q14c (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026) The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

C2c.Q14d: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q14d (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Quantifying change in ecological value | International NC V7

C2c.Q15: Has the SQE deemed Biodiversity Net Gain to be appropriate for the site?

☐ Yes (go to Q16) ☒ No (go to Q20)

Criterion 5 (Lue 04)

C2c.Q16: Which version of the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool have you used?

☐ Ramboll Global Biodiversity Metric
☒ Country specific biodiversity metric

If you have used a country specific biodiversity metric, please state which one below:

DEFRA Statutory Metric

C2c.Q17: How many BUs per hectare are present for the site pre-development?

24.13 BHau in 11.28 Hectares = 2.14

C2c.Q18: How many BUs per hectare are present for the site post-development?

32.92 BHau, in 11.28 Hectares = 2.92

C2c.Q19: Has the Biodiversity Metric calculation of BU/ha and site plans been submitted as evidence?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please reference the sources of data used in the calculation of BNG (C2c.Q15-Q19)

Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

In addition to completion of the calculation tool please confirm the following:

C2c.Q19a: Habitat losses and gains relating to legally protected species are included in the calculations and have been clearly identified.

☐ Yes ☒ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q19a (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Not applicable as no habitat losses or gains relate to legally protected species

C2c.Q19b: Losses and gains calculated for the pre-development and post-development scenarios are reported separately, i.e. per habitat type.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q19b (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Paragraph 6.1 Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

C2c.Q19c: All site survey information and the data associated with the calculations are included within evidence provided. This may include date stamped photographs and GIS layers containing data on the habitat types.

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q19c (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026)
The_Statutory_Metric_- Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

C2c.Q19d: Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q19d (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which items	Why not appropriate

Criteria 6-8 (Lue 04)

C2c.Q20: Have the Urban Greening Factor targets been met according to asset type?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q20 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Not Applicable to this development

C2c.Q21a: Has the local authority set targets for Urban Greening Factor?

☐ Yes ☒ No

C2c.Q21b: If yes, what are the targets? If they are lower than the BREEAM targets, the BREEAM targets must be met.

Evidence reference for C2c.Q21 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2c.Q22a: Does the baseline of the site already meet the target level?

☒ Yes ☐ No

C2c.Q22b: If yes, has the project improved upon this by +0.1?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q22 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Paragraph 6.1 Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026) The_Statutory_Metric_ - Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

C2c.Q23: In addition to meeting the targets, has the ecologist also confirmed that the vegetation specified to meet the targets provides ecological benefits?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2c.Q23 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Paragraph 5.13 - Project Spitfire Ecological Appraisal (Pro Vision 2026)

d. Long term ecology management (Lue 05)

Prerequisite: Ecological change and enhancement

Criterion 1 (Lue 05)

C2d.Q1: Have the relevant criteria for 'Change and enhancement of ecological value' been achieved?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Evidence reference for C2d.Q1 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)
Section 5.0, Paragraph 6.1 Project Spitfire BNG Assessment (Pro Vision, 2026) The_Statutory_Metric_ - Project Spitfire (Pro Vision, 2026)

Handover to building owner or tenant

Criterion 2 (Lue 05)

C2d.Q2: As part of the tenant or building owner information being supplied, has a section been included on ecology and biodiversity to inform the tenant or owner of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements? Please include an overview below:

Evidence reference for C2d.Q2 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

Landscape and ecology management plan

Criterion 3 (Lue 05)

C2d.Q3: Has a landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, been developed covering 30 years after project completion?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please provide an overview of how the plan meets the points outlined in the technical manual:

However a Habitat Managment and Maintenance Plan will be produced to discharge the Biodiversity Gain Condition

Evidence reference for C2d.Q3 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

C2d.Q4: Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Evidence reference for C2d.Q4 (including clear locational referencing such as page or clause numbers as relevant)

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

C3: Signature of validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of ecologist: Alex Hannam

Signature of ecologist:

Date: 13-Mar-2026