peakecology LIMITED
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANTS



Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Stand Farm, Crich

Project No: MarAl01 Client: Mark Allwood Date: 21/10/2025

ISSUE RECORD

Client name	Mark Allwood
Project name	Stand Farm, Crich
Project number	MarAl01
Report title	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Issue number	1
Date	21/10/2025
Written by	Helena Coles BSc (Hons) Field Ecologist
Checked by	Niamh Sherborne BSc (Hons) ACIEEM Senior Ecologist
Approved by	Charlotte Haylock BSc (Hons) Senior Ecologist

The information and advice contained in this report has been prepared and provided in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's Code of Professional Conduct. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions.

Peak Ecology Limited
Arden House
Deepdale Business Park
Bakewell
Derbyshire
DE45 1GT
01629 812511

www.peakecology.co.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

This report has been prepared by Peak Ecology Ltd, on behalf of Mark Allwood. It presents the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNG) for the proposed construction of a new agricultural barn at Stand Farm, Crich, Derbyshire.

At the time of the survey, the site comprised poor-condition modified grassland, maintained at a short sward due to livestock grazing, and an access track leading to Plaistow Green Road.

Results

The results of the BNG assessment indicate that, based on current proposals, the development will result in an overall **net loss of 0.09 of Habitat Units**, equivalent to a **percentage net change of -100%.**

Under the baseline scenario, the Trading Rules have **not been satisfied** within the metric.

Recommendations

Due to the existing habitats present, it will not be possible to meet the required 10% net gain target on-site (within the red line boundary).

However, the client has access to additional land within the wider ownership of Stand Farm, which offers suitable opportunities for delivering the required biodiversity enhancements.

With the inclusion of an **off-site planting area**, involving the planting of **nine small-sized, moderate-condition native trees** (as detailed in Table 4), the development would achieve an **overall net gain of 0.01 Habitat Units**, equivalent to a **percentage net change of 15.79%**. Under this scenario, the **Trading Rules would be satisfied**.

Alternatively, the client may opt to **purchase biodiversity units through an approved off-site biodiversity unit provider** to meet the statutory net gain requirement.

CONTENTS PAGE

1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Scope of Report 1
1.2 Site Description 1
1.3 Planning Context and Legislation 2
2 METHODOLOGY 4
2.1 Desk Study 4
2.2 Surveyors 4
2.3 Habitat Survey 4
2.4 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment 5
2.5 Limitations 5
2.6 Lifespan of Data 5
3 RESULTS 6
3.1 Desk Study 6
3.2 Baseline Habitat Survey 6
3.3 Proposed Habitats – On-site 7
3.4 Example Off-site Habitat Creation 7
3.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations 8
4 EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12
4.1 Evaluation 12
4.2 Recommendations 12
5 REFERENCES 14
APPENDIX A : Botanical Species Lists 16
APPENDIX B : Site Photographs 17
APPENDIX C : Habitat Condition Assessment - Modified Grassland 19

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1: Location Plan 2
Table 1: Summary of Habitat Assessment 6
Table 2: Proposed Habitats 7
Table 3: Example Off-site Habitat Baseline 8
Table 4: Example Proposed Off-site Habitat Creation 8
Figure 2: On-site Baseline Habitat Map 10
Figure 3: On-site Proposed Habitat Map 11

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope of Report

This report has been prepared by Peak Ecology Ltd on behalf of Mark Allwood. It provides the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment associated with the proposed development at Stand Farm, Plaistow Green Road, Crich. The proposals include the construction of a new agricultural barn.

The purpose of this report is to:

- Describe the ecological baseline of the site, including existing habitats, and assess the biodiversity value of each habitat;
- Calculate the post-development change in biodiversity units, and identify the extent of the net-loss or net-gain in biodiversity as a result of the development;
- Highlight opportunities for ecological enhancement where appropriate; and
- Set out requirements for post-development habitat monitoring.

In relation to planning and development, this report provides all relevant details to accompany a planning application.

The approach to this assessment follows best practice published by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2016) and the British Standards Institution (BSI, 2013). Details of individual survey methods and associated supporting information are provided in Section 2.

1.2 Site Description

The site comprised an approximately 0.13ha area of land (central grid reference: SK 34842 55555) within Stand Farm, Plaistow Green Road, Crich. The site itself consisted of an area of modified grassland with an access track extending to the road. The site is located north of the village of Crich, and the surrounding land is predominantly agricultural.

The survey boundary is as per the redline boundary on the Location Plan (drawing no: 1460553) provided by the client. The site location is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Location Plan



© Crown copyright and database rights 2025 Ordnance Survey

1.3 Planning Context and Legislation

The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 states that when assessing a planning application all Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) must consider potential impacts on biodiversity that may result from the proposals.

In relation to habitats, the LPA requires sufficient information about the value of the current habitats on site and the likely value of the proposed habitats on site, to **secure measurable net gains for biodiversity** as a result of the development. This is in order to satisfy the NPPF requirement of using planning to help improve biodiversity (Paragraphs 187 to 193).

As of the 12th February 2024, under Schedule 7a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) all major developments in England, unless exempt, must deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain of 10%. This ensures that development results in a measurable increase in size or improvement in quality of natural habitats, and will be a material consideration in determining a planning application.

In addition to this, county and borough councils typically have biodiversity policies within their Local Development Frameworks that they must also comply with.

For Amber Valley Borough Council this is covered by policy “EN9” (Amber Valley Borough Council, 2024, p. 72)

> *“Net gain is expected to be provided on site but where it can be demonstrated that this would not be possible or desirable, it should be provided on one or more sites within the Borough (unless this is demonstrated not to be possible) that would deliver local priorities for biodiversity, having regard to the Derbyshire Natural Capital Strategy, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Derbyshire, the Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) and other locally identified priorities, or as a last resort, through national credits.”*

The Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Action Plan identifies the following Priority Habitats as targets for protection, restoration and enhancement (Derbyshire County Council, 2011):

- Floodplain Grazing Marsh
- Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland
- Wood-pasture and parkland
- Ponds
- Rivers and streams

In practice, this means that potential impacts on Priority Habitats, including those listed under Local Biodiversity Action Plans and the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework (JNCC, 2012) (formerly the UK Biodiversity Action Plan) are all material planning considerations.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Desk Study

An online data search was carried out prior to the site visit, to identify the presence of any Priority Habitats, statutory designated sites, and records of notable indicator species to help inform the assessment of the site's biodiversity value. Data sources including the Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) (DEFRA, 2025) tool. An analysis of aerial mapping was also carried out to identify any recent changes to baseline habitats.

2.2 Surveyors

The survey was carried out by Senior Ecologist Niamh Sherborne BSc (Hons) ACIEEM and assisted by Field Ecologist Helena Coles BSc (Hons). Niamh has been a professional ecologist for five years and is experienced in the identification of vascular plants, the use of the UK Habitat Classification system and survey methodology (UKHab, 2023 and Butcher *et al,* 2020), and the use of the Biodiversity Net Gain metric.

2.3 Habitat Survey

The habitat survey was undertaken on the 6th October 2025 and comprised a walkover of the site to classify and map the extent of habitat types, based on the identification of individual plant species. Any evidence of invasive plants was also noted.

Habitats were recorded using the UK Habitat Classification to allow conversion of habitat types to those listed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool. Condition assessments were then attributed to the habitats present on site, as shown in Section 3, using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 1. Some habitat conditions have been listed as "N/A"; these habitats do not require a condition assessment within the Biodiversity Metric.

It should be noted that any habitats on site that have evidently been recently destroyed or intentionally degraded will be recorded as the pre-degradation habitat. The habitat lost will be assigned high distinctiveness and good condition in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Nomenclature for vascular plant species follows the New Flora of the British Isles (Stace, 2019). A full species list for the site including binomial nomenclature is provided in Appendix A.

The fine scale Minimum Mapping Unit (MMU) (Butcher *et al,* 2020) was used throughout the survey area to allow the capture of small features and present any finer grain or mosaic of habitats. Minimum mapping units used were:

- 25m² for areas of habitat; and
- 5m for linear habitat.

Features smaller than the minimum mapping unit are denoted as point or line features, and assigned secondary codes or target notes.

2.4 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment

The extent of each habitat on site was mapped, to allow the areas to be calculated for comparison with post-development habitats. Proposed habitat area calculations were produced using the Location Plan (drawing no: 1460553) provided by the client.

Area figures were then added to the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool, with the associated condition and Strategic Significance of each habitat parcel, to assess whether the development would incur a biodiversity net loss or gain. Target conditions for proposed habitats have been assigned based on information provided within the landscaping plans, including extent of habitats, predicted management and land use pressures. The assessment of the Strategic Significance of existing and proposed habitats was made based on relevant habitat action plans or any inclusion within the local strategy.

All documents and calculation tools used are from the July 2025 update of the Biodiversity Metric.

2.5 Limitations

2.5.1 *Survey Methods*

Based on the identification of individual plant species, the Habitat Survey provides sufficient information to enable classification of broad habitat types; however, it does not constitute a detailed, exhaustive botanical survey. Plant species lists compiled by this type of survey should be considered definitive as not all species will be apparent at all times of year.

2.5.2 *Survey Timing and Conditions*

The habitat survey was undertaken outside the optimal survey season (April to September, inclusive). However, based on the habitats present on site, the timing of the survey was not considered a constraint to the assessment of the habitats on site or their conditions.

2.6 Lifespan of Data

The results and recommendations contained within this report are considered to be valid for up to two years from the date of the survey. After this period, or should amendments be made to the site proposals beyond those which may be recommended within this report, an updated calculation will be required to accompany the planning application.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Desk Study

Within a 2 km search radius of the site, eight types of Priority Habitat Inventory were identified. The closest of these include Lowland Dry Acid Grassland located approximately 0.3km to the east, and Lowland Calcareous Grassland approximately 0.4km to the west of the site.

The Cromford Canal Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is located approximately 1.92km to the west.

Two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) lie within the search area: Cromford Canal SSSI, approximately 1.75km to the west and Crich Chase SSSI, located approximately 1.83km to the south-west. The site also falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Shining Cliff Woods, located approximately 2.2km to the north-west.

3.2 Baseline Habitat Survey

The individual habitat types recorded at the site are listed below, with brief descriptions. Full habitat condition assessments are provided in Appendix C.

Table 1: Summary of Habitat Assessment

UK Habitat Classification	BNG Habitat Type	Description (Latin nomenclature for species provided in Appendix A)	Condition Assessment
g4- Modified grassland; grazed	Grassland – Modified grassland	At the time of the survey, the grassland supported a short sward maintained by livestock grazing. The grassland was dominated by perennial rye grass with occasional white clover, and rare occurrences of creeping thistle, creeping buttercup, and broad-leaved dock.	**Poor** Condition sheet: Grassland (low distinctiveness) Conditions passed: C, D, F, G. **Fails essential criterion A; preventing Moderate or Good condition from being achieved.**
u1b6 – Developed land; sealed surface; other developed land	Urban; developed land, sealed surface	An area of hardstanding located outside of an existing agricultural barn.	**N/A**
u1c 839 – Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface; tracks	Urban – Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface	An unsealed access track running from the proposed site towards Plaistow Green Road, which was separated midway by the area of hardstanding.	**N/A**

3.3 Proposed Habitats – On-site

3.3.1 *Development Proposals*

The proposals include the clearance of the existing modified grassland to facilitate the construction of a new agricultural barn. The existing access track and area of hard-standing will be retained.

3.3.2 *Post-Development Habitats*

Table 2: Proposed Habitats

Habitat Type	Description	Target Condition and Justification
u1b6 - Other developed land; barn	New agricultural barn to be constructed, adjacent to the existing access track.	**N/A**

3.4 Example Off-site Habitat Creation

The site of the proposed barn is located within a wider agricultural field of poor-condition modified grassland. In order for the proposed development to achieve the mandatory 10% net gain in Habitat Units, an additional area of land would be required for habitat creation.

As the wider field was part of the same land ownership, this area would be suitable for habitat creation. Similarly, the adjacent pasture fields would also be considered suitable for use as off-site habitat creation land.

Tables 3 and 4 below provide an example of habitat creation which would achieve the required net gain and would satisfy the metric Trading Rules. This would involve the planting of nine native species trees planted within the existing modified grassland field outside of the redline application boundary.

The baseline area required to facilitate the tree planting has been calculated by using the potential Root Protection Area (RPA) for each tree. The following assumptions have been made to calculate this area:

1 – The maximum diameter at breast height measurement for a small tree is 30cm. This diameter has been used to calculate the RPA. For trees with a single stem, the RPA is calculated as an area equivalent to a circle with a radius 12 times the stem diameter (BSI, 2013).

2 – The RPA per tree is therefore calculated to be approximately 11m^2. The total modified grassland area input into the off-site baseline in the metric is therefore 99m^2 to accommodate the planting of nine individual trees.

3 – At this stage we have not considered the species of the individual trees, which would have an impact on the potential size which could be achieved by the tree. A generalised calculation was considered appropriate to illustrate the potential to achieve a net gain using land within the client's ownership.

Table 3: Example Off-site Habitat Baseline

Habitat Type	BNG Habitat Type	Description	Target Condition and Justification
g4- Modified grassland; grazed	Grassland – Modified grassland	This area formed a continuation of the modified grassland within the same field. The grassland was maintained at a short sward through regular livestock grazing. The grassland was of similar species composition; dominated by perennial rye grass.	**Poor** Condition sheet: Grassland (low distinctiveness) Conditions passed: C, D, E, F, G. **Fails essential criterion A; preventing Moderate or Good condition from being achieved**

Table 4: Example Proposed Off-site Habitat Creation

Habitat Type	BNG Habitat Type	Description	Target Condition and Justification
200 – Tree	Individual Trees – Rural Tree	It is proposed that nine small, moderate-condition trees will be planted within an off-site habitat creation area. These trees should all be of native species.	**Moderate** It is considered likely that each of the small trees will be able to achieve moderate condition, they will be a native species and will be managed to ensure no adverse impacts are incurred. **Conditions to projected to pass:** **A, B, D, F**

3.5 Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

The results of the BNG assessment indicate that, based on the current proposals, the development of the site would result in a **net loss of 0.09 Habitat Units** on site, equating to a **net change of -100%.** The Trading Rules for the metric are also not met.

In order for the proposed development to achieve the mandatory 10% net gain in Habitat Units, an additional area of land would be required for habitat creation.

As set out in Tables 3 and 4 above, the incorporation of proposed tree planting on off-site land within the same agricultural field would result in an **overall net gain of 0.01 Habitat Units, equivalent to a 15.79% net gain.** If the wider area within the same grassland field is not able to be used for habitat creation, then a similar alternative site may be used. Further details are provided in Section 4.

Under this scenario, the **Trading Rules of the metric have been satisfied** for this development.

No hedgerows were present within the redline boundary, and no watercourses were present within 10m, and therefore Hedgerow and Watercourse Units have not been included within this report or metric.

Two versions of the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool will be submitted alongside this report; the first demonstrating the on-site habitat loss only and the second detailing the habitat creation example.





Survey Information	
	Site boundary (1,276.5m^2)

UKHab Habitat Survey	
	g4 - Modified grassland (425.3m^2)
	u1b6 - Other developed land (368.7m^2)
	u1c - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (482.5m^2)

Secondary Codes:

100 - Grazed
869 - Track

Source:
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2025, All rights reserved. License Number 100049837.

N

0 2.5 5 10
Metres

PROJECT TITLE

STAND FARM, PLAISTOW GREEN ROAD

DRAWING TITLE

Figure 2. Baseline Habitat Plan

VER	DATE	REMARKS	Drawn	Checked
1.0	09/10/25	Baseline	MP	HC

DRAWING NUMBER: PeakEcology/StandFarm/Baseline

peakecology LIMITED
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANTS
Arden House,
Deepdale Business Park,
Bakewell,
Derbyshire.
DE45 1GT.
www.peakecology.co.uk

DATUM	OSGB
PROJECTION	BNG
PLOT SIZE	A3
SCALE	1:500





Survey Information	
	Site boundary (1,276.5m^2)

UKHab Habitat Survey	
	u1b5 - Building (425.3m^2)
	u1b6 - Other developed land (368.7m^2)
	u1c - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (482.5m^2)

Secondary Codes:

833 - Barn
869 - Track

Source:
Ordnance Survey © Crown copyright 2025, All rights reserved. License Number 100049837.

N

0 2.5 5 10
Metres

PROJECT TITLE

STAND FARM, PLAISTOW GREEN ROAD

DRAWING TITLE

Figure 3. Proposed Habitat Plan

VER	DATE	REMARKS	Drawn	Checked
1.0	09/10/25	Proposed	MP	HC

DRAWING NUMBER: PeakEcology/StandFarm/Proposed

peakecology LIMITED
ECOLOGICAL CONSULTANTS
Arden House,
Deepdale Business Park,
Bakewell,
Derbyshire.
DE45 1GT.
www.peakecology.co.uk

DATUM	OSGB
PROJECTION	BNG
PLOT SIZE	A3
SCALE	1:500

4 EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Evaluation

4.1.1 *Designated Sites & Priority Habitats*

None of the designated sites, or parcels of Priority Habitat within 2 km of the site are anticipated to be impacted, either directly or indirectly, as a result of the proposed works. All potential impacts are expected to be contained within the redline boundary.

Crich Chase SSSI and Cromford Canal are located within 2 km of the site; however, the proposed works do not include any elements likely to affect the features for which the sites are designated. Although the site falls within the Shining Cliff Woods SSSI IRZ, the proposed development does not meet any of the criteria that would trigger the requirement for consultation with Natural England.

4.1.2 *Habitats*

The results indicate that the development of the site, based on the current landscaping plan, will result in a **net loss** in biodiversity. A minimum 10% biodiversity net gain is required to meet the statutory obligations under the Environment Act 2021.

Based on the existing habitat composition and the limited scope for on-site enhancement, achieving the net gain within the red line boundary is not feasible.

Two potential options for achieving the required biodiversity net gain are outlined in Section 4.2.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 *Option 1 - Off-site Habitat Creation*

With the incorporation of an off-site area utilised for habitat creation, the proposed development would be able to achieve an overall net gain in Habitat Units. The example provided in Section 3 utilises an area of 99m^2 of modified grassland within the land ownership boundary where nine small trees could be planted (resulting in a net gain of **0.01 Habitat Units**, which is equivalent to a **percentage net gain of 15.79%).**

The example off-site land lies within the same field of the proposed development and therefore lies within the same local planning authority (LPA) and National Character Area (NCA) boundary and so is not subject to any spatial risk multipliers. This adheres to the mitigation hierarchy, despite avoidance not being possible, habitat creation being in such close proximity to the development boundary would minimise the overall impact on the local area.

If the example habitat creation area cannot be secured, then an alternative parcel of land could be used to achieve an overall net gain for the development. This would need to be assessed to determine the baseline habitats present and for its suitability to support tree planting, and should, where possible, be located to avoid spatial risk multipliers as discussed above.

If the client proceeds with this option, a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan should be produced for all off-site habitats. This should include details of appropriate planting schemes, and ongoing management techniques that will be required to guarantee proposed habitats reach their target conditions within the timeframes predicted by the calculator. Methods of habitat maintenance should be secured prior to the commencement of the development.

Any habitat creation areas would also need to be secured under a legal agreement to be maintained and monitored for a period of 30 years.

4.2.2 *Option 2 - Purchasing Units*

Alternatively, If the client cannot contribute Habitat Units from within a wider landownership, in order to satisfy the BNG net gain requirements and the Trading Rules for this site, they will be required to purchase units and formally secure the required net gain for the development through an agreement (Section 106) elsewhere. The purchase of units may be through an off-site enhancement scheme via the Local Planning Authority (LPA), a habitat bank or other unit trading platform, or as a last resort via the purchase of statutory biodiversity credits. To minimise Spatial Risk Multipliers, the units should be purchased from within the same LPA or NCA.

If the client proceeds with this option, they should contact the LPA to discuss options for the allocation and purchase of units.

Wild Solutions, a company owned by Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, operate in Derbyshire and could be consulted regarding the potential to purchase Biodiversity Units to offset the loss on-site, as the unit deficit in this case is small. (https://www.wildsolutionsdwt.co.uk/bng). Other Biodiversity Unit providers may also be able to offer purchase of units locally.

5 REFERENCES

Amber Valley Borough Council (2024). *Amber Valley Borough Local Plan 2022-2040.* Amber Valley Borough Council, Ripley from https://info.ambervalley.gov.uk/docarc/docviewer.aspx?docguid=4f90603569e841be827ba722c54b7cd2

BSI. (2013). *BS42020:2013 Biodiversity - code of practice for planning and development.* London: British Standards Institution.

Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L., & Treweek, J. (2020). *The UK Habitat Classification - Habitat Definitions Version 1.1.* https://www.ukhab.org/.

Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L., & Treweek, J. (2020). *The UK Habitat Classification User Manual Version 1.1.* https://www.ukhab.org/.

CIEEM. (2016). *Biodiversity Net Gain. Good practice principles for development.* Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

DEFRA. (2025). *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric, User Guide.* DEFRA.

DEFRA. (2025). *Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside*. Retrieved 2025, from https://www.magic.defra.gov.uk

Derbyshire County Council. (2011). *Lowland Derbyshire Biodiversity Plan 2011-2020.* Derbyshire County Council, Matlock from https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/site-elements/documents/pdf/environment/conservation/ecology/lowland-derbyshire-biodiversity-action-plan/lowland-derbyshire-biodiversity-action-plan-lbap-2011-2020.pdf

JNCC. (2012). *UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework.* JNCC and Defra (on behalf of the Four Countries' Biodiversity Group.

MHCLG. (2024). *National Planning Policy Framework.* London: Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government.

Stace, C. (2019). *New Flora of the British Isles. 4th Edition.* Suffolk: C & M Floristics.

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

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A : Botanical Species Lists 16
APPENDIX B : Site Photographs 17
APPENDIX C : Habitat Condition Assessment - Modified Grassland 19

APPENDIX A : Botanical Species Lists

Latin Name	Common Name	DAFOR
Cirsium arvense	Creeping thistle	R
Lolium perenne	Perennial rye grass	D
Ranunculus repens	Creeping buttercup	R
Rumex obtusifolius	Broad-leaved dock	R
Trifolium repens	White clover	O

DAFOR Key: D = Dominant (>75%), A = Abundant (51-75%), F = Frequent (26-50%), O = Occasional (11-25%), R = Rare (1-10%), L = Locally

APPENDIX B : Site Photographs

No.	Description	Photograph
1	Modified grassland field, where proposed barn is to be built.	
2	Example species composition of poor-condition modified grassland present on site.	
3	Example of access track and area of hardstanding.	

No.	Description	Photograph
3	Example of an existing agricultural barn present on site; the proposed barn to be of the same type.	

APPENDIX C : Habitat Condition Assessment - Modified Grassland

Condition Assessment Criteria		Baseline	
		Criterion passed Y/N	Notes
A	There must be 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2. **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.** Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m^2, please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	N	Criterion not met.
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	N	Grassland maintained at a short sward, due to grazing.
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. May be present). Note – patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub type.	Y	No scrub present.
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	Y	Criterion met.
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens).	N	No bare ground.
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Y	No bracken present.
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981).	Y	No invasive species present.
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		N	
Number of criteria passed		4	
Final condition		**Poor**	