The Royal Parks

Roehampton Cafe, Richmond Park
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Final report
Prepared by LUC
July 2024

The Royal Parks

Roehampton Cafe, Richmond Park
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Project Number
12551

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	First Issue	R. Glackin	R. Glackin	D. Green	19.07.2024

Bristol
Cardiff
Edinburgh
Glasgow
London
Manchester
Sheffield

landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number 2549296
Registered office:
250 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8RD

100% recycled paper

Landscape Design
Strategic Planning & Assessment
Development Planning
Urban Design & Masterplanning
Environmental Impact Assessment
Landscape Planning & Assessment
Landscape Management
Ecology
Historic Environment
GIS & Visualisation
Transport & Movement Planning
Arboriculture

FS566056
EMS566057
OHS627041

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction

Project Background

1.1 In June 2024, LUC was appointed by The Royal Parks to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment to inform a proposed redevelopment scheme at the Roehampton Gate Café within Richmond Park (hereafter referred to as 'the Site').

1.2 This report sets out the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment of the current redevelopment proposals and is supplemented by the updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the Site[1]. The Site boundary is outlined in the Phase 1 Habitat Plan in **Appendix A**

Purpose of Assessment

1.3 Following the Environment Act 2021[2], and as of 12th February 2024, BNG is now mandatory for major developments and therefore is now a legal requirement for the Roehampton Gate Café planning application.

1.4 In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)[3] proposals should seek to demonstrate Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The NPPF states plans should '*promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity*'.

1.5 This assessment has examined baseline ecological information and current landscape proposals to identify the current BNG provision, any risk in achieving BNG and identify further actions required to secure BNG through the proposals.

1.6 Whilst the process of BNG does consider the Site's value to locally relevant protected species and nearby Designated Sites, potential impacts and planning requirements for these ecological receptors have been considered separately within the detailed PEA.

1.7 BNG data should be considered part of the iterative process of calculation and design alteration. This report provides a BNG assessment for design as of:

[1] LUC (2024) 12551 – Roehampton Gate Café PEA Update 2024
[2] https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted
[3] Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2023). National Planning Policy Framework. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a11af7e8f5ec000f1f8c46/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

- Roehampton Restored: The Royal Parks – Design & Access Statement (June 2024) David Morley Architects.
- Drawing 20-1105-TPP draft-Layout1.
- Drawing 20-1105-TSS-A.
- RCH14 Roehampton Plant List_REV01.
- Drawing RCH14-L-DR-SC-600-001 Planting_REV01.
- Drawing RCH14-L-DR-SC-600-001 Soft Landscape GA.
- RCH14-L-DR-SC-200-001-Landscape GA

1.8 Therefore, this assessment should not be considered valid for any subsequent design revisions.

Site Description

1.9 The Site lies within the Northeast corner of Richmond Park, to the East of Priory Lane (OS grid reference: TQ 21328 74061). The Site was occupied by a café with decked seating area, temporary public toilets, a cycle hire building, cycle shed, cycle infrastructure and car parking. The habitats that were recorded on the Site were predominantly hardstanding, building and amenity grassland, with areas of poor semi-improved grassland and broadleaved scattered trees.

Project Proposals

1.10 The proposed scheme entails the following:

- The demolition of the existing café and associated hardstanding. This will be replaced with a new café with an acid grassland green roof. The seedmix for the green roof will be taken from lowland dry acid grassland within the wider Site.
- The partial loss and enhancement of existing modified grassland. Areas subject to enhancement will be targeting lowland dry acidic grassland in line with adjacent habitats within the wider area. This will be achieved through incorporating the seedbank from the neighbouring acid grassland habitats into the existing grassland through selective scraping.
- The loss of bare ground to the northwest of the Site.
- 33 trees are present within the Site. The proposals include the removal of 2 medium sized trees and 5 small sized trees, with the remaining trees being retained. The tree loss will be compensated for with the provision of 13 small sized trees.
- The provision of a biodiverse swale along the southwest of the Site. This will assist in managing surface run-off within the proposed Site, and provide an array of opportunities for local mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles and invertebrates.
- The provision of associated hardstanding in the form of car parking units, and pedestrian footpaths.

Policy and Legal Considerations

1.11 This report has been prepared in cognisance of relevant legislation and policy. The primary documents of relevance are outlined below:

- The Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981 (as amended).
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CroW Act), 2000 (as amended).
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act).
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/2012), as amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/579).
- The Protections of Badgers Act 1992.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (September 2023).
- The Environment Act (2021).
- The London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Adopted Local Plan (2018).

1.12 This report has been prepared for the exclusivity of The Royal Parks. No part of this report should be considered as legal advice.

Chapter 2
Methodology

Defra Biodiversity Statutory Metric

2.1 Calculations have been carried out in cognisance of Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development guidance[4] and the British Standards Institute[5],[6]. The assessment was undertaken with the Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric[7] in line with latest guidance[8]. The metric yields the biodiversity unit a site's land is worth, based on the type, distinctiveness, extent, and condition of the habitats within it. The metric approach compares the pre-development baseline against the project proposals, accounting for any habitat losses, gains, impacts and enhancements.

2.2 Typically, to meet the mandatory BNG requirements, the biodiversity value of the post-development scenario must be 10% (as a minimum) higher than the baseline. In addition to achieving a net gain, not all habitats are considered "tradeable" within the metric. Depending on the distinctiveness of the habitat, habitat losses may not be permitted and/or may need to be replaced with units of the same habitat type or higher.

2.3 BNG is being delivered within the Site, as demonstrated through **Figures A.1** and **Figure A.2, Appendix A**. This is in accordance with BNG Good Practice Principles: the process of BNG should follow a hierarchical approach of achieving net gains on-site wherever possible, or if this is not possible within adjacent land, before considering as a final option the delivery of BNG off-site.

2.4 While the Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric is the default approach to calculating BNG, it should not be considered a complete tool in assessing BNG and therefore professional judgement has been used where appropriate. Where professional judgement has been used, this is outlined in the text and additional references, where required, are provided.

2.5 The BNG assessment has been carried out by Rory Glackin BSc MSc, a Qualifying Member of CIEEM with 8 years

[4] Baker J., Hoskins R. and Butterworth T. (2019). *Biodiversity Net Gain. Good practice principles for development: A practical guide*. Ciria, London.
[5] BSI (2021). BS 8683:2021, Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain – Specification. British Standards Institute, London.
[6] BSI (2013). Biodiversity – code of practice for planning and development, BS 42020:2013. British Standards Institution, Bristol.
[7] Natural England (November 2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: User Guide (draft). Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides.
[8] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides/transferring-data-from-40-to-the-statutory-biodiversity-metric-calculation-tool

of ecological consultancy experience, and 3 years of BNG experience.

Baseline Calculation

2.6 The Site was subject to an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey which included detailed mapping of habitats within the Site. The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was completed on the 25th of July 2023 by Jasmine Bernard BSc, a Qualifying member of CIEEM and Pedro Freitas BSc, MSc a Qualifying member of CIEEM.

2.7 To calculate the ecological baseline units for the Site, the following data and assessments were collated:

- Phase 1 Habitat classifications were converted to UK Habitat Classification Habitat types through the Defra Biodiversity Statutory Metric conversion tool, and assigned a pre-set distinctiveness value, indicative of the inherent 'value' of these habitats.
- The area (hectares) of each habitat and length of linear habitats (km) within the application boundary was calculated from Phase 1 Habitat mapping using ESRI ArcMap. The Baseline Map is presented in **Figure A.1, Appendix A**.
- Habitats were subject to a 'condition assessment' retrospectively, informed by historic data including species lists, management styles and photographs of the habitats. Where this historic information was not available, a precautionary approach and professional judgement was used to inflate the conditions to a higher quality. The condition of the habitat is considered a measure of habitat quality and measures the 'working-order' against the optimal potential of habitat type. Assessment criteria cover broad habitat types therefore further clarification is provided and professional judgement used to assign condition where appropriate, using Defra condition sheets and associated guidance.
- Each habitat was subject to a Strategic Significance assessment based on its position within the landscape. This includes consideration of local plans, Supplementary Planning Documents and Guidance and local partnership publications to identify local priorities for targeting biodiversity.
- Baseline inputs (as detailed above) were entered into the Defra Biodiversity Statutory Metric to calculate baseline 'biodiversity units' for the Site.

Proposed Development

2.8 The same process was repeated for the proposals, as detailed below:

- The loss of baseline habitats (both polygon and linear data) was calculated by overlaying the footprint of the proposals onto the Phase 1 Habitat mapping using ESRI ArcMap. Using this method, the area of loss to each habitat block was determined.
- The proposals were reviewed to identify habitats created, retained and enhanced. The proposed habitats were subject to condition and strategic significance assessment.
- Where a new habitat or existing habitat has been created or enhanced, additional consideration has been given towards the time taken for habitats to establish and reach target condition (temporal multiplier) and the difficulty of habitat re-creation (difficulty multiplier). Both temporal and difficulty multipliers were pre-assigned within the Defra Statutory Metric Guidance.

2.9 Collated data and assessments were entered into the Defra Biodiversity Statutory Metric to calculate a biodiversity unit score for the proposals.

2.10 The proposed scheme is presented in **Figure A.2, Appendix A**.

Data Summary and Discussion

2.11 The results of Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric are presented as:

- A detailed summary of the resultant biodiversity unit change, separated by habitat type. It is important to note that the process of BNG should consider habitat types in isolation, and any unit losses or gains must be considered in detail for each habitat group / priority habitat type. This is referred to as "trading rules", which set minimum habitat creation and enhancement requirements to compensate for specific habitat losses, where necessary.
- The percentage change in biodiversity units delivered by the development proposal i.e. the uplift in biodiversity units. A minimum of 10% uplift is required. The below assessment details that this has been achieved for area habitats. No linear habitats were to be impacted through the scheme, therefore a net gain is not required for linear habitats.

Chapter 3
Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

3.1 Results are presented for each of the BNG calculation phases:

- Baseline assessment of the habitats on Site only.
- Proposal assessment, or post-development scenario.

3.2 Within each phase, area, linear (hedgerows and tree lines) and watercourse habitats are presented separately where appropriate.

Baseline Assessment Inputs

3.3 The majority of the Site was comprised of low to negligible value habitats including building, hardstanding, amenity grassland and poor semi-improved grassland. In addition to this, the Site also supported a number of mature and veteran trees, which are of higher ecological value.

3.4 **Table 3.1** provides a summary of the baseline assessment inputs for area habitats within the Site. No linear or watercourse habitats were present within the Site. Full condition assessment proformas are provided within **Appendix B**.

Table 3.1 Summary of Baseline Assessment Inputs on Site

Habitat parcel reference	Area (ha) / Length (km)	JNCC Phase 1 Classification	UKHABS Classification	Condition
Area habitats				
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16	0.337	J1.2 Amenity grassland	Modified grassland	Poor
7, 8, 9, 13 and 19.	0.332	J3.6 Buildings and HS Hard standing	Developed land; sealed surface	N/A
6, and 17.	0.065	J4 Bare ground	Bare ground	Poor
T3, T34 and T42	0.1099	A3.1 Mixed scattered trees	Urban tree	Good
T17, T19, T20, T26, T27, T29, T30, T31, T32, T33, T35, T36, T37, T38, T40, T41, T43, T44, T46, T47,	0.2199	A3.1 Mixed scattered trees	Urban tree	Moderate

Habitat parcel reference	Area (ha) / Length (km)	JNCC Phase 1 Classification	UKHABS Classification	Condition
T49, T103, T105, T106, T107, T108, T109, T110, T111 and T112.				

3.5 It should be noted that the red line boundary incorporates a single building (B4) and a small area of other broadleaved woodland, which are separated from the main area for development within the proposals. As they are being retained and not influenced by the scheme, they have been omitted from the BNG assessment of the scheme.

Proposed Assessment Inputs

3.6 Proposed landscape plans and post development habitat plans can be found in **Appendix A**. These landscape plans detail the mitigation measures proposed such as the creation of green roofs, bioswales, tree planting and lowland acid grassland. Provisions also include the enhancement of modified grassland to lowland dry acidic grassland.

3.7 Full calculations taken directly from the Statutory metric are provided in **Appendix C**. Results are outlined and discussed in detail below.

Habitat Loss

3.8 The extent of habitat loss was concentrated mainly on habitats of low distinctiveness and value, namely the modified grassland, bare ground and developed land; sealed surfaces. The proposals also entailed the removal of 5 small and 2 medium sized urban trees.

Retained Habitats

Area Habitats

3.9 Habitat retention within the scheme comprised 3 large good condition trees, 6 medium moderate condition trees, and 14 small moderate condition trees.

Table 3.2 Retained Area Habitats on Site

Habitat Type (UK Hab)	Baseline (ha/km)	Retained (ha/km)	% Retained
Area habitats			
Urban tree (Good condition)	0.1099	0.1099	100
Urban tree (Moderate condition)	0.2199	0.1669	76

Enhanced Habitats

3.10 0.20ha of the 0.337ha of modified grassland within the Site was enhanced to good condition, very high distinctiveness lowland dry acid grassland within the scheme.

3.11 This has a targeted condition of good within 30 years minimum of establishment. The proposed management is to be in line with that within the wider park which is a designated SSSI (partially for lowland dry acidic grassland) and therefore this created habitat will be accounted for within the on-going management of the Site (for which lowland dry acidic grasslands are currently in a favourable condition). Therefore, it is expected that given the on-going management strategy within the wider park that this Site and habitat will be included within, the favourable condition of lowland dry acid grassland within the wider Site, and that the existing seedbank with the wider area will be utilised, that this habitat will be able to achieve a good condition within the desired timeframe.

Created on Site Habitats

3.12 Lowland acid dry grassland was proposed predominantly within the northwest and eastern segments of the Site. This grassland is to be seeded utilising the local seedbank from neighbouring grassland habitats within the wider park. It will be managed in line with the wider park, and therefore, as above, will be considered to achieve a good condition within a 30 year timeframe minimum.

3.13 Developed land; sealed surfaces will comprise the new café, with associated hardstanding facilitating new footpaths/walkways and car parking units.

3.14 An acid grassland green roof is to be proposed on top of the new café building. The green roof will be substrate-based, with a seedmix taken from the adjacent lowland acidic grassland which will comprise approximately 18 grasses and wildflower species. The roof will also include the provision of deadwood piles and stone/rubble piles to provide a varied habitat for a range of species including invertebrates, birds and bats.

3.15 Given the composition of the proposed roof and anticipated value, the roof was classified as being a "fairly poor" biodiverse roof as opposed to an "other roof" classification which would equate to a low distinctiveness habitat with no condition available within the metric. Therefore, although the proposed roof does not completely align with the biodiverse roof UK Habs definition[9] (namely the requirement for a 60:40 wildflower to sedum ratio), it does contain some elements of the biodiverse roof such as the other habitat features (log piles, stone rubble). The proposed roof also aligns with 2 out of the 4 condition criteria for biodiverse roofs which would equate to a moderate condition Therefore, it is considered that as this habitat will be incorporated into the SSSI's current management plan for acidic grassland, and would be managed to represent a UK priority habitat providing a niche opportunities for a range of species within the Site (including stag beetles for which the SAC/SSSI is partially designated for), that the green roof provision would be significantly undervalued within the metric if listed as an "other green roof". This is considered a limitation within the metric. Therefore given that the roof will not align entirely with the Biodiverse roof classification, the proposed roof has been designated as an biodiverse roof achieving a "fairly poor" condition within 3 years of establishment instead to account for this trade-off in features/composition needed to be classified as a biodiverse roof. This ensures the value of this habitat is not misrepresented as a result of the metric.

3.16 The scheme proposes a bioswale along the western edge of the Site. This will comprise a mixture of grassland species and shrubby/wildflower species that can thrive within both dry and wet spells of weather. This habitat is targeted to achieve a good condition within 3 years of establishment.

3.17 The scheme also proposes the provision of 13 small trees to compensate for those being lost within the scheme. These are targeted a moderate condition within 27 years of establishment.

Table 3.3 Created Habitats on Site

Habitat Type	Created Area (ha/km)	Condition
Lowland dry acid grassland	0.099	Good
Developed land; sealed surface	0.332	N/A
Bioswale	0.059	Good
Biodiverse Roof	0.044	Fairly Poor
Urban trees	0.053	Moderate

[9] Extensive green roof designed specifically for biodiversity that: 1) has a depth of substrate (not including a blanket or turf) that varies between 80 and 150mm, with at least 30% of the roof at 150mm deep; and 2) is planted and seeded with a wide range of dry grassland wildflowers and Sedum species. Species: A biodiverse green roof should have a ratio of 60:40 between wildflower and sedum species, with the species richness of dry grassland species including >25 wildflower species. A biodiverse green roof should include other habitat features (for example, bricks for solitary nesting bees or logs).

Chapter 4
Results and Interpretation

Biodiversity Net Gain Results

Baseline Assessment

4.1 The baseline calculations of the Site prior to development are outlined below.

The baseline site comprised:

- A total of **4.46** habitat units.

4.2 The key contributors to the baseline habitat units within the Site include:

- The urban individual trees of Good condition (1.52 habitat units) and Moderate condition (2.02 habitat units) equating to a total of 3.54 habitat units (79.37%).

4.3 The remaining units comprised modified grassland in poor condition (0.78 habitat units) and bare ground (0.15 habitat units).

4.4 The Site was mainly comprised of low and very low distinctiveness habitats, with the urban trees comprising the only higher value habitats.

Proposed Assessment

4.5 The proposed scheme will achieve the following units below.

The proposed scheme comprised:

- A total of **4.95** habitat units.

4.6 The key contributors to the uplift in habitat units are:

- Lowland dry acid grassland in good condition (created and enhanced) equating to 1.28 habitat units (25.86%).
- A bioswale in good condition, equating to 0.25 habitat units (5.05%).

4.7 Additionally, the provision of 13 small, moderate condition trees equated to 0.19 habitat units, and the fairly poor condition biodiverse roof equated to 0.18 habitat units.

Site Baseline Comparison

4.8 The change in the Site baseline biodiversity value is outlined below:

The overall net gain within the Site:

- A total of **+0.48 (10.85%)** habitat units.

Overview of Changes

4.9 **Table 4.1** outlines the changes in habitat unit for each habitat distinctiveness.

Table 4.1 Unit Change by Area Habitat Group

Habitat Group	Project Wide Unit Change
Very High Distinctiveness	
Grassland – Lowland dry acid grassland	1.28
Medium Distinctiveness	
Urban – Biodiverse green roof	0.18
Individual trees - Urban Tree	-0.30
Low Distinctiveness	
Grassland – Modified grassland	-0.78
Urban – Bioswale	0.25
Urban – Bare Ground	-0.15

4.10 In addition, trading rules are summarised in **Table 4.2** below.

Table 4.2 Trading Summary

Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Satisfied?
Very High	Bespoke compensation likely to be required	Yes
High	Same habitat required	N/A
Medium	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	Yes
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes
Very Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	N/A

4.11 The scheme has satisfied the trading rules through either ensuring broad habitat compensation has been achieved by providing like-for-like replacements for habitats lost, or providing a habitat of higher distinctiveness. It is imperative that the trading rules are satisfied to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, and to satisfy planning requirements.

Ensuring Deliverance and Securing Gains

4.12 The successful delivery of BNG at the Site would require detailed landscaping plans and the conditioning of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP). This document would specify how the condition targets set through the Defra Statutory Metric will be entered into management in the long term and monitored against set criteria.

4.13 Crucially, the existing levels of protection afforded to protected species and habitats are not changed by use of this or any other metric. Statutory obligations will still need to be satisfied.

4.14 To ensure these recommendations and enhancement opportunities are delivered within the Site, it is recommended that habitat creation and enhancement measures are secured through a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP)[10]. The HMMP sets out:

- How any significant on-Site enhancements will be managed, taking into account any legal restrictions and requirements;
- When and how the habitats will be monitored;
- When and how the monitoring results will be report;
- When and how the management proposals will be reviewed; and
- How the way the management of the habitat will change, so that the habitats or wider outcome are achieved.

[10] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/creating-a-habitat-management-and-monitoring-plan-for-biodiversity-net-gain

4.15 The HMMP tools, including the HMMP report template, checklist and companion document are recommended when creating a HMMP.

Anticipated Management Measures

4.16 The following measures are expected to be included within the HMMP post-planning consent, to ensure that the habitats will achieve their desired condition over the course of the next 30 years, and ensuring health and safety hazards for visitors are taken into account. The final HMMP document is anticipated to contain more mitigation measures, and provide remedial measures should habitats be found to not be meeting their desired condition during monitoring protocols.

Acid Grassland

- Cutting during establishment – to aid development of a dense sward and control growth of ruderal weeds likely to establish with bare ground (e.g. ragwort, thistle, nettle etc.). This will be undertaken bi-monthly during Year 1 based on visual observations during monitoring inspections. Monthly visual checks will be undertaken by TRP Park Management Team to determine whether maintenance is required, or additional action is needed (such as spot pulling of ruderal weeds)
- Selective mowing / strimming of road verges and car park edges to improve visibility and address H&S risks for cyclists, pedestrians etc. This will be facilitated in targeted areas as and when deemed necessary by TRP management team. It is envisioned that 4 cuts may be needed annually during the summer months.
- Deer grazing will be the main managerial method for controlling the sward height, but if necessary, annual cutting and the collection of arisings will be undertaken in July/August subject to growth. Annual monitoring will follow TRPs Grassland Monitoring Protocol as implemented elsewhere in the park (based on a rapid condition assessment methodology using indicator species/characteristics).

Biodiverse Living Roof

- Hand removal of ruderal weeds and invasive scrub (e.g. butterfly-bush, turkey oak, bramble etc.) as required subject to annual quarterly inspections.
- Annual cut and collect (if required) by management team, as a result of findings from TRPs Grassland Monitoring Protocol inspection. Anticipated one cut a year.

Bioswales

- Cutting during establishment – to aid development of a dense sward and control growth of ruderal weeds likely to establish with bare ground (e.g. ragwort, thistle, nettle etc.). This will be undertaken bi-monthly in Year 1.
- Annual cut and collection of arisings, through targeted deer grazing or manual cutting in July/August.

Tree Planting (new planting)

- Watering (trees to be fitted with watering bags or similar) subject to weather conditions. It is anticipated that weekly watering may be required during the summer months for Years 1 – 2, and reducing thereafter for 5 years. Annual tree surveys in accordance with TRP protocols will be undertaken by TRP Arboricultural Officers to determine if any remedial measures or amendments to the current management plan are required.
- Formative pruning if deemed necessary to ensure appropriate growth , such as for vehicles in car parks. This assessment will be undertaken annually by the Arboricultural Officers
- Health and Safety tree management as required in accordance with TRP protocols. These works are usually restricted to Autumn/Winter months unless deemed urgent in regard to Health and Safety requirements

General Management

- Litter collection, weeding and maintenance of paths, drains and roads.

Appendix A
Mapping

Figure A.1 – Baseline UKHab Habitats – 2020 Site Baseline Habitats

Figure A.2 – Baseline UKHab Habitats – 2024 Site Baseline Habitats

Roehampton Café Redevelopment
The Royal Parks

LUC

Figure 1: Baseline habitat plan

Site boundary
Tree line

UKHab habitat area

Grassland - Modified Grassland
Urban - Bare Ground
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
Woodland – Other; broadleaved woodland

12551_001_Ecology/12551_003_r0_Fig01_Baseline_BNG_Habitats_A3L 28/06/2024 EB:holmes_g

Roehampton Café Redevelopment
The Royal Parks

LUC

Figure 2: Proposed habitat plan

Site boundary

Tree line

UKHab habitat area

- Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland
- Green Roof Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland
- Urban – Developed land; sealed surface
- Wetland – Bioswale
- Woodland – Other; broadleaved woodland

Appendix B

Baseline Condition Assessments

Table B.1 Amenity grassland

JNCC PH1 Classification	J1.2 Amenity grassland	Distinctiveness	Low
UKHABS Classification	G4 Modified grassland		
Habitat Description	Areas of amenity grassland were recorded predominantly along the western border of the Site boundary. There were smaller areas of amenity grassland by the café and behind the cycle shed. Grasslands were species-poor, regularly managed for amenity use, and were comprised of common species, including dominant perennial rye grass *Lolium perenne* and cock's-foot *Dactylis glomerata*, abundant false oat-grass *Arrhenatherum elatius* and smaller cat's-tail *Phleum bertolonii*, and locally abundant wall barley *Hordeum murinum*, frequent annual meadow grass *Poa annua*, creeping bent *Agrostis stolonifera*, and hedge mustard *Sisymbrium officinale*, and locally frequent white clover *Trifolium repens*, occasional dandelion *Taraxacum* agg., cleavers *Galium aparine*, cat's ear *Hypochaeris radicata*, and common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*, locally occasional ribwort plantain *Plantago lanceolata*, rare crested dog's-tail *Cynosurus* cristatus, and locally rare dove's-foot crane's-bill *Geranium mole*.. The Western areas of grassland had bare patches due to erosion from recreational use.	Habitat parcel reference	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16
		Area of parcel (ha)	0.337ha
Condition Sheet	GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)	Strategic Significance	Formally identified in local strategy
Limitations	N/A	Condition	Poor
Criteria Number	**Condition Assessment Criteria**	**Passed criteria (Yes or No)**	**Rationale**
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2 present, including at least 2 forbs (this may include those listed in Footnote 1). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.**	No	Less than 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% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	No	Uniform sward height.
C	Some scattered scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) may be present, but scrub accounts for less than 20% of total grassland area.	Yes	Scrub less than 20%.
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.	Yes/No	Less than 5% damage/More than 5% damage.
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)2.	Yes/No	1-10% bare ground/>10% bare ground.
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	No bracken.
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA).	Yes	No invasive non-native plant species.
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		No	
Number of criteria passed		4/5	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)		
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4-6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Poor	

Table B.2 Buildings and Hardstanding

JNCC PH1 Classification	J3.6 Buildings	Distinctiveness	Very low
UKHABS Classification	Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	Strategic Significance	Formally identified in local strategy
Habitat Description	Hardstanding was recorded in the form of a large car park and public footpaths. This habitat dominated the Site, compartmentalising the amenity grassland and buildings within. There were four buildings / structures recorded on Site. These comprised the following: ■ Prefabricated public toilets, situated in an additional area of the red line boundary to the southeast of the main Site. ■ Café building, situated in the centre of the Site. ■ Cycle hire, north adjacent to the café. ■ Cycle shed, north adjacent to the café..	Habitat parcel reference	7, 8, 9, 13 and 19
Condition sheet	No assessment required - condition N/A	Area (Ha)	0.332
Limitations	None	**Condition**	**N/A**

Table B.3 Bare ground

JNCC PH1 Classification	J4 Bare ground	Distinctiveness	Low
UKHABS Classification	U1c Artificial unvegetated unsealed surface / 510 bare ground		
Habitat Description	Bare ground was recorded on Site in the form of small, localised areas within the grassland habitat, resulting from heavy recreational use. Along the western boundary of the Site, there was a bare ground public footpath extending across the entire length of the Site (north to south).	Habitat parcel reference	6, and 17
		Parcel area (ha)	0.065
Condition Sheet	URBAN Habitat type	Strategic Significance	Formally identified within the local strategy
Limitations	N/A	Condition	Poor
Criteria Number	Condition Assessment Criteria	Passed criteria (Yes or No)	Rationale
A	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type	No	No vegetation present.

	does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.		
B	The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial to wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year.	No	No plants present.
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area. **Note – to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).**	Yes	No invasive non-native species or species detrimental to native wildlife present.
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		Yes	
Number of criteria passed		1	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 3 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved	
Passes all 3 core criteria; AND Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Good (3)		
Passes 2 or 3 core criteria OR Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)		
Passes 0 or 1 of 3 criteria.	Poor (1)	Poor	

Table B.4 Urban Individual Trees (Moderate condition)

JNCC PH1 Classification	Broadleaved Scattered Trees	Distinctiveness	Medium
UKHABS Classification	Urban Individual Trees		

Habitat Description	Scattered trees were recorded across the Site, predominantly within the grassland habitats but also within hardstanding. Tree species that were dominant included English oak Quercus robur, with abundant hawthorn Crataegus monogyna and cockspur hawthorn Crataegus crus-galli, occasional sweet chestnut Castanea sativa, hornbeam Carpinus betulus and English elm Ulmus procera, and rare Norway maple Acer platanoides and elder Sambucus nigra. There was a mixture of both young and mature tree species across the site, including one veteran sweet chestnut tree and a dying mature elm tree. The Site presents suitable deadwood habitat especially in the form of veteran trees, which have a higher ecological value due to its importance for stag beetle. The Site presents a line of trees to the south of the Site with dominant hawthorn and cockspur hawthorn, which has potential to be used by foraging and commuting bats, although is limited by the young age of the trees.	Tree ID references	Tree IDs: T30, T40, T41, T46, T47, T103, T106, T109 (medium size) T17, T19, T20, T26, T27, T29, T31, T32, T33, T35, T36, T37, T38, T43, T44, T49, T110, T111, T112 (small size)
		Area of parcel (ha)	0.2199ha
Condition Sheet	Individual Trees (medium distinctiveness)	Strategic Significance	Formally identified in local strategy
Limitations	N/A	Condition	Moderate

Criteria Number	Condition Assessment Criteria	Passed criteria (Yes or No)	Rationale
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes/No	A variety of native and non-native species are present within the Site, that are proposed to be removed to facilitate the scheme
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	Individual trees pass this automatically
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)	No	Semi-mature or young specimens
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	As described
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	Due to age and management, these features/niches are not present on specimens. (health and safety)

F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	As described.
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		N/a	
Number of criteria passed		3 or 4/6	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4	Moderate (2)	Moderate	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	Poor	

Table B.5 Urban Individual Trees (Good condition)

JNCC PH1 Classification	Broadleaved Scattered Trees	Distinctiveness	Medium
UKHABS Classification	Urban Individual Trees		
Habitat Description	Scattered trees were recorded across the Site, predominantly within the grassland habitats but also within hardstanding. Tree species that were dominant included English oak Quercus robur, with abundant hawthorn Crataegus monogyna and cockspur hawthorn Crataegus crus-galli, occasional sweet chestnut Castanea sativa, hornbeam Carpinus betulus and English elm Ulmus procera, and rare Norway maple Acer platanoides and elder Sambucus nigra. There was a mixture of both young and mature tree species across the site, including one veteran sweet chestnut tree and a dying mature elm tree. The Site presents suitable deadwood habitat especially in the form of veteran trees, which have a higher ecological value due to its importance for stag beetle. The Site presents a line of trees to the south of the Site with dominant hawthorn and cockspur hawthorn, which has potential to be used by foraging and commuting bats, although is limited by the young age of the trees.	Tree ID references	Tree IDs: T3, T34 and T42
		Area of parcel (ha)	0.1099ha
Condition Sheet	Individual Trees (medium distinctiveness)	Strategic Significance	Formally identified in local strategy
Limitations	N/A	Condition	Good
Criteria Number	Condition Assessment Criteria	Passed criteria (Yes or No)	Rationale

A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Oak (Quercus robur)
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	Individual trees pass this automatically
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)	Yes	Mature specimens
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	As described
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes	Niche opportunities available such as rot holes and loose bark. General size and mature nature of these specimens will provide opportunities for birds, mammals, invertebrates, lichens and fungi
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	As described.
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		N/A	
Number of criteria passed		6/6	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	Good	
Passes 3 or 4	Moderate (2)	Moderate	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	Poor	

Appendix C
BNG Calculations

Project Name: Roehampton Café, Richmond Park Map Reference:
A-1 On-Site Habitat Baseline

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	0.48
Total Net % Change	10.86%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance				Ecological baseline							Bespoke compensation agreed for losses of VHDH or irreplaceable habitat	Comments		
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Total habitat units	Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost		User comments	Planning authority comments	Habitat reference number
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	0.337	Low	2	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.78	0	0.2	0.00	0.46	0.14	0.32		Modified Grassland: Poor Condition (Amenity Grassland)		
2	Urban	Bare ground	No	0.065	Low	2	Poor	1	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.15	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.15		Bare Ground A fail B fail C pass		
3	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.2199	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (2)	2.02	0.1669	0	1.54	0.00	0.05	0.49		Good condition large trees Tree IDs: T3, T34, T42 A Pass B Pass C Pass D Pass E Pass F Pass		
4	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.1099	Medium	4	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (2)	1.52	0.1099	0	1.52	0.00	0.00	0.00		Moderate condition medium or small trees Tree IDs: T30, T40, T41, T46, T47, T103, T106, T109 (medium size) T17, T19, T20, T26, T27, T29, T31, T32, T33, T35, T36, T37, T38, T43, T44, T49, T110, T111, T112 (small size) A Fail/Pass B Pass C Fail D Pass E Fail F Pass		
5	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	No	0.332	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	Compensation Not Required	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00		Buildings and hardstanding		
6																							
7																							
8																							
9																							
10																							
11																							
			Total habitat area	1.06									4.46	0.28	0.20	3.05	0.46	0.59	0.95				
			Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard structures)	0.73																			

Total area lost (excluding area of individual trees, green walls and intertidal hard structures)	0.53

M² to hectares conversion tool:	Select a	Hectares	M²

Project Name: Roehampton Café, Richmond Park Map Reference:

A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows | Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	0.48
Total Net % Change	10.88%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓
Area Check	Area Acceptable ✓

Note; Habitat selected has a time to target condition greater than 30 years. Non standard agreement may be required.

A 'Fairly' Category has been used - check evidence to ensure this is appropriate ⚠

				Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance		Temporal multiplier					Difficulty multipliers					Comments		
Ref	Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard time to target condition (years)	Habitat created in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat creation (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier	Standard difficulty of creation	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of creation	Difficulty multiplier applied	Habitat units delivered	User comments	Planning authority comments	Habitat reference number
				Post intervention habitats																		
1	Grassland	Lowland dry acid grassland	0.099	V.High	8	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	30+	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	30+	0.320	High	Standard difficulty applied	High	0.33	0.29	Proposed lowland dry acidic grassland		
2	Urban	Biodiverse green roof	0.044	Medium	4	Fairly Poor	1.5	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	3	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	3	0.899	Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	0.18	Proposed acidic grassland roof which will comprise 18 species from an existing seedmix taken from the park, and include the provision of deadwood piles and stone/rubble piles to provide a varied habitat for a variety of species. Equates to moderate condition in Biodiverse Roof categeory, however given that the roof does not 100% align with the Biodiverse Roof specification (sedum compistion), but contains elements of this habitat, would be incorporated within the SSSI's current management plan for acidic grassland, and would be considerably undervalued categorised as "other roof", it has been categorised as a fairly poor condition Biodiverse Roof.		
3	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.332	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	0	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	0	1.000	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.00	Developed land; sealed surfaces		
4	Urban	Bioswale	0.059	Low	2	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	3	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	3	0.899	Medium	Standard difficulty applied	Medium	0.67	0.25	Proposed Bioswale along the southwest of the Site. Predicted Good condition given varied, native species mix of grassland and shrub/flowering species that could be suited to dry and wet conditions.		
5	Individual trees	Urban tree	0.053	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	27	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	27	0.382	Low	Standard difficulty applied	Low	1	0.19	13 small size trees to be planted.		
6																							
7																							
8																							
9																							
10																							
		Total habitat area	0.59																Total Units	0.90			

Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal, hard structures)	0.53

M² to hectares conversion tool:	Select a unit	Hectares	M²

Project Name: Roehampton Café, Richmond Park Map Reference:

A-3 On-Site Habitat Enhancement

Condense / Show Columns | Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	0.49
Total Net % Change	10.88%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Note: Habitat selected has a time to target condition greater than 30 years. Non standard agreement may be required.

Baseline habitats											Post intervention habitats																				
											Proposed Habitat (Broad habitat pre-populated but can be overridden)		Change in distinctiveness and condition						Strategic significance			Temporal risk multiplier						Difficulty risk multipliers				
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Total habitat area (hectares)	Baseline distinctiveness band	Baseline distinctiveness score	Baseline condition category	Baseline condition score	Baseline strategic significance category	Baseline strategic significance score	Baseline habitat units	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Proposed Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Distinctiveness change	Condition change	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic significance multiplier	Standard time to target condition (years)	Habitat enhanced in advance (years)	Delay in starting habitat enhancement (years)	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final time to target multiplier	Standard difficulty of enhancement	Applied difficulty multiplier	Final difficulty of enhancement	Difficulty multiplier applied	Habitat units delivered
1	Grassland - Modified grassland	0.337	Low	2	Poor	1	High strategic significance	1.15	0.78	Some distinctiveness or better habitat required 2	Grassland	Lowland dry acid grassland	Low - V.High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.2	V.High	8	Good	3	Formally identified in local strategy	High strategic significance	1.15	30+	0	0	Standard time to target condition applied	30+	0.333	High	Standard difficulty applied	High	0.33	0.99
														Total habitat area	0.20																	0.99

Comments		
User comments	Planning authority comments	Habitat reference number
Poor condition Modified Grassland to be enhanced to Good condition dry acidic grassland. Management to be in line with that within the Habitat Management Plan (HMP) (which is written for lowland dry acidic grassland) and therefore this habitat will be accounted for within the on-going management of the Site (for which lowland dry acidic grasslands are currently in a favourable condition)		

Roehampton Café, Richmond Park

Headline Results

Scroll down for final results ⚠

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	*Habitat units*	4.46	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	4.95	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	*Habitat units*	0.48	10.85%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Off-site baseline	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	*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)	*Habitat units*	0.48	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	*Habitat units*	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	

FINAL RESULTS

Total net unit change	*Habitat units*	0.48

Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Hedgerow units*	0.00
	Watercourse units	0.00

Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	*Habitat units*	10.85%
	Hedgerow units	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00%

Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	4.46	4.91	0.00	No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Return to results menu

Trading summary hedgerows

Trading summary watercourses

Trading Summary

Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Satisfied?
Very High	Same habitat required – bespoke compensation option ⚠	Yes ✓
High	Same habitat required =	Yes ✓
Medium	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	Yes ✓
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	Yes ✓

Very High Distinctiveness

Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project-wide unit change	Unit losses
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland	Grassland	1.28	0.00	1.28	✓
Grassland - Lowland meadows	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Upland hay meadows	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Mountain heaths and willow scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grasslands	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Limestone pavement	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Blanket bog	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Depressions on peat substrates (H7150)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Lowland raised bog	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Oceanic valley mire[1] (D2.1)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Wood-pasture and parkland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass on peat, clay or chalk	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		1.28	0.00	1.28	0.00

Very High Distinctiveness Summary

Very High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	1.28	✓
Remaining losses; Like for like not satisfied	0.00	

High Distinctiveness

Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project-wide unit change	Losses not yet accounted for
Grassland - Traditional orchards	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430)	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Lowland Heathland	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Upland heathland	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - High alkalinity lakes	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Low alkalinity lakes	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Marl lakes	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Moderate alkalinity lakes	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Peat lakes	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Maritime cliff and slopes	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Wetland - Reedbeds	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Felled/Replacement for felled woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Coastal lagoons - Coastal lagoons	Coastal lagoons	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock	Rocky shore	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral mud	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral mixed sediments	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Coastal saltmarsh - Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds	Coastal saltmarsh	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral biogenic reefs - Sabellaria	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Features of littoral sediment	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral muddy sand	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

High Distinctiveness Summary

High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	0.00	
Remaining losses; Like for like not satisfied	0.00	

Medium Distinctiveness

Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change	Cumulative broad habitat change
Cropland - Arable field margins cultivated annually	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Arable field margins game bird mix	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Cropland - Arable field margins pollen and nectar	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Cropland - Arable field margins tussocky	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Grassland - Upland acid grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Willow scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lakes - Reservoirs	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.18 ✓
Urban - Biodiverse green roof	Urban	0.18	0.00	0.18	
Individual trees - Urban tree	Individual trees	-0.30	0.00	-0.30	-0.30 ⚠
Individual trees - Rural tree	Individual trees	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Littoral sand	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)	Intertidal hard structures	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		-0.12	0.00	-0.12	

Medium Distinctiveness Summary

Medium Distinctiveness Units available to offset Lower Distinctiveness Deficit	0.18	✓
Medium Distinctiveness Broad Habitat losses to be offset by trading up	-0.30	⚠
Higher Distinctiveness Surplus Units minus Medium Distinctiveness Broad Habitat Deficit	0.98	✓
Cumulative surplus of units	1.16	✓

Low Distinctiveness

Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change
Cropland - Cereal crops	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Horticulture	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Intensive orchards	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Non-cereal crops	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Temporary grass and clover leys	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cropland - Winter stubble	Cropland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland	-0.78	0.00	-0.78 ⚠
Grassland - Bracken	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00
Heathland and shrub - Rhododendron scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond	Lakes	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/ephemeral	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs	Sparsely vegetated land	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Bioswale	Urban	0.25	0.00	0.25 ✓
Urban - Bare ground	Urban	-0.15	0.00	-0.15 ⚠
Urban - Allotments	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00

Low Distinctiveness Summary

Low Distinctiveness net change in units	-0.68	⚠
Cumulative surplus of units	0.48	✓

Urban - Facade-bound green wall	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Ground based green wall	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Ground level planters	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Other green roof	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Intensive green roof	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Introduced shrub	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Rain garden	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Actively worked sand pit quarry or open cast mine	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Sustainable drainage system	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Vacant or derelict land	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Urban - Vegetated garden	Urban	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland	Woodland and forest	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coastal saltmarsh - Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds	Coastal saltmarsh	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral mud	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral sand	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral muddy sand	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral mixed sediments	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral biogenic reefs	Intertidal sediment	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures	Intertidal hard structures	0.00	0.00	0.00
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial features of hard structures	Intertidal hard structures	0.00	0.00	0.00
Heathland and shrub - Other sea buckthorn scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00
		-0.68	0.00	-0.68