HABITAT WORKS

Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

30th August 2024

PREPARED BY: JOE TRAVIS BSc (Hons), MSc, ACIEEM, SENIOR ECOLOGIST

Habitat Works Ltd

Issued By: Joe Travis



Date: 28th August 2024

_____

Approved By: Stuart Silver

Date: 30th August 2024

Contents

Executive Summary

Habitat Works Limited (Habitat Works) was commissioned in July 2024 by Paul Matthews Architectural to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) for approximately 632 m^2 area of the land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield, South Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 27620 05074), hereafter referred to as 'the Site'.

This BNGA has been carried out to determine the potential change in biodiversity value of the Site based upon the proposed development and associated post development habitats, using the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 'Small Sites Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric): User Guide' (SSM) (February, 2024).

The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing '*Proposed Block Plan*' (Dwg No. 24/1017/03, dated June 2024). The proposals are for the construction of a new agricultural livestock shed.

The total area of the Site has been calculated at 632 m^2 and baseline area-based habitats recorded for the Site comprise '*Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface*', '*Grassland – Modified grassland*' and '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface*'.

It is anticipated that the proposals will see the partial loss of '*Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface'*. Post-development area-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface*'. Post-development linear-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Species-rich native hedgerow*'.

The current proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.0668 HU and 0.2008 HeU, representing a net change of ±0.0000 HU and +0.2008 HeU, equating to a no net change in HU (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000); failing to meet the 10% net gain requirement.

In order to achieve a 10 % net gain, alterations are required to achieve the 10% net gain in HU on the Site. The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon suggested alterations to the post-development proposals as show in the '*Proposed Block Plan*', as a possible way to achieve the 10% net gain on the Site. A summary of these calculations is provided in Appendix 3.

The recommended alterations post-development comprise the shortening of the proposed hedgerow by 5 m, and planting a single small '*Individual trees – Urban/rural tree*' in its place.

Recommended alterations to the proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.0792 HU and 0.2008 HeU, representing a net change of +0.0124 HU and +0.1674 HeU, equating to a +18.62% gain of HU (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000); exceeding the 10% net gain requirement.

1. Introduction

1.1 *Background*

1.1.1 Habitat Works Limited (Habitat Works) was commissioned in July 2024 by Paul Matthews Architectural to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) for approximately 632 m^2 area of the land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield, South Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 27620 05074), hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and as displayed in Figure 1. This BNGA has been carried out to determine the potential change in biodiversity value of the Site based upon the proposed development and associated post development habitats, using the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) 'Small Sites Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric): User Guide' (SSM) (February, 2024).

1.1.2 The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing 'Proposed Block Plan' (Dwg No. 24/1017/03, dated June 2024). The proposals are for the construction of an agricultural livestock building.

1.1.3 This report details the results of the BNGA using biodiversity metric calculations which have been completed based upon the Habitat Works site walkover undertaken in August 2024, and calculations of the post-development habitats taken from the 'Proposed Block Plan'. The methodologies employed and all survey findings are described along with an evaluation and assessment of the biodiversity value of the Site. Any recommendations with regard to ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) are also detailed as required.

2. Methodology

2.1 *Background*

2.1.1 This BNGA uses the industry recognised best practice methodology within the (DEFRA) '*Small Sites Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric): User Guide*' (SSM) (February, 2024).

2.1.2 The Small Sites Metric (SSM) or Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) uses habitat features as a measure for their importance and value to nature. The following information on each habitat are required for the metric input:

- Habitat type;
- Irreplaceable habitat;
- Area/length;
- Habitat distinctiveness (automatically calculated);
- Habitat condition; and,
- Strategic significance.

2.2 *Biodiversity Metric Inputs*

Habitat Type

Baseline

2.2.1 The Site was surveyed on 2nd August 2024 by Senior Ecologist Joe Travis BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM.

2.2.2 The Site visit included an ecological walkover survey using the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) system (Butcher *et al.,* 2020) and was conducted as part of the PEA survey. The habitats present on the Site were identified and classified according to the UKHab system which closely aligns with the SSM. The baseline habitats are displayed in Figure 1.

2.2.3 The SBM uses a classification system based mainly on the UKHab with inputs from other systems including the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Lakes Typology (UKTAG, 2003); the European Nature Information System (EUNIS) habitat type hierarchical view (EEA, 2109; and Natura 2000 Annex I habitats (JNCC, 2019) in addition to further habitats specific to the SSM.

Post-Development

2.2.4 Proposals for the Site have been assessed and habitats present post-development have been based upon the '*Proposed Block Plan*' and using best knowledge of the likely habitats to be created/retained/lost.

2.2.5 The post-development habitats were classified according to the habitat classification system used by the SSM.

Habitat Area/Length

2.2.6 The Site was surveyed on 2nd August 2024 by Senior Ecologist Joe Travis BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM.

2.2.7 The area/length of each baseline and post-development habitat type was mapped using QGIS 3.34.5 '*Prizren*' Geographical Information System (GIS). Area habitats are recorded in metres squared (m^2) and linear habitats are recorded in metres (m) as per the SSM calculator.

Habitat Condition

2.2.8 The condition of a habitat is the measure of the biological 'working order' of a habitat judged against the perceived ecological optimum for that particular habitat. The condition assessments were undertaken using the '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annexe 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology*' spreadsheet (February, 2024). In the SSM, habitat condition is not necessary for baseline habitats, and is only required for post-development habitats.

Post-Development

2.2.9 The condition that post-development habitats have been assigned is based upon reasonable and the likely habitat condition in line with the condition assessment criteria. The condition of each habitat was assessed and either calculated as 'Good', 'Moderate' or 'Poor', where appropriate. Within the SSM, some habitats are not suitable for condition assessment, and as such are automatically calculated as either '*Condition Assessment N/A*' or '*N/A – Other*'.

2.2.10 If a habitat type varied in condition within the Site, these habitats were mapped and recorded separately to allow this distinction.

Habitat Strategic Significance

2.2.11 The SSM accounts for whether the habitats is situated within an area locally identified as significant for nature conservation.

2.2.12 Data on the areas and habitats locally identified as significant for nature conservation were obtained from the following sources:

- Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website for mapped statutory designated sites (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx); and,
- Habitats listed within the Sheffield Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP).

3. Biodiversity Metric Calculations

3.1 *Background*

3.1.1 Biodiversity metric calculations provide a numerical score for the value of existing habitats on the Site and their likely value post-development in Habitat Units (HU), Hedgerow Units (HeU) and Watercourse Units (WU) (where present and applicable), in order to quantitively assess the impact of the proposed development.

3.1.2 Using the SSM, habitat values are calculated via the criteria described within Sections 2.1 and 2.2. This results in individual scores for each habitat, and subsequently baselines for HU, HeU and WU (where present and appropriate).

3.1.3 The post-development value can also be calculated for habitats where factors including time to target condition and difficulty of creation/enhancement are also taken into consideration. The values for area habitats and linear habitats are calculated separately. This provides an overall picture of the biodiversity net gain or loss as a result of a development. To achieve BNG, all three of HU, HeU and WU are treated individually, and individual gains cannot be combined to form an overall gain for the Site.

3.2 *Trading Rules*

3.2.1 The SSM considers distinctiveness as described earlier and using this data, SSM applies trading rules that require that any habitat loss is replaced on a 'like for like' or 'like for better' basis. The trading rules are detailed below in Table 1.

Table 1 – Trading Rules within the SSM

Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rules
Very High	Bespoke compensation likely to be required
High	Same habitat required
Medium	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat requires
Very Low	Compensation not required

3.3 *Assumptions and Limitations*

3.3.1 For strategic significance, all habitats on the Site (both baseline and post-development) have been considered '*Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy*' as they do not qualify as priority habitats and are not identified on any strategic plans.

3.3.2 The quantification of biodiversity is one of several factors to be considered when assessing the impact of the proposed development on biodiversity. Note that this BNGA does not cover potential impacts of the proposed development on protected species and designated sites.

3.3.3 The information contained within this report is considered valid for a period of 24 months from the date of the survey visit (CIEEM, 2019). If the development has not commenced by August 2026, it is recommended that the Site is fully re-surveyed to determine if there have been any significant changes to baseline habitats within that timeframe.

4. Findings and Evaluation

4.1 *Baseline Habitats*

4.1.1 Baseline area-based habitats recorded for the Site comprise, 'Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface', 'Grassland – Modified grassland' and 'Urban – Developed land; sealed surface' and (see Figure 1).

4.1.2 The total area of the Site has been calculated at 632 m^2. The habitat type, irreplaceability, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 2. Baseline area-based habitats have a biodiversity value of 0.0668 HU.

Table 2 – Site Baseline Area-based Habitats and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	**Area (m^2)**	**Habitat Units (HU)**
Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	388	0.00
Grassland – Modified grassland	167	0.07
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	77	0.00
Total Habitat Units (HU)		0.0668

**Individual habitat HU are rounded to two decimal places, however the calculator outputs the Site's total HU to four decimal places.*

4.2 *Post-development Habitats*

4.2.1 The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon the post-development proposals as show in the '*Proposed Block Plan*'. A summary of the calculations is provided in Appendix 2.

4.2.2 It is anticipated that the proposals will see the partial loss of '*Urban – Bare ground*' habitats currently present on the Site.

4.2.3 Post-development area-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface*'.

4.2.4 The predicted area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 3. The post-development area-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.0668 HU and are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 3 – Post-development Area-based Habitats Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Condition	Area (m^2)	Habitat Units (HU)
Lost			
Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	-	209	0.0000
Created			
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	209	0.0000
Total Change in Habitat Units (HU)			±0.0000

4.2.5 Post-development linear-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Species-rich native hedgerow*'.

4.2.6 The predicted area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and Hedgerow Units (HeU) of the linear-based habitats are provided within Table 4. The post-development linear-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.2008 HeU and are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 4 – Post-development Linear-based Habitats Condition and Hedgerow Units

Habitat Type	Condition	Length (m)	Hedgerow Units (HeU)
Created			
Species-rich native hedgerow	Moderate	30	0.2008
Total Change in Hedgerow Units (HeU)			+0.2008

4.3 *Net Change in Biodiversity*

4.3.1 Considering the reasonable assumptions and estimates made within this report as soft landscape drawings were not available at the time writing the construction of the proposed development is predicted to result in a net unit change of ±0.0000 HU and +0.2008 HeU which is a net percentage change of ±0.00% (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000), as detailed in Table 5.

Table 5 – Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

Habitat Type	Baseline Units	Post-development Units	Change in Units	% Change in Units
Habitat Units (HU)	0.0668	0.0668	±0.0000	±0.00%
Hedgerow Units (HeU)	0.0000	0.2008	+0.2008	N/A

4.3.2 For the Site to achieve a greater than 10% net gain in HU, a total of 0.2411 HU would have to be proposed post development. This leaves a deficit of 0.1055 HU, as detailed in Table 6.

Table 6 – Summary of Biodiversity Units required Post-development

Habitat Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit as per Current Proposals
Habitat Units (HU)	10.00%	0.0668	0.0735	0.0067

4.4 *Recommended Changes to Post-development Habitats*

4.4.1 In order to achieve a 10 % net gain, alterations are required to achieve the 10% net gain in HU on the Site. The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon suggested alterations to the post-development proposals as show in the '*Proposed Block Plan*', as a possible way to achieve the 10% net gain on the Site. A summary of these calculations is provided in Appendix 3.

4.4.2 The recommended alterations post-development comprise the shortening of the proposed hedgerow by 5 m, and planting a single small '*Individual trees – Urban/rural tree*' in its place. This will increase the HU on the Site, whilst not significantly impacting the gain in HeU provided by the proposed '*Species-rich native hedgerow*'. All other habitat changes will remain the same.

4.4.3 The recommended area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 7. The post-development area-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.0668 HU and are displayed within Figure 3.

Table 7 – Recommended Post-development Area-based Habitats Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Condition	Area (m^2)	Habitat Units (HU)
Lost			
Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	-	209	0.0000
Created			
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	209	0.0000
Individual trees – Urban/rural tree	Moderate	40.69	0.0124
Total Change in Habitat Units (HU)			+0.0124

4.4.4 Post-development linear-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Species-rich native hedgerow*'.

4.4.5 The recommended linear-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and Hedgerow Units (HeU) of the linear-based habitats are provided within Table 8. The post-development linear-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.1.674 HeU and are displayed within Figure 3.

Table 8 – Recommended Post-development Linear-based Habitats Condition and Hedgerow Units

Habitat Type	Condition	Length (m)	Hedgerow Units (HeU)
Created			
Species-rich native hedgerow	Moderate	25	0.1674
Total Change in Hedgerow Units (HeU)			+0.1674

4.5 *Net Change in Biodiversity of Recommendations*

4.5.1 Considering the reasonable assumptions and estimates made within this report of recommended changes to the proposed development, it is predicted that the proposed development will result in a net unit change of ±0.0000 HU and +0.2008 HeU which is a net percentage change of ±0.00% (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000), as detailed in Table 9.

Table 9 – Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

Habitat Type	Baseline Units	Post-development Units	Change in Units	% Change in Units
Habitat Units (HU)	0.0668	0.0792	+0.0.124	+18.62%
Hedgerow Units (HeU)	0.0000	0.2008	+0.2008	N/A

5. Discussion and Recommendations

5.1 *Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Delivery*

5.1.1 The current proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.0668 HU and 0.2008 HeU, representing a net change of ±0.0000 HU and +0.2008 HeU, equating to a -±0.00 no change of HU (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000); failing to meet the 10% net gain requirement.

5.1.2 Recommended alterations to the proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.0792 HU and 0.2008 HeU, representing a net change of +0.0124 HU and +0.1674 HeU, equating to a +18.62% gain of HU (N/A for HeU given a baseline score of 0.0000); exceeding the 10% net gain requirement

5.2 *Discussion*

5.2.1 Given the current proposals, it is not considered that a 10% net gain in HU on Site would be achievable.

5.2.2 Small changes to the proposed layout comprising shortening of the '*Species-rich native hedgerow*' from 30 m to 25 m, to allow space for the planting of a small '*Individual trees – Urban/rural tree*'. This small change to the proposals would be sufficient to achieve the necessary gains in biodiversity on the Site post development.

5.3 *Habitat Management and Monitoring*

5.3.1 Ordinarily, the production of a Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (BEMP) is recommended to ensure that the Site habitats deliver the habitat scores listed within the final design stage BNGA. However, given that the proposed hedgerow is the only habitat that requires condition assessment and this is not integral to the Site achieving the necessary BNG, a BEMP is not considered necessary in this instance.

5.4 *BNG Good Practice Principles*

5.4.1 Appendix 1 details the BNG Good Practice Principles (CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA, 2016) which should be adhered to when undertaking BNGAs in association with proposed developments The actions within Appendix 1 should be taken into account throughout the design stage of a development at this Site.

6. References

CIEEM (2019). '*Advice Note: On the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys*'. Charted Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester. Available: https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Advice-Note.pdf

CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA (2016). '*Biodiversity Net Gain – Good practice principles for development*'. Available: https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf

DEFRA (2011). '*Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services*. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78c263ed915d04220651ea/pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-111111.pdf

DEFRA (2018). '*A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65fd713d65ca2f00117da89e/CD1.H_HM_Government_A_Green_Future_Our_25_Year_Plan_to_Improve_the_Environment.pdf

DEFRA (2024) '*The Small Sites Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric): User Guide*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65c60ec19c5b7f0012951bdd/The_Small_Sites_Metric__Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric__-_User_Guide.pdf

Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) (2023). '*National Planning Policy Framework*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a11af7e8f5ec000f1f8c46/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

European Environment Agency (EEA) (2023). '*Eunis habitat distribution plots (spatial data)*'. Available: https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/datahub/datahubitem-view/ce3e4bf4-e929-404a-88c7-37f2c614fd1d

DEFRA (2011). '*Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services*. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78c263ed915d04220651ea/pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-111111.pdf

His Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) (2006). '*Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*'. Available: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/pdfs/ukpga_20060016_en.pdf

HMSO (2024). '*The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024*'. Available: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2024/48/pdfs/uksi_20240048_en.pdf

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2019). '*Annex I Habitats List*'. Available: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/habitat/

Natural England (2024). '*The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment*

Sheets and Methodology'. Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides

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

UK Technical Advisory Group (UKTAG) on the Water Framework Directive (2003). '*Guidance on Typology for Lakes for the UK*'. Available: https://www.wfduk.org/sites/default/files/Media/Characterisation%20of%20the%20water%20environment/Lakes%20typology_Final_010604.pdf

Figure 1. Baseline Habitats Map



Legend

- Site Boundary
- Grassland - Modified grassland
- Urban - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface

0 5 10 15 20 m

HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews Architectural

Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield

Figure 1
Baseline Habitat Map

August 2024 | Scale - 1: 400 @ A4 | Drawing Reference: 240815/F1/JT

Figure 2. Post-development Habitats Map



Legend

- Site Boundary
- Grassland - Modified grassland
- Urban - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface (buildings)
- Hedgerow - Species-rich native hedgerow

0 5 10 15 20 m

HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews Architectural

Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield

Figure 2
Post-development Habitat Map

Figure 3. Recommended Changes Post-development Habitats Map



Legend

- Site Boundary
- Grassland - Modified grassland
- Urban - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface (buildings)
- Hedgerow - Species-rich native hedgerow
- Individual trees - Urban/rural tree

0 5 10 15 20 m

HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews Architectural

Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield

Figure 3
Recommended Changes Post-development Habitats Map

Appendix 1. BNG Good Practice Principles

The BNG Good practice principles for development are based upon issued joint guidance from the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) and the Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (IEEMA) (CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA, 2019).

The Good practice principles for development outlines 10 principles which should be followed to ensure that BNG is undertaken in the most beneficial and appropriate manner possible. These principles are outlined in the table below.

Principle	Description
Principle 1. **Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy**	Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision-makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensating for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature conservation, then offset biodiversity losses by gains elsewhere.
Principle 2. **Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere**	Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity – these impacts cannot be offset to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain.
Principle 3. **Be inclusive and equitable**	Engage stakeholders early, and involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Net Gain. Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible, and share the benefits fairly among stakeholders.
Principle 4. **Address risks**	Mitigate difficulty, uncertainty and other risks to achieving Net Gain. Apply well-accepted ways to add contingency when calculating biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and the gains being fully realised.
Principle 5. **Make a measurable Net Gain contribution**	Achieve a measurable, overall gain[1] for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing to wards nature conservation priorities. *[1] – Net Gain has been described as a measurable target for development projects where impacts on biodiversity are outweighed by a clear mitigation hierarchy approach to first avoid then minimise impacts, including through restoration and / or compensation. Adhering to these Net Gain principles (i.e. pursuing all principles together) will help in under-pinning good practice for achieving and sustaining Net Gain.*
Principle 6. **Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity**	Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly-justified choices when: • Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses • Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation

	• Achieving Net Gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regional and national levels • Enhancing existing or creating new habitat • Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity
Principle 7. **Be additional**	Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. do not deliver something that would occur anyway).
Principle 8. **Create a Net Gain legacy**	Ensure Net Gain generates long-term benefits by: • Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure Net Gain in perpetuity[2] • Planning for adaptive management and securing dedicated funding for long-term management • Designing Net gain for biodiversity to be resilient to external factors, especially climate change • Mitigating risks for other land uses • Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another • Supporting local-level management of Net Gain activities *[2] – Biodiversity compensation should be planned for a sustained Net Gain over the longest possible timeframe. For development in the UK, the expectation is that compensating sites will be secures for at least the lifetime of the development (e.g. often 25-30 years) with the objective of Net Gain management continuing in the future.*
Principle 9. **Optimise sustainability**	Prioritise Biodiversity Net Gain and, where possible, optimise the wider environmental benefits for a sustainable society and economy.
Principle 10. **Be Transparent**	Communicate all Net Gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders.

Appendix 2. Biodiversity Metric Calculations Summary

Site Name		Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield
Sheet Name		Headline Results

Headline Results

Headline		BNG Targets Not Met ▲
Trading Rules		Trading Rules Satisfied ✓
Next steps		Scheme alterations or offsite units required
Baseline Units	*Habitat units*	0.0668
	Hedgerow units	Zero Units Baseline
	Watercourse units	Zero Units Baseline
Post-development Units	*Habitat units*	0.0668
	Hedgerow units	0.2008
	Watercourse units	0.0000
Total net unit change	*Habitat units*	0.0000
	Hedgerow units	0.2008
	Watercourse units	0.0000
Total net % change	*Habitat units*	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	% target not appropriate
	Watercourse units	% target not appropriate
Habitats units required to meet target		0.0067
Hedgerow units required to meet target		0.0000
Watercourse units required to meet target		0.0000

Chart 1 - Unit change by habitat group



Appendix 3. Biodiversity Metric Calculations Summary following Recommended Changes

Site Name		Land off Barnsley Road, Sheffield
Sheet Name		Headline Results

Headline Results

Headline	BNG Targets Met ✓
Trading Rules	Trading Rules Satisfied ✓
Next steps	Check for input errors/rule breaks present in the metric ⚠

Baseline Units	*Habitat units*	0.0668
	Hedgerow units	Zero Units Baseline
	Watercourse units	Zero Units Baseline
Post-development Units	*Habitat units*	0.0792
	Hedgerow units	0.1674
	Watercourse units	0.0000
Total net unit change	*Habitat units*	0.0124
	Hedgerow units	0.1674
	Watercourse units	0.0000
Total net % change	*Habitat units*	18.62%
	Hedgerow units	% target not appropriate
	Watercourse units	% target not appropriate

Habitats units required to meet target	0.0000
Hedgerow units required to meet target	0.0000
Watercourse units required to meet target	0.0000

Chart 1 - Unit change by habitat group