

Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment



HABITAT WORKS

August 2026



Report Title: Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Report to: Paul Matthews Architectural
Malkin Farm, Brow Lane,
Holmfirth
HD9 2RJ

Version: V4.0

Issue Date: August 2026

Prepared by:

Ashleigh Brentnall BSc (Hons), ACIEEM

Consultant Ecologist

Date: 11.08.2026

**Reviewed and
Approved by:**

Joe Travis BSc (Hons), MSc, ACIEEM

Ecology Team Manager

Date: 15.08.2026

Prepared by:
Habitat Works, Suite 12, Westleigh House, Denby Dale, Huddersfield HD8 8QJ

Version History	Author	Description	Date
V1.0	Ellie Collier	Final Version for Issue	07.11.2024
V2.0	Ellie Collier	Final Version for Issue with New Layout Proposals	30.01.2025
V3.0	Ashleigh Brentnall	Final Version for Issue Following Changes to Layout Proposals	27.02.2026
V4.0	Ashleigh Brentnall	Final Version for Issue Following inclusion of Individual Trees	10.08.2026

Works carried out by Habitat Works on behalf of the client in accordance with the agreed terms of contract and/or written agreement establish the agreed Services. The Services were performed by Habitat Works with the skill and care ordinarily exercised by a reasonably qualified Consultant at the time the Services were performed. Further, the Services were performed by Habitat Works taking into account the limits of the scope of works required by the client, the time scale involved and the resources agreed between Habitat Works and the client.

Other than that expressly contained in the paragraph above, Habitat Works provides no other representation or warranty whether express or implied, in relation to the Services.

This report is produced exclusively for the purposes of the client. Habitat Works is not aware of any interest of or reliance by any party other than the client in or on the Services. Unless expressly provided in writing, Habitat Works does not authorise, consent or condone any party other than the client relying upon the services provided. Any reliance on the services or any part of the services by any party other than the client is made wholly at that party's own risk and Habitat Works disclaims any liability to such parties.

This report is based on Site conditions, regulatory or other legal provisions, technology or economic conditions at the time of the Service provision. These conditions can change with time and reliance on the findings of the Services under changing conditions should be reviewed. The recommended lifetime of the report is detailed within the report text.

Habitat Works accepts no responsibility for the accuracy of any third-party data used in this report.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN ASSESSMENT	1
1.3 RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND POLICY	1
2. METHODOLOGY.....	3
2.1 BACKGROUND.....	3
2.2 BIODIVERSITY METRIC INPUTS	3
3. BIODIVERSITY METRIC CALCULATIONS.....	5
3.1 BACKGROUND.....	5
3.2 TRADING RULES.....	5
3.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	5
4. FINDINGS AND EVALUATION	7
4.1 APPLICATION BOUNDARY - BASELINE HABITATS	7
4.2 ADDITIONAL LANDHOLDINGS - BASELINE HABITATS	7
4.3 APPLICATION BOUNDARY - POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS.....	7
4.4 ADDITIONAL LANDHOLDINGS - POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS	8
4.5 NET CHANGE IN BIODIVERSITY	9
5. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
5.1 SUMMARY OF BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN DELIVERY	10
5.2 HABITAT MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING	10
5.3 BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES.....	10
6. REFERENCES.....	11
FIGURE 1. BASELINE HABITATS MAP	12
FIGURE 2. POST-DEVELOPMENT HAB MAP (APPLICATION BOUNDARY)	14
FIGURE 3. POST-DEVELOPMENT HAB MAP (ADDITIONAL LANDHOLDINGS)	16
APPENDIX 1. BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES	18
APPENDIX 2. BIODIVERSITY METRIC CALCULATIONS SUMMARY.....	20

Executive Summary

Habitat Works Ltd was originally commissioned in October 2024 by Paul Matthews Architecture to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) of an area of land to the east of Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine, Sheffield, South Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 24856 05306), hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and as displayed in Figure 1.

Following changes to the proposed layout, Habitat Works has undertaken a total of four BNGAs for the proposals, issued in November 2024, January 2025, February 2026 and August 2026 respectively.

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) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024). Habitat Works Ltd was originally commissioned in October 2024 by Paul Matthews Architecture to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) of an area of land to the east of Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine, Sheffield, South Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 24856 05306), hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and as displayed in Figure 1.

Following changes to the proposed layout, Habitat Works has undertaken a total of four BNGAs for the proposals, issued in November 2024, January 2025, February 2026 and August 2026 respectively.

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) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024). The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing '*Proposed Block Plan*' (Dwg No. 26/1301/03a, dated 02/2026). The BNG is required to inform proposals for the construction of an agricultural livestock building.

The total area of the Site has been calculated at 0.13 ha and baseline area-based habitats recorded for the Site comprise '*Grassland – Modified grassland*' (see Figure 1). An area of additional land is available immediately south of the site, which has been calculated as 0.06 ha. With the partial retention of '*Grassland – Modified grassland*' on-site and the creation of '*Individual Trees – Urban Tree*' within the Additional Landholdings, the current proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.38 HU, representing a net change of +0.04 HU and +0.33 HeU, equating to a +14.30% gain; exceeding the 10% net gain requirement.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Habitat Works Ltd was originally commissioned in October 2024 by Paul Matthews Architecture to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) of an area of land to the east of Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine, Sheffield, South Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 24856 05306), hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and as displayed in Figure 1.
- 1.1.2 Following changes to the proposed layout, Habitat Works has undertaken a total of four BNGAs for the proposals, issued in November 2024, January 2025, February 2026, and August 2026 respectively.
- 1.1.3 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) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024).
- 1.1.4 The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing '*Proposed Block Plan*' (Dwg No. 26/1301/03a, dated 02/2026). The BNG is required to inform proposals for the construction of an agricultural storage building.
- 1.1.5 This report details the results of the BNGA using biodiversity metric calculations which have been completed based upon a site walkover undertaken on 1st October 2024 by Graduate Ecologist Ellie Collier BSc (Hons), 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 regarding ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) are also detailed where required.

1.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

- 1.2.1 Under the Environment Act 2021, and enforceable since February 2024, developments are required to achieve a minimum 10% BNG to ensure that biodiversity value of habitats post-development is greater than pre-development habitats. BNG calculations are conducted through assessing the condition of habitats present on a site and comparing with the anticipated changes based upon the proposals for the site development. A mitigations hierarchy is followed during a BNGA, which states that everything possible must be done to firstly avoid, secondly minimise and thirdly restore/rehabilitate losses of biodiversity on a site. Only failing these steps should any losses in biodiversity be compensated via habitat creation off-site, whether this be either additional land under the landowner's ownership or paying a financial sum to a third party offset provider. BNGA reports should adhere to the BNG good practice principles (Appendix 1).
- 1.2.2 BNGAs account for biodiversity losses, which previously might not be fully assessed or mitigated for via legal and planning systems. While some species and habitats are afforded legislative protection, many and most habitats are not, resulting in developments being 'legally compliant' whilst simultaneously resulting in significant biodiversity losses. BNGAs guard against this, enabling developments to contribute towards national and global targets of halting biodiversity loss (DEFRA, 2011) and towards local and national strategies for conserving and enhancing wildlife. BNGAs allow stakeholders to demonstrate adherence to national legislation and local planning policy surrounding biodiversity.

1.3 Relevant Legislation and Policy

- 1.3.1 Under the Environment Act 2021, and enforceable since February 2024, developments are required to

achieve a minimum 10% BNG to ensure that biodiversity value of habitats post-development is greater than pre-development habitats. This BNGA has been compiled with reference to the following relevant nature conservation legislation, planning policy, and UK Biodiversity Framework from which the protection of habitats and species is derived in England including:

- UK Government's 25 Year Environment Plan (DEFRA, 2018);
- Biodiversity 2020: A Strategy for England's Wildlife and Ecosystem Services (DEFRA, 2011);
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DLUHC, 2023);
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (HMSO, 2006), and
- The Environment Act (DEFRA, 2021).

2. Methodology

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 This BNGA uses the industry recognised best practice methodology within the (DEFRA) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024).
- 2.1.2 The 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 1st October 2024 by Graduate Ecologist Eleanor Collier BSc (Hons). Additional photographs were provided of the Site by the client in February 2026 to confirm there had been no change in habitat since this initial survey.
- 2.2.2 The Site visit included an ecological walkover survey using the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) system (Butcher *et al.*, 2020). The habitats present on the Site were identified and classified according to the UKHab system which closely aligns with the SBM. 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 SBM.

Post-Development

- 2.2.4 Proposals for the Site have been assessed, and habitats present post-development have been based upon the '*Proposed Overall Site Plan*' drawings 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 SBM.

Habitat Area/Length

- 2.2.6 The area/length of each baseline and post-development habitat type was mapped using QGIS 3.40.4 '*Bratislava*' Geographical Information System (GIS). Area habitats are recorded in hectares (ha) and linear habitats are recorded in kilometres (km) as per the SBM calculator.

Habitat Condition

- 2.2.7 The condition of a habitat is the measure of the biological 'working order' of a habitat judged against the perceived ecological optimum for that habitat. The condition assessments were undertaken using the '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology*'

spreadsheet (February 2024).

Post-Development

- 2.2.8 The condition that post-development habitats have been assigned is based upon reasonable assumptions of 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 SBM, some habitats are not suitable for condition assessment, and as such are automatically calculated as either '*Condition Assessment N/A*' or '*N/A – Other*'.
- 2.2.9 If a habitat type varied in condition within the Site, these habitats were mapped and recorded separately to allow this distinction.

Habitat Strategic Significance

- 2.2.10 The SBM accounts for whether the habitats are situated within an area locally identified as significant for nature conservation.
- 2.2.11 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 Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan.

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), to quantitatively assess the impact of the proposed development.
- 3.1.2 Using the SBM, 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 Individual trees are classified as either '*Urban Tree*' or '*Rural Tree*', depending on the extent of urbanisations surrounding them. The size of an individual tree is dependent on the diameter of the trunk at breast height (centimetres), and categorised as either '*Small*', '*Medium*', '*Large*' or '*Very Large*'. A biodiversity metric area equivalent in hectares is automatically calculated within the SBM dependant on the number of trees and their individual sizes. This area is a separate measurement to other habitat areas and as such, is not included within the total habitat area of the Site.
- 3.1.4 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 because 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 SBM considers distinctiveness as described earlier and using this data, SBM 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 SBM

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 Due to the survey being undertaken outside of the optimal survey period, sufficient information to characterise the habitats present to assess their likely contribution to the biodiversity interest of the area

is usually not possible for all habitats. However, due to the nature of the habitats present, it is considered that this is a valid and fair representation of the habitats present.

- 3.3.4 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 June 2028, 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 Application Boundary - Baseline Habitats

Baseline Area-based Habitats

- 4.1.1 Baseline area-based habitats recorded within the application boundary of the comprise 'Grassland – Modified grassland' (see Figure 1). The Site is comprised of an area of short sward modified grassland. The grassland is regularly grazed and is species poor. Species recorded within the grassland included Perennial ryegrass *Lolium perenne* (A), Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus* (F) and Creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* (O).
- 4.1.2 The total area of land the within the application boundary of the Site has been calculated at 0.13 ha. The habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 2. Baseline area-based habitats have a biodiversity value of 0.23 HU.

Table 2 – Application Boundary Baseline Area-based Habitats, Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.13	0.26
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.26

4.2 Additional Landholdings - Baseline Habitats

Baseline Area-based Habitats

- 4.2.1 An area of additional land under the ownership of the client is present close to the Site where planting is more suitable to offset the losses in HU associated with the development (Figure 1). The Baseline area-based habitats recorded within the additional landholdings are solely comprised of 'Grassland – Modified grassland' (see Figure 1).
- 4.2.2 The total area of land the within the additional landholdings boundary of the Site has been calculated at 0.06 ha. The habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 3. Baseline area-based habitats have a biodiversity value of 0.12 HU.

Table 3 – Additional Landholdings Baseline Area-based Habitats, Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.06	0.12
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.12

4.3 Application Boundary - Post-Development Habitats

Post-Development Area-based Habitats

- 4.3.1 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' drawing. A summary of the calculations is provided in Appendix 2.
- 4.3.2 The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon the partial loss of 'Grassland – Modified grassland' to facilitate the proposals for the creation

of 'Urban – Developed land; sealed surface' and 'Urban – Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface' (see Figure 2).

- 4.3.3 The predicted area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 4. The post-development area-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.04 HU and are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 4 – Application Boundary - Post-development Area-based Habitats, Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Lost				
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.11	-0.22
Retained				
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.02	0.04
Created				
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	N/A – Other	0.08	0.00
Urban – Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.03	0.00
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.04

Post-Development Linear Habitats

- 4.3.4 Post development linear habitat creation has been predicted to include the creation of a single 'Hedgerow – Species rich native hedgerow'.
- 4.3.5 The predicted linear habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, length and HeU of the linear habitats are provided within Table 5. The post-development linear habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.33 HeU and are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 5 – Application Boundary Post-Development Linear Habitats, Condition and Hedgerow Units

Hedge Number	Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Length (km)	Hedgerow Units (HeU)
Created					
H1	Species rich native hedgerow	Medium	Moderate	0.05	0.33
Total Hedgerow Units (HeU)					0.33

4.4 Additional Landholdings - Post-Development Habitats

Post-Development Area-based Habitats

- 4.4.1 The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon the post-development proposals as shown in the 'Proposed Block Plan'. A summary of the calculations is provided in Appendix 2.
- 4.4.2 It is anticipated that the proposals will see the retention of 'Grassland – Modified grassland' and the creation of 21 small, moderate condition 'Individual trees – Urban tree'.
- 4.4.3 The predicted area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats

are provided within Table 6. The post-development area-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.38 HU and are displayed within Figure 3.

Table 6 – Additional Landholdings - Post-development Area-based Habitats, Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
<i>Retained</i>				
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.06	0.12
<i>Created</i>				
Individual trees – Urban tree	High	Moderate	0.08	0.26
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.38

4.5 Net Change in Biodiversity

- 4.5.1 Considering the reasonable assumptions and estimates made within this report, the construction of the proposed development is predicted to result in a net unit change of +0.38 HU which is a net percentage change of +14.30%, as detailed in Table 7.

Table 6 – Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

Habitat Type	Baseline Units	Post-Development Units	Change in Units	% Change in Units
Habitat Units (HU)	0.38	0.45	+0.07	+25.40 %
Hedgerow Units (HeU)	0.00	0.33	+0.33	N/A

5. Discussion and Recommendations

5.1 *Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Delivery*

- 5.1.1 The current proposals, with the inclusion of habitat creation within the Additional Landholdings area, result in a biodiversity value of 0.38 HU, representing a net change of +0.04 HU, equating to a +14.30 % gain; exceeding the 10% net gain requirement.
- 5.1.2 This net gain delivery has been achieved through the partial retention of '*Grassland – Modified grassland*', and the creation of 21 small, moderate condition '*Individual trees – Urban tree*'.

5.2 *Habitat Management and Monitoring*

- 5.2.1 Ordinarily, the production of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is recommended to ensure that the Site habitats deliver the habitat scores listed within the final design stage BNGA. However, given the proposed post-development habitats, this is considered to be disproportionate in this instance.
- 5.2.2 The '*Grassland – Modified grassland*' will reach the anticipated 'Poor' condition due to the anticipated grazed land-use of the Site. The planting of native species '*Individual trees – rural tree*' oversailing this grassland will ensure that the trees all reach the required '*Moderate*' condition. So long as a total of 21 native trees are planted across the Site, the proposals will achieve the required Biodiversity Net Gain. In the event that one or more of these trees fails to establish, replacement tree(s) should be planted to ensure that seven trees are present on the Site post-development.


5.3 *BNG Good Practice Principles*

- 5.3.1 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 considered throughout the design stage of a development at this Site.

6. References

- CIEEM (2019). 'Advice Note: On the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys'. Chartered 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

 Application Boundary

 Additional Landholdings

Baseline Area-based Habitats

 Grassland - Modified grassland

0 50 100 150 m




HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews
Architectural

Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine

Figure 1
Baseline Habitats Map

Figure 2. Post-Development Hab Map (Application Boundary)



Legend

-  Application Boundary
-  Grassland - Modified grassland
-  Urban - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
-  Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
-  Species-rich native hedgerow

0 15 30 45 m




HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews
Architectural

Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine

Figure 3
Post-development Habitats Map (On-site)

Figure 3. Post-Development Hab Map (Additional Landholdings)



Legend

-  Additional Landholdings
-  Grassland - Modified Grassland
-  Individual trees - Urban tree



HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews
Architectural

Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine

Figure 3

Post-development Habitats Map (additional
landholdings)

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 (IEMA) (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. <i>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.</i>
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 perpetuity² • 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 <i>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 secured 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.</i>
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

Cat Hill Lane, Hoylandswaine

Headline Results

Scroll down for final results 

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	Habitat units	0.26	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.04	
	Hedgerow units	0.33	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	-0.22	-84.62%
	Hedgerow units	0.33	N/A
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%

On-site net gain is less than target set 

Zero baseline units - % cannot be calculated

Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.12	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.38	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	0.26	214.33%
	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	0.04	
	Hedgerow units	0.33	
	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 (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.04	
	Hedgerow units	0.33	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	14.30%	
	Hedgerow units	N/A	
	Watercourse units	0.00%	

0 baseline units - % cannot be calculated

Trading rules satisfied?	Yes 
--------------------------	---

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	0.26	0.29	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

No additional area habitat units required to meet target 

No additional hedgerow units required to meet target 

No additional watercourse units required to meet target 

