Biodiversity Net Gain Report

Land at Little Town Dairy, Longridge, Lancashire, PR3 2TB

Provided for:

Alison Moulding, Little Town Dairy Ltd, Chipping lane, Thornley, Longridge, PR3 2TB

2nd April 2025



www.ecologyservice.co.uk T 07752 397 624 E info@ecologyservice.co.uk Registered in England and Wales no. 5329675

Summary

To inform a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment of a proposed development site at Little Town Dairy, Longridge, Lancashire, a habitat survey and a condition assessment of hedgerows, grassland and two individual trees were undertaken in March 2025.

The habitat types in the table below were present on the proposed development site at the time of the ecology surveys.

UK Habitat Classification	Statutory Biodiversity Metric terminology
g4 Modified grassland	Modified grassland
h2a hedgerow	Native hedgerow
w1g6 line of trees	Individual trees, rural
u1b6 Urban – built up areas and gardens – developed	Urban - developed land, sealed surface
land sealed surface – other developed land	
ule Urban – built up areas and gardens – Built	Urban - built linear features
Linear Features	

Table 1 – habitats present on the proposed development site

The development proposal comprises widening of an existing access track and installation of a footpath, as well as planting of new trees and new hedgerows. It is understood that all ground disturbance will take place on existing habitats. There will be no loss of existing hedgerows, and the two existing individual trees and lengths of wall will be retained.

The statutory Biodiversity Metric was used to calculate the pre- and post-development value of the proposed development site. This assessment report should be read in conjunction with the Metric spreadsheet. The Metric calculation shows that the trading rules have been met.

At the time of report preparation, the scheme expects to deliver 11.52% of Biodiversity Net Gain (habitat units) and 145.41% of hedgerow units.

Biodiversity Net Gain will be achieved by on-site measures only.

The date the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitat(s) was calculated is 2nd April 2025.

The pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats on 2nd April 2025 was 0.69 total habitat units.

The publication date of the biodiversity metric tool(s) used to calculate the onsite biodiversity value(s) was 23rd July 2024.

There is no evidence of loss (or degradation) of onsite habitats, resulting from activities carried out <u>before</u> the date the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats was calculated. It is recognised that in 2024, the hedge and one of the two trees were lifted in their entirety from the roadside and moved to their new current positions; this action did not involve loss or degradation of onsite habitats.

The proposed development site does not support any irreplaceable habitats. There are no habitats of high distinctiveness and one habitat of medium distinctiveness (two individual trees).

Report contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Objectives and methodology	8
3.	Baseline conditions of the proposed development site	12
4.	Proposed design	20
5.	Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy	21
6.	Achievement of BNG	22
7.	BNG metric	23

Appendices

- App 1 Map of existing habitats
- App 2 Proposed development plan
- App 3 Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

1 Introduction

- **1.1** Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is an approach to development that attempts to leave biodiversity in a better state than before development. Where a development will have an impact on biodiversity, BNG requires developers to provide an increase in appropriate natural habitat and ecological features over and above that being affected.
- 1.2 In England, biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021). This is referred to as Biodiversity Net Gain in Planning Practice Guidance to distinguish it from other or more general biodiversity gains.
- **1.3** Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to a general biodiversity gain condition to secure the biodiversity gain objective. This objective is to deliver at least a 10% increase in relation to the predevelopment biodiversity value of the development granted permission. This increase can be achieved through on-site biodiversity gains, registered offsite biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.
- **1.4** This report has been produced on behalf of Little Town Dairy Ltd as part of the information required for a proposed development.
- **1.5** Ecology Services UK Limited was commissioned in March 2025 to carry out a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment and to produce a report and a completed Statutory Biodiversity Metric.
- **1.6** The development proposals comprise widening of an existing access track and installation of a footpath, as well as planting of new trees and new hedgerows. It is understood that all ground disturbance will take place on existing habitats. There will be no loss of existing hedgerows, and the two existing individual trees will be retained.
- **1.7** The information contained within this report comprises:
 - The methodology used for the BNG assessment
 - The baseline conditions of the proposed development site
 - A brief description of the proposed design
 - The BNG metric output
- **1.8** This report complies with national best practice guidance as outlined in:

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2021), *Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates*. CIEEM, Winchester, UK.

1.9 Policy and legislation

Policy and Legislation	Purpose	Relevance to proposed development site (PDS)	
National			
Environment Act 2021	Provides a framework of environmental protection following UK's exit from EU. Includes measures on nature protection, water quality, clean air and other environmental protections. Includes a target to halt the decline of nature by 2030, and mandates Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for developments.	BNG is mandatory under schedule 7a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). Developments should comply with principles of BNG.	
National Planning Policy Framework (revised 2023)	Sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.	Developments should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity	
Local			
There is a Local N currently no Loca	Nature Recovery Strategy map (LNRS 1 Nature Recovery Strategy or map (I	S) for Lancashire, but there is LNRS) for Ribble Valley.	
Ribble Valley Local Development Framework – Latest version May 2022	The Local Development Framework (LDF) provides the basis for planning decisions in the Ribble Valley and sets the pattern for development and investment over the coming years.	The LDF reflect the current evidence base, and includes Environmental baselines such as SSSIs, Biological Heritage Sites, RIGS, Biodiversity, and quality of life indicators.	
	The LDF represents the Council approach towards shaping future sustainable development in the Borough. The LDF covers both strategic land allocations and wider development management policies that are important when deciding planning applications.		

 Table 1 – Policy and legislation

The proposed development site is not within or immediately adjacent to any statutory or non-statutory designated sites.

Lancashire County Council are developing a strategy and have completed a step 1 map (Lancashire's Local Nature Recovery Strategy):

https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strategies-policiesplans/environmental/local-nature-recovery-strategy/

https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/c0a78d84606d47c98c47446618a959ac

1.10 Assessment of Strategic Significance

The overall assessment of Strategic Significance for the development at Little Town Dairy is judged as **low**. In the current guidance (Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guidance – July 2024), **low** is where the definitions for medium or high Strategic Significance are not met.

1.11 Personnel

Surveys and the assessment were carried out by Pat Waring and Janette Gazzard from Ecology Services UK Ltd.

Pat is a Chartered Environmentalist and a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Biology.

Pat has been working as an ecological consultant for over 27 years, including over 20 years as Director of Ecology Services UK Limited. This work includes provision of expert advice and guidance to bodies such as Statutory Nature Conservation Organisations and Local Planning Authorities, as well as the delivery of professional ecological training courses at a national level.

Pat has recognised and extensive experience and knowledge of ecological survey, design and undertaking of monitoring and condition assessment, and also impact assessment techniques; this includes surveys and assessment methods in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain.

Janette is a full member of Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Management.

Janette has over 21 years' experience working in ecology and nature conservation, including roles as a Senior Ecologist for a large multidisciplinary company and as a lead adviser for Natural England throughout the North West of England. She has a range of demonstrable skills including habitat surveys, design and undertaking of monitoring and condition assessment, and also impact assessment techniques; this includes surveys and assessment methods in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain. Pat and Janette have undertaken professional training in the following areas:

- UK Habitat classification
- Designing for Biodiversity Net Gain
- Statutory Biodiversity Metric for Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain in England
- Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain: The Policy
- Biodiversity Net Gain for watercourses
- CIEEM Statutory Biodiversity Metric

1.12 Advisory note

The information in this report represents the professional opinion of an ecological consultancy and does not constitute professional legal advice. You may wish to seek professional legal interpretation of the wildlife legislation associated with this area of work.

The information, opinion and advice that Ecology Services UK Ltd has prepared are true, and have been prepared in accordance with the CIEEM Code of Professional Conduct. Ecology Services UK Ltd confirms that the opinions expressed are our true professional bone fide opinions.

Ecology surveys are time-limited; as a rule, survey findings in relation to habitats can generally be relied on for the season in which surveys took place. Statutory agencies will often accept survey results for 12-18 months, but this varies around the country.

2 Objectives and methodology

2.1 General background

The brief for this work was to carry out a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment in relation to a proposed development site at Little Town Dairy, Longridge in Lancashire.

Information gathering involved a desk-based study and site survey.

2.2 Desk-based study

The following sources were consulted as part of the desk-based study:

Source	Data
Ribble Valley Borough Council Local	Provides the basis for
Development Framework	planning decisions in
https://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/local-	the Ribble Valley.
development-framework/local-	Includes environmental
development-framework-ldf	baselines such as SSSIs,
	Biological Heritage Sites,
	RIGS, Biodiversity, and
	quality of life indicators.
Lancashire County Council (Lancashire's	An interactive map of the
Local Nature Recovery Strategy): step 1	most valuable existing areas
map	for nature, as well as
https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/council/strat	specific proposals for
egies-policies-plans/environmental/local-	creating or improving
nature-recovery-strategy/	habitat for nature and wider
	environmental goals.
MAGIC map website	Statutorily designated sites,
(https://magic.defra.gov.uk/)	important habitats and
	features
Mario mapping website of Lancashire	Old maps of Lancashire,
County Council	including the area of the
(http://mario.lancashire.gov.uk/agsmario/)	proposed development site

Table 2 – sources for desk-based study

A general search was also made of other online resources, to check for any relevant information regarding the search area.

2.3 Field-based surveys

A daytime walkover survey relevant to the BNG assessment was undertaken on 31st March 2025.

2.3.1 Field survey

All habitat types were mapped and classified according to the UK Habitat Classification.

The terrestrial habitats listed within the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric are based on the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab).

Notes were made of any potential and actual constraints to the proposed works and aspects which might affect the achievement of Biodiversity Net Gain. Constraints may include presence of legally protected species, or species which have associated legal impediments, such as some invasive non-native species.

2.3.2 Condition assessment

The following habitat types were subject to condition assessment:

- Modified grassland
- Individual tree, rural
- Native hedgerow

Condition assessment is part of the requirement for BNG.

Completed condition assessment forms are included as appendix 3 in this report.

2.3.3 Statutory biodiversity metric calculation

For BNG, biodiversity is measured in standardised biodiversity units.

The statutory biodiversity metric was used to measure the biodiversity value of habitats by calculating the number of biodiversity units.

The metric was used to:

- Calculate the baseline biodiversity value of the proposed development site
- Calculate the biodiversity value of the proposed site layout
- Identify the extent to which the proposed site layout delivers the statutory 10% gain

2.3.4 BNG good practice principles for development

Principle	How the principle has been applied
The metric assessment should be	The metric assessment has been completed
completed by a competent person.	by Janette Gazzard.
A competent person has the	Janette has an extensive professional
knowledge and skills to perform	background in ecology and consultancy,
specified tasks to complete and	including attendance at a wide range of
review biodiversity metric	training courses; as a result, she is regarded
calculations.	as a competent person with the appropriate
	knowledge and skills to perform specified
	tasks to complete and review biodiversity
	metric calculations.
Evidence for metric decisions	Evidence for metric decisions is provided and
should be provided and signposted	signposted within the 'User comments'
within the 'User comments' column	column of the biodiversity metric tool.
of the biodiversity metric tool.	
You should follow up to date	Up to date industry good practice principles
industry good practice principles	have been followed when using the metric.
(CIRIA, CIEEM and	
IEMA) and BS 8683:2021 when	
using the metric.	
Table 3 – BNG good practice princ	riples

2.3.5 Biodiversity Metric rules

Rule	Rule detail	How the rule has been applied
1	The trading rules of this biodiversity metric must be followed.	The trading rules have been followed.
2	Biodiversity unit outputs, for each type of unit, must not be summed, traded, or converted between types. The requirement to deliver at least a 10% net gain applies to each type of unit.	Biodiversity unit outputs have not been summed, traded, or converted between types.
3	To accurately apply the biodiversity metric formula, you must use the statutory biodiversity metric calculation tool or small sites biodiversity metric tool (SSM) for small sites.	The Statutory Biodiversity Metric calculation tool was used.
4	In exceptional ecological circumstances, deviation from this biodiversity metric methodology may be permitted by the relevant planning authority.	No deviation was required for this Biodiversity Metric.

Table 4 – Biodiversity Metric rules

2.4 Limitations

2.4.1 Habitat Survey

Inevitably with any ecological survey it cannot be guaranteed to detect all species and individuals, and surveys cannot be fully representative of all conditions. In this case, given the size and accessibility of the proposed development site, it was concluded that the baseline survey provided a robust data set on which to carry out the BNG assessment. None of the limitations are considered likely to have materially affected the conclusions of this BNG assessment.

Limiting the survey period to a single visit in early spring does not take account of plant growth through the whole of the growing season, or the period over which above-ground plant material is visible. It is likely that a number of flowering vascular plant species would not have been evident during the surveys.

2.4.2 General

This report is based on the proposed development plan provided (please refer to appendix 2). Changes to the proposed development plan will require the statutory biodiversity metric calculation to be updated accordingly.

3 Baseline conditions of the proposed development site

The site proposed for development is at SD 60693 39271 (WTW = brownish.language.snores).

The area to which this BNG assessment applies, which is 0.12 hectares in size, comprises an existing access road with adjacent fences, grassland, hedgerows, walls and trees.

The proposed development site boundary is partly demarcated by Longridge Road and a hedgerow.

The landscape and habitats immediately around the proposed development site are dominated by grassland and hard standing (road and car park). The road and car park were in active, continuous use throughout the survey.

The proposed development site supports a limited range of habitats which are described below in Section 3.2.



Map 1 – 1: 25000 scale map of site and context – proposed development site location shown by black arrow



Image 1 – Wide vertical aerial view of proposed development site location. In the wider landscape, a range of habitats including extensive farmed grassland, hedgerows, waterbodies and woodlands are clearly visible.



Image 2 – Close vertical aerial view of proposed development site. The approximate site boundary is marked with a white dotted line. March 2025

3.1 Presence and condition assessment of sites and features designated for ecological reasons

The proposed development site is not within any statutory or non-statutory designated sites. The nearest designated sites are as follows:

- Arbour Quarry Biological Heritage Site (1.79 km)
- Spade Mill Reservoirs Biological Heritage Site (1.88 km)

Sites and features designated for ecological reasons do not impact on BNG at the proposed development site.

3.2 Presence and condition assessment of habitats

Grassland

There are two separate, large areas of modified grassland (previously 'improved grassland' in Phase 1 Habitat Survey terminology) within the proposed development site. Both fields are similar in their general species composition although the western field has been subject to less disturbance, as indicated by the greater percentage cover of unbroken grassland sward, with fewer species.

The grassland is characterised by dominant perennial ryegrass *Lolium perenne* with locally frequent creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, creeping bent *Agrostis stolonifera*, meadow foxtail *Alopecurus pratensis* and Yorkshire-fog *Holcus lanatus*. A moderate range of other plant species has become established, most likely to due to the disturbance from livestock and vehicle movements, and includes dandelion *Taraxacum officinale*, wood avens *Geum urbanum*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, white clover *Trifolium repens*, common mouse-ear *Cerastium fontanum*, meadow buttercup *Ranunculus acris*, field thistle *Cirsium arvense* and creeping thistle *Cirsium vulgare*.



Image 3 – grassland beside the access track. March 2025

The field to the east had extensive areas of bare ground, primarily as a result of vehicle activity near the entrance to the access road from Longridge Road and poaching resulting from grazing livestock.



Image 4 – Creeping bent grass and creeping buttercup along the grassland boundary with the access track. March 2025

A third, much smaller area of grassland is located at the western side of the site entrance by Longridge Road. This grassland also exhibits a moderate level of plant species diversity and has been subject to extensive disturbance from vehicles.



Image 5 – Area of grassland by site entrance, with adjacent hedgerow (offsite). March 2025

Grassland at the proposed development site has potential secondary value in relation to the foraging opportunities for birds, bats, hedgehog, brown hare and common toad in particular.

UK Habitat Classification – *g4* – *modified grassland*

Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Modified grassland

Existing area of habitat: Modified grassland = 0.922 ha

Condition assessment: Modified grassland = moderate

Hedgerow

The proposed development site supports one hedgerow to the east of the site area. The hedgerow is 74 metres in length and is dominated by hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*. Other woody species comprise frequent hazel *Corylus avellana*, along with occasional ivy *Hedera helix*, ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, blackthorn *Prunus spinosa* and rose *Rosa sp*. The hedgerow ground flora includes nettle *Urtica dioica*, cleavers *Galium aparine*, cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*, bramble *Rubus fruticosus*, lesser celandine *Ficaria verna*, ivy, broad leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* and creeping buttercup. Hedgerow gaps had been planted with hawthorn whips and the hedge was generally narrow and subject to recent heavy pruning. The hedge was unlaid and cut to 1-1.5 metres height at the time of the survey. In 2024 the hedge was lifted in its entirety from the roadside and moved to its current position.



Image 6 – Hedgerow. March 2025

The hedgerow at the proposed development site has potential secondary value in relation to foraging opportunities for birds, bats, hedgehog and amphibians in particular. The hedgerow also has potential secondary value in relation to sheltering opportunities for birds, hedgehog and amphibians.

UK Habitat Classification – *h2a hedgerow*

Statutory Biodiversity Metric – *Native hedgerow*

Linear length of habitat: Native hedgerow (hedgerows 1, 2 and 3) = 0.074 km

Condition assessment: Native hedgerow (hedgerows 1, 2 and 3) = moderate

Individual trees

There are two mature trees on the proposed development site which fit the category of individual trees. On the frontage to Longridge Road is a beech *Fagus sylvatica* tree. The tree bark is typically smooth, with no visible potential sheltering places for invertebrates; however, the bark is broken in places as a result of previous pruning and flush cut limbs. In 2024 the beech tree was lifted in its entirety from the site entrance and moved to its current position.



Image 7 – Beech tree alongside Longridge Road. March 2025



Image 8 – Alder tree within grassland. March 2025

An over mature alder *Alnus glutinosa* lies along the eastern boundary of the proposed development site, within the grassland adjacent to the access track to Little Town Dairy. This tree has typically rough, fissured bark, as well as a long, vertical, deep cavity from ground level to over 2 metres in height. The alder has clear signs of previous livestock damage and supports many potential sheltering places for invertebrates.

Both the alder and beech tree have potential secondary value in relation to foraging opportunities for bats and birds, as well as sheltering and nesting habitat for birds.

UK Habitat Classification – w1g6 line of trees

Statutory Biodiversity Metric - Individual tree, rural

Existing area of habitat and condition:

Individual tree, urban; trees (condition = moderate (alder) and good (beech)) = 0.0163 ha x 2 = 0.0326 ha

Sealed surface – hard standing

The current access to Little Town Dairy from Longridge Road comprises a single width concrete track.



Image 9 – Concrete access track. March 2025

UK Habitat Classification: *u1b6 Urban – built up areas and gardens – developed land sealed surface – other developed land (concrete access track)*

Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Urban - developed land, sealed surface

Existing area of habitat: 0.028 hectares

Condition assessment: not required

Built linear features

The proposed development site has two separate short lengths of drystone wall, beside the entrance to the access track. The walls, which are constructed from local stone, are in a good state of repair. The eastern wall does not support any vegetation. The western wall is part-covered in dense ivy.



Image 10 – Drystone wall at site entrance. March 2025

UK Habitat Classification – *ule* – *Built linear features*

Existing area of habitat – 0.00009 ha

Condition assessment – not applicable

4 Proposed design

The post-development habitat calculations are based on the following supplied plan, showing the proposed development layout and landscaping (at this stage):

Farmplus (2025) Forshaw Site Layout.

The proposed landscaping plan (site location plan) is included as Appendix 2 of this report.

The proposed design includes the following elements:

- Access track widening
- Installation of a footpath
- Retention of existing hedgerow
- Retention of existing individual trees
- Retention of existing walls
- Planting of new hedgerows
- Planting of new trees

The elements within the proposed site location plan are captured in the Biodiversity Metric calculation tool.

5 Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy

The Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy and its effect for the purpose of the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain is set out in Articles 37A and 37D of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. This hierarchy (which does not apply to irreplaceable habitats) sets out a list of priority actions:

• First, in relation to <u>onsite habitats which have a medium, high and very</u> <u>high distinctiveness</u> (a score of four or more according to the statutory biodiversity metric), the avoidance of adverse effects from the development and, if they cannot be avoided, the mitigation of those effects

For the proposed development site at Little Town Dairy, the following habitat has a medium distinctiveness:

- Individual tree, rural (habitat retained with no adverse effects)
- Then, in relation to all <u>on-site habitats which are adversely affected by</u> <u>the development</u>, the adverse effect should be compensated by prioritising in order, where possible, the enhancement of existing onsite habitats, creation of new onsite habitats, allocation of registered offsite gains and finally the purchase of biodiversity credits.

Habitat	Adverse effect	Proposed compensation
Modified grassland	Loss of 0.0354 ha	Enhancement of 0.0568 ha
		of modified grassland to
		other neutral grassland (on-
		site)
Native hedgerow	None	Not required
Line of trees	None	Not required
(individual trees-		
rural)		
Urban - developed	None	Not required
land, sealed surface		_
Urban - built linear	None	Not required
features		_

 Table 5 – Compensation of adverse effects

Summary of Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy

There is one on-site habitat which has a medium distinctiveness.

There is no requirement for mitigation of adverse effects to the habitat of medium distinctiveness; the habitat is being retained.

The compensation for the adverse effect to Modified grassland will involve enhancement of 0.0568 ha (on-site).

6 Achievement of BNG

Based on the current proposals, and without any form of mitigation, the proposed development is predicted to result in an overall net loss of 0.14 habitat units. Therefore, compensation/enhancement is required to achieve no net loss and a minimum of a 10% net gain in biodiversity for all habitat units.

In accordance with best practice, the delivery of biodiversity units should always be initially considered on-site. Where opportunity for additional habitat creation and enhancement on-site is limited, land outside of the development boundary may need to be considered. The on-site enhancement recommendations at land at Little Town Dairy will result in the proposed development achieving a minimum of 10% gain in area-based habitats; therefore, off-site enhancement is not required.

It is therefore proposed that Biodiversity Net Gain will be achieved through on-site measures only.

All measures to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain are itemised in the Little Town Dairy Metric Calculation Tool 2nd April 2025.

The proposed measures are as follows:

Habitat	Retain/rebuild	Enhance	Compensate
Modified grassland	0 ha	0.0568 ha	0 ha
Native hedgerow	0.074 ha	0 ha	0 ha
Line of trees (individual	0.0326 km	0 km	0 km
trees- rural)			

Table 6 – Proposed measures to achieve BNG

In addition to the above information, the following habitats will be created:

Line of trees (individual trees- rural) = 0.0163 ha

Native hedgerow = 0.11 km

7 BNG metric – headline results and final results

Land at Little Town Dairy Headline Results			
Scroll down for final results 🛆			
	Habitat units	0.69	
On-site baseline	Hedgerow units	0.30	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	0.77	
On-site post-intervention	Hedgerow units	0.73	
(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	0.08	11.52%
On-site net change	Hedgerow units	0.43	145.41%
(units & percentage)	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
	Habitat units	0.00	
Off-site baseline	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention	Hedgerow units	0.00	
(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
000 11 1 1	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%
OII-site net change	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
(units & percentage)	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%

	Habitat units	0.08
Combined net unit change	Hedgerow units	0.43
(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00
	Habitat units	0.00
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Hedgerow units	0.00
	777 C	0.00

FINAL RESULTS			
m . 1 1	Habitat units	0.08	
Total net unit change	Hedgerow units	0.43	
(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	11.52%	
Total net % change	Hedgerow units	145.41%	
(mendang an on-sile a on-sile mastar reterment, or earlier a enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes √		

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	0.69	0.76	0.00	No additional area habitat units required to meet target \checkmark
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.30	0.33	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 \checkmark

The Metric calculation tool is provided as a separate excel spreadsheet:

Little Town Dairy Metric Calculation Tool 2nd April 2025

The spreadsheet should be referred to alongside this Biodiversity Net Gain report.

The Metric calculation shows that the trading rules have been met.

At the time of report preparation, the scheme expects to deliver 11.52% of Biodiversity Net Gain (habitat units) and 145.41% of hedgerow units.

Biodiversity Net Gain Report

Land off Little Town Dairy, Longridge, Lancashire, PR3 2TB

Appendices

Appendices

- App 1 Map of existing habitats
- App 2 Proposed development plan
- App 3 Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets





Co	Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)									
Uł	UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type									
Gr	Grassland - Modified grassland									
Or Io	n-site or off-site, site name and cation	Little Town Dairy - proposed farm entrance	Survey date and Surveyor name	31st March 2025 J Gazzard & P Waring						
Li	nitations (if applicable)		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)							
Gr	id reference	Habitat parcel reference								
Ha	bitat Description									
<u>uk</u>	<u>hab – UK Habitat Classification</u>									
Co	ondition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes	Notes (such as justification)						
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant specific include those listed in Footnote 1 Good condition. Where the vascular plant species distinctiveness grassland, or ther (excluding those listed in Footnot	cies per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs (these may). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or is present are characteristic of medium, high or very high e are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m ² e 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess	Yes							
	whether the grassland should ins a grassland is classed as mediur condition sheet. Sward height is varied (at least 2	tead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where n, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant 0% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than	Yes							
в	Any scrub present accounts for le	ess than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub	Yes							
с	such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosu</i> Note - patches of scrub with cont relevant scrub habitat type.	s agg. may be present). inuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the								
D	Physical damage is evident in les damage include excessive poach high levels of access, or any othe	vsical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical mage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by h levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.								
E	Cover of bare ground is between concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	Νο	Bare ground greater than 10%							
F	Cover of bracken Pteridium aquil	<i>inum</i> is less than 20%.	Yes							
G	There is an absence of invasive i	~								
		Essential criter	ion achieved (Yes or No)	Yes						
		N	lumber of criteria passed	5						
Сс (о	ondition Assessment Result ut of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/√							
Pa pa	sses 6 or 7 criteria including ssing essential criterion A	Good (3)								

Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	Moderate achieved								
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)									
Suggested enhancement intervent	ions to improve condition score									
Footnotes	Footnotes									
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle Cirsium arvense, spear thistle Cirsium vulgare, curled dock Rumex crispus, broad-leaved dock Rumex obtusifolius, common nettle Urtica dioica, creeping buttercup Ranunculus repens, greater plantain Plantago major, white clover Trifolium repens and cow parsley Anthriscus sylvestris.										

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Condition sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Types Habitat Type										
Native hedgerow Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Native hedgerow with trees Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Species-rich native hedgerow with trees Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch Habitat Description										
Single	Single native hedgerow (H1)									
Se	See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2 and UK Habitat Classification: ukhab – UK Habitat Classification									
On-si name	te or off-site, site and location	Little Town Dairy		Survey date and Surveyor name	31st March 2025, J Gazzard & P Waring					
Limitations (if applicable)				Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)						
Grid ı	reference			Habitat parcel reference						
Cond A seri condi This a Hand Best p	ition Assessment E es of ten attributes, ion of a hedgerow is ussessment is based book. practice would be to	Details representing key physical characteristics and s assessed according to the number of attrib I on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook ¹ and F record the species, age, spacing and other	e used for this assessme outes from these functiona avourable Conservation key information about all	nt. Each attribute is assigned to one of five al groups which pass or fail the 'favourable Status document ² . For further clarification p trees present along a hedgerow within the	functional groups (, condition' criteria. please refer to the H 'Habitat Descriptior	A – E) and the ledgerow Survey ' box, as well as other				
key fe Heda	atures of the hedge erow favourable co	row. ondition attributes								
Attrib funct (A. B.	utes and onal groupings C. D and E)	Criteria - the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Criteria description		Criterion passed	Notes (such as				
Core	groups - applicable	e to all hedgerow types	ſ			Decently out and				
A1.	Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of w to the top of the shoots, hedgerow, any gaps or i Newly laid or coppiced h management and pass t years (if undertaken acc A newly planted hedgero >1.5 m height).	oody growth estimated from base of stem excluding any bank beneath the solated trees. nedgerows are indicative of good his criterion for up to a maximum of four ording to good practice). bw does not pass this criterion (unless it is	NO	Recently cut and therefore currently, less than 1.5m high				
A2.	Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of wo of the canopy, excluding Outgrowths (such as bla included in the width est Laid, coppiced, cut and good management and j four years (if undertaker	body growth estimated at the widest point gaps and isolated trees. ckthorn <i>Prunus spinosa</i> suckers) are only imate when they are >0.5 m in height. newly planted hedgerows are indicative of pass this criterion for up to a maximum of a according to good practice).	No	Recently cut and therefore currently, less than 1.5m wide				
B1.	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).		Yes					
B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'ga hedgerow. Gaps are cor matter how small). Access points and gates are not subject to the >5 gate).	his is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the dgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no atter how small). ccess points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but e not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a ate).						

C1.	Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: Measured from outer edge of hedgerow; and · Is present on one side of the hedgerow (at least).	This is the level of distur the base of the hedgerow Undisturbed ground is pi length, greater than 1 m least one side of the hed This criterion recognises boundary habitat with the species. Cultivation, hea etc. can limit available he	bance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at w. resent for at least 90% of the hedgerow in width and must be present along at Igerow. the value of the hedgerow base as a e capacity to support a wide range of wily trodden footpaths, poached ground abitat niches.	Yes					
C2.	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	The indicator species us <i>Galium aparine</i> and doc singly or together, does	ed are nettles <i>Urtica</i> spp., cleavers ks <i>Rumex</i> spp. Their presence, either not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	Yes					
D1.	Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ³) and recently introduced species.	Recently introduced spe in the UK since AD 1500 natives. For information JNCC website ⁴ , as well a Atlas of the British and In the status of species. Fo species see the GB Non	Recently introduced species refer to plants that have naturalised n the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives. For information on archaeophytes and neophytes see the JNCC website ⁴ , as well as the BSBI website ⁵ where the 'Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora ⁶ contains an up-to-date list of the status of species. For information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website ⁷ .						
		>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed	This criterion addresses or lead to deterioration in	damaging activities that may have led to nother attributes.	No	hedge recently moved (replanted) therefore				
D2.	Current damage	ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	This could include evide or inappropriate manage hedgerow cutting).	nce of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, ment practices (for example, excessive		recent distubance				
Addit	ional group - appli	cable to hedgerows with trees only								
E1.	Tree class Tree class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient ⁸), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.		This criterion addresses morphologies which allo opportunities for differen	is criterion addresses if there are a range of age-classes or orphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide portunities for different species.						
E2. Tree health		At least 95% of hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	This criterion identifies if compromises the surviva	the trees are subject to damage which and health of the individual specimens.						
The h	edgerow condition a	assessment generates a weighting (score) ra	anging from 1 - 3, which is	s used within the Statutory Biodiversity Met	ric. The scores for e	each are set out in the				
Cond	ition categories fo	r hedgerows without trees								
Categ	Jory	Category Requirements	Metric Score							
Good		AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3							
Mode	rate	No more than 4 failures in total; AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).	2							
Poor		Fails a total of more than 4 attributes; OR Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1							
Cond	ition categories fo	Score achieved:	<u></u>							
Categ	Jory	Category Requirements	Metric score							
Good		No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3							
Moderate		No more than 5 failures in total; AND Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 and E1 = Moderate condition).	2							
Poor		Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; OR Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1							
Suga	Score achieved. Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score		re							

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUA	TREES Habitat Type											
Habitat Types												
Individual trees – Urban trees	S											
Complete a condition sheet for	each tree or block of trees.											
- I												
Please see separate Line of t	rees condition sheet for a line of Rural tree	<u>s.</u>										
Habitat Description												
Individual trees (description	applied to the urban or rural environment):											
Young trees over 7.5 cm in dia	meter at breast height whose canopies are not	touchi	ng.									
linkan Darimatan (Linaan Dia	also and Onesses (dependentian applied to the				مساديك							
Groups or stands of trees (size	requirement as defined above) within and arou	und the	enviro perime	eter of i	urban la	nd Thi	s inclue	les tho	se alon	n urban	streets	highways railways
and canals, and also former fie	Id boundary trees incorporated into developme	nts. Ca	anopies	must o	verlap o	continue	ously. (Groups	of urba	n trees	that dor	i't match the
descriptions for woodland may	be assessed within this category.											
	Little Town Dairy	Surve	urvey date and 31st March 2025, J Gazzard & P Waring									
On-site or off-site, site name		Surve	eyor na	me	T1 - A	Ider T		ah h	oth mod	dium ai-	ad trac	
and location		Surve	ey refer	rence	1 = A	lder, 1	2 = Bee	ecn - D	oin meo	lium siz	ed trees	5
		wider survey)) a v)								
		Habit	at narc	ol rofo	ronco							
		T1	T2		ence				1			
Limitations (if applicable)		``	1.2									
		Grid	referen	се					-			
				1				1				
				1				1				
Condition Assessment Criter	ia			-				-				
		Crite	rion pa	ssed ()	es or l	NO)						Notes (such as
												justification)
		Y	Y									
	(an at least 700) within the black are notive											
A species)	(or at least 70% within the block are halive											
species).												
		Y	Y	1				1				
The tree canopy is predomi	nantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover			1				1				
B making up <10% of total are	ea and no individual gap being >5 m wide			1				1				
	ny pass this chienon).			1				1				
		~	~									
		1	1									
C The tree is mature (or more	than 50% within the block are mature) ¹ .			1				1				
)	,			1				1				
			NI	-		<u> </u>		-				both trackers
There is little or no evidence	e of an adverse impact on tree health by	IN	IN	1				1				damage from either
human activities (such as va	andalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural			1				1				prunning or stock
activity). And there is no cu	rrent regular pruning regime, so the trees											
retain >75% of expected ca	nopy for their age range and height.			1				1				
		V	N									
		['		1				1				
- Natural ecological niches fo	r vertebrates and invertebrates are present,			1				1				
such as presence of deadw	ood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.			1				1				
		V	V									
		1	1	1				1				
F More than 20% of the tree of	canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath			1				1				
	.,			1				1				
		L				L	L					
	Number of criteria passed	5	4							1		
Condition Assessment				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Result (out of 6 criteria) Condition Assessment Score		Score	Achie	ved ×/	/							
Passes 5 or 6 criteria Good (3)		Yes										
			Yes									
Passes 3 or 4 criteria Moderate (2)			.03									
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fair	ly Poor' condition categories are not available f	for this	broad I	nabitat	type.							
Suggested enhancement inte	erventions to improve condition score ²											
							-					