

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Site Address:

Langho FC, Northcote Rd, Old Langho, Langho, Blackburn BB6 8BE

Client:

Adam Allen

Assessment Date:

2nd June 2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Ribble Valley Borough Council. The proposal is described as:

‘3G football pitch, with associated changing room’

BNG assessment methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **BNG Methodology and Legislation – 2025.**

The results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit and BNG assessment may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Version Control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Katie Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc, Graduate Ecologist	06/02/2026
Proof	0.2	Katie Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc, Graduate Ecologist	06/02/2026
Final	1.0	Katie Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc, Graduate Ecologist	06/02/2026
Part 2 added	2.0	Katie Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	03/06/2026

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

Arbtech cannot be held responsible for any project management failures, delays or unforeseen costs arising from failure to read and ensure understanding of the content with in, nor is Arbtech responsible for any adverse outcomes arising from failure to account for ecological advice given at any stage throughout the project collaboration.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Site Location and Context

A baseline habitat map is provided in **Appendix 1**, a post development habitat map in **Appendix 2**, a proposed development plan in **Appendix 3**, headline BNG results in **Appendix 4**, and condition assessments in **Appendix 5**.

The site is centred at National Grid Reference SD 70518 35049 and has an area of approximately 0.104ha. The site is characterised by a building, unsealed surfaces, scattered trees, line of trees, ditch and modified grassland. The ditch is disregarded from the watercourse habitats due to being dry. The site is surrounded by agricultural fields with strong hedgerow networks and several pockets of woodland. The wider landscape comprises more extensive agricultural fields, with residential areas interspersed within.

This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- ❖ Statutory BNG Metric – Langho FC, BB6 8BE (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026)
- ❖ Proposed Plan (2026)
- ❖ Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) - Langho FC, BB6 8BE – v1 (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026)
- ❖ Tree Survey Report - Langho FC, BB6 8BE – v1 (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026)

Executive Summary

The current landscaping proposal generates a net loss of area-based habitat units (-42.94%) and a net loss of linear-based habitat units (-0%) with unmet trading rules for area-based habitats. At present, trading conditions are not satisfied for the loss of modified grassland (low distinctiveness).

In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for area-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 3.32 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of **1.60** units. These units can be of any habitat distinctiveness to satisfy trading rules.

In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for linear-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 0.27 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of **0.02** units.

A financial contribution to off-site ecological enhancements (i.e. purchasing biodiversity units) within an approved scheme is required to make up the +10% net gain for area-based habitat units.

The mechanism for securing this off-setting will need to be proposed to and confirmed by the LPA and would be linked to the application through a planning obligation Section 106 (s106) agreement.

Introduction

BNG Informative	
Habitat Degradation Statement	Date reflected by BNG calculations20th January 2026 The baseline biodiversity value of the site is derived from the site as observed during the PEA field survey (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026). As evident in the screenshots of satellite imagery obtained from GoogleEarth dated 28th June 2018 and 21st September 2026, the site does not appear to have undergone any degradation. The habitats on site, and therefore biodiversity value of the site, is not considered to have undergone degradation since 30th January 2020. Historical imagery < 28 Jun 2018 > > 19852000  Historical imagery < 21 Sept 2025 > > 19852000 
	Irreplaceable Habitat StatementNo irreplaceable habitats as listed under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations (2024) are currently present nor were present before 30 th January 2020.
	Metric Version & Publication DateStatutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool first published 29 th November 2023 with last updates to metric tools and user guides on 23 rd July 2024.

BNG Target Uplift	+10%		
National Character Area (NCA)	35 – Lancashire Valleys		
Strategic Significance	Lancashire County Council Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS): ❖ Local Nature Recovery Strategy 2026 - Lancashire County Council		
	Habitat	Baseline / Post-Development	Justification
	Developed land; sealed surface	Baseline and post-development	The site/habitat is not formally identified within the LNRS and as such the habitat has 'low' strategic significance.
	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	Baseline and post-development	The site/habitat is not formally identified within the LNRS and as such the habitat has 'low' strategic significance.
	Modified grassland	Baseline and post-development	The site/habitat is not formally identified within the LNRS and as such the habitat has 'low' strategic significance.
	Scattered trees	Baseline and post-development	The site/habitat is not formally identified within the LNRS and as such the habitat has 'low' strategic significance.
	Line of trees	Baseline and post-development	The site/habitat is not formally identified within the LNRS and as such the habitat has 'low' strategic significance.
Limitations			
There were no specific limitations to the assessment.			

Baseline

Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site

Area-Based Habitats (A-1)

Habitat	Area (ha)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Developed land; sealed surface	0.0086	There are two buildings on site (Fig.1). B1 is a single-storey prefabricated building with pebbledash roughcast used for site office/utility/welfare. B2 is a metal storage container used for storage/welfare.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Condition Assessment Supplement.	Low Strategic Significance
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.2230	Situated within the northern development boundary is section of gravel hardstanding used for car parking.	Habitat condition pre-determined as ' N/A ' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Condition Assessment Supplement.	
Modified Grassland	0.8311	The majority of the site is dominated by modified grassland (Fig.3). The grassland is frequently mown and has a uniform short sward height (~10cm). Large sections of the grassland are used for playing sports and there is evident physical damage to sections of grass which are frequently utilised. Species present include: perennial rye <i>Lolium perenne</i> (D), creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> (F), mouse-ear chickweed <i>Cerastium fontanum</i> (F), common daisy <i>Bellis perennis</i> (F), lesser celandine <i>Ficaria verna</i> (F). There is a strip of grassland at the southern site boundary situated close to the ditch which runs along the southern site boundary which is less frequently mown with a longer sward height (~20cm) and has damp sections. Species present which are absent in the remaining grassland include: cock's foot <i>Dactylis glomerata</i> (O), cleavers <i>Galium aparine</i> (O), common rush <i>Juncus effusus</i> (O), broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> (R).	Poor: passes 4 of 7 criteria excluding essential criterion A. Assessed using the 'Grasslands Low Distinctiveness' habitat type condition sheet.	

Urban Tree	0.1131	10no. trees were considered in the baseline, all of which were present at the time of the PEA survey. All 10no. extant trees achieve 'good' condition by passing 6 of 6 criteria. See PEA and AIA for more information.	Good: <i>passes 5 of 6 criteria.</i> 9no. small (T1-T6, T8-T10) 1no. very large (T7) Assessed using the 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	
------------	--------	---	--	--

Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site
Linear-Based Habitats (B-1)

Habitat	Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Line of trees	0.061	Situated along the southern site boundary is a line of trees comprising a broken line of holly <i>Ilex aquifolium</i>, hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i> and hawthorn <i>Crataegus monogyna</i>. (Fig.5). Ivy <i>Hedera helix</i> (A), bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> (F) are present in the understory. A ditch is found adjacent to such trees, however, was assessed as dry and as such was not included in this assessment.	Moderate: passes 4 of 5 criteria. Assessed using the 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet.	Low Strategic Significance

Post-Development

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site					
Area-Based Habitats					
	Habitat	Area (ha)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained (A-1)	Sealed surfaces	0.0086	Sealed surfaces retained in full.	N/A	Low Strategic Significance
	Unsealed surfaces	0.2039	Retained parcels of unsealed surfaces.	N/A	
	Modified grassland	0.1829	Retained parcels of modified grassland.	Poor	
	Urban tree	0.1131	Urban trees retained in full.	Good	
Created (A-2)	Developed land; sealed surface	0.6769	Created 3g football pitch with associated change room block and creation of hardstanding extending to existing car park.	Habitat condition pre-determined as 'N/A' as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Condition Assessment Supplement.	

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site					
Linear-Based Habitats					
	Habitat	Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained (B-1)	Line of trees	0.061	Line of trees retained in full.	Moderate	Low Strategic Significance

Change of Biodiversity Value

		Biodiversity Units		
		Area-Based	Linear-Based	Watercourse-Based
On-Site	Baseline	3.02 ❖ Sealed surfaces (0) ❖ Unsealed surfaces (0) ❖ Modified grassland of poor condition (1.66) ❖ Urban trees of good condition (1.36)	0.24 ❖ Line of trees of moderate condition (0.24)	N/A
	Post-Development	1.72 ❖ Retained sealed surfaces (0) ❖ Retained unsealed surfaces (0) ❖ Retained modified grassland of poor condition (0.37) ❖ Retained urban trees of good condition (1.36) ❖ Created sealed surfaces (0)	0.24 ❖ Retained line of trees of moderate condition (0.24)	
	Overall Net Change	-1.30 (42.94%)	0.00%	

Results, Discussion, and Next Steps

BNG Informative					
Results	The current landscaping proposal generates a net loss of area-based habitat units (-42.94%) and a net loss of linear-based habitat units (-0%) with unmet trading rules for area-based habitats. In line with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (2024), any loss of a habitat must be replaced on a like-for-like or like-for-better principle. At present, trading conditions are not satisfied for the loss of modified grassland (low distinctiveness). With unmet trading conditions and a net loss, the proposal fails principal Rules 1 and 2 of BNG and is not compliant with current legislation (Environment Act 2021) and planning policies (National Planning Policy Framework, 2024).				
	In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for area-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 3.32 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of 1.60 units. These units can be of any habitat distinctiveness to satisfy trading rules.				
	In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for linear-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 0.27 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of 0.02 units.				
Recommendations and Next Steps	There is limited scope on site and this provision may not be possible to achieve on site (within the redline boundary) considering the size of the proposed development area and the limited amount of soft landscaping within the parcel.				
	Based on the proposed plans, it is unlikely that net gain will be achieved by ways of habitat creation/enhancement without significant changes to the proposals on site. As such, a financial contribution to off-site ecological enhancements (i.e. purchasing biodiversity units) within an approved scheme is required to make up the +10% net gain for area-based habitat units. The mechanism for securing this off-setting will need to be proposed to and confirmed by the LPA and would be linked to the application through a planning obligation Section 106 (s106) agreement. The proposed habitat compensation must be of an appropriate distinctiveness to meet the trading rules of BNG.				
	A summary as to what off-site units will be required is detailed in the table below.				
		Distinctiveness	Broad Habitat Group	Habitat	Units Required

		Area-Based	Low	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.30	
				ANY	ANY	0.30	
			Total				
BNG Mitigation Hierarchy							
Avoidance	Impacts to notable habitats such as scattered trees and line of trees have been avoided in full. The loss of areas of modified grassland is necessary to facilitate the development and as such impacts to such habitat could not be minimised.						
Minimisation							
Mitigation	The loss is to be offset via a financial contribution to a suitable habitat bank.						
Offset							


Appendix 1: Baseline Habitat Plan



Appendix 2: Post-Development Habitat Plan



Appendix 3: Proposed Development Plan



Appendix 4: Headline BNG Results

FINAL RESULTS			
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-1.30	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-42.94%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲
	Hedgerow units	0.00%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲
	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲		

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	3.02	3.32	1.60
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.24	0.27	0.02
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Appendix 5a: Baseline Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

Urban Trees; assessed using 'Individual Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Achieved (Y/N)							
		T1-T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
E	Natural Ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.								
Number of criteria passed		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score		Score Achieved ✓					
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria		Good (3)		✓					
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria		Moderate (2)							
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria		Poor (1)							

Modified Grassland; assessed using 'Grasslands Low Distinctiveness' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria:		Condition passed (Yes or No)	Notes/Justification
A	There must be 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² , including at least 2 forbs. Note – this criterion is essential for achieving moderate condition.	N	Less than 6 vascular plant species per m ² .
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	N	Sward height is uniform.
C	Some scattered scrub (including bramble) may be present, but scrub accounts for less than 20% of total grassland area. Note - patches of shrubs with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Y	Scrub present for <20% of habitat parcel.
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or	N	Physical damage present in more than 5% of total grassland area.

	storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.		
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens).	Y	Bare ground cover between 1% and 10%.
F	Cover of bracken less than 20%.	Y	No bracken observed (less than 20% coverage).
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981).	Y	Absence of invasive species.
Essential criterion achieved (Y/N)			N
Number of criteria passed			4
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ✓	
Passes 6 or 7 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)		
Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)		
Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 7 criteria; OR 4, 5 or 6 of criteria but failing criterion A	Poor (1)	✓	

Line of Trees; assessed using 'Line of Trees' habitat type condition sheet:

Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes/Justification
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	Y	At least 70% of trees are native species.
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5m wide.	Y	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous. Gaps in canopy cover <10% and no individual gap >5m wide.
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Y	One or more trees has veteran features and/or ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates.
D	There is an undisturbed naturally-vegetated strip of at least 6m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice.	N	There is not an undisturbed naturally vegetated strip of at least 6m on both sides.
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this). 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.	Y	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition. There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health.
Number of criteria passed			4
Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ✓
Passes 5 criteria		Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria		Moderate (2)	✓

Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		
----------------------------	----------	--	--

Appendix 5b: Post-Development Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

Condition assessment for proposed habitats are N/A.