

BAMFORD MEWS, ROCHDALE

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

February 2026



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Bamford Mews, Rochdale
Reference: CW20-2429
Report Title: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Report Reference: CW20-2429 RPT 002
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

<i>Rev</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Prepared</i>	<i>Reviewed</i>	<i>Approved</i>
/	19/11/2025	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	KBrewer	KB	KB
//	03/02/2026	Amended report sent to Client.	KBrewer	EC	KB

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to McCarthy Stone and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with McCarthy Stone and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client's agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to McCarthy Stone and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1	SCOPE & PURPOSE	4
1.2	LOCATION	4
1.3	OBJECTIVES	4
1.4	PLANNING CONTEXT	4
2	METHODS.....	6
2.1	EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE)	6
2.2	PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)	6
2.3	STATUTORY METRIC	6
2.4	HABITAT SCORING	6
2.5	LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT	7
3	BASELINE CONDITIONS.....	8
3.1.	STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE	8
3.2.	HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT	8
3.3.	RETAINED AND ENHANCED HABITATS	9
3.4.	LOST HABITATS	9
3.5.	PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE	9
4	HABITAT CREATION	10
5	SUMMARY	11
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	12
	APPENDIX 1: CONDITION ASSESSMENT SHEETS	13

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by McCarthy Stone to prepare a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the proposed works at Bamford Mews, Rochdale. The report has been produced in support of a planning application for a residential development at the site.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Katie Brewer BSc (Hons), Senior Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Katie holds three years' experience managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.

1.1.2. This report has been written broadly following the Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates (CIEEM, 2023).

1.2. LOCATION

1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location.



Figure 1.1 Site Location

1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The report has been produced to document the methods, results and conclusions of a BNG Assessment undertaken based on the proposed development for the site to fulfil the following:

- Ensure that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied;
- Identify the baseline habitats present and provide a condition assessment;
- Identify the post development habitats on site, assess the possible target condition and provide an indication of the likely importance of those habitats;
- Calculate the overall change in biodiversity score from pre- post development
- Provide design recommendations to maximise potential net gain achievable
- Provide an indication of likely outcomes and indicative cost as required.

1.4 PLANNING CONTEXT

- 1.4.1 The Government 25-year Environment Plan states that government will “embed environmental net gain principle for development.”
- 1.4.2 National policy already sets out that planning should provide Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) where possible. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraphs 174(d), 179(b) and 180(d) refer to this policy requirement and the Natural Environment Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further explanation on how this should be done.
- 1.4.3 Under the Environment Act 2021, all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) except for small sites will have to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain. BNG will be measured using Defra's biodiversity metric and habitats will need to be secured for at least 30 years. Key points regarding BNG are listed below:
- Minimum 10% gain required calculated using Biodiversity Metric & approval of net gain plan.
 - Habitat secured for at least 30 years via obligations/ conservation covenant.
 - Habitat can be delivered on-site, off-site or via statutory biodiversity units.
 - There will be a national register for net gain delivery sites.
 - The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation, and compensation for biodiversity loss.
 - Will also apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs)
 - Does not apply to marine development.
 - Does not change existing legal environmental and wildlife protections.
- 1.4.4 Developers are required to undertake an assessment (using the nationally set BNG metric tool) of the current biodiversity value of their site both prior to and post the development proposal. In the event that the value of the site post-development is less than 10% better than it was prior to development then the developer will have an obligation to provide additional off-site BNG units to achieve the mandatory 10% net gain.

2 METHODS

2.1 EXISTING HABITAT (BASELINE)

- 2.1.1. A walkover of the site was undertaken by Caitlin O'Connor, Consultant Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. The survey was undertaken on the 5th November 2024. The walkover survey was undertaken broadly in line with standard UK HAB Methodology, Version 2 (2023).
- 2.1.2. An updated walkover was completed by Katie Brewer BSc (Hons) Senior Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. The survey was undertaken on the 5th September 2025. The weather was overcast (8/8 oktas), with light precipitation, wind speed 1 and 17C. This walkover found the habitats onsite to be of higher value and therefore an updated BNG assessment was undertaken. Please refer to 20-2429 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Collington Winter for the findings.

2.2 PLANNING LAYOUT (POST-DEVELOPMENT)

- 2.2.1 The Site Layout (Ref: Job No – 4922, Drawing Number – 101 Revision E) produced by tpm Landscape has provided a red line boundary and indicative post-development habitats for the development.

2.3 STATUTORY METRIC

- 2.3.1 The BNG calculation was undertaken utilising Statutory Metric from DEFRA, the site's UK Habitat map and the Site Plan. The calculation was performed by a technically competent and experienced ecologist as detailed in British Standard BS8683 – Suitably qualified person –definition in BS8683:2020.
- 2.3.2 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric uses habitat features as a proxy measure for capturing the value and importance of nature. The metric considers the size, ecological condition, location and proximity to nearby 'connecting' features. The metric enables assessments to be made of the present and forecast future biodiversity value of a site.
- 2.3.3 The Small Sites Metric could not be utilised due to the presence of Priority Habitat Inventory - Deciduous Woodland located approximately 100m north of the site.

2.4 HABITAT SCORING

- 2.4.1 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric supplies reference documents and user guides in which to accurately evaluate and assess the different habitats on site. The methodology for the baseline and post development calculations are demonstrated in the following sections.

Baseline Units

- 2.4.2 To assess the quality of a habitat and therefore calculate the units scored the Statutory Biodiversity Metric utilises three scoring factors as detailed below.

Condition

- 2.4.3 The condition of a habitat is assessed utilising the Condition Sheets provided for each habitat type. These list positive indicators for each habitat and indicate how many of these indicators need to be present to meet certain thresholds of condition. These condition sheets can be found in The Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets with instructions tool Technical (Natural England Joint Publication, 2023).

Distinctiveness

- 2.4.4 The distinctiveness of each habitat (area and linear) is automatically assigned by the tool, based upon national records of the occurrence and rarity of each habitat (The Statutory Biodiversity metric).

Strategic Significance

- 2.4.5 The idea of strategic significance works at a landscape scale. It gives additional unit value to habitats that are in preferred locations for biodiversity and other environmental objectives. Strategic significance utilises published local plans and objectives to identify local priorities for targeting biodiversity and nature improvement, such as Nature Recovery Areas, local biodiversity plans, National Character Area objectives and green infrastructure strategies.

Post Development Units

2.4.6 Additional factors are implemented when assessing post development habitats.

- Difficulty of Creation/Enhancement
- Temporal Risk “Time to target condition”
- Spatial Risk (when offsite mitigation is necessary)

2.5 LIMITATIONS OF ASSESSMENT

2.5.1 Whilst every effort has been made to provide a comprehensive description of the site, no investigation could ensure the complete characterisation and prediction of the natural environment. The conclusions and recommendations detailed in this report are based upon the site redline boundary and the development proposals as outlined by the client at the time of writing. Should there be any changes to the site redline boundary or development proposals at a later stage, this assessment should be reviewed to determine whether any amendments or additional survey work is required.

2.5.2 Habitat areas (predevelopment) have been measured using online mapping and therefore will not be completely accurate. Post development areas have been provided by the client.

Table 2.1 Limitations Review

Limitation	Analysis
Competence of surveyor	Condition Assessment was undertaken by Katie Brewer, Senior Ecologist who holds three years' experience in ecological consultancy and holds key experience undertaking BNG assessments and providing advice on habitat creation, management and enhancements for both developers and habitat banks.
Competence of ecologist completing the metric	The Metric was completed by Katie Brewer and reviewed by Katie Bird MEnvSci, ACIEEM Associate Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd.
Age of survey data	The condition assessment was undertaken in September 2025 and is therefore less than 12 months old. There is no constraint to the age of survey data and this falls within best practice guidance.
Timing of survey	N/A.
Departure from best practice guidance	There was no departure from best practise guidance.

3 BASELINE CONDITIONS

3.1. STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

- 3.1.1. The site lies within the jurisdiction of Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council. The responsible authority for the production of a Local Nature Recovery Strategy in this region is the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA).
- 3.1.2. A published Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) is available for the Greater Manchester region, approved by the GMCA in June 2025. The strategy identifies a network of core nature sites and opportunity areas for habitat restoration and sets priorities and targets for nature recovery across the region. The site does not fall within the interactive map.
- 3.1.3. The site is “Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy” as the site does not fall under the local plan.

3.2. HABITATS PRE-DEVELOPMENT

- 3.2.1. The pre-development habitats on site consist of a large area of un-managed grassland containing individual trees and bound by both treelines and hedgerows.
- 3.2.2. Table 3.1 summarises the baseline habitats and condition assessment. Please refer to the Appendix 1 for the Condition Assessment Sheets for each habitat.

Table 3.1 Habitat Type and Condition Assessment (pre-development)

Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Condition	Description
Developed land; sealed surface	0.0105	N/A - Other	Small area of car parking associated with adjacent residential area.
Other Neutral Grassland	1.245	Moderate	Unmanaged Holcus- Juncus Neutral Grassland
Tall forbs	0.0622	Good	Boundary areas of unmanaged forb species.
Bramble scrub	0.015	Condition Assessment N/A	Patches of bramble dominated scrub along boundaries.
Other woodland; broadleaved	0.1024	Moderate	Areas of broadleaved woodland associated with western boundary.
Urban tree	0.0489	Moderate	Twelve small individual trees throughout site.
Hedgerow Type	Length (km)	Condition	Description
Native Hedgerow	0.055	Good	Southwestern hedgerow
Line of trees	0.132	Moderate	Northern line of trees
Ecologically valuable Line of trees	0.03	Moderate	Eastern line of trees

3.3. RETAINED AND ENHANCED HABITATS

3.3.1. The following habitats are to be retained throughout the development:

- A total area of 0.089ha of woodland is to be retained, the remaining area will fall within a private garden and therefore the understory vegetation will be altered, this is assessed as downgraded and “created” in the metric.
- A total area of 0.07ha of other neutral grassland is to be retained.
- The total area of 0.015ha of bramble scrub is to be enhanced to mixed scrub.
- A total area of 0.006ha of Tall forbs is to be retained adjacent to the woodland.
- A total of nine individual trees are to be retained.
- The full length of the Ecologically Valuable Line of Trees is to be retained (TL1).
- The full length of the Line of Trees is to be retained (TL2) and buffered from vegetated gardens via a footpath.
- A total length of 0.053km of native hedgerow is to be retained.

3.4. LOST HABITATS

3.4.1. All other habitats within the red line boundary are to be lost to development.

3.5. PRE- DEVELOPMENT HABITAT BASELINE

3.5.1. Please refer to Table 3.3 summarising the Habitat Baseline for the calculation, demonstrating habitats to be retained, enhance and/or lost.

Table 3.3 Habitat Baseline

	<i>On site Baseline</i>	<i>Retained</i>	<i>Enhanced</i>	<i>Lost</i>
<i>Habitat (Area) Units</i>	11.6	1.6	0.06	9.94
<i>Hedgerow Units</i>	1.1	1.09	-	0.01

4 HABITAT CREATION

4.1.1. The following habitats creation is proposed post-development. It is anticipated that the development will have a 1-year delay in starting habitat creation.

Table 4.1 Habitat and Hedgerow Creation

Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness		Condition		Habitat Units Delivered
		Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	
Other Woodland, Broadleaved	0.014	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.05
Developed land; sealed surface	0.8	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	0
Vegetated garden	0.33	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	0.61
Modified Grassland (Front gardens under HMMP)	0.035	Low	2	Poor	1	0.07
Mixed Scrub	0.015	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.06
Introduced Shrub	0.067	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	0.12
Urban tree	0.0733	Medium	4	Poor	2	0.2
Urban Tree	0.1832	Medium	4	Moderate	2	0.54

4.1.2. It should be noted that 0.0733ha is the equivalent of 18 small urban trees and 0.1832ha is equivalent to 45 small urban trees.

5 SUMMARY

5.1.1. This report and the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric submitted have demonstrated that the proposed habitat creation will achieve a net loss of -71.07% in Habitat Units, and a net gain of 89.78% in Hedgerow Units.

5.1.2. The Trading Rules have not been satisfied due to the loss in habitat units.

Figure 5.1 On site net %

FINAL RESULTS		
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-8.25
	Hedgerow units	0.99
	Watercourse units	0.00
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-71.07%
	Hedgerow units	89.78%
	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%	11.60	12.76	9.41
Hedgerow units	10.00%	1.10	1.21	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓

No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

5.1.3. Given the lack of scope within the site to achieve 10% net gain relating to Habitat Units, offsetting will be required to meet policy requirements. It is calculated that 9.41 Habitat Units are required for the scheme to achieve the minimum 10% net gain. As a 10% net gain cannot be achieved onsite, Rochdale Borough Council or Local Habitat Banks should be contacted to identify potential offsetting options.

5.1.4. It is recommended that a 30 Year Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) be conditioned as part of the planning permission to meeting the targeted conditions of post development habitats. The HMMP will detail full management prescriptions, for the 30-year period required as best practice for biodiversity net gain. The HMMP will be provided to all tenants and future homeowners and will detail where monitoring surveys are to be conducted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CIEEM (2021) Biodiversity Net Gain Report and Audit Templates.
- DEFRA (2023) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Auditing and Accounting for Biodiversity

APPENDIX 1: CONDITION ASSESSMENT SHEETS

APPENDIX 2 – Post Development Target Habitat Conditions

Habitat Type: Modified Grassland		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	The are 6-8 vascular plant species per m2 present including at least 2 forbs. Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.	Yes
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	No
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area	No
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of the total grassland area.	Yes
C	Cover of bare ground between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.	Yes
E	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> less than 20%.	Yes
E	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on the Schedule 9 of WCA)	Yes

Habitat Type: Individual Trees		Target Condition: Moderate
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species).	Yes
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	No
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	No

Habitat Type: Native Hedgerow		Target Condition: Poor
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A1 – Height	>1.5 m average along length	Yes
A2 - Width	>1.5 m average along length	Yes
B1 - Gap - hedge base	>1.5 m average along length Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	No
B2 - Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length	No
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).	No
C2 - Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	No
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 WCA3) and recently introduced species.	No
D2 - Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	No

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type					
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types					
Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood Woodland and forest - Wet woodland					
Habitat Description					
Small area of broadleaved woodland situated along western site boundary.					
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification					
This condition sheet is based on the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG) Woodland Condition Survey Method, available here:					
Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)					
IMPORTANT: This biodiversity metric woodland condition assessment must be used to assess woodland being input into the biodiversity metric. The outputs of this condition assessment are not equivalent to, nor are they comparable with the scores from the EWBG condition assessment, because the EWBG assessment has been adapted for the biodiversity metric, including the removal of EWBG Indicator 7 (Proportion of favourable land cover around woodland) and Indicator 14 (Size of woodland), and minor changes to other indicators.					
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024		
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A		
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A		
Condition Assessment Criteria					
Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
A Age distribution of trees	Three age-classes ¹ present.	Two age-classes ¹ present.	One age-class ¹ present.	1	
B Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland ² .	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in less than 40% of whole woodland ² .	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland ² .	3	
C Invasive plant species	No invasive species ³ present in woodland.	Rhododendron <i>Rhododendron ponticum</i> or cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> not present, and other invasive species ³ <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species ³ ≥10% cover.	3	
D Number of native tree species	Five or more native tree or shrub species ⁴ found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species ⁴ found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species ⁴ across woodland parcel.	2	
E Cover of native tree and shrub species	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native ⁵ .	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native ⁵ .	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native ⁵ .	3	

Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs Urban - Allotments Urban - Biodiverse green roof Urban - Bioswale Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards Urban - Facade-bound green wall Urban - Ground based green wall Urban - Intensive green roof Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land Urban - Rain garden Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS) Urban - Vacant or derelict land Urban - Bare ground			
Habitat Description			
Area of tall forb species along the site boundary.			
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats:			UKHab – UK Habitat Classification
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - must be assessed for all urban habitat types :			
A	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.	No	
B	The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year.	No	
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ¹) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) ² cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area ³ . Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).	Yes	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land only:			
D	The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS: - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i); Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.	N/A	
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for Bioswale and SuDS habitat types only:			
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife ⁴ .	N/A	
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.	N/A	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Intensive green roofs only:			

F	The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).	N/A	
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Biodiverse green roofs only:			
G	The roof has a varied depth of 80 – 150 mm; at least 50% is at 150 mm and is planted and seeded with wildflowers and sedums or is pre-prepared with sedums and wildflowers. Note – to achieve Good condition some additional habitat, such as sand piles, stones, logs etc. are present.	N/A	
Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No)			Yes
Number of criteria passed			One
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/✓
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 3 core criteria only (all listed urban habitats except Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land, Bioswale, SuDS and Green roofs):			
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.		Good (3)	
• Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.		Moderate (2)	
• Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria.		Poor (1)	Yes
Results for Green roofs and Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (requiring assessment of 4 criteria only - core criteria plus additional criterion specified for habitat type):			
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes additional criterion relevant to specific habitat type (D, F or G).		Good (3)	N/A
• Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.		Moderate (2)	N/A
• Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria.		Poor (1)	N/A
Results for Bioswale or SuDS (requiring assessment of 5 criteria - core criteria plus additional criteria specified for habitat type):			
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E)		Good (3)	N/A
• Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR • Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.		Moderate (2)	N/A
• Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria.		Poor (1)	N/A
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Seeding to increase species diversity.			
Footnotes			

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Modified grassland			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Habitat Description			
Waterlogged modified grassland parcel associated with adjacent gated residential estate.			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m² present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition. Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m² (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	No	
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	No	
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Yes	
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	No	
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)².	Yes	
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Yes	

G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	Yes	
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			No
Number of criteria passed			Four
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)		
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Yes	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Seeding to improve species diversity.			
Footnotes			
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . 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: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees Individual trees – Rural trees Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.			
<i>Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of <u>rural</u> trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in <u>rural</u> locations.</i>			
Habitat Description			
Six small trees scattered across the site: SD 86227 13245, SD 86168 13264, SD 86163 13268, SD 86147 13279, SD 86132 13171, SD 86133 13165			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.			
Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only): Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) ¹ .	No	
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	
Number of criteria passed		Four	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/√	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	Yes	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.			
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score ²			

N/A

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Line of trees Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch Ecologically valuable line of trees Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch			
<i>Please see the separate Individual trees condition sheet for linear blocks and groups of trees in an <u>urban</u> setting. You should only use this Line of trees condition assessment and record this habitat type in <u>rural</u> locations.</i>			
Habitat Description			
An ecologically valuable line of trees, situated along the eastern site boundary.			
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide. This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook ¹ . For further clarifications please refer to the Handbook. Where ancient and veteran trees are present within the line of trees, see Footnote 2 for standing advice.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	Yes	
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	Yes	
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.	No	
D	There is an undisturbed naturally-vegetated strip of at least 6 m 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 ² .	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Number of criteria passed			Four
Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	Yes	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			

N/A

Footnotes

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Individual trees – Urban trees Individual trees – Rural trees Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.			
<i>Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of <u>rural</u> trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in <u>rural</u> locations.</i>			
Habitat Description			
Twenty-six medium trees scattered across the site and along the site boundaries: SD 86258 13237, SD 86249 13240, SD 86237 13243, SD 86231 13245, SD 86221 13249, SD 86215 13251, SD 86198 13254, SD 86185 13260, SD 86178 13263, SD 86172 13265, SD 86254 13241, SD 86159 13272, SD 86154 13275, SD 86147 13279, SD 86139 13284, SD 86131 13291, SD 86124 13289, SD 86120 13283, SD 86118 13278, SD 86115 13273, SD 86111 13265, SD 86115 13140, SD 86123 13147, SD 86115 13164, SD 86129 13165, SD 86130 13172			
Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.			
Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only): Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale	Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A	Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228	Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) ¹ .	Yes	
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Yes/No	
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	
Number of criteria passed		Five/Six	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/√	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	Yes	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.			
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score ²			

N/A

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 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				
Hawthorn hedgerow along the southern boundary on the western side of the site.				
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification				
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Bamford Mews, Rochdale		Survey date and Surveyor name	Caitlin O'Connor 05/11/2024
Limitations (if applicable)	N/A		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	N/A
Grid reference	SD 86172 13228		Habitat parcel reference	N/A
Condition Assessment Details				
A series of ten attributes, representing key physical characteristics are used for this assessment. Each attribute is assigned to one of five functional groups (A – E) and the condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of attributes from these functional groups which pass or fail the 'favourable condition' criteria. This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook¹ and Favourable Conservation Status document². For further clarification please refer to the Hedgerow Survey Handbook. Best practice would be to record the species, age, spacing and other key information about all trees present along a hedgerow within the 'Habitat Description' box, as well as other key features of the hedgerow.				
Hedgerow favourable condition attributes				
Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D and E)	Criteria - the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Criteria description	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core groups - applicable to all hedgerow types				
A1.	Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of the shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is >1.5 m height).	Yes
A2.	Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (such as blackthorn <i>Prunus spinosa</i> suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they are >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).	No
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).	No

B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).	Yes	
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 disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedgerow. Undisturbed ground is present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1 m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedgerow. This criterion recognises the value of the hedgerow base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat 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 used are nettles <i>Urtica</i> spp., cleavers <i>Galium aparine</i> and docks <i>Rumex</i> spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.	No	
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 species refer to plants that have naturalised in 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 .	Yes	
D2.	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (for example, excessive hedgerow cutting).	Yes	
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only					
E1.	Tree class	There is more than one age-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 if there are a range of age-classes or morphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide opportunities for different species.	N/A	
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 the trees are subject to damage which compromises the survival and health of the individual specimens.	N/A	

The hedgerow condition assessment generates a weighting (score) ranging from 1 - 3, which is used within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The scores for each are set out in the tables below.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees		
Category	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 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 <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1
Score achieved:		2
Condition categories for hedgerows with trees		

Category	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 <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> 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 <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1	
Score achieved:		N/A	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			
Increase the width of the hedge through changes to management practices.			