



MyPad

Barton Road, Osbaston Phase 2

Biodiversity Net Gain Design Stage Report

3480319

OCTOBER 2025

RSK GENERAL NOTES

Document ref.: 3480319-D01(00)

Title: Barton Road, Osbaston – Biodiversity Net Gain Stage Report

Client: MyPad

Office: Bristol

Status: Draft

Document control

Revision	Date	Comments/amendments	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
00	07/10/2025	First issue	EP22	ML22	ML22

RSK Biocensus (RSK) has prepared this report for the sole use of the client, showing reasonable skill and care, for the intended purposes as stated in the agreement under which this work was completed. The report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express agreement of the client and RSK. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report.

Where any data supplied by the client or from other sources have been used, it has been assumed that the information is correct. No responsibility can be accepted by RSK Biocensus for inaccuracies in the data supplied by any other party. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on the assumption that all relevant information has been supplied by those bodies from whom it was requested.

No part of this report may be copied or duplicated without the express permission of RSK and the party for whom it was prepared.

Where field investigations have been carried out, these have been restricted to a level of detail required to achieve the stated objectives of the work.

This work has been undertaken in accordance with the quality management system of RSK Biocensus.

Switchboard: +44 (0)330 223 1074 Company contact: Enquiries@biocensus.co.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This document has been prepared by RSK Wilding, on behalf of MyPad, to present the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment for the proposed works at Phase 2 of Land North of Barton Road, Osbaston, located in the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough of Leicestershire (site central grid reference SK 41905 05689). The proposed works comprise the construction of a residential development
2. The BNG assessment uses the results of a UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) survey undertaken at the site during June 2025, to determine the habitats present on site before construction and to provide each habitat with a biodiversity value using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The biodiversity value of each habitat present on site is then totalled to provide an overall biodiversity value of the site before construction.
3. Proposed habitat changes after construction, based on a detailed landscape proposals plan provided by ISL Associated on behalf of the Client, are also provided a biodiversity value using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The biodiversity value for each habitat that will be present on site after construction is totalled and then compared against the total biodiversity value of habitats present before construction to provide an indication of the net change in biodiversity value as a result of the proposed development.
4. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric measures biodiversity value of habitats in 'biodiversity units' and this BNG assessment follows the methods set out in Statutory Biodiversity Metric user guide. A habitat is assigned a biodiversity unit score by considering its area (or length), distinctiveness, condition and strategic significance.
5. The full biodiversity assessment calculation can be found in the accompanying Excel document 3480319 – D02 - Osbaston, Barton Road - Biodiversity Assessment; however, screenshots of the main results tables are presented here in Appendix A, for convenience.
6. The condition assessments for all habitats present before construction are listed in Appendix B. This includes any deviation from standard guidance, assumptions and justifications for habitat classification and condition.
7. The site was found to comprise a total of four different habitats including *Modified grassland*, *Pond (non-priority habitat)*, *Native hedgerow* and *Native hedgerow with trees*. This results in a baseline of 6.35 area habitat biodiversity units, and 1.37 hedgerow biodiversity units. No irreplaceable or very high distinctiveness habitats are present onsite.
8. During the UKHab survey, it was noted that some of the Site was being used for spoil storage from the adjacent Phase 1 development, this had degraded the baseline habitat. In line with guidelines on habitat degradation of baseline habitats, the degraded area has been included as *Modified grassland* in good condition in line with the non-degraded habitat present in the remainder of the Application Site
9. Post-development plans include retaining hedgerows and the pond, and creating new Developed land; sealed surface, Introduced shrub, Modified grassland, Other neutral grassland, Vegetated Garden and Urban trees, totalling 2.80 area habitat biodiversity units and 2.82 hedgerow biodiversity units.

10. This BNG assessment thus concludes that the current proposed development will result in a net change of -3.54 area habitat biodiversity units and 1.45 hedgerow biodiversity units. This equates to a -55.83% net loss in biodiversity. The trading rules in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric have not been met for low distinctiveness habitat types.
11. The Applicant proposes to purchase units from a Habitat Bank in order to get a 10% net gain in biodiversity and meet the trading rules.
12. A habitat management and monitoring plan will be produced as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to ensure the habitats created and enhanced are managed appropriately to deliver maximum biodiversity value.

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of Document.....	1
1.2 Landscape Context.....	1
1.3 The Proposed Development.....	1
1.4 Policy context	2
The Environment Act	2
Town and Country Planning Act	2
National Planning Policy Framework.....	2
Local Plans	2
2.0 METHODS.....	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Biodiversity Assessment Methods.....	3
2.3 BNG Good Practice Principles for Development.....	5
2.1 Irreplaceable Habitats and Very High Distinctiveness Habitats	6
2.2 Assumptions and Limitations.....	6
3.0 RESULTS	8
3.1 Overview.....	8
3.2 Pre-development	8
g4 – <i>Modified grassland</i>	8
r1a - Eutrophic standing waters (41 – pond (non-priority habitat)).....	9
h2a - Native hedgerow (11 - hedgerow with trees)	9
h2a – Native hedgerow.....	9
Area habitats.....	9
Hedgerows.....	10
3.3 Post-development.....	11
Area habitats.....	11
Hedgerows.....	12
3.4 Change in Biodiversity Value	13
4.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION PLAN	15
5.0 OUTLINE BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING PLAN.....	16
6.0 EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS	22
6.1 Biodiversity Net Gain	22
6.2 Purchasing Units to Achieve 10% Net Gain	22
REFERENCES.....	23
FIGURES	24
APPENDIX A – BNG ASSESSMENT	25
APPENDIX B – PRE-DEVELOPMENT HABITAT CONDITION SURVEY RESULTS	28
APPENDIX C - POST-DEVELOPMENT CONDITION ASSESSMENTS.....	34

TABLES

Table 1 – Statutory Biodiversity Metric multipliers and their explanations.....	4
Table 2 – Defra metric good practice principles and justification.....	5
Table 3 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each habitat recorded within the Application Site before construction	10

Table 4 – Extent of baseline area habitats being lost, retained and enhanced within Application Site along with their associated biodiversity unit values	10
Table 5 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each hedgerow recorded within Application Site before construction	10
Table 6 – Extent of baseline hedgerows being lost, retained and enhanced within Application Site along with their associated biodiversity unit values	11
Table 7 – Post-development area habitat biodiversity unit values within the Application Site based on the current design	11
Table 8 – Post-development hedgerow biodiversity unit values within the Application Site based on the current design	12
Table 9 – Change in biodiversity units as a result of the Proposed Development	14
Table 10 – Recommended management and maintenance actions to establish newly created or enhanced habitats on the Site.	17
Table 11 – Habitat condition survey results for <i>Modified grassland</i>	28
Table 12 - Habitat condition survey results for <i>Pond (non-priority habitat)</i>	29
Table 13 - Habitat condition survey results for <i>Native hedgerow</i>	30
Table 14 - Habitat condition survey results for <i>Native hedgerow with trees (southern boundary)</i>	31
Table 15 - Habitat condition survey results for <i>Native hedgerow with trees (around pond)</i>	33

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Document

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared by RSK Wilding, on behalf of MyPad ('the Applicant') to present the results of a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment for the proposed housing ('the Proposed Development') at Phase 2 of Land north of Barton Road, Osbaston ('the Application Site'). This report is being used to support a Full Planning application to Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.
- 1.1.2 The document provides:
- a detailed methodology, including assumptions, for undertaking the BNG assessment;
 - the baseline biodiversity value of habitats within the Application Site prior to construction;
 - the likely biodiversity value of habitats within the Application Site post-development based on the current design information; and
 - the relative biodiversity change of habitats within the Application Site after construction compared with before construction, determining whether the Proposed Development has achieved a 10% net gain in biodiversity.

1.2 Landscape Context

- 1.2.1 The Application Site is located within the administrative boundary of Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council and is in the Leicestershire and South Derbyshire Coalfield National Character Area (NCA). The Application Site is situated at site central grid reference SK 41905 05689. It is c. 1.05 hectares (ha) and comprises grassland and a pond (Figure 1).
- 1.2.2 The Application Site is bordered to the north by arable land, to the south by Barton Road, to the east by Phase 1 of the residential development and to the west by arable land (which is intended to also be developed as a later Phase of the same development).
- 1.2.3 The Application Site is situated in a largely rural context, surrounded by a network of arable fields and pasture interconnected by hedgerows, pockets of woodland, ditches and small streams. The village of Osbaston sits 160 m to the east and the town of Market Bosworth sits 2.5 km to the south west.
- 1.2.4 There are hedgerow habitats that qualify as the priority habitat types under Section 41 of The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 within the Application Site.

1.3 The Proposed Development

- 1.3.1 The Proposed Development consists of 28 dwellings including 2 bungalows, 8 two bedroom houses and 18 three bedroom houses. The development is being undertaken in Phases with phase 1 (directly east of the development) having been approved under

24/00294/REM being under construction at the time of writing. Phase 1 was approved prior to the requirement for mandatory BNG and so did not receive a BNG assessment. This report and assessment refer only to the development within Phase 2 (Figure 3).

1.4 Policy context

- 1.4.1 The primary aims of the BNG process are for developments to secure a measurable improvement in habitat for biodiversity, to minimise biodiversity losses and to help to restore ecological networks whilst streamlining development processes. BNG does not replace other existing legislation and policy for nature conservation. The below legislation and policy provide the context behind the need to achieve BNG.

The Environment Act

- 1.4.2 The Environment Act 2021 mandates a statutory requirement for developments to deliver a minimum 10% BNG which has been mandatory from February 2024.

Town and Country Planning Act

- 1.4.3 Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) mandates a statutory requirement for developments to deliver a minimum 10% BNG which will have been mandatory from January 2024.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 1.4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied by Local Authorities within their Local Development Frameworks (LDF). The revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2024 (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, 2024).
- 1.4.5 Chapter 15 of the NPPF 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' sets out the requirements to consider BNG in planning decisions. Paragraph 192 states: "*To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: ... b) propose the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.*"

Local Plans

- 1.4.6 The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan (2022) includes NAT08 Enhancing Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity which states '*Development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve and enhance features of nature conservation and geological value including proposals for their long-term future management and how the scheme is pollinator friendly. All development should provide a measurable 10% net gain in biodiversity on site in the first instance, through biodiversity enhancement off-site, or through off setting where appropriate. All proposals should be supported by evidence to demonstrate a biodiversity net gain using the recognised biodiversity accounting metric and provide details of the long-term maintenance and management of the net gain.*'

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 This BNG assessment has been carried out as a desk-based exercise and has been undertaken by a competent person in accordance with best practice¹ (EP22, MCIEEM) .
- 2.1.2 The results of UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) surveys carried out within the Application Site by RSK Biocensus (sister company of RSK Wilding) in June 2025 has been used to determine the biodiversity value of habitats within the Application Site before construction (Figure 2).
- 2.1.3 The detailed landscape proposals provided by ISL Associates on behalf of the Applicant for the Proposed Development have been used to determine the biodiversity value of habitats within the Application Site after construction (Figure 3).
- 2.1.4 The primary documents consulted as part of this assessment include:
 - Barton Road, Osbaston Ecological Appraisal (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, 2020)
 - Residential Development Barton Road, Osbaston, Leics Detailed Landscape Proposals (ISL Associates, 2025)

2.2 Biodiversity Assessment Methods

- 2.2.1 This assessment was undertaken in line with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2021), the British Standard for Biodiversity Net Gain (BS 8683) and industry best practice (CIEEM/CIRIA/IEMA, 2016).
- 2.2.2 To calculate the baseline values for the Application Site, and assess any changes arising from the Proposed Development, this study uses methods set out the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (hereafter 'the Metric') user guide (Defra, 2024). The Metric measures biodiversity value for habitats in 'biodiversity units' (BUs)².
- 2.2.3 The Metric is designed to quantify losses and gains of biodiversity as a result of proposed development or land management to inform and improve planning, design, land management and decision-making. The Metric uses habitats and as a proxy to describe biodiversity.
- 2.2.4 The Metric can calculate biodiversity value of:
 - existing habitats;
 - habitat enhancement; and
 - habitat creation.

¹ A competent person has the knowledge and skills to perform specified tasks to complete and review biodiversity metric calculations. This is obtained through training, qualifications, experience, or a combination of them. Competency is aligned with the British Standard '*Process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain* (BS 8683:202)'.

² 'Biodiversity units' are used to describe relative biodiversity value. There are three types of biodiversity units: area habitat units, hedgerow units and watercourse units. Each of these are calculated in separate 'modules' of the biodiversity metric.

- 2.2.5 The Metric can calculate different types of BUs. There are three types of biodiversity units, which are calculated in three separate 'modules' of the Metric. These are:
- area habitat units (e.g. woodland, grasslands, wetlands);
 - hedgerow units (e.g. hedgerows and lines of trees); and
 - watercourse units (e.g. culverts, canals, wet ditches, rivers and streams).
- 2.2.6 Consequently, a site can have three biodiversity unit values, which are assessed using the Metric, but which cannot be summed together or traded between.
- 2.2.7 The area or length of a habitat is multiplied by several factors in the Metric (called multipliers) that indicate its quality and value (distinctiveness, condition and strategic location), and this provides its BU value.
- 2.2.8 In addition, for those habitats that are to be created or enhanced, the risk of failure is accounted for by applying multipliers for risk factors (difficulty, time to target condition, and off-site risk).
- 2.2.9 A brief description of the different multipliers contained within the Metric are detailed below in Table 1.

Table 1 – Statutory Biodiversity Metric multipliers and their explanations

Biodiversity Metric multiplier	Explanation
Habitat distinctiveness	A measure based on the type of habitat and its distinguishing features. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consideration of species richness and rarity; • the extent to which the habitat is protected by designations; and • the degree to which a habitat supports species rarely found in other habitats.
Habitat condition	A measure of the habitat against its ecological optimum state. Condition is a way of measuring variation in the quality of patches of the same habitat type.
Strategic significance	Describes the local significance of the habitat based on its location and the habitat type.
Difficulty	A measure which represents the uncertainty in the effectiveness of management techniques used to enhance or create habitat.
Time to target condition	The average time taken between starting creation or enhancement of habitats and that habitat reaching its target condition or distinctiveness.
Spatial risk	Spatial risk represents the relationship between the location of biodiversity loss (on-site) and where the off-site habitat is being delivered. This is applied to off-site interventions only.
Riparian zone encroachment	A measure of any feature or intervention within the riparian zone that reduces the quantity, quality or ecological function of the riparian habitat.
Watercourse encroachment	A measure of any feature that adversely affects the natural function of the watercourse, or results in localised changes in habitat, species and migratory pathways.

2.3 BNG Good Practice Principles for Development

2.3.1 The Metric has been designed as a tool to help inform plans and decisions; however, when undertaking BNG assessments this must be undertaken in accordance with set principles outlined in the user guide (Defra, 2024). These are outlined in Table 2 along with a full justification regarding how each principle has been considered.

Table 2 – Defra metric good practice principles and justification

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
Principle 1: The metric assessment should be completed by a competent person.	The Assessment was completed by EP22 senior ecologist, MCIEEM who has five years' experience undertaking BNG assessments. Quality and technical review has been carried out by Technical Director with 30 years' experience, FCIEEM, CEcol.
Principle 2: The use of this biodiversity metric does not override existing biodiversity protections, statutory obligations, policy requirements, ecological mitigation hierarchy or any other requirements. This includes consenting or licensing processes, for example woodlands.	Existing levels of protection afforded to protected species and habitats are not changed by use of this or any other metric. Statutory obligations will still need to be satisfied. The Ecological Appraisal (FPCR, 2020) details the presence of protected and/or notable species, sites and habitats, and assesses potential impacts and outlines suitable mitigation measures to address these.
Principle 3: The biodiversity metric should be used in accordance with established good practice guidance and professional codes.	The mitigation hierarchy has been applied to the design of the Proposed Development. The area of permanent habitat loss has been kept to a minimum without comprising the development. The habitats that will be created and enhanced within the Application Site will be appropriate, and of the correct distinctiveness, to compensate for the habitats that will be impacted.
Principle 4: The biodiversity metric is not a complex or comprehensive ecological model and is not a substitute for expert ecological advice.	RSK Wilding acknowledges that the Defra Metric has been kept deliberately simple to be of practical use. The calculations have been undertaken by specialists and input is underpinned by robust baseline evidence and ecological knowledge and experience.
Principle 5: Biodiversity units are a proxy for biodiversity and should be treated as relative values.	RSK Wilding acknowledges that the Defra Metric is tool to be used as a means of assessing changes in biodiversity value (losses or gains) brought about by the proposed development and is a habitat based approach to determining a proxy biodiversity value within the Application Site and the output does not represent absolute values.
Principle 6: This biodiversity metric is designed to inform decisions in conjunction with locally relevant evidence, expert input, or guidance.	Impacts to protected and notable species and habitats have been fully assessed as part of the Ecological Appraisal undertaken for the Proposed Development
Principle 7: Habitat interventions need to be realistic and deliverable within a relevant project timeframe.	The habitats chosen for creation and enhancement have been done so based on the existing on-site conditions and local context, not

Principle	Justification of how principle has been applied
	purely to achieve the greatest possible BNG result using the Defra Metric.
Principle 8: Created and enhanced habitats should be, where practical and reasonable, local to any impact and deliver strategically important outcomes for nature conservation.	The landscape plans has been designed to be in keeping with the local character of the area whilst also being in accordance with the Lawton principles of 'bigger, better, more and joined up'.
Principle 9: The biodiversity metric does not enforce a minimum habitat size ratio for compensation of losses. Proposals should aim to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain habitat extent - supporting more, bigger, better and more joined up ecological networks ensure that proposed or retained habitat parcels are of sufficient size for ecological function 	Where possible, in the first instance the same habitat type of better condition will be created. If conditions do not allow for the same habitat type to be created, consideration will be given to the creation of different habitats of the same broad type or higher and of better condition. A buffer of habitat will be either retained, created or enhanced around the perimeter of the Proposed Development which will continue to provide an ecological corridor to the wider landscape.

2.1 Irreplaceable Habitats and Very High Distinctiveness Habitats

- 2.1.1 Irreplaceable habitats (as provided for in secondary legislation for BNG³) do not have a BNG requirement as they are too valuable to be compensated for. As such, any losses to irreplaceable habitats cannot be calculated by the biodiversity metric tool and they are removed from the baseline.
- 2.1.2 There are no irreplaceable or very high distinctiveness habitats within the Application Site.

2.2 Assumptions and Limitations

- 2.2.1 The pond within the Application Site was not accessible at the time of the survey due to being surrounded by overgrown vegetation. To be precautionary this area has therefore been recorded as *Pond (non-priority habitat)* in moderate condition. This pond will be retained in the Proposed Development.
- 2.2.2 A large section of the site was being used for spoil storage from the adjacent Phase 1 development, this had degraded the baseline habitat. In line with guidelines on habitat degradation of baseline habitats, the degraded area has been included as *Modified grassland* in good condition in line with the non-degraded habitat present in the remainder of the Application Site.
- 2.2.3 The vast majority of vascular plants and bryophytes were confidently identified to species level. The exceptions to this rule were those genera with large numbers of superficially similar 'microspecies': Dandelions (*Taraxacum* sp.) were mostly identified to section level, and Brambles (*Rubus* sp.) were identified as an aggregate (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.).

³ <https://defralanduse.blog.gov.uk/2023/10/05/irreplaceable-habitats-and-bng-what-you-need-to-know/>

- 2.2.4 Vascular plant species were recorded during the survey, although no attempt was made to produce an exhaustive species list (additional species would almost certainly be found during more detailed surveys or repeat surveys at various times of the year).
- 2.2.5 The Metric Guidance (Defra, 2024) states that areas of individual trees should not be deducted from the total area of other habitats within the Application Site boundary. The 'area equivalent' is used to represent the area of individual trees. This value is a representation of canopy biomass, and is based on the root protection area formula, derived from BS 5837:2012. The area equivalent of individual trees is not related to the Site area and the metric does not count the area of individual trees towards the total Application Site area. The area of habitat underneath individual tree should be recorded as the relevant habitat type and captured within the biodiversity metric tool.
- 2.2.6 All habitat areas included within the assessment have been measured manually using ArcGIS based on the UKHab plan, as such habitat areas are approximations only. Values have been rounded to two decimal places where appropriate.
- 2.2.7 The UKHab Plan (Figure 2) has been used to determine all of the habitats present within the Application Site before construction.
- 2.2.8 The Proposed Site Plan (Figure 3) and discussions with the Applicant have been used to determine the habitats present within the Application site post-construction and their targeted conditions.
- 2.2.9 Leicestershire have not yet published their Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) which will lay out how strategic significance should be applied. However, a draft strategy has been published (Leicestershire and Rutland, 2025). This has been used to assign strategic significance to habitats. The site did not occur within a draft mapped strategy area – areas which could become of particular importance for biodiversity (ACB) and therefore a low strategic significance has been applied to all habitats in the pre and post construction.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 To calculate the overall biodiversity accounting position for the Proposed Development, the BU values for the existing habitats (pre-development) and the proposed newly created/enhanced habitats (post-development) need calculating.
- 3.1.2 The full results of this assessment are summarised in Appendix A, with the habitat condition sheets presented in Appendix B (pre-development) and Appendix C (post-development). The full Statutory Biodiversity Metric spreadsheet is presented separately in 3480319 – D02 – Barton Road, Osbaston – Biodiversity Assessment.

3.2 Pre-development

- 3.2.1 The Application Site comprises *Modified grassland* in good condition as well as a pond and several hedgerows. During the survey, a large proportion of the site was recorded as *Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface* as the land was being used for spoil and materials storage associated with the construction occurring on the Phase 1 development site (Figure 2).
- 3.2.2 Government advice⁴ on dealing with habitat degradation states that where habitat has been degraded prior to the submission of a planning application, the biodiversity pre-development value of the onsite habitat should be calculated as the biodiversity value of the habitat on the date immediately before the carrying out of these degradation activities.
- 3.2.3 In this case, the degraded habitat was previously analogous to the surrounding un-degraded *Modified grassland*. Therefore, for the purposes of this BNG assessment, the baseline for these areas have been considered as *Modified grassland* in good condition.
- 3.2.4 The UKHab Plan (Figure 2) has been used to determine all of the habitats present within the Application Site before construction.

g4 – Modified grassland

- 3.2.5 The majority of the site was considered to be *Modified grassland*. Previous ecological surveys on the Application Site (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, 2020) categorised the grassland on site as an arable ley. However, these surveys were undertaken in Phase 1 (a different habitat categorisation system than that used for Biodiversity net gain) and were also undertaken in 2020. Since this survey the grassland has been taken out of an arable rotation and appears to be unmanaged, and has developed now resembling a *Modified grassland* habitat type. A review of historical aerial imagery indicates that the last time the grassland field was cropped was 2023 which means that it cannot be considered an arable habitat in UKHab. Modified grassland was considered the best fit with the UK Habitat descriptions.

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain#para36>

- 3.2.6 The grassland was dominated by perennial rye grass (*Lolium perenne*) with creeping thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) abundant and docks (*Rumex* sp.) and creeping bent (*Agrostis stolonifera*) frequent in the sward. The following species were recorded as occasional: common couch (*Elymus repens*), dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale* agg.), hogweed (*Heracleum sphondylium*), white clover (*Trifolium repens*), Yorkshire fog (*Holcus lanatus*) and creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*). Field buttercup (*Ranunculus arvensis*), timothy (*Phleum pratense*) and scentless mayweed (*Tripleurospermum inodorum*) were all recorded as rare. Along the hedgerows common nettle (*Urtica dioica*), bramble (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.), cleavers (*Galium aparine*) and cow parsley (*Anthriscus sylvestris*) were all also recorded.
- 3.2.7 The grassland was considered to be in good condition. The condition assessment sheet for this habitat can be found in Appendix B.

r1a - Eutrophic standing waters (41 – pond (non-priority habitat))

- 3.2.8 The southeastern corner of the site contained a pond. This pond was not accessible during the survey due to being surrounded by a dense hedgerow which could not be penetrated by the surveyor. Therefore, the condition assessment for this habitat has been completed on a precautionary basis using information from the previous ecology surveys within the Application Site (FPCR Environment and Design Ltd, 2020). The condition of this pond is considered to be in moderate condition, failing on the fact that there isn't moderate distinctiveness semi-nature habitat completely surrounding the pond for a radius of 10m and that the pond is shaded by the nearby vegetation. The condition assessment sheet for this habitat can be found in Appendix B.

h2a - Native hedgerow (11 - hedgerow with trees)

- 3.2.9 The southern boundary of the Application Site was bordered by a hedgerow which comprised hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), elder (*Sambucus nigra*), ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) and field maple (*Acer campestre*). This hedgerow was in moderate condition.
- 3.2.10 Surrounding the pond in the southeast of the Application Site was a hedgerow comprising blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*) and ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) which was in moderate condition.

h2a – Native hedgerow

- 3.2.11 A single species hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) hedgerow was present on the southeast of the Application Site. This hedge was in good condition.

Area habitats

- 3.2.12 The total area of each area habitat recorded within the Application Site before construction, the condition of each habitat (i.e. its current status) and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each habitat recorded within the Application Site before construction

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Area (ha)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Modified grassland	Good	1.05	6.27
Pond (non-priority habitat)	Moderate	0.01	0.07
Total		1.05	6.35

3.2.13 The total area of each existing area habitat that will be lost, retained or enhanced within the Application Site and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4 – Extent of baseline area habitats being lost, retained and enhanced within Application Site along with their associated biodiversity unit values

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Area lost (ha)	Area retained (ha)	Area enhanced (ha)	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) lost	Forecast biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Modified grassland	Good	1.05	0.00	0.00	6.27	0.00	0.00
Pond (non-priority habitat)	Moderate	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00
Total		1.05	0.01	0.00	6.27	0.07	0.00

Hedgerows

3.2.14 The total length of each hedgerow recorded within the Application Site before construction, the condition of each habitat (i.e. its current status) and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5 – Baseline biodiversity unit values for each hedgerow recorded within Application Site before construction

Habitat type (UKHab classification)	Baseline habitat condition	Length (km)	Baseline biodiversity unit value (BU)
Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	0.15	1.19
Native hedgerow	Good	0.03	0.18
Total		0.18	1.37

- 3.2.15 The total length of each existing hedgerow that will be lost, retained or enhanced within the Application Site and a summary of the BUs this represents, are all presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6 – Extent of baseline hedgerows being lost, retained and enhanced within Application Site along with their associated biodiversity unit values

Habitat type	Baseline habitat condition	Length lost (km)	Length retained (km)	Length enhanced (km)	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) lost	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) retained	Baseline biodiversity units (BU) enhanced
Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	1.19	0.00
Native hedgerow	Good	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00
Total		0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	1.37	0.00

3.3 Post-development

- 3.3.1 The detailed landscape proposals (Figure 3) have been used to identify all the habitats that will be created, enhanced or retained within the Application Site after construction.

Area habitats

- 3.3.2 A breakdown of areas for each proposed area habitat created or enhanced post-development within Application Site and a summary of the BUs this represents are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 – Post-development area habitat biodiversity unit values within the Application Site based on the current design

Habitat type	Forecast habitat condition	Habitat intervention	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Vegetated garden	N/A	Created	0.21	0.41
Modified grassland	Poor	Created	0.04	0.07
Introduced shrub	N/A	Created	0.02	0.04
Other neutral grassland	Moderate	Created	0.29	1.94
Urban tree	Moderate	Created	0.09	0.26
Developed land; sealed surface	N/A	Created	0.48	0.00
Pond (non-priority habitat)	Moderate	Retained	0.01	0.07

Habitat type	Forecast habitat condition	Habitat intervention	Forecast area (ha)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Total			1.05	2.80

3.3.3 The post-development biodiversity accounting calculations for area habitats have been undertaken using the following assumptions based off the detailed landscape proposals (Figure 3).

- Amenity grass turf within what will be private gardens has been recorded as *Vegetated garden*.
- Amenity grass turf outside of private gardens have been recorded as *Modified grassland* in poor condition. This grassland will likely be species poor and will likely be kept short.
- Proposed areas of shrub planting have been recorded as *Introduced shrub*. The planting mix for this area indicates that species will be largely non-native.
- Grass seeding to attenuation basin and wildflower/grass mix have been included as *other neutral grassland* in moderate condition. These areas will likely be managed for wildlife and be allowed to develop into a species rich and diverse sward.
- The proposed tree planting (excluding the trees in the hedge on the northern boundary of the Application Site) have been recorded as *Urban trees* in moderate condition.
- New houses and areas of hardstanding have been recorded as *Developed land; sealed surface*.
- The detailed landscape proposals show that the pond in the southeast of the site will be retained. This will be safeguarded during construction and will be retained in its existing condition (moderate).

3.3.4 The planting schedules and seed mixes for each newly created area habitat will be detailed within the LEMP.

3.3.5 Condition assessment criteria for newly created and enhanced area habitats are provided in Appendix C.

Hedgerows

3.3.6 A breakdown of lengths for each proposed hedgerow created or enhanced post-development within Application Site and a summary of the BUs this represents are presented in Table 8.

Table 8 – Post-development hedgerow biodiversity unit values within the Application Site based on the current design

Habitat type	Forecast habitat condition	Habitat intervention	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
Native hedgerow	Moderate	Creation	0.07	0.25
	Good	Retention	0.03	0.18
Non-native and	N/A	Creation	0.13	0.13

Habitat type	Forecast habitat condition	Habitat intervention	Forecast length (km)	Forecast biodiversity unit value (BU)
ornamental hedge				
Species-rich native hedgerow	Good	Creation	0.04	0.25
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	Good	Creation	0.10	0.82
Native hedgerow with trees	Moderate	Retention	0.15	1.19
Total			0.52	1.45

3.3.7 The post-development biodiversity accounting calculations for hedgerows have been undertaken using the following assumptions based off the detailed landscape proposal plans (Figure 3).

- *Carpinus betulus* (Native Hornbeam) Hedge has been recorded as a native hedgerow in moderate condition. These hedgerows will be present in close proximity to hardstanding and buildings and are unlikely to reach good condition.
- *Prunus lusitanica* (Portuguese Laurel) hedge was recorded as *Non-native ornamental hedge* as it will comprise only non-native species.
- Proposed native hedgerow has been recorded as two separate habitat types within the BNG. The hedgerow along the northern boundary of the Application Site has been recorded as *Species-rich native hedgerow with trees* as the detailed landscape proposals indicate that trees will be present in the hedge in this location. The remainder of this habitat type has been recorded as *Species-rich native hedgerow*. The detailed landscape proposals indicate that these hedgerows will be planted with over five woody species per 30m making them species rich. It is thought that moderate condition will be achievable for these hedgerows.
- The detailed landscape proposals indicate that all of the existing hedgerows will be retained. They will be safeguarded during construction and retained in their current conditions (moderate and good).

3.3.8 The planting schedules and seed mixes for each newly created / enhanced hedgerow are detailed within the LEMP.

3.3.9 Condition assessment criteria for newly created and enhanced hedgerows are provided in Appendix C.

3.4 Change in Biodiversity Value

3.4.1 The habitat creation and enhancement proposals as per the detailed landscape proposals (Figure 3) is anticipated to result in a net decrease of area habitat and hedgerow BUs. This is summarised in Table 9.

Table 9 – Change in biodiversity units as a result of the Proposed Development

Post-development area habitat biodiversity units (BU)		Baseline area habitat area biodiversity units (BU)		Change in area habitat biodiversity units (BU)	Percentage change (%)
2.80	-	6.35	=	-3.54	-55.83
Post-development hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)		Baseline hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)		Change in hedgerow biodiversity units (BU)	Percentage change (%)
2.82	-	1.37	=	1.45	106.11

3.4.2 The change in biodiversity value for the Proposed Development, as set out in Table 9, indicates that post-development:

- there would be a decrease of **3.54** area habitat BUs which equates to a **-55.83%** net loss in area habitats. The trading rules associated with the Metric have not been met for area habitats as a result of the Proposed Development. This is because there is a net loss in low distinctiveness habitat units.
- there would also be an increase of **1.45** hedgerow BUs which equates to an **106.11%** net gain in hedgerows. The trading rules associated with the Metric have been met for hedgerows as a result of the Proposed Development.

4.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSTRUCTION PLAN

- 4.1.1 The implementation and creation of habitats post development will be detailed in a Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). An outline BNG management and monitoring plan is presented in Section 5 below.
- 4.1.2 These will include detailed drawings, management proposals and timetables, as well as a plan to define who is responsible for activities.

5.0 OUTLINE BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING PLAN

- 5.1.1 The LEMP will detail the adaptive management and monitoring plan which will guide all habitat management and monitoring at the Application Site. The LEMP will also include necessary interventions should habitats fall short of their desired future condition.
- 5.1.2 Whilst the proposed habitat management and monitoring plan will be set out in further detail in the LEMP, recommended management and maintenance actions are summarised here in Table 13, which are based on current proposals (Figure 3), however as the development progresses these will be revised and updated accordingly.
- 5.1.3 The proposed habitat management and monitoring activities will be the responsibility of the Client to complete

Table 10 – Recommended management and maintenance actions to establish newly created or enhanced habitats on the Site.

Subject	Task	Management to be undertaken	Rationale	Timing	Year					Summary of long-term management and monitoring
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
Modified grassland	Watering	During Years 1-3 only water seeded areas if unseasonal conditions result in a lack of adequate rainfall to aid germination of seed, water as necessary to ensure the establishment and continued thriving of all seeding.	Watering to be undertaken if required to ensure establishment of grassland sward.	May to September	✓	✓	✓			<p>Cut grassed areas to height of 25-40mm regularly as required.</p> <p>Undesirable species should be controlled through spot treatment in August each year.</p> <p>Grassland should be monitored for 30 years between May and August</p>
	Mowing	Mowing of grass	Cutting aims to establish a grassland sward suitable for recreation and amenity use.	April-September	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Control of weeds	Cover of undesirable species including docks, thistles and ragwort to be reviewed annually and spot treatment with herbicide and suitable portable applicator (or pulling where appropriate) to be undertaken to maintain overall presence in at 5% or less.	Aims to prevent undesirable species gaining dominance within the grassland sward.	August	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Other neutral grassland	Watering	During Years 1-3 only water seeded areas if unseasonal conditions result in a lack of adequate rainfall to aid germination of seed, water as necessary to ensure the establishment and continued thriving of all seeding.	Watering to be undertaken if required to ensure establishment of grassland sward.	April to September	✓	✓	✓			Undesirable species should be controlled through spot treatment in August each year.

Subject	Task	Management to be undertaken	Rationale	Timing	Year					Summary of long-term management and monitoring
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
	Cut grassland to 150mm at end of first growing season.	Undertake grassland cut at height of 150mm in August. An uncut margin to be left around the perimeter of grassland areas. Cut material from the remaining grassland areas to be collected and removed from the site. Remove all litter and debris prior to cutting.	Cutting aims to encourage an open sward and ensure structural diversity and provide habitat that is suitable for invertebrates, reptiles and amphibians.	August	✓					Grassland should be cut to a height of 150mm each year in August with all arisings immediately removed from site. Grassland should be monitored for 30 years between May and August
	Control of undesirable species	Cover of undesirable species including docks, thistles and ragwort to be reviewed annually and spot treatment with herbicide and suitable portable applicator (or pulling where appropriate) to be undertaken to maintain overall presence at 5% or less.	Aims to prevent undesirable species gaining dominance within the grassland sward.	August	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Cut grassed areas to height of 150mm	Cut grass to a height of 150mm once a year in August. Cuttings should be removed from the site immediately. Remove all litter and debris prior to cutting.	Cutting aims to encourage an open sward and ensure structural diversity and provide habitat that is suitable for invertebrates, reptiles and amphibians.	August		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Introduced shrub	Remove litter	Planted areas should be checked for any debris, litter or fly tipping and cleared of any such materials.	Aims to keep habitat healthy	When necessary	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Ornamental shrub habitats should be

Subject	Task	Management to be undertaken	Rationale	Timing	Year					Summary of long-term management and monitoring
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
	Weed and Invasive none native species (INNS) control	Cover of undesirable species including docks, spear or creeping thistles and common ragwort to be reviewed annually and spot treatment with herbicide and suitable portable applicator (or pulling where appropriate) to be undertaken to maintain overall presence at 5% or less. Treatment should be done before species set seed.	Aims to prevent undesirable species outcompeting newly planting stock.	When necessary	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>monitored every 30 years.</p> <p>Undesirable species should be removed when necessary to keep below 5% of ground cover</p> <p>Litter should be removed when necessary</p>
Urban tree	Planting stock	Prepare the ground and plant stock.	Aims to provide a good bed to plant stock into.	November to February	✓					<p>Standard trees should not be subject to a regular pruning regime and should be allowed to develop in a natural way.</p> <p>Damage to trees should be avoided and vegetation below trees should be maintained</p> <p>Trees should be monitored for 30 years.</p>
	Pruning	Removal of dead, damaged or straggly branches after planting	To ensure stock is healthy	Once annually between November and February	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Remove stakes, ties, guards and fence	Removal of stakes, ties, guards and fences.	To prevent build-up of waste plastic on the Site	November to February					✓	
	Watering	During Years 1-3 only water trees if unseasonal conditions result in a lack of adequate rainfall to aid establishment; water as necessary to ensure the establishment and continued thriving of all stock.	Watering to be undertaken if required to ensure establishment of stock.	April to September	✓	✓	✓			
	Replacement planting	Replacement tree planting where necessary	Aims to establish healthy trees	The following November - February		✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Monitoring and pruning / remedial surgery	Checking tree planting for any required pruning or remedial surgery.	To ensure stock is healthy	As required (November to February)		✓				

Subject	Task	Management to be undertaken	Rationale	Timing	Year					Summary of long-term management and monitoring
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
Native hedgerow and Non-native and ornamental hedge	Watering	During Years 1-3 only water hedgerows if unseasonal conditions result in a lack of adequate rainfall to aid establishment; water as necessary to ensure the establishment and continued thriving of all stock.	Watering to be undertaken if required to ensure establishment of stock.	April to September	✓	✓	✓			<p>Hedgerows should be pruned as necessary.</p> <p>Any gaps should be filled in where stock fails.</p> <p>Hedgerows should be monitored for 30 years.</p>
	Inspect guards, stakes and replace mulch	Inspect guards, stakes and replace mulch.	Aims to ensure stock establishes correctly.	November to February	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Replacement of failed stock (if required)	Re-planting failed stock.	Aims to establish intact hedgerow	November to February	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Control of undesirable species	Cover of undesirable species including docks, spear or creeping thistles and common ragwort to be reviewed annually and spot treatment with herbicide and suitable portable applicator (or pulling where appropriate) to be undertaken to maintain overall presence in the Site at 5% or less. Treatment should be done before species set seed.	Aims to prevent undesirable species outcompeting newly planting stock.	May to June	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Removal of guards	Removing guards around stock once plants have established.	To prevent build-up of waste plastic on the Site	November to February					✓	
	Hedge cutting	Cut the hedge as required	To keep hedges at appropriate height and width	November to February					✓	
Species-rich native hedgerow and species rich hedgerows with trees	Planting stock	Prepare the ground and plant stock.	Aims to provide a good bed to plant stock into.	November to February	✓					<p>Hedgerows should be allowed to grow bushy to provide habitat for birds and small mammals.</p> <p>Hedgerows should be cut in an A shape with alternate sides cut each year. Hedges</p>
	Watering	During Years 1-3 only water hedgerows if unseasonal conditions result in a lack of adequate rainfall to aid establishment; water as necessary to ensure the establishment and continued thriving of all stock.	Watering to be undertaken if required to ensure establishment of stock.	April to September	✓	✓	✓			

Subject	Task	Management to be undertaken	Rationale	Timing	Year					Summary of long-term management and monitoring
					Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4	Yr 5	
	Inspect guards, stakes and replace mulch	Inspect guards, stakes and replace mulch.	Aims to ensure stock establishes correctly.	November to February	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>should be allowed to be over 1.5m tall and 1.5m wide.</p> <p>Hedgerow should be monitored for 30 years.</p>
	Replacement of failed stock (if required)	Re-planting failed stock.	Aims to establish intact hedgerow	November to February	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Control of undesirable species	Cover of undesirable species including docks, spear or creeping thistles and common ragwort to be reviewed annually and spot treatment with herbicide and suitable portable applicator (or pulling where appropriate) to be undertaken to maintain overall presence in the Application Site at 5% or less. Treatment should be done before species set seed.	Aims to prevent undesirable species outcompeting newly planting stock.	May to June	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Removal of guards	Removing guards around stock once plants have established.	To prevent build-up of waste plastic on the Site	November to February					✓	
	Hedgerow cutting	Hedgerow cutting to encourage dense growth, cutting alternative sides each year on rotation. Hedgerow should be cut to A shape.	Aims to encourage dense growth.	November to February					✓	

6.0 EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Biodiversity Net Gain

- 6.1.1 The Proposed Development will lead to the loss of *Modified grassland* habitat. However, to compensate and offset for these impacts the Proposed Development will result in the creation of *Modified grassland*, *Other neutral grassland*, *Vegetated garden*, *Introduced shrub*, and *Urban trees*. The Proposed Development will also result in retaining hedgerows and a pond on site.
- 6.1.2 Overall, the Proposed Development will result in a 55.83% net loss in area habitat BUs, and a 106.11% net gain in hedgerow Bus.
- 6.1.3 The trading rules associated with the Metric have not been met for area habitats.
- 6.1.4 A habitat management plan will be produced as part of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan to ensure the habitats created deliver maximum biodiversity value.

6.2 Purchasing Units to Achieve 10% Net Gain

- 6.2.1 An additional 4.18 BUs are required in order for the Proposed Development to achieve a 10% net gain in area habitats. As the impacted habitats are of low distinctiveness, any area habitat BUs can be used to offset these losses and meet the trading rules.
- 6.2.2 The Applicant intends to purchase the required units from a habitat bank.
- 6.2.3 The spatial risk multiplier means that units purchased from a habitat bank in the same LPA or NCA score more highly – and therefore fewer units are required to be purchased. Slightly more units would be required if the offset is located in the adjacent LPA or NCA, and even more units would be required if the offset was located outside of these areas,
- 6.2.4 Although no habitat banks could be located within the same LPA or NCA as the Application Site. Several habitat banks are located within the adjacent NCA of Leicestershire Vales which have units available to purchase. These include two sites run by the Environment Bank. Their Kilby Habitat Bank and Newton Harcourt Habitat Bank are both within the adjacent Leicestershire Vales NCA and offer units suitable for this Application's requirements. Habitat banks should be contacted directly for more information and for unit prices.

REFERENCES

- British Standard Institute (2021) *BS 8683: Process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain – Specification* Available: <https://www.bsigroup.com/en-GB/our-services/events/webinars/2021/bs-8683-process-for-designing-and-implementing-biodiversity-net-gain/> [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- Butcher, B. et al (2023) *UK Habitat Classification v2.0* Available: <https://ukhab.org/> [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- CIEEM/CIRIA/IEMA (2016) *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good practice principles for development* Available: [Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf \(cieem.net\)](https://www.cieem.net/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf) [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- Defra (2023) *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric* Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides> [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (2024) *National Planning Policy Framework*. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2> [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (2022) *Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan 2020-2039* Available: <https://share.google/liAuEha4We8oIcC5a> [Accessed 06/10/2025].
- Lawton, J. et al (2010) 'Making space for nature': a review of England's wildlife sites published today Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/making-space-for-nature-a-review-of-englands-wildlife-sites-published-today> [Accessed 06/10/2025].

FIGURES

Figure 1. Site location plan

Figure 2. UKHab Plan

Figure 3. Post-Development Habitat Plan



Legend:

- Site boundary
- Area degraded at baseline
- Habitat Classification**
- Modified grassland
- Ponds (non-priority habitat)
- Native hedgerow
- Native hedgerow with trees
- Fence
- Secondary code

Secondary Code	Habitat Name
521	Unmanaged



00	07/10/2025	3480319	RG	RJ	EP
Rev	Date	Project Code	Drm	Chk	App

Osbaston



TITLE: Figure 2:
Baseline Habitat Plan

051015

Metres

SCALE: 1:500 @ A3

N
W
E
S

REV 00

B. Post development calculations

Area Habitats

Project Name: Barton Road, Barlestone Map Reference: A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation				Area habitat summary						
<div>Condense / Show Columns</div> <div>Condense / Show Rows</div> <div>Main Menu</div>				Total Net Unit Change		-3.54				
				Total Net % Change		-35.83%				
				Trading Rules Satisfied		No - check trading summaries ▲				
				Area Check		Area Acceptable ✓				
Post intervention habitats										
Ref	Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier	Difficulty	Habitat units delivered	
				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)		Final difficulty of creation
1	Urban	Developed land, sealed surface	0.483073958	V Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Low	0.00
2	Urban	Introduced shrub	0.0306489	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.04
3	Grassland	Modified grassland	0.03737986	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.07
4	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.09031378	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.94
5	Urban	Vegated garden	0.214087306	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.41
6	Individual trees	Urban tree	0.085501586	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.86
7										
8										
9										
10	Total habitat area			1.13						8.78
Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard structures)			1.05							

Hedgerows

Project Name: Barton Road, Barlestone

Map Reference:

B-2 On-Site Hedge Creation

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Hedgerow summary

Total Net Unit Change	1.45
Total Net % Change	106.11%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Proposed habitats				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty risk multipliers	Hedge units delivered
Ref	New hedge number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final difficulty of creation	
1		Native hedgerow	0.0735858	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.25
2		Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.1313666	V Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.13
3		Species-rich native hedgerow	0.0376051	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.25
4		Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.0981718	High	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	0.88
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
			0.34							1.45

C. Summary Results

Barton Road, Barlestone

Headline Results

Scroll down for final results ▲

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	Habitat units	6.35		
	Hedgerow units	1.37		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	2.80		
	Hedgerow units	2.82		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	-3.54	-55.83%	On-site net gain is less than target set ▲
	Hedgerow units	1.45	106.11%	
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%	
Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%	
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%	
Combined net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-3.54		
	Hedgerow units	1.45		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		

FINAL RESULTS

Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-3.54		
	Hedgerow units	1.45		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-55.83%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲	
	Hedgerow units	106.11%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲			

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	6.35	6.98	4.18	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
Hedgerow units	10.00%	1.37	1.50	0.00	
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	
					No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Input errors/rule breaks present in metric ▲

APPENDIX B – PRE-DEVELOPMENT HABITAT CONDITION SURVEY RESULTS

Table 11 – Habitat condition survey results for *Modified grassland*

Source of condition assessment criteria: Defra Metric Technical Annex 1	
Date of survey	
03/06/2025	
Condition Assessment Criteria	Condition Assessment Criteria
A There 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. 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 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.	Pass
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.	Pass
C Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus agg.</i> may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Pass
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.	Pass
E Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens).	Fail
F Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Pass
G There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA).	Pass
Total	6
Overall Condition Assessment	
Good	

Photograph



Table 12 - Habitat condition survey results for Pond (non-priority habitat)

Source of condition assessment criteria: Defra Metric Technical Annex 1		
Date of survey		
03/06/2025		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Condition Assessment Criteria
A	The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. Turbidity is acceptable if the pond is grazed by livestock.	Pass
B	There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10 m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter.	Fail
C	Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed <i>Lemna</i> spp. or filamentous algae.	Pass
D	The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework.	Pass
E	Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams, pumps or pipework.	Pass
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species.	Pass
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.	Pass
H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed) cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.	Pass
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.	Fail

Total	7
Overall Condition Assessment	
Moderate	
Photograph	
No photograph available	

Table 13 - Habitat condition survey results for *Native hedgerow*

Source of condition assessment criteria: Defra Metric Technical Annex 1			
Date of survey			
03/06/2025			
Condition Assessment Criteria			Condition Assessment Criteria
A1	Height	>1.5 m average along length	Pass
A2	Width	>1.5 m average along length	Pass
B1	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	Pass
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).	Pass
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	Fail
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) and recently introduced species.	Pass
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Pass
Total			6
Overall Condition Assessment			
Good			

Photograph



Table 14 - Habitat condition survey results for *Native hedgerow with trees (southern boundary)*

Source of condition assessment criteria: Defra Metric Technical Annex 1			
Date of survey			
03/06/2025			
Condition Assessment Criteria			Condition Assessment Criteria
A1	Height	>1.5 m average along length	Pass
A2	Width	>1.5 m average along length	Fail
B1	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Fail
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	Fail
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).	Pass
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	Fail

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) and recently introduced species.	Pass
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Pass
E1	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	Pass
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.	Pass
Total			6


Overall Condition Assessment

Moderate

Photograph



Table 15 - Habitat condition survey results for *Native hedgerow with trees (around pond)*

Source of condition assessment criteria: Defra Metric Technical Annex 1			
Date of survey			
03/06/2025			
Condition Assessment Criteria			Condition Assessment Criteria
A1	Height	>1.5 m average along length	Pass
A2	Width	>1.5 m average along length	Fail
B1	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Pass
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	Pass
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).	Pass
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	Fail
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) and recently introduced species.	Pass
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Pass
E1	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	Fail
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.	Pass
Total			7
Overall Condition Assessment			
Moderate			
Photograph			
			

APPENDIX C - POST-DEVELOPMENT CONDITION ASSESSMENTS

This appendix presents the assessment of the condition of the post-development habitats against the condition sheets in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric technical supplement (Defra, 2024).

Grassland (low distinctiveness)

UKHAB classification		Grassland – Modified grassland
Distinctiveness		Low
Targeted condition		Poor
Habitat Description		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation dominated by a few fast growing grasses on fertile neutral soils. It is frequently characterised by an abundance of Rye-grass (<i>Lolium</i> sp.) and White Clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>) 		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	There 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. 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 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)	No
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Yes
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA).	Yes
Total targeted		3
Condition Assessment Results		Condition Assessment Score
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;		Poor (1)

Grassland (medium and high distinctiveness)

UKHAB classification		Grassland – Other neutral grassland
Distinctiveness		Medium
Target condition		Moderate
Habitat Description		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation dominated by grasses and herbs on a range of neutral soils usually with a pH between 4.5 and 6.5. Includes enclosed dry hay meadows and pastures, together with a range of grassland which are periodically inundated with water or permanently moist. Grassland communities have few diagnostic indicator species but lack strong calcicoles or calcifuges characteristic of base-rich and acid soils respectively. Differ from agriculturally improved grasslands by having a less lush sward, greater range and cover of herb species and usually less than 25% cover of Perennial Rye-grass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>). 		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	Yes
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 insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	Yes
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.	No
D	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.	Yes
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA5) are present, this criterion is automatically failed."	No
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only."	No
Total targeted		3
Condition Assessment Results		Condition Assessment Score
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F.		Good (3)
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A.		Moderate (2)
Passes 2 or fewer criteria;		Poor (1)

Individual trees

UKHAB classification		Individual trees – Urban trees
Distinctiveness		Medium
Target condition		Moderate
Habitat Description		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual trees – young trees over 7.5cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching 		
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?
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).	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
Total targeted		4
Condition Assessment Results		Condition Assessment Score
Passes 5 or 6 criteria		Good (3)
Passes 3 or 4 criteria		Moderate (2)
Passes 2 or fewer criteria		Poor (1)

Native hedgerows

UKHAB classification		Hedgerows – Native hedgerow	
Distinctiveness		Low	
Target condition		Moderate	
Habitat Description			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Native hedgerows with 4 or less species			
Condition Assessment Criteria		Targeted?	
A1	Height	>1.5 m average along length	No
A2	Width	>1.5 m average along length	No
B1	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Yes
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	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).	No
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	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) and recently introduced species.	Yes
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Yes
Total			5

Condition Assessment Results		Condition Assessment Score
No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.		Good (3)
No more than 4 failures in total; AND Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).		Moderate (2)
"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).		Poor (1)

Species rich native hedgerow

UKHAB classification		Hedgerows – Species rich native hedgerow	
Distinctiveness		Medium	
Target condition		Good	
Habitat Description			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Native hedgerows with 5 or more species			
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	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Yes
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	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).	No
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	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) and recently introduced species.	Yes
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Yes
Total			5
Condition Assessment Results			Condition Assessment Score
No more than 2 failures in total; AND			Good (3)

No more than 1 failure in any functional group.		
No more than 4 failures in total; AND Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).		Moderate (2)
"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).		Poor (1)

Species rich native hedgerow with trees

UKHAB classification		Hedgerows – Species rich native hedgerow with trees	
Distinctiveness		Medium	
Target condition		Good	
Habitat Description			
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Native hedgerows with 5 or more species and trees			
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	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	Yes
B2	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5 m	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).	No
C2	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	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) and recently introduced species.	Yes
D2	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	Yes
E1	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	No
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.	Yes
Total			8
Condition Assessment Results		Condition Assessment Score	
No more than 2 failures in total:		Good (3)	

AND No more than 1 failure in any functional group.		
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).		Moderate (2)
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).		Poor (1)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

RSK Biocensus is owned by RSK Environment Ltd

Registered office

Spring Lodge, 172, Chester Road, Helsby, Frodsham, England, WA6 0AR, UK

Registered in England No. 04364279

www.rsk.co.uk