MIDDLEMARCH ENVIRONMENTAL

Simon Willgress
Project Manager
Panattoni
Tournament Court
Edgehill Dr
Warwick CV34 6LG

6th July 2021 **Our Ref: RT-MME-155397-01**

Dear Simon,

Ecological Walkover Survey – Land off Hoad Way, Theale, Berkshire

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd undertook an ecological walkover survey at the land off Hoad Way, Theale in Berkshire on 22nd June 2021. This letter summarises the scope, methods, results and conclusions of the walkover, together with recommendations for further actions to help secure a biodiversity net gain and to ensure compliance with UK legislation regarding biodiversity.

Scope

Guidance on the lifespan of ecological survey work[1] states that ecological data between 18 months to 3 years old should be supported by a site visit to determine the validity of the report and identify additional surveys that might need updating or undertaking. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) (Report RT-MME-150244-02) for the site was carried out by Middlemarch Environmental Ltd in 2019 and so the purpose of this ecological walkover was to review the findings of the PEA report (Report RT-MME-150244-02) and to determine if any update surveys or additional recommendations are required to support the proposed development.

In addition to the above, Middlemarch Environmental Ltd has carried out the following species surveys:

- A Dusk Emergence and Dawn Re-entry Bat Survey (Report RT-MME-154545-01)
- A Badger Survey (Report RT-MME-150545-02); and,
- A Reptile Survey (Report RT-MME-150545-03).

The findings of these surveys were also considered during the walkover to assess if the status of the site has materially changed from that previous described and whether further survey works is required.

Methods

The survey walkover was conducted following the Phase 1 Habitat Survey methodology of the Joint Nature Conservation Committee[2] and the Institute of Environmental Assessment[3] to determine the change in extent or composition of habitats in the site and to assess changes in their suitability to support protected/ notable species. During the survey, a Habitat Condition Assessment was also carried out to determine the ecological status of each habitat recorded. The condition assessment was assessed using published criteria in Crosher *et al.* (2019)[4], the details of which are presented in Appendix B for each habitat recorded in the site.

---

[1] Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2019) Advice note on the lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys. [Available https://cieem.net/resource/advice-note-on-the-lifespan-of-ecological-reports-and-surveys/]

[2] Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010). *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey: A technique for environmental audit (reprint).* Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

[3] Institute of Environmental Assessment. (1995). *Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment, Institute of Environmental Assessment*. E&FN Spon, An Imprint of Chapman and Hall. London.

[4] Crosher, I., Gold, S., Heaver, M., Heydon, M., Moore, L., Panks, S., Scott, S., Stone, D. and White, N. (2019) *The Biodiversity Metric 2.0: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (Beta Version, July 2019). Natural England.

The ecological walkover survey was undertaken on the 22nd June 2021 by Richard Wheat (Principal Consultant). The weather conditions at the time of the survey are detailed in Table 1.

Parameter	Conditions
Temperature (ºC)	22
Cloud (%)	90
Wind (Beaufort)	F2
Precipitation	Nil

Table 1: Weather Conditions

Constraints
Access to the eastern periphery of the site was partially restricted due to the density of vegetation. This limited visual inspection of the scrub habitats for evidence of protected species, namely badger setts. The implications of this for the findings in this report are outlined in the Discussion section below.

Results
The results of the ecological site walkover are presented in Tables 2 and 3 below. A revised habitat map is provided in Appendix A together with target notes describing and any additional habitats or features that were deemed suitable for protected/notable species. Condition assessment tables indicating the assessment of each habitat type against published condition criteria is included in Appendix B.

Habitats
Table 2 summarises the habitat types that were recorded on site during the field survey.

Habitat	Target Note	Area (Ha) / Length (Km)	Condition
A1.1.1 Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland	TN7	0.05 ha	Moderate
A2.1 Dense scrub	TN4, 5 and 8	0.26 ha	Poor
A3.1 Scattered Trees (Linear)	TN9	0.04 km	Moderate
B6 Poor Semi-improved grassland	TN1-3	4.70 ha	Fairly Poor
C3.1 Tall ruderal	-	0.36 ha	Habitat assessed as a component of poor semi-improved grassland
J4 Bare ground	TN10	0.04 ha	N/A Other
J2.2.1 Intact species-poor hedgerow	TN6	0.23 km	Good

Table 2: Summary of Habitats Recorded during the Field Survey

Fauna
Table 3 summarises any additional habitat opportunities for any protected/notable species within the site. Field evidence of each species is noted where observed.

Species	Target Note/s	Description
Amphibians	TN12	The site did not support any additional aquatic habitat for amphibian species from that recorded in 2019. The ditches along the southern and eastern peripheries were dry at the time of survey. A small area of saturated and partially inundated ground was observed towards the southeast but this did hold a sufficient depth of water for breeding amphibians and is deemed to be ephemeral in nature.

Table 3: Summary of Habitats Recorded during the Field Survey

Species	Target Note/s	Description
	-	The extent of terrestrial habitats was largely in conformity to that previously recorded on site in 2019, with the exception that the area of grassland was unmown at the time of survey and several brash piles were noted towards the north of the site.
Bats	TN4	The tree group (Tree Group 4) in the southwest of the site that was previously identified as supporting bat roost potential was largely intact and deemed to provide some bat roost potential. The large ash situated within the group had however split and fallen at breast height. Whilst the upper half remained in situ, it was considered unlikely to support roosting bats. The remaining semi to early mature trees associated with the woodlands along the site periphery appeared to be in good condition and did not support any additional bat roost potential.
	-	The suitability of the habitats for bat foraging/dispersal are considered to be similar to that described in 2019 with the hedgerow and peripheral areas of woodland providing the greatest opportunities for foraging bats.
Terrestrial Mammals	TN11	The site continues to provide suitable habitat opportunities for terrestrial mammals including badger and hedgehog. A badger sett comprising four entrances, with evidence of recent digging and badger guard hairs, was observed adjacent to the eastern boundary. No further evidence of badger activity within the site was observed but visual inspection of some of the peripheral woodland habitat was obstructed due to the density of vegetation.
Reptiles	TN12	The site appears to have been unmanaged since the 2019 survey and as such, the grassland appeared to provide greater suitability for reptiles throughout the site. The brash piles towards the north also provides some limited refugia.
Birds, Invertebrates, and plants.	-	No additional changes in site condition were observed for birds, plants or invertebrates at the site since the 2019 survey.

Table 3: Summary of Habitats Recorded during the Field Survey

Discussion

Proposals

The proposals include the erection of three industrial/commercial buildings, together with associated car parking, access, Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) and landscaping. The following conclusions are based on Landscape Drawing 18-095-SGP-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A_131001-Rev A by SGP.

Impact Assessment

Table 4 summarises the potential effects of the proposed development on the habitats and species recorded in the site and any additional considerations for the PEA that were identified during the walkover.

Feature	Summary of effects
Habitats	
Broad-leaved woodland, hedgerows	It is proposed that the existing hedgerow on the northern boundary, together with the area of broad-leaved woodland on the eastern boundary of the site, will be retained. The proposal should seek to protect these features from direct or indirect impacts during the construction phase of the proposed development as per Recommendation R1 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA). An additional recommendation to incorporate these measures into a combined Construction Ecological Management Plan is also given below.

Table 4: Summary of effects of the Proposed Development on Habitat and Species

Scattered trees	The proposed development will result in the loss of several scattered early mature trees. The mature ash previously recorded has split and fallen and therefore is not a notable consideration for the proposed development. The remaining trees contribute towards the overall habitat structure and composition in the site and therefore opportunities should be sought to replace these features as part of the green infrastructure for the proposed development.
Poor semi-improved grassland, scrub, tall ruderal, ephemeral/short perennial	The proposed development will result in the loss 3.91 ha of poor semi-improved grassland, 0.16 ha of ruderal, 0.14 ha of scrub and 0.03 of bare ground. These habitats contribute towards the overall habitat structure and composition within the site and therefore compensation for their loss will be required to ensure that the proposals will result in a net gain for biodiversity in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policy CS17 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy. A recommendation to this effect is given below. A Biodiversity Net Gain assessment is being undertaken in parallel with this report and this will guide the type and extent of habitats that are needed to ensure a biodiversity net gain can be achieved.
Species	
Amphibians	The status of the site for amphibians has not significantly changed since the 2019 survey and therefore no further surveys for amphibians is recommended. The proposed development will however result in the loss of suitable amphibian terrestrial habitat and so sensitive working practices during site clearance as per Recommendation R7 in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal will be required. An additional recommendation to incorporate these measures into a combined Construction Ecological Management Plan is also given below.
Bats	The site still supports some bat roosting habitat associated with Tree Group 4 and so an updated Bat Emergence and dusk re-entry survey should be undertaken for these trees in accordance with CIEEM guidelines work. A recommendation to has been provided below but a Bat Survey meeting these specifications has been instructed and is being carried out in parallel with this report.
	The bat foraging opportunities are unchanged from the 2019 report. Three species of bat (Common and soprano pipistrelle and a Myotis sp.) were recorded within the site during the 2019 survey principally associated with the peripheral features which are to be retained as part of the proposed development. In order to limit impacting on bat activity within the site or on dispersal routes around the site, a lighting strategy should be produced to minimise the adverse effects of light spill on sensitive habitats, as detailed in Recommended R3 of the PEA.
Terrestrial mammals	**Badger** – The badger sett on the eastern boundary is within 30 m of one of the proposed new buildings and as such is likely to be disturbed during the construction phases of the proposed development. The badger sett was deemed to be in current use during the survey but not confirmed by monitoring and it is possible that additional setts may have been obstructed by the density of peripheral vegetation. As such an updated badger survey should be carried out to determine the status of badger activity on site and the extent they are likely to affected by the proposed works. Where the works will result in the disturbance of a badger sett, suitable mitigation and/or a licence may be required to accord with the Protection of Badgers Act 1997. An additional recommendation is included below.
	Badger, Hedgehog, brown hare - The site continues to support suitable habitat for these species and so the sensitive working practices and safeguards for terrestrial mammals detailed in Recommendations R6 and R7 of the PEA should still be employed. An additional recommendation to incorporate these measures into a combined Construction Ecological Management Plan is also given below.
Reptiles	A reptile survey was undertaken at the site in 2019 and no reptiles were recorded. Whilst the unmown grassland noted during the walkover does provides greater reptile habitat suitability than that in 2019, it is is considered unlikely that the site will have since been colonised by notable reptile populations given the poor connectivity to surrounding areas of suitable habitat. The individual presence of more mobile species, such as grass snake, cannot be ruled out at this stage however and so it is recommended that sensitive working practices and safeguards for reptiles are adopted during the construction phase to ensure compliance with Section 9(5) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. A recommendation to this effect is given below (See Recommendation RA3).
Birds, Plants, invertebrates	The status of the site for these species has not changed since the 2019 PEA and as such no additional recommendations are given. The loss of scrub habitat from the proposed development could impact on nesting birds, therefore Recommendation R9 of the PEA (relating to the timing of vegetation clearance) is upheld. An additional recommendation to incorporate these measures into a combined Construction Ecological Management Plan is also given below.

Table 4 (cont.): Summary of effects of the Proposed Development on Habitat and Species

Recommendations

The following recommendations are given in addition to those within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal produced by Middlemarch Environmental Ltd (Report RT-MME-150244-02) which should be read alongside this report. The recommendations below are based on Middlemarch Environmental's current understanding of the project. If works are changed in any way these recommendations will need to be amended if appropriate.

R1 **Biodiversity Net Gain**: The Proposed Development will need to incorporate compensatory habitat creation into the green infrastructure proposals for the site to support the delivery of biodiversity net gain, in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy. A Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment should be carried out to inform the extent of compensatory habitat creation required (using a biodiversity metric calculator tool) and how this can be achieved within the site.

R2 **Bat Survey:** An updated Dusk Emergence and Bat Re-entry Survey should be undertaken to update and review the status of the site for roosting bats. The survey should principally focus on Tree Group 4 to determine if any bat roosting features are present and what if any, mitigation may be required to ensure that any tree removal works are undertaken in accordance with UK wildlife legislation. (This recommendation supersedes Recommendation R4 of the PEA.)

A Dusk Emergence and Dawn Re-entry Survey has been instructed and is being prepared in parallel with this report.

R3 **Badger Survey**: An updated Badger Survey should be undertaken to determine the status of the badger setts within eh site and the extent that they are likely to be affected by the proposed development. It is recommended that the badger survey is undertaken during later autumn/ winter when there is greater capacity to review badger activity through denser vegetation. The survey will inform the need for mitigation and/or licence requirements. (This recommendation supersedes Recommendation R5 of the PEA.)

R4 **Construction Ecological Management Plan**: A Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP)should be produced setting out the ecological safeguards, timings and sensitive working practices need to avoid impacts on protected/notable species and features during the construction phase of the proposed development. The plan should as a minimum:

- Safeguards for all retained woodland, hedgerows and trees as detailed in Recommendation R1 of the PEA,
- The overnight covering of excavations or mammal ramps to avoid trapping/injuring terrestrial mammals as detailed in Recommendation R6 of the PEA,
- Sensitive working practices including phased vegetation removal (phase and direction strimming of grassland habitats to allow amphibians and reptiles to disperse to surrounding habitats) and sensitive removal of habitat features (e.g. brash piles) (see Recommendation R7 of the PEA); and,
- Timing vegetation clearance works to avoid the nesting birds season or ensuring all features are checked by a suitably qualified ecologist before vegetation clearance commences (See Recommendation R9 of the PEA.

Subject to the implementation of the above, this supersedes Recommendations R6, R7, R8 and R9 of the PEA.

I trust that this assessment meets your requirements, however if you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,
For and On Behalf of Middlemarch Environmental Ltd.

Richard Wheat ACIEEM
Principal Consultant

Checked and Approved By:

Tom Docker CEcol MCIEEM
Managing Director

Appendix A

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd. Triumph House, Birmingham Road, Allesley, Coventry CV5 9AZ
Email: richard.wheat2@middlemarch-environmental.com,Tel: 01676 525880

C155397-01-01

Legend

- Site Boundary
- Scattered tree
- Target note
- Species-poor inact hedgerow
- Bare ground
- Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland
- Dense scrub
- Poor semi-improved grassland
- Tall ruderal

N

Project	Land off Hoad Way,Theale
Drawing	Phase 1 Habitat Map
Client	Panattoni
Drawing Number: C155397-01-01	Revision: 00
Scale @ A3: 1:1,250	Date: July 2021
Approved By: TD	Drawn By: RW

MIDDLEMARCH ENVIRONMENTAL
Triumph House, Birmingham Road, Allesley, Coventry CV5 9AZ
T:01676 525880
E:admin@middlemarch-environmental.com

Target Note	Description
TN1	**B6 Poor semi-improved grassland** A variable mosaic of unmanaged coarse grassland tall herbs. Grassland was the dominant habitat type with a species-poor sward dominated by rye-grass *Lolium cf. multiflorum*, false oat-grass *Arrhenathrerum elatius*, rough meadow-grass *Poa trivalis* with frequent to abundant common couch *Elytrigia repens*, Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus*, soft brome *Bromus hordaceus*, timothy *Phleum pratense* and barren brome *Anisantha sterilis*. Forbs were scattered with no one species consistent throughout. Creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, smooth tare *Vicia tetrasperma*, common mouse-ear *Cerastium fontanum* and were the most frequently recorded whilst horsetail *Equisteum sp*. and common comfrey *Symphytum officinale* locally abundant. Tall herbs such as common nettle and creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, whilst occasional with the grassland formed locally abundant patches along the southern boundary and throughout the grassland respectively.
TN2	**B6 Poor semi-improved grassland** A sub-section of TN1 comprising a damp and partially inundated area overlying disturbed and rutted ground. The grassland was species poor being dominated by sweet-grass *Glyceria cf. fluitans* with occasional creeping bent *Agrostis stolonifera*, common couch and rough meadow-grass.
TN3	**B6 Poor semi-improved grassland** A sub-section of TN1 interspersed with a high proportion of soft rush *Juncus effusus*, hard rush *Juncus inflexus*, Yorkshire fog and rough-meadow grass with no or few additional forbs.
TN4	**A2.1 Dense scrub** A dense stand of woody scrub interspersing a stand of scattered early mature trees. The stand comprises a loose shrub layer of elder *Sambus nigra* and bramble *Rubus fruitocsus* over topped by several ivy *Hedera helix* covered alder *Alnus glutinosa* and ash *Fraxinus excelsior*. A mature tree had split at breast height and had fallen in this location with the top half of the tree lying in situ. Nettle, ivy and hedge mustard *Alliiaria petiolata* were frequent in the field layer.
TN5	**A2.1 Dense Scrub** A dense stand of bramble scrub lining the northwest corner and south-eastern boundaries, the former grading into a dense stand of tall herb dominated by nettle.
TN6	**J2.2.2 Intact Species-poor hedgerow** Unmanaged hedgerow lining the north boundary. Canopy up to 3.5 m in height by 2.5-3 m in width, largely intact withy some minor gaps (<5 m) at either end. Hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna* is dominant throughout with some scattered occasional (mostly dead) elm *Ulmus sp*. and elder. The hedgerow was accompanied by a wide (>2 m) un-grazed margin on the field side dominated by tall herbs including nettle, hemlock *Conium maculatum* and creeping thistle.
TN7	**A1.1.1 Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland** An early mature secondary woodland adjacent but partially overlapping the eastern boundary into the site. The woodland comprises an enclosed canopy of ash and Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* overlying a sparse understorey of coppiced hazel *Corylus avellana*. The field layer is loosely vegetated with abundant cleavers, nettle and cow parsley.
TN8	**A2.1 Dense scrub** A dense stand of early mature willows *Salix sp*. principally located along a dry ditch in on the southern boundary. Mostly located offsite but partially with and partially encroaching laterally into the site boundary. The scrub was underlain by a dense stand of common nettle, cleavers and ground ivy *Glechoma hederacea.*
TN9	**A3.1 Scattered broad-leaved trees** A single dense line of planted early -mature alders forming a potential shelter belt in the southwest corner.
TN10	**J4 Bare ground** An unsealed stand of crushed gravel situated at the site entrance gateway on the north of the site. The ground was loosely vegetated with scattered grasses ruderals and perennials including ryegrass, common poppy *Papaver rhoeas*, wall barley *Hordeum murinum*, ribwort plantain *Plantago lanceolata* and prickly sow-thistle *Sonchus asper*.
TN11	**Badger sett** Four sett entrances located adjacent to the eastern site boundary. Evidence of recent digging, badger guard hairs and mammal paths around the sett were evident.
TN12	**Brash piles** Three brash/log piles situated amongst the grassland.

Appendix B

Woodland (Including plantation and semi-natural)		
Condition Assessment Criteria		**TN7**
This should be an area of trees with complete canopy cover.		Yes
Native species are dominant. Non-native and invasive species account for less than 10% of the vegetation cover.		Yes
A diverse age and height structure of the trees.		No
Free from damage [Bark stripping; Browse line; Damage shoot tips] (in the last five years) from stock or wild mammals with less than 20% of vegetation being browsed.		No
There should be evidence of successful (i.e. not browsed off before it gets well established) tree regeneration such as seedlings, saplings and young trees.		No
Standing and fallen dead wood of over 20 cm diameter are present including fallen large dead branches/stems and stumps.		Yes
Wetland habitat if they exist within the wood has little sign of drainage or channel straightening.		-
The area is protected from damage by agricultural and other adjacent operations.		Yes
There should be no evidence of inappropriate management (e.g. deep ruts, animal poaching or compaction).		Yes
Invasive non-native plants are below 5% (see list below).		Yes
No signs of significant nutrient enrichment present.		Yes
More than 3 different native trees and 3 shrub species in an average 10 m radius.		No
Condition	**Assessment Criteria**	
Moderate (Score = 2)	• Clearly fails at least 2 of the criteria above. • OR invasive non-native plants are 5-20%. • OR where non-native species comprise more than 20% of the canopy, the woodland should be recorded as either non-native plantation or mixed woodland. • A mixed woodland is woodland with native and non-native species. (This includes woodlands established by planting and by natural regeneration.) • Trees of similar age and height structure throughout the woodland. • Little standing or fallen deadwood present.	✓
Notes		
Undesirable species: • American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus* • Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera* • Japanese knotweed *Fallopia japonica* • Cherry Laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* • Shallon *Gaultheria shallon* • Snowberry *Symphoricarpos albus* • Variegated yellow archangel *Lamiastrum galeobdolon* subsp. *argentatum* • Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum*		

Woodland Condition Assessment Criteria (Adapted from Crosher *et al*., 2019)

Scrub				
Condition Assessment Criteria		**TN4**	**TN5**	**TN8**
There are at least three woody species, with no one species comprising more than 75% of the cover (except common juniper, sea buckthorn or box, which can be 100% cover).		No	No	No
There is a good age range – a mixture of seedlings, saplings, young shrubs, and mature shrubs		Yes	No	No
Pernicious weeds and invasive species make up less than 5% of the ground cover.		No	No	No
The scrub has a well-developed edge with ungrazed tall herbs.		Yes	Yes	Yes
There are many clearings and glades within the scrub		No	No	No
Condition	**Assessment Criteria**			
Poor (Score = 1)	• The single woody species cover is greater than 75% • The age range is missing some size classes. • Scrub type of high biodiversity value in poor condition. • The scrub has minor differences between what is described in the relevant habitat classifications and what is visible on site. • Cover of undesirable and invasive species at 5-20%. • Single-age scrub present. • Potentially restorable to improved scrub habitat with improved management. • All of the condition criteria are being failed. • The scrub type has major differences between what is described in the relevant classifications and what is visible on site. • Cover of undesirable and invasive species above 20% [see below] • All Rhododendron stands will be this condition.	✓	✓	✓
Notes				
Undesirable species: • Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense* • Common nettle *Urtica dioica* • Himalayan balsam *Impatiens gladulifera* • Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria (Fallopia) japonica* • Cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* • *Rhododendron ponticum*				

Scrub Condition Assessment Criteria (Adapted from Crosher *et al*., 2019)

Grassland (incorporating areas of grassland and ruderal detailed in TN1, TN2 and TN3)		
Condition Assessment Criteria		**TN1-3**
The area is clearly and easily recognisable as a good example of this type of habitat and there is little difference between what is described in the relevant habitat classifications and what is visible on site.		No
The appearance and composition of the vegetation on site should very closely match the characteristics for the specific Priority Habitat [i.e as described by either the Phase 1 Habitat Classification or the UK Habitat Classification], with species typical of the habitat representing a significant majority of the vegetation.		No
Wildflowers, sedges and indicator species for the specific Priority grassland habitat are very clearly and easily visible throughout the sward and occur at high densities in high frequency. See relevant Habitat Classification for details of indicator species for specific habitat.		No
Undesirable species and physical damage is below 5% cover.		No
Cover of bare ground less than 10% (including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens).		Yes
Cover of bracken less than 20% and cover of scrub and bramble less than 5%.		Yes
Condition	**Assessment Criteria**	
Moderate (Score = 2)	• Typical grasses include: cock's-foot, common bent, creeping bent, crested dog's-tail, false oat-grass, meadow fescue, meadow foxtail, red fescue, sweet vernal grass, Timothy, tufted hair-grass and Yorkshire-fog. • Total cover of wildflowers and sedges less than 30%, excluding white clover, creeping buttercup and injurious weeds. • Rye-grass cover is less than 25% including amenity grasslands. • OR clearly fails at least 1 of the condition criteria. • OR The grassland type has some differences between what is described in the relevant habitat classifications and what is visible on site. It is a Lower Quality Priority Habitat, but clearly recognisable as such. 2 20 • Potentially restorable to grassland Priority Habitat with improved management. • Cover of undesirable species at 5- 15%.	
Poor (Score = 1)	• Agricultural grasslands are characterised by vegetation dominated by a few fast-growing grasses on fertile, neutral soils. It is frequently characterised by an abundance of rye-grass *Lolium* spp. (above 25% cover) and white clover *Trifolium repens*. These grasslands are typically either managed as pasture or mown regularly for silage production or in non-agricultural contexts for recreation and amenity purposes. • OR Most of the condition criteria are being failed. • Cover of undesirable species above 15%, usually resulting in a dense scrub or tree cover, or high cover of exotic species.	✓ (Assessed as fairly poor*)
Undesirable species: • creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex otusifolius*, common ragwort *Senecio jacobea*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, white clover *Trifolium repens*, cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*, marsh thistle *Cirsium palustre* and marsh ragwort *Senecio aquaticus*. * Fairly poor – Exhibits characteristics of both poor and moderate condition - includes typical semi-improved grasses but with Lolium sp at >25% cover and with undesirable species locally abundant at >15% cover.		

Grassland Condition Assessment Criteria (Adapted from Crosher *et al*., 2019)

Hedgerow		
Attributes and functional groups	**Criteria (the minimum required for favourable condition)**	**TN6**
A1. Height	>1.5 m average along length	Yes
A2. Width	> 1.5 m along length	Yes
B1. Gap – hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for > 90% of length (unless line of trees)	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	Yes
C2. Undesirable 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 and neophyte species	Yes
D2. Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities	Yes
Condition	**Assessment Criteria**	
Good (Score = 3)	No more than 2 failures in total and no more than 1 in any functional group.	✓

Hedgerow Condition Assessment Criteria [Cont.] (Adapted from Crosher *et al*., 2019)