



CLIENT: INDURENT MANAGEMENT LIMITED
SITE: LAND TO THE EAST OF MOORGATE POINT, KNOWSLEY
DATE: NOVEMBER 2025
DOCUMENT: JN00457 D03 BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Rev01

Associated Figures and Appendices:

JN00457/DW03 – BNG Baseline Plan

JN00457/DW04 – BNG Proposed Plan

Appendix 1 – Condition Sheets

Defra Metric spreadsheet (supplied electronically alongside the BIA):

JN00457/BNG – Moorgate Point BNG

Executive Summary

- 1.1 SK Environmental Solutions Limited (SKE) was commissioned by Indurent Management Limited to undertake a detailed Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) to support a planning application for a proposed commercial development on an existing site to the east of Moorgate Point, Alchemy Way, in Knowsley Business Park.
- 1.2 The BIA has been carried out for the development using the Statutory Defra Metric. The Metric *'provides a way to measure biodiversity loss and gain in a consistent and robust way'*. It calculates a biodiversity value (measured in biodiversity units) for a site both before development commences and after development is completed, allowing the difference (positive or negative) to be measured.
- 1.3 Baseline habitat survey work was undertaken by SKE in May 2025. No irreplaceable habitats were identified on the site and, as a result, no impacts upon such habitats will occur as a result of the proposed development.
- 1.4 Post development habitats within the site have been based on the Detailed Soft Landscape Proposals (2465-25-10 Rev 03 - Detailed Planting Plan) produced by BCA Design. This assessment has been updated in line with comments received from the Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS) in the autumn of 2025.
- 1.5 The BIA indicates that the proposal will result in an onsite net loss of **-12.54 habitat units (-77.55%)** and **-0.94 watercourse units (-100.00%)**, with a net gain of **2.00 hedgerow units**

(no percentage calculated). A 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of habitat units and watercourse units will therefore need to be delivered through off site units, either through enhancements on other areas of land controlled by the applicant or by purchasing units from the open market, or a combination of both.

Background

- 1.6 This BIA has been prepared in support of a planning application for the proposed development known as Moorgate Point (hereafter referred to as the 'site'), undertaken by Indurent Management Limited. The red line boundary comprises the eastern end of an existing commercial area along with an area of intermittently managed habitat and extends to approximately 4.48 hectares (ha).
- 1.7 This BIA has taken into account the baseline and post development habitats and hedgerows for the site (as informed by the 2465-25-10 Rev 03 - Detailed Planting Plan).
- 1.8 The site comprises a mix of existing commercial land and intermittently managed habitats. This includes hard standing, bare ground and amenity grassland along with areas of unmanaged grassland, scrub and standing water. A surface drain bounds much of the eastern and northern sides of the site. Two individual trees are also present adjacent to the northern site boundary.
- 1.9 The project proposal has been sympathetically designed to mitigate impacts upon, and promote ongoing opportunities for, other ecological receptors.

Planning Policy

- 1.10 Under the Environment Act 2021, all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) must deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain, as of the 12th February 2024. The net gain must be demonstrated using the Statutory Defra Metric.
- 1.11 Chapter 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) describes the Government's objectives on achieving sustainable development. The environmental objective is "*– to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.*"
- 1.12 Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's objectives for planning in regard to the protection of habitats and biodiversity. The planning objectives in relation to biodiversity and the natural environment are laid out in paragraph 187 as follows:

"Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ...

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs; ...

f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.”

- 1.13 The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further guidance to local authorities in relation to biodiversity planning. The PPG explains that planning applications should be informed by appropriate ecological survey work and that developments should be encouraged to protect and enhance biodiversity by following the ‘mitigation hierarchy’ to avoid, mitigate, or compensate for significant adverse effects to biodiversity.
- 1.14 The PPG also sets out and explains that plans should encourage a ‘net gain’ in biodiversity, whereby development leaves the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand.
- 1.15 The local policies of Knowsley Council do not require a net gain higher than the 10% mandated by the Environment Act 2021.

Methodology

Statutory Defra Metric

- 1.16 There are a number of equations undertaken as part of the metric, but simply put, the metric calculates the change in biodiversity resulting from a development by subtracting the number of pre-intervention or ‘baseline’ biodiversity units (those generated by existing habitats) from the number of post-intervention units (those anticipated to be provided after the development).
- 1.17 The calculation includes three separate categories: ‘Habitat’, ‘Hedgerows and Lines of Trees’ and ‘Rivers and Streams’. Each category is considered separately and generates individual loss/gain results.
- 1.18 In order to populate the metric baseline, each land parcel (defined as contiguous habitats of the same type) and linear feature is measured and then assigned the following:
- Habitat Type - which carries with it a pre-assigned ‘distinctiveness’ classification, from ‘very low’ to ‘very high’. This is a measure of habitat rarity and/or importance;
 - Condition – this is a measure of habitat quality as an example of the given habitat type (as per criteria set out in Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide) and can be ‘poor’, ‘moderate’, or ‘good’. In exceptional circumstances, when justified, certain habitats can be assigned the intermediate condition classifications of ‘fairly poor’ and ‘fairly good’.
 - Strategic Significance – this is determined by whether the location of an existing/proposed habitat parcel is considered to be significant for nature. Such areas are typically identified in relevant published local strategies and objectives, such as an allocation for nature conservation purposes within a Local Plan or designated as a statutory site under the relevant legislation etc.
- 1.19 The metric then multiplies the area or linear length of a land parcel by the assigned distinctiveness, condition and strategic significance ‘multipliers’ to provide a baseline score in habitat or hedgerow units.

- 1.20 The same process is followed for post development land parcels which will have either been retained (no change), enhanced (either through an increase in condition or to habitat type which is of a higher distinctiveness) or lost and replaced with a different habitat type. There are also a number of additional factors involved in calculating the post-intervention scores such as:
- How long it would take for newly created habitats to reach the target condition;
 - Whether there will be a delay in habitat creation, or indeed whether habitats have been created/enhanced in advance of impacts; and
 - How difficult it is to create a particular habitat type. Generally, the higher the distinctiveness the more difficult it is to create. For this reason, the metric also includes a number of 'trading rules' which must be satisfied when habitats are lost. For example, habitats of 'very high' distinctiveness, such as ancient woodland, are classed as 'irreplaceable' and therefore cannot be compensated for within the metric and habitats that are of 'high' distinctiveness must be replaced by the same habitat as that which was lost.
- 1.21 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric is a tool designed to aid the enhancement of the ecological value of sites. The biodiversity units calculated by the metric, used to give the net gain score, are designed as a best fit proxy for biodiversity and should be treated as relative values, as per the User Guide. Consequently, the metric should be used in conjunction with, rather than instead of, other relevant evidence, professional expertise and guidance.

Baseline Survey Work

- 1.22 A UKHab survey was undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist on 8th May 2025. Given the habitats present, this was considered to be an ideal time of year to carry out such a survey, in line with the relevant good practice guidelines. The full results of this survey and the desk study information that informed it are detailed in JN00457/D02 – Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.
- 1.23 This survey informed the completion, where required, of the relevant Condition Assessment Sheets for the habitats recorded on site (see Appendix 1).
- 1.24 Seasonal trends and inherent variations in ecosystem dynamics mean that some species of flora may not have been recorded. However, the purpose of the survey was to record habitat types and therefore this is not considered to be a significant limitation.
- 1.25 No other limitations were encountered during the site survey.
- 1.26 All field and desk work has been undertaken in line with the British Standard set out in BS 8683: Process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain – specification, as well as other relevant good practice guidelines.

Baseline

Baseline Habitats

- 1.27 The site comprises two parts of broadly different character. The western part of the site comprises existing commercial land with extensive developed land; sealed surface, areas of

close-mown modified grassland, a building and occasional bare ground. The modified grassland and bare ground here both achieve moderate condition.

- 1.28 The larger, eastern part of the site is an area of intermittently managed habitats, dominated by other neutral grassland and native scrub (mixed and willow) with ephemeral areas of standing surface water (mapped as ponds (non-priority habitat). Of these, the other neutral grassland is in poor condition while the 'ponds' are in moderate condition. Most of the scrub is in poor condition, however, the mixed scrub adjacent to the site boundaries is in moderate condition.
- 1.29 A small patch of bramble scrub separates the site from Alchemy Way at its southeastern corner.
- 1.30 One large tree in good condition and one small tree in moderate condition are situated close to the northern site boundary.
- 1.31 In lieu of a Local Nature Recovery Strategy, strategic significance is assigned in line with the Liverpool City Region BNG Guidance Note. This stipulates that North Merseyside Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats should be assigned high strategic significance. In this instance, that is applied to the areas of other neutral grassland and urban trees.
- 1.32 All baseline habitats and conditions have been informed by the site survey undertaken on 8th May 2025. These are displayed on JN00457_DW03 BNG Baseline Plan with Condition Sheets included as Appendix 1.
- 1.33 None of the habitats within the site are of 'very high' or 'high' distinctiveness and no 'irreplaceable habitats' were recorded.
- 1.34 The overall 'habitats' baseline score for the site is **14.32 Habitat Units**. Table 1 below, sets out the baseline habitats and how they contribute to the baseline score.

Table 1 – Baseline Habitats

Habitat Type	Area (Ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Habitat Units
Modified grassland	0.30	Low	Moderate	1.19
Other neutral grassland	1.34	Medium	Poor	6.16
Bramble scrub	0.00	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	0.02
Mixed scrub	0.30	Medium	Moderate	2.36
Mixed scrub	0.16	Medium	Poor	0.65
Willow scrub	0.59	Medium	Poor	2.37
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	0.11	Medium	Moderate	0.84
Bare ground	0.04	Low	Moderate	0.17
Developed land; sealed surface	1.64	Very low	N/A – Other	0.00
Urban tree	1 no.	Medium	Moderate	0.51
Urban tree	1 no.	Medium	Poor	0.04
TOTAL	4.48	n/a	n/a	14.32

* Totals are taken from the Statutory Defra Metric. Due to rounding, totals may differ slightly to the sum of the columns. **Tree area is not included in the total area; however tree units are included in the total of Habitat Units.**

Baseline Hedgerows

- 1.35 There are no existing on site hedgerows or tree lines. Therefore, a percentage uplift in hedgerow units cannot be calculated.

Baseline Watercourse

- 1.36 A drain runs parallel to much of the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. While this feature best fits being assessed as a linear habitat, rather than an areal one, it supports little to no water flow. The drain totals approximately 235m in length and is assessed as being in poor condition. There is no watercourse or riparian encroachment.
- 1.37 The overall baseline 'watercourse' score for the site is therefore **0.94 Watercourse Units**.

Impact Assessment - Loss

Habitats

- 1.38 The proposed design is for the erection of two new commercial units. These will be associated with new access routes, car parking and landscaping.
- 1.39 All existing areal habitats and individual trees are to be lost to facilitate these proposals. Consequently, there are no habitat enhancements proposed as part of the scheme.
- 1.40 Table 2, below, summarises the number of habitat units that will be lost prior to any habitat creation.

Table 2 - Baseline Habitat Units Lost to Proposals

Habitat Type	Area Retained (Ha)	Area Enhanced (Ha)	Area Lost (Ha)	Habitat Units Lost
Modified grassland	0.00	0.00	0.30	1.19
Other neutral grassland	0.00	0.00	1.34	6.16
Bramble scrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
Mixed scrub	0.00	0.00	0.46	3.01
Willow scrub	0.00	0.00	0.59	2.37
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.84

Bare ground	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.17
Developed land; sealed surface	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.00
Urban tree	0.00	0.00	2 no.	0.55
TOTAL	0.00	0.00	4.48	14.32

Watercourses

- 1.41 The existing 235m drain is to be lost as part of the development.

Habitat Proposals – Creation and Enhancement

Habitats

- 1.42 Table 3 identifies the habitat creation that is proposed as part of the development within the site. There are no onsite habitat enhancements proposed as part of the development.

Table 3 – Habitat Creation Proposals

Habitat Creation				
Habitat Type	Area (Ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Habitat Units Delivered
Modified grassland	0.06	Low	Poor	0.12
Other neutral grassland	0.50	Medium	Poor	2.14
Bare ground	0.00	Low	Poor	0.00
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.01	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.00
Developed land; sealed surface	3.73	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.00
Sustainable drainage system	0.06	Low	Moderate	0.14
Introduced shrub	0.12	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	0.23
Urban tree	4 no.	Medium	Moderate	0.06
Urban tree	39 no.	Medium	Poor	0.51
TOTAL	4.48	n/a	n/a	3.21
*Total area excludes tree areas.				

- 1.43 All roads, buildings, parking areas and other areas of hard standing are recorded as developed land; sealed surface.
- 1.44 Grass verges and areas of amenity grassland are to be sown with DLF PM 120 'Slowgrowth' or similar lawn mix and will be close mown. These areas are mapped as modified grassland and are only considered likely to achieve poor condition. The remaining grassland areas are to be sown with a species-rich grassland mix such as DLF Trifolium Pro Flora 8 or similar and are to be managed to promote biodiversity. It is considered that these areas will retain sufficient species diversity to be best classified as other neutral grassland, however, given the highly urbanised environment in which they will be located, only poor condition is considered to be an appropriate expectation of their condition.
- 1.45 To the southeast of the site, an attenuation basin is to be created. This is mapped as a sustainable drainage system and it is considered that moderate condition can be achieved.
- 1.46 The remaining areal landscaping comprises introduced shrubs. Where hedgerows are to be planted adjacent to hard standing, the area 'beneath' the hedgerow is mapped as bare ground in poor condition.
- 1.47 A total of forty-three new individual trees are to be planted as part of the landscape design. In line with BNG guidelines, all trees are classified as small, reflecting their size at time of planting. Native species will achieve moderate condition while non-native or cultivars are classified as achieving poor condition.
- 1.48 As for the baseline habitats, high strategic significance is applied to areas of other neutral grassland and urban trees.
- 1.49 Post development habitats are shown on JN00457_DW04 BNG Proposals Plan.

Hedgerows

- 1.50 Table 4 identifies the hedgerow creation proposals for hedgerows located within the site. No hedgerow enhancements are proposed as part of the development.

Table 4 – Hedgerow Creation Proposals

Proposed Hedgerow Type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Hedgerow Units Delivered
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.231	Very low	Poor	0.22
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.718	Medium	Poor	2.77
TOTAL	0.949			2.99

- 1.51 Within amenity areas, new hedgerow planting largely comprises ornamental or single-species hedgerows within landscaped areas.

- 1.52 Much of the site boundaries are to be planted with new species-rich native hedgerows. Given their situation, it is not considered that any condition other than poor is appropriate for these hedgerows.

- 1.53 Post development hedgerows are shown on JN00457_DW04 BNG Proposals Plan.

Watercourses

- 1.54 There is no watercourse creation or enhancement proposed as part of the development.

Post Development Score – Net Change

- 1.55 Following development of the proposed site, a Biodiversity Net Gain of **-12.54 habitat units (-77.55%), 2.45 hedgerow units (no percentage calculated) and -0.94 watercourse units (-100.00%)** is achieved. See Plate 1, below.

FINAL RESULTS		
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	-11.10
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	2.99
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	-0.94
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	-77.55%
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	N/A
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	-100.00%
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲	

Plate 1 – Headline Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Results from the Statutory Defra Metric

- 1.56 This leaves the overall scheme requiring a further **12.54 habitat units and 1.03 watercourse units** in order to fully achieve the required 10% net gain. See Plate 2, below.

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
<i>Habitat units</i>	10.00%	14.32	15.75	12.54
<i>Hedgerow units</i>	10.00%	0.55	0.61	0.00
<i>Watercourse units</i>	10.00%	0.94	1.03	1.03

Plate 2 – BNG Unit Deficits

- 1.57 Of the 12.54 habitat units required to achieve 10% net gain, the metric's trading rules dictate that at least 4.02 units must be of medium distinctiveness grassland, 5.40 units must be of medium distinctiveness scrub and 0.84 units must be of medium distinctiveness lakes/ponds, or of higher distinctiveness habitats. This leaves 2.28 units that can be delivered by any habitat type.
- 1.58 The 1.03 watercourse units required can be of any available watercourse type, with the exception of culverts.
- 1.59 The BNG guidelines contain a hierarchy of preference for the delivery of 10% net gain by developments. Preferably, 10% net gain should be delivered on site, within the red line boundary of the development. If, as is the case for habitats on this scheme, 10% net gain cannot

be delivered on, habit units gained elsewhere (off site) should be allocated to the scheme to ensure the overall required net gain is achieved. This can be delivered through habitat improvements undertaken on other land within the applicant's control or through purchasing units from the open BNG marketplace, either from a habitat bank or another provider.

- 1.60 In the unlikely event that sourcing off site units is not possible, then statutory credits can be purchased from Natural England. The price of credits is deliberately inflated so as to discourage this option as being only one of last resort.

DRAWINGS

DRAWING TITLE: BNG Baseline Plan

KEY:

 Red Line Boundary

INDIVIDUAL TREES

 Existing Large Urban Tree

 Existing Small Urban Tree

WATERCOURSES

 Ditches

HABITATS

 Bramble scrub

 Developed land; sealed surface

 Mixed scrub

 Modified grassland

 Other neutral grassland

 Ponds (non-priority habitat)

 Willow scrub

 Bare ground

SITE: Moorgate Point, Knowsley
CLIENT: Indurent Management Limited
JOB NUMBER: JN00457
DRAWING NUMBER: JN00457_DW03
DATE: October 2025
DRAWN/CHECKED: JW / MK
SCALE: NTS

KEY:

 Red Line Boundary

INDIVIDUAL TREES

 Proposed Small Urban Tree

HEDGEROWS

 Non-native and ornamental hedgerow

 Species-rich native hedgerow

HABITATS

 Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface

 Developed land; sealed surface

 Introduced shrub

 Modified grassland

 Other neutral grassland

 Sustainable drainage system

 Bare ground

SITE: Moorgate Point, Knowsley
CLIENT: Indurent Management Limited
JOB NUMBER: JN00457
DRAWING NUMBER: JN00457_DW04
DATE: October 2025
DRAWN/CHECKED: JW / MK
SCALE: NTS

APPENDIX 1

Condition Sheet: DITCH Habitat Type			
Habitat Type			
Watercourses - Ditches			
Habitat Description			
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On Site, Moorgate Point	Survey date and Surveyor name	8th May 2025, EJ
Limitations (if applicable)		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Grid reference		Habitat parcel reference	
Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The ditch is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution.	N	
B	A range of emergent, submerged and floating-leaved plants are present. As a guide >10 species of emergent, floating or submerged plants present in a 20 m ditch length.	N	
C	There is less than 10% cover of filamentous algae and or duckweed <i>Lemna</i> spp. (these are signs of eutrophication).	Y	
D	A fringe of aquatic marginal vegetation is present along more than 75% of the ditch.	Y	
E	Physical damage is evident along less than 5% of the ditch, with examples of damage including: excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, or any other damaging management activities.	N	
F	Sufficient water levels are maintained - as a guide a minimum summer depth of approximately 50 cm in minor ditches and 1 m in main drains.	N	
G	Less than 10% of the ditch is heavily shaded.	N	
H	There is an absence of non-native plant and animal species ¹ .	Y	
Number of criteria passed		3	
Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√	
Passes 8 criteria	Good (3)		
Passes 6 or 7 criteria	Moderate (2)		
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	X	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score			

--

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)													
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types													
Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland Grassland - Lowland meadows Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland Grassland - Other neutral grassland Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430) [Not to be confused with the Tall forbs secondary code – see UKHab guidance for details.] Grassland - Upland acid grassland Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland Grassland - Upland hay meadows Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland													
Habitat Description													
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification													
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On Site, Moorgate Point, Knowsley	Survey date and Surveyor name		8th May 2025 EJ									
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)											
Limitations (if applicable)		Habitat parcel reference										Notes (such as justification)	
		TN1	TN5	TN6	TN11								
Condition Assessment Criteria		Grid reference											
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)											
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 (and relative to Footnote 3 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description). ¹ Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	N	N	N	N								
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.	Y	Y	Y	Y								
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens ² .	Y	Y	Y	Y								
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%.	N	N	N	N								
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition ³ 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 ⁴ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁵) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.	N	N	N	N								
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types													

F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m ² present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 3 and 5 cannot contribute towards this count). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	Y	Y	N	Y								
Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)		N	N	N	N								
Number of criteria passed		3	3	2	3								
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√											
Acid grassland types (Result out of 5 criteria)													
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)												
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)												
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)												
Non-acid grassland types (Result out of 6 criteria)													
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; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)	X	X	X	X								
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score													
Notes													
Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.													
Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing for plant colonisation, or localised patches not exceeding 5% cover.													
Footnote 3 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.													
Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.													
Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).													

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)													
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type													
Grassland - Modified grassland													
Habitat Description													
4 sections of mown and 1 less intensively managed strips of grassland in raised beds													
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification													
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On site, Moorgate Point, Knowsley	Survey date and Surveyor name		EJ - 08/05/25									
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)											
Limitations (if applicable)		Habitat parcel reference											
		MG1	MG2										
		Grid reference											
Condition Assessment Criteria													
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										Notes (such as justification)	
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition. Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m ² (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	Y	Y										
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	N	Y										
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.	N	N										
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.	Y	N										
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .	N	Y										
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Y	Y										
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).	Y	Y										
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		Y	Y										
Number of criteria passed		4	5										
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√											
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)												
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	X	X										

Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)											
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score												
Footnotes												
Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover. Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).												

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type													
Habitat Type													
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)													
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)													
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170) [Use this condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools, use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes]													
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental ponds, use Lake condition sheet for Ornamental lakes]													
Habitat Description													
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification													
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On site, Moorgate Point, Knowlsey	Survey date and Surveyor name		EJ- 08/05/25									
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)											
Limitations (if applicable)		Habitat parcel reference											
		P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6						
		Grid reference											
Condition Assessment Criteria													
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)											Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - applicable to all ponds (woodland ¹ and non-woodland):													
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.	N	N	N	N	N	N						
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.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
C	Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed <i>Lemna</i> spp. or filamentous algae.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
D	The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
E	Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams ² , pumps or pipework.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species ³ .	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y						
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for all non-woodland ponds:													
H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed) ⁴ cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.	N	N	N	N	N	N						
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.	N	N	N	N	N	N						
Number of criteria passed		6	6	6	6	6	6						
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved x/√											
Results for woodland ponds which require assessment of 7 core criteria													

Passes 7 criteria	Good (3)												
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Moderate (2)												
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)												
Results for non-woodland ponds which require assessment of 9 criteria													
Passes 9 criteria	Good (3)												
Passes 6 to 8 criteria	Moderate (2)	X	X	X	X	X	X						
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)												
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score													
Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat. Footnote 2 – This excludes natural dams such as those created by Eurasian beaver <i>Castor fiber</i>. Footnote 3 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent: WFD UKTAG (2021) <i>Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact</i> [online]. Available from:													

Condition Sheet: SCRUB Habitat Type													
Habitat Types													
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub Heathland and shrub - Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160) Heathland and shrub - Willow scrub													
Habitat Description													
For Dunes with sea buckthorn see:		Dunes with sea-buckthorn (Dunes with Hippophae rhamnoides) - Special Areas of Conservation (incc.gov.uk)											
For other scrub types see:		ukhab – UK Habitat Classification											
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On site - Moorgate Point, Knowsley			Survey date and Surveyor name		EJ - 08/05/25							
				Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)									
Limitations (if applicable)				Habitat parcel reference									
				TN2	TN3	TN7	TN10	E BOUNDARY					
				Grid reference									
Condition Assessment Criteria													
				Criterion passed (Yes or No)								Notes (such as justification)	
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description (where in its natural range). ¹ - At least 80% of scrub is native, - There are at least three native woody species ² , - No single species comprises more than 75% of the cover (except hazel <i>Corylus avellana</i> , common juniper <i>Juniperus communis</i> , sea buckthorn <i>Hippophae rhamnoides</i> (only in its restricted native range), or box <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> , which can be up to 100% cover).			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
B	Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran ³) shrubs are all present.			N	N	Y	N	N					
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ⁴ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁵) and species indicative of suboptimal condition ⁶ make up less than 5% of ground cover.			N	Y	N	N	Y					
D	The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat.			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y					
E	There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges.			N	N	N	N	N					
Number of criteria passed				2	3	3	2	3					
Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)		Condition Assessment Score		Score Achieved x/√									
Passes 5 criteria		Good (3)											
Passes 3 or 4 criteria		Moderate (2)			X	X		X					
Passes 2 or fewer criteria		Poor (1)		X			X						
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score													



[illegible]

Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)		X														
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)																
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.																	
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score ²																	

Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Type												
Habitat Types												
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs Urban - Allotments Urban - Biodiverse green roof Urban - Bioswale Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards Urban - Facade-bound green wall Urban - Ground based green wall Urban - Intensive green roof Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land Urban - Rain garden Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS) Urban - Vacant or derelict land Urban - Bare ground												
Habitat Description												
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs, and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats: ukhab – UK Habitat Classification												
On-site or off-site, site name and location	On site, Moorgate Point		Survey date and Surveyor name		EJ 8th May 2025							
			Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)									
Limitations (if applicable)			Habitat parcel reference									
			BG1	BG2								
Condition Assessment Criteria		Grid reference										
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)								Notes (such as justification)		
Core Criteria - must be assessed for all urban habitat types :												
A	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.		N	N								
B	The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year.		Y	Y								
C	Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ¹) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) ² cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area ³ . Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).		Y	Y								
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land only:												
D	The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS: - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i); Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.											
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for Bioswale and SuDS habitat types only:												
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife ⁴ .											
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Intensive green roofs only:												
F	The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for Biodiverse green roofs only:												

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