



**Ecological Consultants
Environmental and Rural Chartered Surveyors**

Your Ref:
Our Ref: AWG/6054

Mr Nick Cooper
51 Cookridge St
Leeds
LS2 3AW

Tuesday, 27 October 2020

Dear Mr Cooper

RE: KING JAMES SCHOOL - BIO-DIVERSITY OFFSETTING CALCULATIONS

In respect of construction work to be undertaken at King James School. I would provide the following which highlights details within the submitted planning documents.

BIODIVERSITY CALCULATIONS

In respect of biodiversity, defining enhancement proves problematic as “valuing” the natural environment requires a standardised methodology and baseline values against which to compare a site before and after.

Ecological valuation is complicated, and is highly sensitive to the type and condition of the habitat being lost, and the type and condition of the habitat being created on-site in mitigation and also off-site in compensation. Differences in habitat type and condition can make a large difference to the amount of offsetting required.

The Biodiversity Metric 2.0 published as a 'beta test' has been used in this assessment. This is an experimental calculation methodology and is currently subject to review and public testing.

The author of this report is a Rural Practice Chartered Surveyor, Chartered Environmentalist and full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. The author is a full member of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) and therefore is competent in a range of valuation techniques and procedures.



Tel: 015395 61894
Email: info@envtech.co.uk
Web: www.envtech.co.uk
Envirotech NW Ltd

The Stables, Back Lane, Hale, Milnthorpe, Cumbria. LA7 7BL
Directors: A. Gardner BSc (Hons), MSc, CEnv, MRICS, Dip NDEA
H. Gardner BSc (Hons), MSc, CEnv, MRICS
Registered in England and Wales. Company Registration Number 5028111

“Biodiversity Metric 2.0”

We have utilised a spread sheet for calculating the biodiversity value of the site before and after “Biodiversity Metric 2.0 Calculation Tool Beta Test - December 2019 Update”. This was the most current version of the spread sheet at the time of compilation.

Baseline conditions were taken as reported by Envirotech (2020) following a site visit.

Post development conditions are taken from drawing 303_020-FC-03-00-DR-A-0707 submitted with the planning application.

A full landscaping plan has not been prepared, the following are therefore indicative scores for what can be achieved at the site.

Pre development, the ecology report for the site indicates the site comprises amenity and modified grassland as well as hardstanding and buildings.

Post development, there will be buildings and hardstanding as well as shrubs and wildflower grassland. Some of the existing modified grassland will be enhanced.

All habitats will be created on site.

Using the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 calculations for habitat types, distinctiveness, condition, difficulty of creation and allowing suitable discount periods for the habitats to reach their target value, the site pre development is 0.21 Units, post development the site will be 0.23 Units, an ecological gain of 0.02 Units. On an area basis the site is therefore **10.21% better ecologically post development than pre-development.**

The proposal delivers an ecological aim in respect of habitats under the Biodiversity Metric 2.0 Calculation Tool Beta Test - December 2019 Update of between 0.02 Units and 10.21%.

Yours Sincerely



Andrew Gardner BSc (Hons), MSc, MRICS
Director Envirotech NW Ltd

On-site baseline	Habitat units	0.21
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation, enhancement & succession)	Habitat units	0.23
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.00
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation, enhancement & succession)	Habitat units	0.00
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Total net unit change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention/creation)	Habitat units	0.02
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	River units	0.00
Total net % change (including all on-site & off-site habitat creation + retained habitats)	Habitat units	10.21%
	Hedgerow units	0.00%
	River units	0.00%

Headline Results

	Habitats and areas			Habitat distinctiveness	Habitat condition	Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance	Suggested action to address habitat losses	Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance		Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Grassland - Modified grassland	0.067	Low	Poor	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	0.13
2	Urban	Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	0.041	V.Low	N/A - Other	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
3	Urban	Urban - Amenity grassland	0.03	Low	Poor	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	0.06
4	Urban	Urban - Amenity grassland	0.008	Low	Poor	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	0.02
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
	Total site area ha		0.15					Total Site baseline	0.21

Retention category biodiversity value							
Area retained	Area enhanced	Area succession	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhance	Baseline units succession	Area lost	Units lost
	0.044		0.00	0.09	0.00	0.02	0.05
			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00
			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.06
	0.008		0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.09	0.11

Pre-development

Post development/ post intervention habitats								Habitat units delivered
Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Ecological	Strategic significance	Temporal	Difficulty	
				Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance	Time to target condition/years	Difficulty of creation category	
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	0.094	V.Low	N/A - Other	N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	0	Low	0.00
Totals	0.09							0.00

Enhancement

	Baseline habitats	Change in distinctiveness and condition			Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Ecological connectivity	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier	Difficulty multipliers	Habitat units delivered
Baseline ref	Baseline habitat	Proposed habitat (Pre-populated but can be overridden)	Distinctiveness change	Condition change				Ecological connectivity score	Strategic significance	Time to target condition/years	Difficulty of enhancement category	
1	Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland - Tall herb communities	Low - High	Lower Distinctiveness Habitat - Good	0.044	High	Good	Medium	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	30	High	0.18
4	Urban - Amenity grassland	Urban - Introduced shrub	Low - Low	Poor - Good	0.008	Low	Good	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	1	Low	0.05
Total site area					0.05						Enhancement total	0.23

Creation