Moorgate Farm, Netherton

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

HABITAT WORKS

October 2025

HABITAT WORKS

Report Title: Moorgate Farm, Netherton
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Report to: Paul Matthews Architectural
Malkin Farm
Brow Lane
Holmfirth
HD9 2RJ

Version: *V1.0*

Issue Date: October 2025

Prepared by:

Ellie Collier BSc (Hons)

Graduate Ecologist

Reviewed and Approved by:

Joe Travis BSc (Hons), MSc ACIEEM

Ecology Team Manager

Prepared by:
Habitat Works, Suite 12, Westleigh House, Denby Dale, Huddersfield HD8 8QJ

Version History	Author	Description	Date
V1.0	Joe Travis	Final Version for Issue	06.10.2025

Works carried out by Habitat Works on behalf of the client in accordance with the agreed terms of contract and/or written agreement establish the agreed Services. The Services were performed by Habitat Works with the skill and care ordinarily exercised by a reasonably qualified Consultant at the time the Services were performed. Further, the Services were performed by Habitat Works considering the limits of the scope of works required by the client, the time scale involved, and the resources agreed between Habitat Works and the client.

Other than that, expressly contained in the paragraph above, Habitat Works provides no other representation or warranty whether express or implied, in relation to the Services.

This report is produced exclusively for the purposes of the client. Habitat Works is not aware of any interest of or reliance by any party other than the client in or on the Services. Unless expressly provided in writing, Habitat Works does not authorise, consent or condone any party other than the client relying upon the services provided. Any reliance on the services or any part of the services by any party other than the client is made wholly at that party's own risk and Habitat Works disclaims any liability to such parties.

This report is based on Site conditions, regulatory or other legal provisions, technology or economic conditions at the time of the Service provision. These conditions can change with time and reliance on the findings of the Services under changing conditions should be reviewed. The recommended lifetime of the report is detailed within the report text.

Habitat Works accepts no responsibility for the accuracy of any third-party data used in this report.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... **IV**

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1 BACKGROUND 1

2. METHODOLOGY **2**

2.1 BACKGROUND 2
2.2 BIODIVERSITY METRIC INPUTS 2

3. BIODIVERSITY METRIC CALCULATIONS **4**

3.1 BACKGROUND 4
3.2 TRADING RULES 4
3.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS 4

4. FINDINGS AND EVALUATION **6**

4.1 BASELINE HABITATS 6
4.2 POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS 6
4.3 BASELINE HABITATS 7
4.4 POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS 8
4.5 NET CHANGE IN BIODIVERSITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 8

5. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS **9**

5.1 SUMMARY OF BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN DELIVERY 9
5.2 DISCUSSION 9
5.3 HABITAT MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING 9
5.4 BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES 9

6. REFERENCES **10**

FIGURE 1. BASELINE HABITATS MAP **12**

FIGURE 2. POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS MAP **14**

APPENDIX 1. BNG GOOD PRACTICE PRINCIPLES **16**

APPENDIX 2. BIODIVERSITY METRIC CALCULATIONS SUMMARY **18**

Executive Summary

Habitat Works Limited (Habitat Works) was commissioned in September 2025 by Paul Matthews Architectural to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) for approximately 1.9 ha area of the land at Moorgate Farm, Netherthong, Kirklees, West Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 12949 09472), hereafter referred to as 'the Site'.

This BNGA has been carried out to determine the potential change in biodiversity value of the Site based upon the proposed development and associated post development habitats, using the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024).

The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing '*Proposed Block Plan*' (Dwg. no. 25/1148/04, dated 05/2025). The proposals are for the conversion of a section of the garden to a paddle court.

The total area of the Site has been calculated at 1.9 ha and baseline area-based habitats recorded for the Site comprise '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface', 'Urban – Vegetated garden', 'Grassland – Modified grassland*' and '*Woodland and forest – Other woodland; mixed'.*

It is anticipated that the current proposals will see the partial loss of '*Urban – Vegetated garden'.* Post-development area-based habitat creation has been predicted to include '*Urban –Developed land; sealed surface'.*

The current proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.14 HU, which equates to a 18.04% total net change overall. These recommendations allow the 10% net gain requirement to be fulfilled.

Given this significant increase in HU, and only the partial loss of '*Urban – Vegetated garden'*, it is considered that this is a significant increase in the biodiversity across the Site and will provide significantly more ecological value on the Site post-development compared to pre-development.

1. Introduction

1.1 *Background*

1.1.1 Habitat Works Limited (Habitat Works) was commissioned in September 2025 by Paul Matthews Architectural to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (BNGA) for approximately 1.9 ha area of the land at Moorgate Farm, Netherthong, Kirklees, West Yorkshire (central Ordnance Survey National Grid Reference (OS NGR) SE 12949 09472), hereafter referred to as 'the Site' and as displayed in Figure 1.

1.1.2 This BNGA has been carried out to determine the potential change in biodiversity value of the Site based upon the proposed development and associated post development habitats, using the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024).

1.1.3 The Site boundary is detailed within the Paul Matthews Architectural drawing '*Proposed Block Plan*' (Dwg. no. 25/1148/04, dated 05/2025). The proposals are for the conversion of a section of the garden to a paddle court.

1.1.4 This report details the results of the BNGA using biodiversity metric calculations which have been completed based upon the Habitat Works site walkover undertaken in August 2025, and calculations of the post-development habitats taken from the '*Proposed Block Plan*'. The methodologies employed and all survey findings are described along with an evaluation and assessment of the biodiversity value of the Site. Any recommendations regarding ensuring Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) are also detailed as required.

2. Methodology

2.1 *Background*

2.1.1 This BNGA uses the industry recognised best practice methodology within the (DEFRA) '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*' (SBM) (February, 2024).

2.1.2 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) uses habitat features as a measure for their importance and value to nature. The following information on each habitat are required for the metric input:

- Habitat type;
- Irreplaceable habitat;
- Area/length;
- Habitat distinctiveness (automatically calculated);
- Habitat condition; and,
- Strategic significance.

2.2 *Biodiversity Metric Inputs*

Habitat Type

Baseline

2.2.1 The Site was surveyed on 26th August 2025 by Graduate Ecologist Ellie Collier BSc (Hons) and Seasonal Ecologist Alice Shaw BSc (Hons).

2.2.2 The Site visit included an ecological walkover survey using the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) system (Butcher *et al.,* 2020). The habitats present on the Site were identified and classified according to the UKHab system which closely aligns with the SBM. The baseline habitats are displayed in Figure 1.

2.2.3 The SBM uses a classification system based mainly on the UKHab with inputs from other systems including the Water Framework Directive (WFD) Lakes Typology (UKTAG, 2003); the European Nature Information System (EUNIS) habitat type hierarchical view (EEA, 2109; and Natura 2000 Annex I habitats (JNCC, 2019) in addition to further habitats specific to the SSM.

Post-Development

2.2.4 Proposals for the Site have been assessed and habitats present post-development have been based upon the '*Proposed Block Plan*' and using best knowledge of the likely habitats to be created/retained/lost.

2.2.5 The post-development habitats were classified according to the habitat classification system used by the SBM.

Habitat Area/Length

2.2.6 The area/length of each baseline and post-development habitat type was mapped using QGIS 3.40.4 '*Bratislava*' Geographical Information System). Area habitats are recorded in hectares (ha) and linear habitats are recorded in kilometres (km) as per the SBM calculator.

Habitat Condition

2.2.7 The condition of a habitat is the measure of the biological 'working order' of a habitat judged against the perceived ecological optimum for that particular habitat. The condition assessments were undertaken using the '*Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annexe 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology*' spreadsheet (February, 2024).

Post-Development

2.2.8 The condition that post-development habitats have been assigned is based upon reasonable and the likely habitat condition in line with the condition assessment criteria. The condition of each habitat was assessed and either calculated as 'Good', 'Moderate' or 'Poor', where appropriate. Within the SBM, some habitats are not suitable for condition assessment, and as such are automatically calculated as either '*Condition Assessment N/A*' or '*N/A – Other'.*

2.2.9 If a habitat type varied in condition within the Site, these habitats were mapped and recorded separately to allow this distinction.

Habitat Strategic Significance

2.2.10 The SBM accounts for whether the habitats are situated within an area locally identified as significant for nature conservation.

2.2.11 Data on the areas and habitats locally identified as significant for nature conservation were obtained from the following sources:

- Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website for mapped statutory designated sites (https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx); and,
- Habitats listed within the Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan (2007).

3. Biodiversity Metric Calculations

3.1 *Background*

3.1.1 Biodiversity metric calculations provide a numerical score for the value of existing habitats on the Site and their likely value post-development in Habitat Units (HU), Hedgerow Units (HeU) and Watercourse Units (WU) (where present and applicable), to quantitively assess the impact of the proposed development.

3.1.2 Using the SBM, habitat values are calculated via the criteria described within Sections 2.1 and 2.2. This results in individual scores for each habitat, and subsequently baselines for HU, HeU and WU (where present and appropriate).

3.1.3 The post-development value can also be calculated for habitats where factors including time to target condition and difficulty of creation/enhancement are also taken into consideration. The values for area habitats and linear habitats are calculated separately. This provides an overall picture of the biodiversity net gain or loss as a result of a development. To achieve BNG, all three of HU, HeU and WU are treated individually, and individual gains cannot be combined to form an overall gain for the Site.

3.2 *Trading Rules*

3.2.1 The SBM considers distinctiveness as described earlier and using this data, SBM applies trading rules that require that any habitat loss is replaced on a 'like for like' or 'like for better' basis. The trading rules are detailed below in Table 1.

Table 1 – Trading Rules within the SBM

Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rules
Very High	Bespoke compensation likely to be required
High	Same habitat required
Medium	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat requires
Very Low	Compensation not required

3.3 *Assumptions and Limitations*

3.3.1 For strategic significance, all habitats on the Site (both baseline and post-development) have been considered '*Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy*' as they do not qualify as priority habitats and are not identified on any strategic plans.

3.3.2 The quantification of biodiversity is one of several factors to be considered when assessing the impact of the proposed development on biodiversity. Note that this BNGA does not cover potential impacts of the proposed development on protected species and designated sites.

3.3.3 The information contained within this report is considered valid for a period of 24 months from the date of the survey visit (CIEEM, 2019). If the development has not commenced by September 2027, it is recommended that the Site is fully re-surveyed to determine if there have been any significant changes to baseline habitats within that timeframe.

4. Findings and Evaluation

Redline Boundary

4.1 *Baseline Habitats*

4.1.1 Baseline area-based habitats recorded within the redline boundary of the Site comprise '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface'* and *'Urban – Vegetated garden'* (see Figure 1).

4.1.2 The total area of the redline boundary has been calculated at 0.10 ha. The habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 2. Baseline area-based habitats have a biodiversity value of 0.12 HU.

Table 2 – Redline Site Baseline Area-based Habitats and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.042	0.00
Urban – Vegetated garden	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	0.062	0.12
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.12

4.2 *Post-development Habitats*

4.2.1 The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon the post-development proposals as show in the '*Proposed Block Plan*'. A summary of the calculations is provided in Appendix 2.

4.2.2 It is anticipated that the proposals will see the partial loss of '*Urban – Vegetated garden'* and the addition of *'Urban – Developed land; sealed surface'.*

4.2.3 Post-development area-based habitats are predicted to include '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface' and 'Urban – Vegetated garden' (*see Figure 2).

4.2.4 The predicted area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 3. The post-development area-based habitats estimated a biodiversity value of 0.08 HU and are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 3 – Redline Post-development Area-based Habitats Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Lost				
Urban – Vegetated garden	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	0.02	-0.04
Retained				
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.042	0.00
Urban – Vegetated garden	Low	Condition Assessment – N/A	0.042	0.08
Created				
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.02	0.00
Total Habitat Units (HU)				0.08

Blueline Boundary

4.3 *Baseline Habitats*

4.3.1 Baseline area-based habitats recorded within the blueline boundary of the Site comprise '*Urban – Developed land; sealed surface*', '*Urban – Vegetated garden*', '*Grassland – Modified grassland*' and '*Woodland and forest – Other woodland; mixed*' (see Figure 1).

4.3.2 The total area of the blueline boundary has been calculated at 1.80 ha. The habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 4. Baseline area-based habitats have a biodiversity value of 4.02 HU.

Table 4 – Blueline Site Baseline Area-based Habitats and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (ha)	Habitat Units (HU)
Urban – Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	N/A - Other	0.261	0.00
Urban – Vegetated garden	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	0.402	0.80
Grassland – Modified grassland	Low	Poor	0.972	1.94
Woodland and forest – Other woodland; mixed	Medium	Moderate	0.159	1.27
Total Habitat Units (HU)				4.02

4.3.3 The proposals do not affect the area within the blueline boundary so therefore there is no change in HU and the biodiversity value remains 4.02 HU meaning the overall biodiversity is unaffected.

4.4 *Post-development Habitats*

4.4.1 The following calculations present a version of the completed feasibility biodiversity metric calculations based upon the post-development proposals as show in the '*Proposed Block Plan*'. A summary of these calculations is provided in Appendix 2.

4.4.2 These comprises the planting of a minimum of five '*Individual trees – Urban tree'* within the blueline boundary. This will increase the HU present on the Site post-development. All other habitat changes will remain the same.

4.4.3 The recommended area-based habitat type, distinctiveness, condition, area and HU of the area-based habitats are provided within Table 5. The post-development area-based habitats will create 0.06 HU, locations are displayed within Figure 2.

Table 5 – Recommended Post-development Area-based Habitats Condition and Habitat Units

Habitat Type	Distinctiveness	Condition	Area (m^2)	Habitat Units (HU)
Created				
Individual trees – Urban tree	Medium	Moderate	0.0204	0.06
Total Change in Habitat Units (HU)				+0.02

4.5 *Net Change in Biodiversity of Recommendations*

4.5.1 Considering the reasonable assumptions and estimates made within this report, it is predicted that the proposed development will result in a net unit change of +0.02 HU which is a net percentage change of +18.04% as detailed in Table 6.

Table 6. – Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

Habitat Type	Baseline Units	Post-development Units	Change in Units	% Change in Units
Habitat Units (HU)	0.12	0.14	+0.02	+18.04%

5. Discussion and Recommendations

5.1 *Summary of Biodiversity Net Gain Delivery*

5.1.1 The current proposals result in a biodiversity value of 0.14 HU representing a net change of +0.02 HU equating to a +18.04% gain of HU, exceeding the 10% net gain requirement.

5.2 *Discussion*

5.2.1 Given current proposals, it is considered that a 10% net gain in HU on Site would be achievable through the planting of a minimum of five '*Individual trees – Urban tree*' in the blueline area, would be sufficient to achieve the necessary gains in biodiversity on the Site post-development.

5.3 *Habitat Management and Monitoring*

5.3.1 Ordinarily, the production of a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is recommended to ensure that the Site habitats deliver the habitat scores listed within the final design stage BNGA. However, given that the proposals require the planting of a five urban trees, the production of a HMMP is considered disproportionate in this instance.

5.3.2 To ensure that the required net gain is achieved, it is recommended that 10 '*Individual trees – Urban tree*' are planted initially to ensure that in the allocated 30 years time there will be at least five remaining healthy trees, securing the 10% gain. Native species should be planted oversailing existing grasslands, which would ensure that the tree reaches the required moderate condition.

5.4 *BNG Good Practice Principles*

5.4.1 Appendix 1 details the BNG Good Practice Principles (CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA, 2016) which should be adhered to when undertaking BNGAs in association with proposed developments The actions within Appendix 1 should be considered throughout the design stage of a development at this Site

6. References

CIEEM (2019). '*Advice Note: On the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys*'. Charted Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester. Available: https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Advice-Note.pdf

CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA (2016). '*Biodiversity Net Gain – Good practice principles for development'.* Available: https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf

DEFRA (2011). '*Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services*. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78c263ed915d04220651ea/pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-111111.pdf

DEFRA (2018). '*A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65fd713d65ca2f00117da89e/CD1.H_HM_Government_A_Green_Future_Our_25_Year_Plan_to_Improve_the_Environment.pdf

DEFRA (2024) '*The Small Sites Metric (Statutory Biodiversity Metric): User Guide*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65c60ec19c5b7f0012951bdd/The_Small_Sites_Metric__Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric__-_User_Guide.pdf

Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) (2023). '*National Planning Policy Framework*'. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65a11af7e8f5ec000f1f8c46/NPPF_December_2023.pdf

European Environment Agency (EEA) (2023). '*Eunis habitat distribution plots (spatial data)*'. Available: https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/datahub/datahubitem-view/ce3e4bf4-e929-404a-88c7-37f2c614fd1d

DEFRA (2011). '*Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services*. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78c263ed915d04220651ea/pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-111111.pdf

His Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) (2006). '*Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*'. Available: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/pdfs/ukpga_20060016_en.pdf

HMSO (2024). '*The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024*'. Available: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2024/48/pdfs/uksi_20240048_en.pdf

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) (2019). '*Annex I Habitats List*'. Available: https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/habitat/

Kirklees Council (2007). *'Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan'*. Available: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/delivering-services/pdf/biodiversity-species.pdf

Natural England (2024). '*The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology*'. Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides

UKHab Ltd (2023). '*The UK Habitat Classification: Version 2.0'*. Available: https://www.ukhab.org

UK Technical Advisory Group (UKTAG) on the Water Framework Directive (2003). '*Guidance on Typology for Lakes for the UK*'. Available: https://www.wfduk.org/sites/default/files/Media/Characterisation%20of%20the%20water%20environment/Lakes%20typology_Final_010604.pdf

Figure 1. Baseline Habitats Map

Legend

- Redline Boundary
- Blueline Boundary

Baseline Areas

- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
- Urban - Vegetated garden
- Grassland - Modified grassland
- Woodland & forest - Other woodland; mixed

0 20 40 60 80 m

HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews Architectural

Moorgate Farm

Figure 1
UKHab Baseline Habitats Map

Basemap: Copyright Google 2025

October 2025 | Scale - 1: 2400 @ A4 | Drawing Reference: 251003/F1/EC

Figure 2. Post-development Habitats Map

Legend

- Redline Boundary
- Blueline Boundary

Baseline Areas

- Urban - Developed land; sealed surface
- Urban - Vegetated garden
- Grassland - Modified grassland
- Woodland & forest - Other woodland; mixed
- Individual trees - Urban tree (Indicative locations)

0 20 40 60 80 m

HABITAT WORKS

Paul Matthews Architectural

Moorgate Farm

Figure 2
Post-development Habitats Map

Basemap: Copyright Google 2025 | October 2025 | Scale - 1: 2400 @ A4 | Drawing Reference: 251003/F2/EC

Appendix 1. BNG Good Practice Principles

The BNG Good practice principles for development are based upon issued joint guidance from the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), the Construction Industry Research and Information Association (CIRIA) and the Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment (IEEMA) (CIEEM, CIRIA & IEMA, 2019).

The Good practice principles for development outlines 10 principles which should be followed to ensure that BNG is undertaken in the most beneficial and appropriate manner possible. These principles are outlined in the table below.

Principle	Description
Principle 1. **Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy**	Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision-makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensating for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature conservation, then offset biodiversity losses by gains elsewhere.
Principle 2. **Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere**	Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity – these impacts cannot be offset to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain.
Principle 3. **Be inclusive and equitable**	Engage stakeholders early, and involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Net Gain. Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible, and share the benefits fairly among stakeholders.
Principle 4. **Address risks**	Mitigate difficulty, uncertainty and other risks to achieving Net Gain. Apply well-accepted ways to add contingency when calculating biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and the gains being fully realised.
Principle 5. **Make a measurable Net Gain contribution**	Achieve a measurable, overall gain[1] for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing to wards nature conservation priorities. *[1] – Net Gain has been described as a measurable target for development projects where impacts on biodiversity are outweighed by a clear mitigation hierarchy approach to first avoid then minimise impacts, including through restoration and / or compensation. Adhering to these Net Gain principles (i.e. pursuing all principles together) will help in under-pinning good practice for achieving and sustaining Net Gain.*
Principle 6. **Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity**	Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly-justified choices when: • Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses • Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation

	• Achieving Net Gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regional and national levels • Enhancing existing or creating new habitat • Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity
Principle 7. **Be additional**	Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. do not deliver something that would occur anyway).
Principle 8. **Create a Net Gain legacy**	Ensure Net Gain generates long-term benefits by: • Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure Net Gain in perpetuity[2] • Planning for adaptive management and securing dedicated funding for long-term management • Designing Net gain for biodiversity to be resilient to external factors, especially climate change • Mitigating risks for other land uses • Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another • Supporting local-level management of Net Gain activities *[2] – Biodiversity compensation should be planned for a sustained Net Gain over the longest possible timeframe. For development in the UK, the expectation is that compensating sites will be secures for at least the lifetime of the development (e.g. often 25-30 years) with the objective of Net Gain management continuing in the future.*
Principle 9. **Optimise sustainability**	Prioritise Biodiversity Net Gain and, where possible, optimise the wider environmental benefits for a sustainable society and economy.
Principle 10. **Be Transparent**	Communicate all Net Gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders.

Appendix 2. Biodiversity Metric Calculations Summary

Moorgate Farm

Headline Results

Return to results menu

Scroll down for final results ⚠

On-site baseline	Area habitat units	0.12		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	0.08		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	-0.04	-32.26%	On-site net gain is less than target set ⚠
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%	
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%	
Off-site baseline	Area habitat units	4.02		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	4.08		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Area habitat units	0.06	1.55%	
	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)	Area habitat units	0.02		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Area 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)	Area habitat units	0.02
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	Watercourse units	0.00
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	18.04%
	Hedgerow units	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00%
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓	

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Area habitat units	10.00%	0.12	0.14	0.00	No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓