

Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Site Address:

Land at Netherley Drive, Marsden, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, HD7 6HL

Client:

Ross Thornton

Assessment Date:

8th June 2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Kirklees Council. "The erection of 10 (no.) dwellings within the site."

BNG assessment methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **BNG Methodology and Legislation – 2025.**

The results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit and BNG assessment may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion.

Version Control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Jessica Sibley BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	08/06/2026
Reviewed	0.2	Kayleigh Davies, BSc (Hons), MSc, Consultant Ecologist	18/06/2026
Final	1.0	Jessica Sibley BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	22/06/2026
Amended	2.0	Leah Cook, Consultant Ecologist	02/06/2026

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

Arbtech cannot be held responsible for any project management failures, delays or unforeseen costs arising from failure to read and ensure understanding of the content with in, nor is Arbtech responsible for any adverse outcomes arising from failure to account for ecological advice given at any stage throughout the project collaboration.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Site Location and Context

The site is centred at National Grid reference SE 04514 10890 and has an area of approximately 0.856ha comprising bare ground, hardstanding, other neutral grassland, a treeline, non-native ornamental hedgerow, small scattered trees and built linear features, in Huddersfield.

The site is well connected to nearby pasture, grassland, woodland, treelines, scattered trees, as well as watercourses and Butterley Reservoir.

This report should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

- ❖ Statutory BNG Metric – Land at Netherley Drive, HD7 6HL – V1 (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026)
- ❖ Proposed Plan
- ❖ Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) - Land at Netherley Drive, HD7 6HL – V1 (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026)

Executive Summary

The current landscaping proposal generates a net loss of area-based habitat units (-61.10%) with unmet trading rules. In line with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (2024), any loss of a habitat must be replaced on a like-for-like or like-for-better principle. With unmet trading conditions and a net loss, the proposal fails principal Rules 1 and 2 of BNG and is not compliant with current legislation (Environment Act 2021).

In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for area-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 8.07 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of **5.22** units. 5.31 units must be delivered of other neutral grassland to satisfy trading rules.

A 58.47%

Introduction

BNG Informative	
Habitat Degradation Statement	Date reflected by BNG calculations03/06/2026
	The baseline biodiversity value of the site is derived from the site as observed during the PEA field survey (Arbtech Consulting Ltd., 2026). As evident in the screenshots of satellite imagery obtained from GoogleEarth dated 15th May 2019 and 19th March 2025, the site does not appear to have undergone any degradation. The habitats on site, and therefore biodiversity value of the site, is not considered to have undergone degradation since 30th January 2020.
	Historical imagery < 15 May 2019 > > 198519992002200320052009201620182019202020212025 

	Historical imagery < 19 Mar 2025 > > 1985 1999 2002 2003 2005 2009 2016 2018 2019 2020 2021 2025  
Irreplaceable Habitat Statement	No irreplaceable habitats as listed under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations (2024) are currently present nor were present before 30 th January 2020.
Metric Version & Publication Date	Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool first published 29 th November 2023 with last updates to metric tools and user guides on 3 rd July 2025.
BNG Target Uplift	+10%
National Character Area (NCA)	51 - Dark Peak

Strategic Significance	Kirklees Council the responsible authority for drafting the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) for Kirklees Council, has yet to adopt a comprehensive LNRS. As advised by the Kirklees Council, the following documents from its adopted Local Plan (including Supplementary Planning Documents, SPDs), were used to determine strategic significance: Local Plan		
	Habitat	Baseline	Justification
	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	Low	Habitat not in the local plan.
	Developed land; sealed surface	Low	Habitat not in the local plan.
	Other Neutral Grassland	Medium	Habitat is not in the local plan but provides valuable habitat for pollinating insects as well as foraging habitat for a range of fauna including bats, birds and small mammal.
	Built linear features	Low	Habitat not in the local plan.
	Line of trees	Medium	Habitat is not in the local plan but provides valuable habitat for pollinating insects as well as foraging habitat for a range of fauna including bats, birds and small mammal.
	Non-native ornamental hedgerow	Low	Habitat not in the local plan.
	Rural Trees	Medium	Habitat is not in the local plan but does provide habitat of value for various fauna including invertebrates, bats, and breeding birds.
Limitations			
There were no specific limitations to the assessment.			

Baseline

Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site				
Area-Based Habitats				
Habitat	Area (ha)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.005	As described in the PEA.	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy
Developed land; sealed surface	0.025	As described in the PEA.	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy
Other neutral grassland	0.826	As described in the PEA.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
Rural tree	0.0081	As described in the PEA. 2 small trees.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
Baseline Biodiversity Value: On-Site				
Linear-Based Habitats				
Habitat	Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Line of trees	0.0577	As described in the PEA.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.0729	As described in the PEA.	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy

Post-Development

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site

Area-Based Habitats

	Habitat	Area (ha)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained	Other neutral grassland	0.116	Retained areas of grassland.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
Created	Developed land; sealed surface	0.398	New dwellings and access.	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy
	Vegetated garden	0.208	New gardens.	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy
	Other neutral grassland	0.058	Species rich front lawns.	Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
	Other neutral grassland	0.076	Semi-rural green space.	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
	Urban tree	0.147	36 small, planted trees.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy

Post-Development Biodiversity Value: On-Site

Linear-Based Habitats

	Habitat	Length (km)	Description	Condition Assessment	Strategic Significance
Retained	Line of trees	0.0577	As described in the PEA.	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy
	Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.0729	As described in the PEA.	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy
Created	Native hedgerow	0.09	Hedgerow around semi-rural green space.	Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy

Change of Biodiversity Value

		Biodiversity Units		
		Area-Based	Linear-Based	Watercourse-Based
On-Site	Baseline	7.34	0.33	0.00
	Post-Development	2.86	0.52	0.00
	Net Change	-4.48	+0.19	0.00
Off-Site	Baseline	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Post-Development	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Net Change	0.00	0.00	0.00
Overall Net Change		-4.48	+0.19	0.00

Results, Discussion, and Next Steps

BNG Informative														
Results	The current landscaping proposal generates a net loss of area-based habitat units (-61.10%) with unmet trading rules. In line with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (2024), any loss of a habitat must be replaced on a like-for-like or like-for-better principle. With unmet trading conditions and a net loss, the proposal fails principal Rules 1 and 2 of BNG and is not compliant with current legislation (Environment Act 2021). In order to achieve a +10% biodiversity net gain for area-based habitats, a minimum area-based unit score of 8.07 will need to be achieved. At present, there is a unit deficit of 5.22 units. 5.31 units must be delivered of other neutral grassland to satisfy trading rules. A 58.47%													
Recommendations and Next Steps	In order to achieve the required net gain in biodiversity as a result of the proposed development, the provision of additional or alternative landscaping should be explored and the proposed plans amended accordingly to achieve a net gain on site. The provisioning of additional landscaping should first be considered within the site boundary. There is limited scope on site and this provision may not be possible to achieve on site or adjacent with the current arrangement (within the redline boundary or offsite on other owned land) considering the size of the proposed development area and the limited amount of soft landscaping within the parcel. Based on the proposed plans, it is unlikely that net gain will be achieved by ways of habitat creation/enhancement without significant changes to the proposals on site or require unfeasible commitments off-site. As such, a financial contribution to off-site ecological enhancements (i.e. purchasing biodiversity units) within an approved scheme is required to make up the +10% net gain for area-based habitat units. The mechanism for securing this off-setting will need to be proposed to and confirmed by the LPA and would be linked to the application through a planning obligation Section 106 (s106) agreement. The proposed habitat compensation must be of an appropriate distinctiveness to meet the trading rules of BNG. A summary as to what off-site units will be required is detailed in the table below. <table><tr><th></th><th>Distinctiveness</th><th>Broad Habitat Group</th><th>Habitat</th><th>Units Required</th></tr><tr><td></td><td>Medium</td><td>Grassland</td><td>Other Neutral Grassland</td><td>5.31</td></tr></table>					Distinctiveness	Broad Habitat Group	Habitat	Units Required		Medium	Grassland	Other Neutral Grassland	5.31
	Distinctiveness	Broad Habitat Group	Habitat	Units Required										
	Medium	Grassland	Other Neutral Grassland	5.31										

		Area-Based	Total	5.31	
Pre-Commencement	A Biodiversity Gain Plan (BGP) and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) must be produced for the site. This should include recommendations for the implementation, management and monitoring of the site for at least 30 years to ensure that biodiversity net gain is delivered. These additional requirements can only be actioned following the finalisation of the BNG assessment – be it on-site or off-site net gains sought.				

Appendix 1: Baseline Habitat Plan



Appendix 2: Post-Development Habitat Plan



Appendix 3: Proposed Development Plan



Appendix 4: Headline BNG Results

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-4.48		
	Hedgerow units	0.19		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Area habitat units	-61.10%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲	
	Hedgerow units	58.47%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	7.34	8.07	5.22
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.33	0.36	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
				No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
				No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Appendix 5: Baseline Habitat Condition Assessment Sheets

Other neutral grassland (g3c) condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
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 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.	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 insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	Y
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens. For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.	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
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA5) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.	Y
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (Schedule 9 species cannot contribute towards this count).	N
		Total 4/6
	Condition moderate due to passing 4 of 6 criteria. Essential criteria (F) for good condition not met.	

Broadleaved mixed and yew woodland (w1) - Line of trees (33) condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	N
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	Y
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	N
D	There is an undisturbed naturally-vegetated strip of at least 6 m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice.	Y
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	Y
		Total 3/5
	Condition moderate due to passing 3 of 5 criteria.	

Scattered trees (T1, T2) condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Y
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Y
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	N
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Y
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	N
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Y
		Total 4/6
	Condition moderate due to passing 4 of 6 criteria.	