Hopkins Ecology

Site: New Wastewater Treatment Works, Beeston St Andrew,

Norwich

Item: Biodiversity Net Gain Estimates (Statutory Metric)

Client: Quinn Estates

Author: Dr GW Hopkins CEnv MCIEEM FRES

Date: 16 February 2024

Hopkins Ecology Ltd, St George's Works, 51 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1DD

T. 01603 435598 M: 07481 477103 E: graham@hopkinsecology.co.uk W: www.hopkinsecology.co.uk

1. Introduction

1.1 Hopkins Ecology Ltd was appointed by Quinn Estates to prepare a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment for a new wastewater treatment works at Beeston Park.

1.2 The assessor is Dr Graham Hopkins who qualifies as a competent person by virtue of academic¹ and professional qualifications², and professional experience³.

2. BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

- 2.1 The statutory BNG metric⁴ is used here to estimate the change in biodiversity units for habitats. In brief, the change in biodiversity value is calculated as a function of:
 - The difference between the biodiversity value pre- and post-development.
 - Value is calculated as a function of habitat type x habitat condition x habitat area or length. There are additional multipliers that take-into account the strategic location of a site and factors such as the time for habitats to develop once created.
 - Area is used for blocks of habitat, while linear features including hedgerows use length.
- 2.2 The documentation accompanying the Metric, e.g. the Technical Supplement (DEFRA, 2024⁵), includes protocols for identifying habitat types and assessing their condition, and in some instances the condition is pre-set within the Metric without the option for this to be modified.

² CEnv MCIEEM FRES

¹ A PhD in ecology.

³ 18 years of consultancy experience.

⁴ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides

⁵ DEFRA (2024) *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide*). Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65c60e0514b83c000ca715f3/The_Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_-_User_Guide_.pdf

3. ASSUMPTIONS

SPATIAL MULTIPLIER

3.1 Throughout, the spatial multiplier for semi-natural or low-input habitats is set at 1.1 to reflect the Site's location within a green infrastructure corridor.

BASELINE HABITATS

3.2 The BNG assessment only considers the plot where new wastewater works is proposed, which is mainly an improved sward, with some peripheral tall ruderal vegetation and a length of hedgerow. The conversion of these Phase 1 habitats to the UKHab classification is presented in the Calculations.

Figure 1. Habitat plan.



POST-DEVELOPMENT HABITATS

3.3 The concept plan is shown overleaf (Figure 2) and the key point is that there is an extensive area of new landscaping.

Indicative track

| Indicative track| | Indica

Figure 2. Concept plan with the legend increased in size.

HEDGEROWS

3.4 There is one length of existing hedgerow which is not directly impacted, but the infrastructure will have boundary hedgerow planting.

4. CALCULATIONS

HABITATS

Baseline

4.1 The habitat baseline is characterised below (Table 1), and the total area is taken as 0.99ha; additional commentary is provided in Table 2.

Table 1. Baseline condition of habitats.

Ref	Ref Habitat type		Area	Distinct	iveness	Condition		Area	Units
			(ha)	Desc.	Score	Desc.	Score	retained (ha)	lost
1	1 Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface		80.0	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	0.08	0.00
2	Non-cereal crops		0.91	Low	2	Condition Assessment N/A	1	0	2.00
							Habitat Units	Lost 2.0	

Table 2. Explanatory notes for the baseline assessment (cross-referencing to Table 1).

Ref	Comment
1	This is the existing track, which is effectively a bare substrate.
2	The is the main part of the Site, and is under arable.

Post-Development Habitats and Units

4.2 The post-development habitats are shown in Table 3 and additional notes are provided in Table 4.

 Table 3. Post-development habitats.

Ref	Broad	Habitat type Area Distinctiveness		ness	Condition	Units			
	habitat		(ha)	Desc.	Score	Desc.	Score	delivered	
1	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.26	V.Low	0	N/A - Other	0	0.00	
2	Grassland	Modified grassland	0.1	Low	2	Poor	1	0.21	
3	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.08	Medium	4	Moderate	2	0.59	
4	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.47	Medium	4	Moderate	2	3.46	
5	Individual trees	Urban tree	0.1059	Medium	4	Moderate	2	0.36	
	Habitat Units Delivered 4.62								

Table 4. Explanatory notes for the post-development assessment (cross-referencing to Table 3).

Ref	Comment					
1	This is the access and infrastructure.					
2	This is a mown sward around the infrastructure, assumed to be the lowest quality grassland					
	type.					
3	The landscaping includes scrub and this is rated as moderate.					
4	Wildflower sward will be planted outside of the hedgerows.					
5	An assumed 26 trees are counted here, excluding those within the scrub blocks.					

HEDGEROWS

4.3 The hedgerow is shown in Figure 1 and will be retained (Table 5). A new length of boundary planting will be included (Table 6). The condition of the hedgerow is moderate rather than good as it fails three criteria: A2, width; B1, gaps in the hedge base; C1, undisturbed vegetation.

Table 5. Hedgerow baseline.

Ref	Hedgerow	Length	Distinctiveness Condition			Length retained	Units	
	type	(km)	Desc. Score D		Desc.	Score	(km)	lost
West	Native hedgerow	0.05	Low	2	Moderate	2	0.05	0
	Habitat Units Lost 0							

Table 6. Hedgerow enhancement.

	Table of Floageren emaileement								
	Ref	Ref Hedgerow type		Distinctiveness		Condition		Units created	
			created (km)	Desc.	Score	Desc.	Score		
	Boundary	Species-rich native hedgerow	0.25	Medium	4	Moderate	2	1.84	
Habitat Units (itat Units Gained 1.84		

5. RESULTS

5.1 The scheme achieves a Biodiversity Net Gain of +130% driven by the low baseline and extensive high-quality landscaping (Table 7). The new hedgerow without removals represents a gain of >800%.

Table 7. Summary of results.

Table 1. Summary of results.			
	Habitat units	2.00	
On-site baseline	Hedgerow units	0.22	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	4.62	
On-site post-intervention	Hedgerow units	2.06	
(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	2.62	130.70%
On-site net change	Hedgerow units	1.84	836.83%
(units & percentage)	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
	Habitat units	0.00	l
Off-site baseline	Hedgerow units	0.00	
Olf-Site Daseille	Watercourse units	0.00	
	-		
Off-site post-intervention	Habitat units	0.00	
(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%
(units & percentage)	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
(units or percentage)	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
	Habitat units	2.62	l
Combined net unit change	Hedgerow units	1.84	
(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
	Habitat units	0.00	1
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Hedgerow units	0.00	
Spatia Isk IIIalipioi (Stari) doddololo	Watercourse units	0.00	
		0.00	
FINAL RESULTS			
M-4-14 - '1 1	Habitat units	2.62	
Total net unit change	Hedgerow units	1.84	
(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00	
m . 1	Habitat units	130.70%	
Total net % change	Hedgerow units	836.83%	
(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Ye	s√	

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The scheme readily achieves gain for habitats and hedgerows.
- 6.2 The scheme achieves a Biodiversity Net Gain of +130% driven by the low baseline and extensive high-quality landscaping.
- 6.3 The new hedgerow without removals represents a gain of >800%.