

Land rear of 53-59 Southview Road Southwick Brighton BN42 4TS

BNG Statement and condition assessment

July 2025



Plumb Associates Ltd

Tel: 01621 744710

Email: steve@plumb-associates.co.uk

Web: www.plumb-associates.co.uk

© Plumb Associates Ltd 2025

Land rear of 53-59 Southwick Road– BNG statement

Plumb Associates Ltd

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Plumb Associates Ltd was commissioned by S.D Holdings Ltd to undertake a preliminary ecological appraisal and prepare a BNG calculation of land to the rear of 53-59 Southview Road, Southwick where planning permission is being sought to construct two new dwellings on part of the site.
- 1.2 This report summarises the methodology used to complete the BNG calculation and the calculation results and provides the information required in accordance with the government's BNG guidance. The completed Metric is attached.

Methodology

- 1.3 The biodiversity net gain calculation has been carried out using the full Statutory Biodiversity Metric completed in accordance with the Defra User Guidance updated in July 2025.
- 1.4 A preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) was prepared by Plumb Associates Ltd and used to establish the baseline habitats.
- 1.5 The site survey and the completion of the BNG Metric were all undertaken by Steve Plumb MCIEEM CEnv CMLI, an ecologist with over 35 years of professional experience.
- 1.6 The site survey was undertaken on 22nd May 2025. Full access was available to the site to enable the existing habitat to be assessed and measured.

2 Biodiversity net gain baseline

- 2.1 The site currently a vacant plot containing grassland that it is cut once or twice a year. There are small patches of scrub and small trees on the southern boundary.
- 2.2 There are no hedgerows or watercourses present.

Habitat degradation since 2020

- 2.3 There has been no habitat degradation since 2020.

3 Baseline habitat

- 3.1 The area within the red line boundary is 4049 square metres, comprising:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| • Modified grassland (poor condition) | 982m ² |
| • Developed land, sealed surface | 73m ² |
| • Urban tree moderate condition | 122m ² |
| • Mixed scrub (poor condition) | 95m ² |

3.2 Condition assessment sheet has been prepared for the grassland, trees and scrub and are attached below.

3.3 The on-site baseline is 0.33 habitat units.

Irreplaceable habitat and Priority Habitat

3.5 There is no irreplaceable habitat or priority habitat within the site which would be affected by the proposal.

4 Onsite habitat creation

4.1 The total area of developed land, sealed surface post-development would be 763m². Vegetated gardens will total 387m².

4.2 The scheme has followed the BNG Hierarchy by delivering as much BNG onsite and avoiding the loss of any important habitat features. However, there will be net loss of 0.26 habitat units on-site. This equates to a -77.50% net loss.

5 Offsite habitat creation

5.1 It will be necessary to secure 0.29 habitat units ideally through a suitable local offsite habitat bank or if none are available then through statutory credits.

6 Conclusion

6.1 The BNG measures are in accordance with the BNG hierarchy and trading rules. The scheme will achieve the 10% net gain required under the Environment Act 2021 through a mix of on-site and off-site provision.

Extract of Headline results

| Land rear of 53-59 Southview Road South | | Return to results menu | |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|---------|
| Headline Results | | | |
| Scroll down for final results ▲ | | | |
| On-site baseline | Habitat units | 0.33 | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | |
| On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement) | Habitat units | 0.07 | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | |
| On-site net change (units & percentage) | Habitat units | -0.26 | -77.50% |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| Off-site baseline | Habitat units | 0.00 | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | |
| Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement) | Habitat units | 0.00 | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | |
| Off-site net change (units & percentage) | Habitat units | 0.00 | 0.00% |
| | 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) | Habitat units | -0.26 | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | |
| Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions | 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) | Habitat units | -0.26 | | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00 | | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00 | | |
| Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement) | Habitat units | -77.50% | | |
| | Hedgerow units | 0.00% | | |
| | Watercourse units | 0.00% | | |
| Trading rules satisfied? | No - Check Trading Summaries ▲ | | | |
| Unit Type | Target | Baseline Units | Units Required | Unit Deficit |
| Habitat units | 10.00% | 0.33 | 0.37 | 0.29 |
| Hedgerow units | 10.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Watercourse units | 10.00% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Condition assessment sheets

| Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness) | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type | | | |
| Grassland - Modified grassland | | | |
| On-site or off-site, site name and location | On-site - Land rear of 53-59 Southview Road, Southwick | Survey date and Surveyor name | 22/05/2025 - Steve Plumb MCIEEM CEnv CMLI |
| Limitations (if applicable) | none | Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey) | |
| Grid reference | | Habitat parcel reference | |
| Habitat Description | | | |
| Area of grassland that is currently unused outside existing gardens. Cut at least once a year. | | | |
| UKHab - UK Habitat Classification | | | |
| 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. | No | most of the sward had only 3 species per sqm. |
| 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. | No | all even-aged and at least 60cm |
| 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. | Yes | |
| 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. | Yes | |
| E | Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² . | Yes | |
| F | Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%. | Yes | |
| G | There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴). | Yes | |
| Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No) | | | No |
| Number of criteria passed | | | 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) | | |
| Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A) | Poor (1) | X | |
| Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score | | | |
| | | | |
| Footnote | | | |
| <p>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>.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).</p> | | | |

| 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 | | | |
| Small patches of larger scrub | | | |
| 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 - Land rear of 53-59 Southview Road, Southwick | Survey date and Surveyor name | 22/07/2025 - Steve Plumb |
| Limitations (if applicable) | None | 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 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). | No | Very small areas |
| B | Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran ³) shrubs are all present. | No | Even-aged |
| 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. | Yes | |
| D | The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and/or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat. | No | |
| E | There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges. | No | |
| | | Number of criteria passed | 1 |
| Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria) | Condition Assessment Score | Score Achieved | */ |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|
| Passes 5 criteria | Good (3) | | |
| Passes 3 or 4 criteria | Moderate (2) | | |
| Passes 2 or fewer criteria | Poor (1) | X | |
| Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score | | | |
| | | | |

| Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|---|-------------------------------|---|-----|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Habitat Types | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual trees – Urban trees Individual trees – Rural trees Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees. Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Description | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Three small trees, 2 sycamore and 1 elder growing beside southern boundary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only): | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| On-site or off-site, site name and location | On-site - Land rear of 53-59 Southview Road, Southwick | | | | Survey date and Surveyor name | 22/05/2025 - Steve Plumb MCIEEM CEnv CMLJ | | | | | | | |
| Survey reference (If relating to a wider survey) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Limitations (If applicable) | None | | | | Habitat parcel reference | | | | | | | | |
| | T1 | T2 | T3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid reference | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion passed (Yes or No) | | | | | | | | | | | | Noise (such as justification) | |
| A | The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species). | | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| 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). | | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| C | The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature) ¹ . | | | | No | No | No | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| E | Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark. | | | | No | No | No | | | | | | |
| F | More than 20% of the tree canopy area is overhanging vegetation beneath. | | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | |
| Number of criteria passed | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | |
| Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria) | Condition Assessment Score | | | | Score Achieved x/4 | | | | | | | | |
| Passes 5 or 6 criteria | Good (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Passes 3 or 4 criteria | Moderate (2) | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| Passes 2 or fewer criteria | Poor (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | |