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# Baseline and Environmental Information

## Biological Records

### Designated Sites (BI-T01)

Provide a concise summary of the designated features within the designated sites that could be affected by the project. Categorise any potential impacts from the project, whether positive, negative, or negligible, as determined by your professional judgement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Site Name | Designation | Distance from Project Site | Potential Impact from Project |
|  |  |  | Positive |
|  |  |  | Negative |
|  |  |  | Negligible |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Designated Sites (BI-B01) |
| List the designated sites identified within the project’s search area.  Briefly outline the details of those designated sites and features that will be relevant to the proposals in this HMMP. |
| **Constraints and Opportunities for Project** (BI-B02) |
| Briefly outline any constraints or opportunities posed to this HMMP by any designated sites within the project’s search area. |

### Protected and Notable Species (BI-T02)

Provide a concise summary of the notable species records within the zone of influence of the project and any potential impacts from the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Species | Dates | Conservation Status | Distance of Closest Record | Potential Impact from Project |
|  |  |  |  | Positive |
|  |  |  |  | Negative |
|  |  |  |  | Negligible |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Protected and Notable Species (BI-B03) |
| List the protected and notable species record identified within the project’s search area. Concisely describe those that will be relevant to this HMMP. |
| **Constraints and Opportunities for Project** (BI-B04) |
| Briefly outline any constraints or opportunities posed to this HMMP by any protected and, or, notable species records identified within the project’s search area. |

### Biological Records Plan - Sites and Species (BI-F01)

Shape
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## Baseline Habitats Survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ecologist responsible for baseline surveys (BI-T03) | |
| Name or Initials |  |
| Organisation |  |
| Survey Date |  |
| Statement of Competency | |
| A competent person is someone who can demonstrate they have acquired through training, qualifications or experience, or a combination of these, the knowledge and skills enabling that person to perform specified tasks. | |
| Survey conditions and limitations | |
| Describe the survey conditions for the habitat and condition assessment surveys. Provide a summary of any limitations that may have affected the surveys or this assessment. | |

### Habitat Degradation

|  |
| --- |
| Are there any signs or evidence that the baseline habitats have been purposefully degraded since 30th January 2020? (BI-B05) |
| Briefly outline the details of any evidence that the habitat may have been degraded since 30th January 2020.  Include notes of any management works observed during site surveys and, or, a review of historical mapping to determine whether any purposeful degradation may have occurred, that may have reduced the project site’s value. |
| **If habitats have been purposefully degraded, provide details of how this has been accounted for** (BI-B06) |
| Detail how the baseline for the site has been adjusted to account for any habitat degradation that is considered to have occurred on site since 30th January 2020. |

### Baseline Habitat Descriptions and Condition

Use the following tables to provide details of the relevant baseline habitats information. Provide a concise overview of the justification for the condition chosen for each parcel(s) in the appropriate column.

#### Habitats (BI-T04)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parcel Refs | Habitat Type and Code | Irreplaceable | Priority | Description and Condition Justification | Condition | Area (ha) |
| Example: 1,2,5,6 | Other neutral grassland – G3C | No | Yes | Habitat description -  criteria 1 - pass  criteria 2 - not targeted  criteria 3 - pass | Moderate | 7.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Hedgerows (BI-T05)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature Refs | Habitat Type and Code | Irreplaceable | Priority | Description and Condition Justification | Condition | Area (ha) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Watercourses (BI-T06)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature Refs | Habitat Type and Code | Irreplaceable | Priority | Description and condition justification | Condition | Area ha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Priority and Irreplaceable Habitats

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Priority and Irreplaceable Habitats (BI-B07) |
| Summarise the details of any priority and irreplaceable habitats located within the project boundary. |
| **Potential Constraints and Opportunities for Project** (BI-B08) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the presence of any priority and, or, irreplaceable habitats located within the project boundary result in constraints or opportunities to the habitat retention, enhancement and creation proposals. |

### Baseline Habitats Plan (BI-F02)

Shape
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### Baseline Distinctiveness and Condition Plan (BI-F03)

Shape
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### Baseline Habitats Photos (BI-F04)

Provide a range of photographs representative of the baseline. Add additional pages for photos as required. Shape
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Shape
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Shape
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Shape
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## Land Tenure and Public Access

|  |
| --- |
| Relevant Land Tenure Information (EI-B01) |
| Concisely summarise the land ownership for the Site. Will this change throughout the life of the HMMP? If so, how will it change? |
| **Potential Impact to Scheme** (EI-B02) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how land tenure will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP. |
| **Public Access Information** (EI-B03) |
| Summarise any public access to the Site. Will this change throughout the life of the HMMP? If so, how will it change? |
| **Potential Impact to Scheme** (EI-B04) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how public access will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP. |

### Land Tenure and Public Access Plan (EI-F01)

Shape
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## Climate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Climate Information (EI-T01) | |
| **Nearest weather station details** |  |
| **Days of rain per year** |  |
| **Average annual rainfall mm** |  |
| **Average temperature °C** |  |
| **Highest temperature – Month and temperature °C** |  |
| **Lowest temperature – Month and temperature °C** |  |
| **Average annual hours of sunshine** |  |
| **Sunniest month and average hours of sunshine** |  |
| **Average number of days with air frost** |  |
| **Frostiest month and number of days** |  |
| **Potential impact of current climate on project** (EI-B05) | |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the current climate will influence the habitat retention, enhancement and creation aspirations set out in this HMMP. | |

|  |
| --- |
| Potential Impact of Climate Change on Proposals (EI-B06) |
| Provide an overview of how climate change could influence the habitat retention, enhancement and creation aspirations proposed in this HMMP. |

## Geology and Topography

|  |
| --- |
| Geological Information (EI-B07) |
| Concisely summarise the relevant geological information for the project site, such as the underlying soilscape of the area. |
| **Potential Impact to Scheme** (EI-B08) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how geology will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP. |
| **Topography** (EI-B09) |
| Concisely summarise the project site’s current and proposed topography. |
| **Potential Impact to Scheme** (EI-B10) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s current and proposed topography will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Geology and Topography Plan (EI-F02)

Shape
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## Agricultural Land Status

|  |
| --- |
| Agricultural Land Status (EI-B11) |
| Concisely summarise the project site’s agricultural land status. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B12) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s agricultural land status will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Agricultural Land Status Plan (EI-F03)

Shape
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## Soils and Substrates (EI-T02)

Provide the results of the soil analysis. Modify the table below to provide the relevant soils information to inform targeted habitat creation proposals.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parcel Refs | Soil Texture | pH | Nitrogen (N) | Phosphorous (P) | Potassium (K) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Soils Information (EI-B13) |
| Following soil analysis surveys, provide an overview of the soils present on site. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B14) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the soils across the project site will influence the habitat types targeted and the management prescriptions and how this will influence habitat retention, enhancement, and creation. |

### Soils and Substrate Plan (EI-F04)

Shape
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## Contaminated Land

|  |
| --- |
| Contaminated Land Information (EI-B15) |
| Concisely summarise the project site’s contaminated land status. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B16) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how any contaminated land present will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Contaminated Land Plan (EI-F05)

Shape
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## Hydrology and Drainage

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Hydrological Information (EI-B17) |
| Provide an overview of the project site’s hydrology and a concise summary of any surveys undertaken to inform this. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B18) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s hydrology will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Hydrology and Drainage Plan (EI-F06)

Shape
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## Flood Risk Zones

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Flood Risk Information (EI-B19) |
| Provide an overview description of the flood risk zone that the project site is within and concisely summarise any assessments which have been undertaken to inform this. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B20) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s flood risk will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Flood Risk Zone Plan (EI-F07)

Shape
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## Landscape Character and Designations

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Landscape Character and Designations (EI-B21) |
| Concisely summarise any relevant landscape character and designations the project site is located in. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B21) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s landscape character and any landscape designations will influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Landscape Character and Designations Plan (EI-F08)

Shape
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## Historic Environment and Earth Heritage

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Historic Environment and Earth Heritage (EI-B22) |
| Concisely summarise any historic environment and earth heritage information relevant to the project site. |
| **Potential Impact on Project** (EI-B23) |
| Provide a concise assessment of how the project site’s historic environment and, or, earth heritage influence the prescriptions contained within this HMMP and how this has guided habitat retention, enhancement and creation. |

### Historic Environment and Earth Heritage Plan (EI-F09)

Shape
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Creation, Enhancement and Management

Standard Tables

# Establishment and Management Standard Tab

## Habitat Creation, Enhancement and Management Plan EM-F01

Show the habitat Creation, Enhancement and Management measures in this plan. Present this as a single, side-wide masterplan. Alternatively, provide a separate plan showing the locations of each specific habitat to be delivered on the project site, copy this page into each of the habitat sheets below. A white square with a blue border

Description automatically generated

## Coastal

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (CO-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 1. Coastal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted?** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its specific habitat type, with characteristic indicator species present in the typical successional stages, transitions and/or mosaics, at sufficient cover and frequency to be a good example.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Vegetation structure (sward height variation, zonation) is varied and not uniform. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Naturally open ground or bare surfaces are present as part of a sequence of colonisation and succession. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Coastal processes needed to support the habitat are functional and are not modified by hard engineering or other forms of negative intervention. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | The landform reflects the interaction of coastal processes and geology, and there is a varied topography present supporting the relevant range of habitat types. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981).  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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | Any scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) present accounts for less than 10% of the area within the habitat or bare substrate matrix.  Blocks of scrub or woodland, which might be desirable in their own right, should be classified and mapped separately. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | Water quality and quantity (for example, seasonal fluctuations in dune slacks or seepages on cliff slopes) is sufficient to support the range of water-dependent parts of the habitat. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (CO-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example, include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Coastal

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (CO-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Coastal Species Lists (CO-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (CO-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (CO-F01)





## Coastal Lagoons

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (CL-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 2. Coastal Lagoons.

For each condition row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale; or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale; or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species ‘Abundant’ on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| B | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| C | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| D | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to more than 47 items per person per 100m per hour. |
| E | Salinity | Salinity is between 15 - 40 ppt. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salinity values are close to (but still within) the ends of range acceptable for lagoons (15-40 ppt). |
| Salinity values are either hypersaline >40 ppt or hyposaline <15 ppt. |
| F | Isolating Barrier | Fully functional and permitting tidal exchange. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slightly damaged but some water exchange still occurring. |
| Not functioning. No water exchange occurring making the lagoon hyposaline. |
| G | Physical damage of lagoon banks | No physical damage present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Only small, isolated patches of physical damage present. |
| Evidence of significant physical damage. |
| H | Water Clarity | Water is clear. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water clarity is reduced. |
| Water is turbid and water clarity is poor (not just after heavy rain). |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (CL-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may, for example, include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Coastal Lagoons

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (CL-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Coastal Lagoons Species Lists (CL-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (CL-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (CL-F01)





### Coastal Saltmarsh

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (CS-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 3. Coastal Saltmarsh.

For each condition criteria row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Target Habitat | | |  | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and absence of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| F | Zonation and transition to other habitats | Zonation of vegetation or communities is clear and continuous. Distribution of the feature and transition to other habitats, including associated transitional habitats within the site is reflective of expected natural distribution seaward and landward. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 2 of the expected zones are absent or significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline, and transitions to other habitats are restricted in less than 20% of the habitat boundaries. |
| Zonation of vegetation or communities is not clearly visible or is significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline. Or transitions to other habitats are restricted in more than 20% of the habitat boundaries. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (CS-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Coastal Saltmarsh

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Methods (CS-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Coastal Saltmarsh Species Lists (CS-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (CS-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (CS-F01)



Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Ditch

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (DI-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 4. Ditch

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The ditch is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. | Yes/ No |  |  |  |  |
| B | A range of emergent, submerged and floating leaved plants are present. As a guide >10 species of emergent, floating or submerged plants present in a 20 m ditch length. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is less than 10% cover of filamentous algae and or duckweed *Lemna* spp. (these are signs of eutrophication). |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | A fringe of marginal vegetation is present along more than 75% of the ditch. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Physical damage is evident along less than 5% of the ditch, with examples of damage including: excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, or any other damaging management activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | Sufficient water levels are maintained - as a guide a minimum summer depth of approximately 50 cm in minor ditches and 1 m in main drains. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | Less than 10% of the ditch is heavily shaded. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of non-native plant and animal species. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (DI-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Ditch

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (DI-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Ditch Species Lists (DI-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting information (DI-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (DI-F01)





## Grassland (Low Distinctiveness)

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (GL-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 5. Grassland Low

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m2 present, including at least 2 forbs. **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 m2, please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should 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. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. may be present).  Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Cover of bare ground between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* less than 20%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA). |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (GL-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Grassland (Low Distinctiveness)

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (GL-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Grassland (Low Distinctiveness) Species Lists (GL-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (GL-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (GL-F01)





## Grassland (Medium, High, and Very High Distinctiveness)

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (GH-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 6. Grassland Med High and V. High.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat | | | |  | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| 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.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Cover of bare ground between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble) less than 5%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area.  If any invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) are present, this criterion is automatically failed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (GH-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Grassland (Medium, High, and Very High Distinctiveness)

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (GH-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Grassland (Medium, High, and Very High Distinctiveness) Species Lists (GH-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (GH-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (GH-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Heathland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (HT-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 7. Heathland

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | There are at least two dwarf shrub species Frequent, and cover of dwarf shrubs is between 25-75% for lowland heathland, 50-75% for upland dry heath, or >20% for upland wet heath.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | All heather *Calluna vulagris* age-classes (pioneer, degenerate and mature) present with at least 10% pioneer heather in the lowlands or at least 10% degenerate or mature in the uplands.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Unshaded bare ground is between 1-10%.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species listed on Schedule 9 of WCA and shallon *Gaultheria shallon.*  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition** |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | No signs of disturbance of sensitive areas, including managed burns. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | No more than 33% of heather shoots have been recently grazed, or flowering heather plants are at least Frequent in autumn. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | The canopy cover of scattered trees and or scrub (not including gorse *Ulex* spp.) is:   * Less than 20% for upland heaths; * Less than 15% for lowland dry heaths; and * Less than 10% for lowland wet heaths. |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | Total gorse cover is less than 50%, with common gorse *Ulex europaeus* less than 25%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| J | The cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 5%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| K | No signs of any damaging activities or contamination to the habitat such as: artificial drains, peat extraction, silt, leachate or eutrophication. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (HT-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Heathland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (HT-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Heathland Species Lists (HT-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (HT-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (HT-F01)





## Hedgerow

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (HD-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and hedgerow type. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 8. Hedgerow

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Hedgerow Type: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted?** | **Relevant Features** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A1 | Height  >1.5m average along length. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| A2 | Width  >1.5m average along length. |  |  |  |  |  |
| B3 | Gap – hedge base  Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5m for >90% of length. |  |  |  |  |  |
| B2 | Gap – hedgerow canopy continuity  Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5m. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation  >1m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length:   * measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and * is present on one side of the hedge (at least) |  |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation  Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1 | Invasive and neophyte species  >90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and recently introduced species. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D2 | Current damage  >90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E1 | Tree class (applicable to hedgerows with trees only)  There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 – 50m of hedgerow. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E2 | E2. Tree health (applicable to hedgerows with trees only)  At least 95% of hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). 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. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (HD-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Hedgerow

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Methods (HD-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Features | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Hedgerow Species Lists (HD-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (HD-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (HD-F01)





## Limestone Pavement

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (LP-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 15. Limestone Pavement

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted?** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Cover of typical emergent pavement flora and clint-top vegetation accounts for at least 25% of total vegetation cover (the area excluding bare rock). | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Cover of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) is less than 1%. Non-native species in this instance include beech *Fagus sylvatica* and sycamore *Acer pseudoplanatus.* |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 1% of vegetated ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Less than 25% of live leaves (broadleaved plants), fronds (ferns) or shoots (dwarf shrubs) show signs of grazing or browsing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is no evidence of damage to the pavement surface. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (LP-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Limestone Pavement

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (LP-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Limestone Pavement Species Lists (LP-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (LP-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (LP-F01)





## Intertidal Biogenic Reefs

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (IB-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 10. Intertidal Biogenic Reefs.

For each condition criteria row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are impacting the habitat. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy >10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies up to 10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (IB-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Intertidal Biogenic Reefs

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (IB-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Intertidal Biogenic Reefs Species Lists (IB-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (IB-B01) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (IB-F01)





## Intertidal Hard Structures

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (IH-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 11. Intertidal Hard Structures.

For each condition criteria row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ occasional on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| E | Amount of colonisation | More than three different communities of flora or fauna present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two or three different communities of flora or fauna present. |
| One or no communities of flora or fauna present. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (IH-B01) the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036m-1min |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Intertidal Hard Structures

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (IH-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Intertidal Hard Structures Species Lists (IH-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (IH-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (IH-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Intertidal Seagrass

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (IS-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 12. Intertidal Seagrass.

For each condition criteria row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (IS-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Intertidal Seagrass

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (IS-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Intertidal Seagrass Species Lists (IS-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (IS-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (IS-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Intertidal Sediment

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (IE-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 13. Intertidal Sediment.

For each condition criteria row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present e.g. groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present e.g. groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy >10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (IE-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Intertidal Sediment

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (IE-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Intertidal Sediment Species Lists (IE-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (IE-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (IE-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Line of Trees

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (LT-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 15. Line of Trees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Line of Trees Type: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Features** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | At least 70% of trees are native species. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (LT-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Line of Trees

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (LT-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Features | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Line of Trees Species Lists (LT-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (LT-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (LT-F01)





## Orchard

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (OR-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 17. Orchard

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Presence of ancient and or veteran trees.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Presence of deadwood in or on trees, or on the ground: at least 20% of mature trees have deadwood associated with them.  Some examples of deadwood are: standing, attached and fallen trees or limbs; dead stems; branches and branch stubs greater than 10 cm diameter; and internal cavities. The types and distribution of deadwood provide a range of habitats suitable to support a wide assemblage of saproxylic invertebrates.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Less than 5% of fruit trees are smothered by scrub. Small patches of dense scrub and or scattered scrub growing between trees can be beneficial to biodiversity, however these occupy less than 10% of ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | There is evidence of formative and or restorative pruning to maintain longevity of trees. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | At least 95% of the trees are free from damage caused by humans or animals, for example browsing, bark stripping or rubbing on non-adjusted ties. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | Grassland is not overgrazed, poaching is not evident around the trees, with no more than 10% of trees poached under the canopy. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | Species richness of the grassland is equivalent to a medium, high, or very high distinctiveness grassland. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 10% of ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (OR-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Orchard

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (OR-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Orchard Species Lists (OR-TO3)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (OR-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (OR-F01)





## Pond

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (PO-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 18. Pond

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. Turbidity is acceptable if the pond is grazed by livestock. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10 m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed *Lemna* spp. or filamentous algae. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams, pumps or pipework. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | In non-woodland ponds: emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)3 cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.  (only applicable to non-woodland ponds) |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | The pond surface of non-woodland ponds is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.  (only applicable to non-woodland ponds) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (PO-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Pond

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (PO-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Pond Species Lists (PO-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (PO-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (PO-F01)





## Rocky Shore

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (RS-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 19. Rocky Shore.

Delete conditions as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale, they occupy more than 10% of the habitat or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies over >10% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (RS-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Rocky Shore

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (RS-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Rocky Shore Species Lists (RS-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (RS-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (RS-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Scrub

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (SC-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 19. Scrub.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| 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).   * At least 80% of scrub is native, * There are at least three native woody species, * No single species comprising more than 75% of the cover (except hazel *Corylus avellana,* common juniper *Juniperus communis,* sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* or box *Buxus sempervirens,* which can be up to 100% cover). | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (SC-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Scrub

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (SC-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Scrub Species Lists (SC-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (SC-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (SC-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Sparsely Vegetated Land

### Creation, Enhancement and Management summary (SV-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 21. Sparsely Vegetated Land

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its specific sparsely vegetated habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with characteristic indicator species consistently present. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, scrub and trees less than 25%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Vegetation cover of vascular and non-vascular plants is between 5 and 50%. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (SV-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Sparsely Vegetated Land

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (SV-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Sparsely Vegetated Land Species Lists (SV-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (SV-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (SV-F01)





## Urban

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (UR-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 22. Urban

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area. | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) cover less than 5% of total vegetated area.  **Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).** |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1 | The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS:  - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i);  Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.  (only applicable to Open mosaic on previously developed land habitat type) |  |  |  |  |  |
| E1 | Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife.  (only applicable to Bioswale and SUDS habitat types) |  |  |  |  |  |
| E2 | The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.  (only applicable to Bioswale and SUDS habitat types) |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).  (only applicable to Intensive green roofs habitat types) |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | The roof has a varied depth of 80-150mm; at least 50% is at 150mm and is planted and seeded with wildflowers and sedums or is pre-prepared with sedums and wildflowers.  **Note – to achieve Good condition some additional habitat, such as sand piles, stones, logs etc. are present.**  (only applicable to Biodiverse green roofs habitat types) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (UR-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Urban

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (UR-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Urban Species Lists (UR-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (UR-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (UR-F01)





## Individual Trees

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (UT-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 9. Individual Trees

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Features** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species). | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| 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). |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature). |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (UT-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Individual Trees

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (UT-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Features | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Individual Trees Species Lists (UT-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (UT-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (UT-F01)





## Wetland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (WE-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 23. Wetland

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | The water table is at, or near the surface throughout the year – this could be open water or saturation of soil at the surface. There is no artificial drainage, unless specifically to maintain water levels as specified above.  **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | The parcel represents a good example of its specific habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | The water supplies (groundwater, surface water and or rainwater) to the wetland are of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Cover of scrub and scattered trees are less than 10%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Cover of bare ground is less than 5%. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover. |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | No more than 25% of the habitat area has a continuous cover of litter (such as dead vegetation) preventing regeneration.  (only applicable to Fen and Purple moor grass and rush pasture habitat type) |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp. and cottongrasses *Eriophorum* spp. are at least Frequent. Cover of ericaceous dwarf shrubs is less than 75%.  (only applicable to Bog habitat type) |  |  |  |  |  |
| I | The reedbed has a diverse structure with between 60 and 80% reeds *Phragmites australis*. Other areas may include open water (at least 10%), species-rich fen and or wet woodland.  (only applicable to Reedbed habitat type) |  |  |  |  |  |
| J | All ditches recorded within the habitat achieve Good condition as assessed using the Ditch condition sheet.  (only applicable to Floodplain wetland mosaic (CFGM) habitat type) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (WE-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Wetland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (WE-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Wetland Species Lists (WE-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (WE-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (WE-F01)





## Wood Pasture and Parkland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (WP-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 25. Wood-Pasture and Parkland

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | **Targeted** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Presence of ancient and or veteran trees.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | Yes / No |  |  |  |  |
| B | Three different life-stages (for example young, mature or veteran) of open grown or pollarded trees are present, to ensure replacement and continuity of tree cohort, veteran characteristics and habitat. |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Native scrub is present with a variety of heights, widths, shapes and species compositions – as planted or naturally established individual plants, or clumps of trees or shrubs. |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Frequent presence of decaying wood providing ecological niches – such as standing, attached and fallen deadwood (for example, dead stems, branches and branch stubs), trees with heart-rot, or hollowing in the trunk or major limbs. Decay features might be revealed by certain types of fungal fruiting bodies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is no evidence of recent adverse impact on tree health by human activities, livestock, wild animals, pests or diseases (this excludes veteran features valuable for wildlife).  For example, no evidence of poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, ground compaction, grazing damage to bark and roots, competition or shading from surrounding trees. |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | Ground cover comprises open habitats, for example grassland or heathland, which are unimproved or semi-improved (medium distinctiveness or higher). |  |  |  |  |  |
| G | Ground cover is subject to an appropriate management regime providing structural diversity for vertebrates and invertebrates, which is not being or threatened by infill of trees and scrub, by natural establishment or forestry plantation, native or non-native. |  |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on schedule 9 of WCA), and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% cover (this excludes ancient and veteran trees). |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (WP-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Wood-Pasture and Parkland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (WP-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Wood-Pasture and Parkland Species Lists (WP-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (WP-B02) |
|  |

### What Does Success Look Like? (WP-F01)

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Shape

Description automatically generated with low confidence

## Woodland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary (WO-T01)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted condition criteria and habitat. Conditions from Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat condition assessment sheets – Sheet 24. Woodland

For each condition row, delete the condition targets that aren’t being targeted as necessary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target Habitat: | | |  |  | | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **Target Score** | **Relevant Parcels** | **Creation Approach** | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
| A | Age distribution of trees | Three age classes present | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Two age classes present |
| One age class present |
| B | Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage | No significant browsing damage evident in woodland |  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland |
| Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland |
| C | Invasive plant species | No invasive species present in woodland |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhododendron *Rhododendrion ponticum* or cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* not present, other invasive species <10% cover |
| Rhododendron or laurel present, or other invasive species) 10% cover |
| D | Number of native trees species | Five or more native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel |  |  |  |  |  |
| Three to four native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel |
| Two or less native tree or shrub species present across woodland parcel |
| E | Cover of native tree and shrub species | >80% of canopy trees and >80% of understorey shrubs are native |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 – 80% of canopy trees and 50-80% of understorey shrubs are native |
| <50% of canopy trees and <50% understorey shrubs are native |
| F | Open space within woodland | 10-20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.  Unless woodland <10ha in which case 0-20% temporary open space is permitted. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21-40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space |
| <10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.  But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category. |
| G | Woodland regeneration | All three classes present in woodland; trees 4-7cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or two classes only present in woodland |
| No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland |
| H | Tree health | Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low risk pest or disease present |
| Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high risk pest or disease present |
| I | Vegetation and ground flora | Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present |
| No recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present. |
| J | Woodland vertical structure | Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two storeys across all survey plots |
| One of less storey across all survey plots |
| K | Veteran trees | Two of more veteran per hectare |  |  |  |  |  |
| One veteran tree per hectare |
| No veteran trees present in woodland |
| L | Amount of deadwood | 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or steams, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |
| Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or steams, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |
| M | Woodland disturbance | No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground |
| More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground |

|  |
| --- |
| Additional Management Prescriptions (WO-B01) |
| Please use this space to detail any additional management measures to be conducted along with the above measures. These may for example include (but are not limited to) measures specifically relating to the presence of protected species or may be additional measures that are in support of local nature recovery targets and, or, planning policy. |

### Woodland

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (WO-T02)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the creation and management of the habitat.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Relevant Parcels | Timing | Prescriptions |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Woodland Species Lists (WO-T03)

Provide a detailed species list for the habitat to be created

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Common Name | Scientific Name | Abundance / % | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Other Supporting Information

|  |
| --- |
| Supporting Information (WO-B02) |
| Please use this space to provide any additional information where relevant. |

### What Does Success Look Like? (WO-F01)
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## Watercourses

### Creation, Enhancement and Management Summary

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted Watercourse characteristics and/or RCA indices.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Summary of Watercourse Enhancement Proposals (WC-B01) | |
| *Please provide a summary overview of management interventions that will be implemented onsite to enhance the watercourse(s) present.* | |
| Will the length of the watercourse be altered as part of the enhancement? (WC-B02) | Yes: ☐ No:☐ |
| *If yes, provide a description of the proposed interventions to the watercourse length that have been included to enhance the River Unit score.* | |
| Will enhancements target improvements to watercourse encroachment? (WC-B03) | Yes: ☐ No:☐ |
| *If yes, provide a description of the proposed interventions to improve the watercourse encroachment score that have been included to enhance the River Unit score.* | |
| Will enhancements target improvements to riparian encroachment? (WC-B04) | Yes: ☐ No:☐ |
| *If yes, provide a description of the proposed interventions to improve the riparian encroachment score that have been included to enhance the River Unit score.* | |
| Will enhancements target improving distinctiveness of the watercourse (WC-B05) | Yes: ☐ No:☐ |
| *If yes, provide a description of the proposed interventions to enhance the distinctiveness of the watercourse.* | |
| Will enhancements target improving condition of the watercourse (WC-B06) | Yes: ☐ No:☐ |
| *If yes, provide a description of the proposed interventions to enhance the condition of the watercourse and complete table WC-T01.* | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Watercourse Condition Enhancements** (WC-T01) | | | | |
| **Watercourse ID:** | |  | | |
| **Watercourse Baseline Condition:** | |  | | |
| **Is the Watercourse Baseline Overdeep?** | | Yes: ☐ No:☐ | | |
| **Watercourse Proposed Condition:** | |  | | |
| **Will the Proposed Watercourse be Overdeep?** | | Yes: ☐ No:☐ | | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **RCA Index Values** | |
| **RCA Index ID\*** | **RCA Index Name** | | **Baseline Score** | **Proposed Score** |
| **Bank Top** | | | | |
| B1 (+) | Bank top vegetation structure | |  |  |
| B2 (+) | Bank top tree feature richness | |  |  |
| B3 (+) | Bank top water-related features | |  |  |
| B4 (-) | Bank top NNIPS cover | |  |  |
| B5 (-) | Bank top managed ground cover | |  |  |
| **Bank face** | | | | |
| C1 (+) | Bank face riparian vegetation structure | |  |  |
| C2 (+) | Bank face tree feature richness | |  |  |
| C3 (+) | Bank face natural bank profile extent | |  |  |
| C4 (+) | Bank face natural bank profile richness | |  |  |
| C5 (+) | Bank face natural bank material | |  |  |
| C6 (-) | Bank face bare sediment extent | |  |  |
| C7 (-) | Bank face artificial bank profile extent | |  |  |
| C8 (-) | Bank face reinforcement extent | |  |  |
| C9 (-) | Bank face reinforcement material | |  |  |
| C10 (-) | Bank face NNIPS cover | |  |  |
| **Channel Margin** | | | | |
| D1 (+) | Channel margin aquatic vegetation | |  |  |
| D2 (+) | Channel margin aquatic morphotype | |  |  |
| D3 (+) | Channel margin physical feature extent | |  |  |
| D4 (+) | Channel margin physical feature | |  |  |
| D5 (-) | Channel Margin artificial features | |  |  |
| **Channel Bed** | | | | |
| E1 (+) | Channel aquatic Morphotype richness | |  |  |
| E2 (+) | Channel bed tree features richness | |  |  |
| E3 (+) | Channel bed hydraulic features richness | |  |  |
| E4 (+) | Channel bed nature features richness | |  |  |
| E5 (+) | Channel bed natural features richness | |  |  |
| E6 (-) | Channel bed material richness | |  |  |
| E7 (-) | Channel bed siltation | |  |  |
| E8 (-) | Channel bed reinforcement extent | |  |  |
| E9 (-) | Channel bed reinforcement severity | |  |  |
| E10 (-) | Channel bed artificial features severity | |  |  |
| E11 (-) | Channel bed NNIPS extent | |  |  |
| E12 (-) | Channel bed filamentous algae extent | |  |  |

\*where (+) are positive scoring indices and (-) are negative scoring

### Watercourses

### Enhancement and Management Summary (WC-T02)

Provide details of the approach to delivering each of the targeted enhancements. Provide the relevant RCA indices and/or other enhancement opportunities targeted (i.e. riparian encroachment) along with an overview of the enhancement and/or management approach that will be implemented to achieve the targeted enhancements. Please do not present detailed prescriptions in this table as these should be provided in WC-T03. Rather, provide a descriptive overview of the approach.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Watercourse ID: | |  | | |
| **Management Prescriptions –** Please provide below an overview of the enhancement and management approaches to achieve the above score | | | | |
| **Enhancement Method/RCA Indices Targeted** | **Creation Approach** | | **Enhancement Approach** | **Management Approach** |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | |  |  |

### Enhancement and Management Detailed Methods (WC-T03)

Provide detailed prescriptions for the enhancement and management targets for the watercourse.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Watercourse ID: |  | |
| **Action** | **Timing** | **Prescriptions** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Monitoring report tables

## Monitoring Plan MT-F01

Use this plan to present the results of monitoring surveys if required. This can be presented as a single, side wite masterplan or can be copied into each of the habitat sheets below to provide a separate plan showing the locations of the specific habitat to be delivered onsite. A white square with a blue border
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## Scrub

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MS-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year : | Provide the monitoring year that this table is relevant to. |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | | e.g. Mixed Scrub - Dense scrub comprising a mixture of species without a single species dominant - Patches of shrubs less than 5 metres tall with continuous (>90%) cover. | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| 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).   * At least 80% of scrub is native, * There are at least three native woody species,   No single species comprising more than 75% of the cover (except hazel *Corylus avellana,* common juniper *Juniperus communis,* sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* or box *Buxus sempervirens,* which can be up to 100% cover). | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran) shrubs are all present. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges. | |  |  |  |  |

### Scrub

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MS-B01) |
| Provide an overview of the specific progress to the targets relevant to this habitat. |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MS-B02) |
| Provide a list of detailed actions for the person responsible for delivering the management plan to implement from this monitoring period onwards. |

### Photographs of Progress (MS-F01)
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## Coastal

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MC-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its specific habitat type, with characteristic indicator species present in the typical successional stages, transitions and/or mosaics, at sufficient cover and frequency to be a good example.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Vegetation structure (sward height variation, zonation) is varied and not uniform. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Naturally open ground or bare surfaces are present as part of a sequence of colonisation and succession. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Coastal processes needed to support the habitat are functional and are not modified by hard engineering or other forms of negative intervention. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | The landform reflects the interaction of coastal processes and geology, and there is a varied topography present supporting the relevant range of habitat types. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981).  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. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | Any scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) present accounts for less than 10% of the area within the habitat or bare substrate matrix.  Blocks of scrub or woodland, which might be desirable in their own right, should be classified and mapped separately. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | Water quality and quantity (for example, seasonal fluctuations in dune slacks or seepages on cliff slopes) is sufficient to support the range of water-dependent parts of the habitat. | |  |  |  |  |

### Coastal

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MC-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**C**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MC-F01)
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## Ditch

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MD-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The ditch is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. | |  |  |  |  |
| B | A range of emergent, submerged and floating leaved plants are present. As a guide >10 species of emergent, floating or submerged plants present in a 20 m ditch length. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is less than 10% cover of filamentous algae and or duckweed *Lemna* spp. (these are signs of eutrophication). | |  |  |  |  |
| D | A fringe of marginal vegetation is present along more than 75% of the ditch. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | Physical damage is evident along less than 5% of the ditch, with examples of damage including: excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, or any other damaging management activities. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | Sufficient water levels are maintained - as a guide a minimum summer depth of approximately 50 cm in minor ditches and 1 m in main drains. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | Less than 10% of the ditch is heavily shaded. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of non-native plant and animal species.  NB Any species included on the Water Framework Directive UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent. | |  |  |  |  |

### Ditch

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MD-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**D**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MD-F01)
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## Grassland (low distinctiveness)

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (ML-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m2 present, including at least 2 forbs. **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 m2, please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. may be present).  Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type. | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | Cover of bare ground between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens.) | |  |  |  |  |
| F | Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* less than 20%. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA). | |  |  |  |  |

### Grassland (low distinctiveness)

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (ML-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**L**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (ML-F01)
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## Grassland (medium, high, and very high distinctiveness)

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MH-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| 1 | There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m2 present, including at least 2 forbs. **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 m2, please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed. | |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. may be present).  Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type. | |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Cover of bare ground between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens.) | |  |  |  |  |

### Grassland (medium, high, and very high distinctiveness)

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MH-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**H**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MH-F01)
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## Heathland

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (ME-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| B | There are at least two dwarf shrub species Frequent, and cover of dwarf shrubs is between 25-75% for lowland heathland, 50-75% for upland dry heath, or >20% for upland wet heath.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| C | All heather *Calluna vulagris* age-classes (pioneer, degenerate and mature) present with at least 10% pioneer heather in the lowlands or at least 10% degenerate or mature in the uplands.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Unshaded bare ground is between 1-10%.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species listed on Schedule 9 of WCA and shallon *Gaultheria shallon.*  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition** | |  |  |  |  |
| F | No signs of disturbance of sensitive areas, including managed burns. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | No more than 33% of heather shoots have been recently grazed, or flowering heather plants are at least Frequent in autumn. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | The canopy cover of scattered trees and or scrub (not including gorse *Ulex* spp.) is:   * Less than 20% for upland heaths; * Less than 15% for lowland dry heaths; and   Less than 10% for lowland wet heaths. | |  |  |  |  |
| I | Total gorse cover is less than 50%, with common gorse *Ulex europaeus* less than 25%. | |  |  |  |  |
| J | The cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 5%. | |  |  |  |  |
| K | No signs of any damaging activities or contamination to the habitat such as: artificial drains, peat extraction, silt, leachate or eutrophication. | |  |  |  |  |

### Heathland

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (ME-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**E**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (ME-F01)
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## Hedgerow

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MG-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A1 | Height  >1.5m average along length. | |  |  |  |  |
| A2 | Width  >1.5m average along length. | |  |  |  |  |
| B1 | Gap – hedge base  Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5m for >90% of length. | |  |  |  |  |
| B2 | Gap – hedgerow canopy continuity  Gaps make up <10% of total length; and no canopy gaps >5m. | |  |  |  |  |
| C1 | Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation  >1m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length:   * measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and   is present on one side of the hedge (at least) | |  |  |  |  |
| C2 | Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation  Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground. | |  |  |  |  |
| D1 | Invasive and neophyte species  >90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and recently introduced species. | |  |  |  |  |
| D2 | Current damage  >90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities. | |  |  |  |  |
| E1 | Tree class (applicable to hedgerows with trees only)  There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 – 50m of hedgerow. | |  |  |  |  |
| E2 | E2. Tree health (applicable to hedgerows with trees only)  At least 95% of hedgerow trees are in a healthy condition (excluding veteran features valuable for wildlife). 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. | |  |  |  |  |

### Hedgerow

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MG-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**G**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MG-F01)
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## Limestone Pavement

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MI-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Cover of typical emergent pavement flora and clint-top vegetation accounts for at least 25% of total vegetation cover (the area excluding bare rock). | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Cover of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) is less than 1%. Non-native species in this instance include beech *Fagus sylvatica* and sycamore *Acer pseudoplanatus.* | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 1% of vegetated ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Less than 25% of live leaves (broadleaved plants), fronds (ferns) or shoots (dwarf shrubs) show signs of grazing or browsing. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is no evidence of damage to the pavement surface. | |  |  |  |  |

### Limestone Pavement

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MI-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**I**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MI-F01)
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## Line of Trees

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MT-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year : |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | At least 70% of trees are native species. | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |

### Line of Trees

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MT-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (M**T**-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MT-F01)
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## Orchard

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MO-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Presence of ancient and or veteran trees.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Presence of deadwood in or on trees, or on the ground: at least 20% of mature trees have deadwood associated with them.  Some examples of deadwood are: standing, attached and fallen trees or limbs; dead stems; branches and branch stubs greater than 10 cm diameter; and internal cavities. The types and distribution of deadwood provide a range of habitats suitable to support a wide assemblage of saproxylic invertebrates.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Less than 5% of fruit trees are smothered by scrub. Small patches of dense scrub and or scattered scrub growing between trees can be beneficial to biodiversity, however these occupy less than 10% of ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | There is evidence of formative and or restorative pruning to maintain longevity of trees. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | At least 95% of the trees are free from damage caused by humans or animals, for example browsing, bark stripping or rubbing on non-adjusted ties. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | Grassland is not overgrazed, poaching is not evident around the trees, with no more than 10% of trees poached under the canopy. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | Species richness of the grassland is equivalent to a medium, high, or very high distinctiveness grassland. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 10% of ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |

### Orchard

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MO-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MO-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MO-F01)
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## Pond

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MP-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The pond is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. Turbidity is acceptable if the pond is grazed by livestock. | |  |  |  |  |
| B | There is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10 m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Less than 10% of the water surface is covered with duckweed *Lemna* spp. or filamentous algae. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, such as agricultural ditches or artificial pipework. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | Pond water levels can fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious artificial dams, pumps or pipework. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | In non-woodland ponds: emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)3 cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.  (only applicable to non-woodland ponds) | |  |  |  |  |
| I | The pond surface of non-woodland ponds is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.  (only applicable to non-woodland ponds) | |  |  |  |  |

### Pond

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MP-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MP-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MP-F01)
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## Sparsely Vegetated Land

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MV-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The parcel represents a good example of its specific sparsely vegetated habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with characteristic indicator species consistently present. | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, scrub and trees less than 25%. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Vegetation cover of vascular and non-vascular plants is between 5 and 50%. | |  |  |  |  |

### Sparsely Vegetated Land

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MV-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MV-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MV-F01)
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## Urban

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MU-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live, eat and breed. A single structural habitat component or vegetation type does not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area. | |  |  |  |  |
| B | The habitat parcel contains different plant species that are beneficial for wildlife, for example flowering species providing nectar sources for a range of invertebrates at different times of year. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Invasive non-native plant species (listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement) cover less than 5% of total vegetated area.  **Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).** | |  |  |  |  |
| D1 | The parcel shows spatial variation and forms a mosaic of bare substrate PLUS:  - At least four early successional communities (a) to (i);  Communities: (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland, (i) pools.  (only applicable to Open mosaic on previously developed land habitat type) | |  |  |  |  |
| E1 | Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife.  (only applicable to Bioswale and SUDS habitat types) | |  |  |  |  |
| E2 | The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.  (only applicable to Bioswale and SUDS habitat types) | |  |  |  |  |
| F | The roof has a minimum of 50% native and non-native wildflowers. 70% of the roof area is soil and vegetation (including water features).  (only applicable to Intensive green roofs habitat types) | |  |  |  |  |
| G | The roof has a varied depth of 80-150mm; at least 50% is at 150mm and is planted and seeded with wildflowers and sedums or is pre-prepared with sedums and wildflowers.  **Note – to achieve Good condition some additional habitat, such as sand piles, stones, logs etc. are present.**  (only applicable to Biodiverse green roofs habitat types) | |  |  |  |  |

### Urban

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MU-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MU-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MU-F01)
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## Individual Trees

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MB-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The tree is a native species (or more than 70% within the block are native species). | |  |  |  |  |
| 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). | |  |  |  |  |
| C | The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature). | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath. | |  |  |  |  |

### Individual Trees

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MB-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MB-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MB-F01)
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## Wetland

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MW-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | The water table is at, or near the surface throughout the year – this could be open water or saturation of soil at the surface. There is no artificial drainage, unless specifically to maintain water levels as specified above.  **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| B | The parcel represents a good example of its specific habitat type – the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | The water supplies (groundwater, surface water and or rainwater) to the wetland are of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Cover of scrub and scattered trees are less than 10%. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | Cover of bare ground is less than 5%. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% of ground cover. | |  |  |  |  |
| G | No more than 25% of the habitat area has a continuous cover of litter (such as dead vegetation) preventing regeneration.  (only applicable to Fen and Purple moor grass and rush pasture habitat type) | |  |  |  |  |
| H | Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp. and cottongrasses *Eriophorum* spp. are at least Frequent. Cover of ericaceous dwarf shrubs is less than 75%.  (only applicable to Bog habitat type) | |  |  |  |  |
| I | The reedbed has a diverse structure with between 60 and 80% reeds *Phragmites australis*. Other areas may include open water (at least 10%), species-rich fen and or wet woodland.  (only applicable to Reedbed habitat type) | |  |  |  |  |
| J | All ditches recorded within the habitat achieve Good condition as assessed using the Ditch condition sheet.  (only applicable to Floodplain wetland mosaic (CFGM) habitat type) | |  |  |  |  |

## Wetland

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MW-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MW-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MW-F01)
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## Wood Pasture and Parkland

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MA-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Targeted? | Relevant parcels | Year: |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Presence of ancient and or veteran trees.  **Note – this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.** | |  |  |  |  |
| B | Three different life-stages (for example young, mature or veteran) of open grown or pollarded trees are present, to ensure replacement and continuity of tree cohort, veteran characteristics and habitat. | |  |  |  |  |
| C | Native scrub is present with a variety of heights, widths, shapes and species compositions – as planted or naturally established individual plants, or clumps of trees or shrubs. | |  |  |  |  |
| D | Frequent presence of decaying wood providing ecological niches – such as standing, attached and fallen deadwood (for example, dead stems, branches and branch stubs), trees with heart-rot, or hollowing in the trunk or major limbs. Decay features might be revealed by certain types of fungal fruiting bodies. | |  |  |  |  |
| E | There is no evidence of recent adverse impact on tree health by human activities, livestock, wild animals, pests or diseases (this excludes veteran features valuable for wildlife).  For example, no evidence of poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, ground compaction, grazing damage to bark and roots, competition or shading from surrounding trees. | |  |  |  |  |
| F | Ground cover comprises open habitats, for example grassland or heathland, which are unimproved or semi-improved (medium distinctiveness or higher). | |  |  |  |  |
| G | Ground cover is subject to an appropriate management regime providing structural diversity for vertebrates and invertebrates, which is not being or threatened by infill of trees and scrub, by natural establishment or forestry plantation, native or non-native. | |  |  |  |  |
| H | There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on schedule 9 of WCA), and species indicative of suboptimal condition make up less than 5% cover (this excludes ancient and veteran trees). | |  |  |  |  |

### Wood-Pasture and Parkland

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MA-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MA-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MA-F01)
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### Coastal Lagoons

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition targets (MN-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale; or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale; or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species ‘Abundant’ on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| B | Water quality | | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| C | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| D | Litter | | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to more than 47 items per person per 100m per hour. |
| E | Salinity | | Salinity is between 15 - 40 ppt. |  |  |  |  |
| Salinity values are close to (but still within) the ends of range acceptable for lagoons (15-40 ppt). |
| Salinity values are either hypersaline >40 ppt or hyposaline <15 ppt. |
| F | Isolating Barrier | | Fully functional and permitting tidal exchange. |  |  |  |  |
| Slightly damaged but some water exchange still occurring. |
| Not functioning. No water exchange occurring making the lagoon hyposaline. |
| G | Physical damage of lagoon banks | | No physical damage present. |  |  |  |  |
| Only small, isolated patches of physical damage present. |
| Evidence of significant physical damage. |
| H | Water Clarity | | Water is clear. |  |  |  |  |
| Water clarity is reduced. |
| Water is turbid and water clarity is poor (not just after heavy rain). |

### Coastal Lagoons

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MN-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MN-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MN-F01)
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## Coastal Saltmarsh

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MM-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and absence of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| F | Zonation and transition to other habitats | Zonation of vegetation or communities is clear and continuous. Distribution of the feature and transition to other habitats, including associated transitional habitats within the site is reflective of expected natural distribution seaward and landward. |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 2 of the expected zones are absent or significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline, and transitions to other habitats are restricted in less than 20% of the habitat boundaries. |
| Zonation of vegetation or communities is not clearly visible or is significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline. Or transitions to other habitats are restricted in more than 20% of the habitat boundaries. |

### Coastal Saltmarsh

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MM-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MM-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MM-F01)
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## Intertidal Biogenic Reefs

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MF-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy >10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies up to 10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1 equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |

### Intertidal Biogenic Reefs

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MF-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MF-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MF-F01)
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## Intertidal Hard Structures

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MK-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ occasional on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m-1 min-1 person-1, equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| E | Amount of colonisation | More than three different communities of flora or fauna present. |  |  |  |  |
| Two or three different communities of flora or fauna present. |
| One or no communities of flora or fauna present. |

### Intertidal Hard Structures

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MK-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MK-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MK-F01)
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## Intertidal Seagrass

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MX-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| 1 | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| 2 | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| 3 | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| 4 | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| 5 | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |

### Intertidal Seagrass

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MX-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MX-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MX-F01)
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## Intertidal Sediment

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MZ-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present e.g. groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present e.g. groynes, that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale; they occupy >10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies >10% of the habitat area (for example, pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100m per hour. |

### Intertidal Sediment

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MZ-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MZ-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MZ-F01)
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## Rocky Shore

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MY-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Coastal processes | Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are clearly impacting the habitat. |  |  |  |  |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting up to 25% of the habitat. |
| Artificial structures present, for example groynes that are impeding the natural movement of sediments or water, affecting more than 25% of the habitat. |
| B | Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species | Not more than one invasive non-native species is ‘Occasional’ on the SACFOR scale or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |  |  |  |  |
| No invasive non-native species are present above ‘Frequent’ on the SACFOR scale or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present. |
| One or more invasive non-native species are present at an ‘Abundant’ level on the SACFOR scale, they occupy more than 10% of the habitat or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present. |
| C | Water quality | No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |  |  |  |  |
| Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. Elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Consider seasonality of survey timing. |
| D | Non-natural structures and direct human impacts | No evidence of impacts from direct human activities, or they occupy <1% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies 1-10% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| Evidence of impacts from direct human activities occupies over >10% of the habitat area (for example pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars). |
| E | Litter | Following the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0036 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to up to 20 items per person per 100 m per hour. |  |  |  |  |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter does not exceed 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1, equivalent to between 21 and 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |
| Following the MCS beach litter survey method, the number of items of litter exceeds 0.0078 m−1 min−1 person−1,equivalent to more than 47 items of litter per person per 100 m per hour. |

### Rocky Shore

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MY-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MY-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MY-F01)
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## Woodland

### Progress Towards Habitat and Condition Targets (MI-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Condition Assessment Criteria | | | Target Score | Relevant parcels | Year 1 |  |
| **Target met?** | **Management Activity Updates** |
| Target Habitat: | |  | N/A |  | Yes / No | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| A | Age distribution of trees | Three age classes present |  |  |  |  |
| Two age classes present |
| One age class present |
| B | Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage | No significant browsing damage evident in woodland |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland |
| Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland |
| C | Invasive plant species | No invasive species present in woodland |  |  |  |  |
| Rhododendron *Rhododendrion ponticum* or cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* not present, other invasive species <10% cover |
| Rhododendron or laurel present, or other invasive species) 10% cover |
| D | Number of native trees species | Five or more native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel |  |  |  |  |
| Three to four native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel |
| Two or less native tree or shrub species present across woodland parcel |
| E | Cover of native tree and shrub species | >80% of canopy trees and >80% of understorey shrubs are native |  |  |  |  |
| 50 – 80% of canopy trees and 50-80% of understorey shrubs are native |
| <50% of canopy trees and <50% understorey shrubs are native |
| F | Open space within woodland | 10-20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.  Unless woodland <10ha in which case 0-20% temporary open space is permitted. |  |  |  |  |
| 21-40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space |
| <10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space.  But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category. |
| G | Woodland regeneration | All three classes present in woodland; trees 4-7cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth |  |  |  |  |
| One or two classes only present in woodland |
| No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland |
| H | Tree health | Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback |  |  |  |  |
| 11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low risk pest or disease present |
| Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high risk pest or disease present |
| I | Vegetation and ground flora | Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists. |  |  |  |  |
| Recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present |
| No recognisable NVC plant community at ground layer present. |
| J | Woodland vertical structure | Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland. |  |  |  |  |
| Two storeys across all survey plots |
| One of less storey across all survey plots |
| K | Veteran trees | Two of more veteran per hectare |  |  |  |  |
| One veteran tree per hectare |
| No veteran trees present in woodland |
| L | Amount of deadwood | 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or stems and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |  |  |  |  |
| Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or steams, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |
| Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing deadwood, large dead branches and or steams, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities. |
| M | Woodland disturbance | No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground |
| More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground |

### Woodland

### General Progress

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MI-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MI-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MI-F01)
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## Watercourses

### Progress Towards Enhancement Targets (MJ-T01)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Watercourse ID: | |  | | | | | |
| **River Enhancements Methods:** | | **Targeted for Enhancement?** | | **Year 1 Targeted Enhancement met?** | | **Actions required to progress or continue delivering target** | |
| Altering River Length | | Yes / No | | Yes / No | |  | |
| Watercourse Encroachment | |  | |  | |  | |
| Riparian Encroachment | |  | |  | |  | |
| Enhancing Distinctiveness | |  | |  | |  | |
| Condition | |  | |  | |  | |
| **Condition Assessment Criteria** | | | **RCA Index Values** | | | | |
| **RCA Index ID** | **RCA Index Name** | | **Targeted for Enhancement?** | | **Year 1 Targeted Enhancement met?** | | **Management Activity Updates** |
| **Bank Top** | | | | | | | |
| B1 (+) | Bank top vegetation structure | | Yes / No | | Yes / No | | Provide details of the actions relevant to this habitat or condition criteria that must be implemented from this monitoring period onwards.  What, if any, adaptive management changes will be implemented to continue delivering targets. |
| B2 (+) | Bank top tree feature richness | |  | |  | |  |
| B3 (+) | Bank top water-related features | |  | |  | |  |
| B4 (+) | *Bank top NNIPS cover* | |  | |  | |  |
| B5 (-) | *Bank top managed ground cover* | |  | |  | |  |
| Bank face | | | | | | | |
| C1 (+) | Bank face riparian vegetation structure | |  | |  | |  |
| C2 (+) | Bank face tree feature richness | |  | |  | |  |
| C3 (+) | Bank face natural bank profile extent | |  | |  | |  |
| C4 (+) | Bank face natural bank profile richness | |  | |  | |  |
| C5 (+) | Bank face natural bank material | |  | |  | |  |
| C6 (+) | Bank face bare sediment extent | |  | |  | |  |
| C7 (+) | *Bank face artificial bank profile extent* | |  | |  | |  |
| C8 (-) | *Bank face reinforcement extent* | |  | |  | |  |
| C9 (-) | *Bank face reinforcement material* | |  | |  | |  |
| C10 (-) | *Bank face NNIPS cover* | |  | |  | |  |
| **Channel Margin** | | | | | | |  |
| D1 (+) | Channel margin aquatic vegetation | |  | |  | |  |
| D2 (+) | Channel margin aquatic morphotype | |  | |  | |  |
| D3 (+) | Channel margin physical feature extent | |  | |  | |  |
| D4 (+) | Channel margin physical feature | |  | |  | |  |
| D5 (-) | *Channel Margin artificial features* | |  | |  | |  |
| **Channel Bed** | | | | | | |  |
| E1 (+) | Channel aquatic Morphotype richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E2 (+) | Channel bed tree features richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E3 (+) | Channel bed hydraulic features richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E4 (+) | Channel bed nature features richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E5 (+) | Channel bed natural features richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E6 (+) | Channel bed material richness | |  | |  | |  |
| E7 (-) | *Channel bed siltation* | |  | |  | |  |
| E8 (-) | *Channel bed reinforcement extent* | |  | |  | |  |
| E9 (-) | *Channel bed reinforcement severity* | |  | |  | |  |
| E10 (-) | *Channel bed artificial features severity* | |  | |  | |  |
| E11 (-) | *Channel bed NNIPS extent* | |  | |  | |  |
| E12(-) | *Channel bed filamentous algae extent* | |  | |  | |  |
| **Overdeepness** | | | | | | | |
| Overdeepness | | |  | |  | |  |

### General Progress

#### Watercourses

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on progress towards project goals (MJ-B01) |
|  |
| **Actions required in next management period** (MJ-B02) |
|  |

### Photographs of Progress (MJ-F01)
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