

Biodiversity Statement & Metric Assessment

Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent

A Report to: Gravesham Borough Council
Report number: RT-MME-181336-01-RevB
Date: August 2025
Last revision: February 2026

Project Information & Site Context	
Site Name & Location	Rose Avenue, Gravesend DA12 2LN
Site Area (ha)	0.43
Grid Reference	TQ 66414 73329
Topography	Flat
Project Background	In November 2024, Gravesham Borough Council commissioned Middlemarch to undertake a Biodiversity Metric Assessment associated with a proposed development at site Rose Avenue, Gravesend. The assessment is informed by ecological and arboricultural works carried out at the site in December 2024 by Middlemarch. These are: ● Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (RT-MME-181336-01); and, ● Preliminary Arboricultural Assessment (RT-MME-181336-04).
Summary of Proposals	The proposed redevelopment of the site will provide several new residential apartment buildings along with associated access roads and soft landscaping. This assessment is based on the documentation provided by the client and detailed below: ● Landscape Planting Masterplan, SLD/HG114 - LP1, Rev A (January 2026), by Standerwick Land Design. ● Landscape Masterplan, SLD/HG114 – LM1, Rev C (January 2026), by Standerwick Land Design.

Methods		
Biodiversity Metric	The biodiversity calculations used within this assessment were undertaken by Ruby Hill MSc (Ecological Project Officer), Amelia Collins BSc (Hons) (Senior Ecological Consultant) and Nick Davey MSc ACIEEM (Ecological Consultant) using 'The Statutory Biodiversity Metric' ¹ and associated User Guide ² .	
Data Sources	The baseline habitat data and condition assessment for the site is detailed in Appendix 2. A Phase 1 Habitat Plan showing the extent and location of each habitat recorded on site pre-development is included in Appendix 1 (C181336-01-01). A post-development habitat map (or the landscape plan) is included in Appendix 1 (C181336-03-01-RevC).	
Habitat Attributes	<i>Distinctiveness</i>	An automated score based on the type of habitat present and its value to wildlife. Highly diverse habitats such as those listed as Habitats of Principal Importance under the NERC Act (2006) or Annex 1 habitats in the Habitats Directive (1992) score highly in this category, whilst highly modified and low diversity habitats such as arable crops will have low distinctiveness scores.
	<i>Condition</i>	A score based on the quality of the habitat parcel against published condition criteria (See Appendix 2).
	<i>Strategic Significance</i>	A score based on information set out in local plans or policies. In this instance, a strategic location was defined using Gravesham Borough Council's Development Management Policies Document ³ .
Constraints & Assumptions	The assumptions regarding target habitat types, or condition, in this report are founded on professional opinion with reference to the likely achievable habitat outcomes at the site, based on the proposed planting plans and presumed management resources. All target habitats presume the implementation of a long-term Management Plan to achieve these ends and a recommendation to this effect is given. Where the baseline value for any area, linear or watercourse features is zero (i.e. no such feature exists at the site), and where new creation of these features is proposed, the percentage uplift cannot be mathematically calculated, and the metric outputs 'N/A' in the headline results tab. However, it is accepted that any new creation where there was previously no area, linear or watercourse habitat, constitutes meeting the statutory biodiversity requirement.	

¹ Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2024) Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool.

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

² Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (2024) Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.

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

³ Gravesham Borough Council's Development Management Policies Document

<https://www.gravesham.gov.uk/local-plan-policy/site-allocation-development-management-policies>

Headline Results					
On-Site Baseline	On-Site Baseline	Habitat units	1.16		
		Hedgerow units	0.00		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		
	On-Site Post Intervention	Habitat units	0.91		
		Hedgerow units	0.19		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		
	On-Site Net Unit Change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	-0.24	-20.91%	
		Hedgerow units	0.19	N/A	
		Watercourse Units	0.00	0.00%	
Off-Site Baseline	Off-Site Baseline	Habitat units	0.00		
		Hedgerow units	0.00		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		
	Off-Site Post Intervention	Habitat units	0.00		
		Hedgerow units	0.00		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		
	Off-Site Net Unit Change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%	
		Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%	
		Watercourse Units	0.00	0.00%	
Combined Net Unit Change (including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)		Habitat units	-0.24		
		Hedgerow units	0.19		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		
Spatial Risk Multiplier (SRM) Deductions		Habitat units	0.00		
		Hedgerow units	0.00		
		Watercourse Units	0.00		

Final Results

Total Net Unit Change <i>(including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</i>	Habitat units	-0.24
	Hedgerow units	0.19
	Watercourse Units	0.00
Total Net % Change <i>(including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</i>	Habitat units	-20.91%
	Hedgerow units	N/A
	Watercourse Units	0.00%
Trading Rules Satisfied*		No

***you must state if irreplaceable habitats are on-site at baseline:**

No irreplaceable habitats were identified on-site at baseline

Unit Type	Target**	Baseline Unit	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	1.16	1.27	0.36
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse Units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

**From January 2024, the UK Mandatory minimum is a 10% net gain in biodiversity for all development. Gravesham Borough Council have set the minimum biodiversity net gain at 10%.

Discussion

The calculations used within the metric to quantify biodiversity units differ between habitat, hedgerow and watercourse features, consequently, the values generated are not comparable, and a net gain in one feature cannot compensate for a net loss within another feature.

The offsite compensation solution should also satisfy the trading rules in relation to loss of individual trees. Urban trees are a medium distinctiveness habitat type and therefore losses must be replaced by area habitat units of either medium band habitats within the same broad habitat type (individual trees) or, any habitat from a higher band from any broad habitat type.

How is the target net gain percentage being delivered?	Habitat units	Only on-site.
	Hedgerow units	N/A
	Watercourse Units	N/A
How many Biodiversity Units are needed off-site to meet the required net gain percentage?	Habitat units	0.36
	Hedgerow units	0.00
	Watercourse Units	0.00

Recommendations

The recommendations below are based on Middlemarch's current understanding of the project. If works are changed in any way these recommendations will need to be amended if appropriate.

R1	The Local Planning Authority should be contacted to discuss the provision of an offsite compensation solution to address the residual requirement of 0.36BU (Habitats) needed to ensure the development proposals can deliver a biodiversity net gain. The offsite compensation solution should also satisfy the trading rules in relation to loss of individual trees. Urban trees are a medium distinctiveness habitat type and therefore losses must be replaced by area habitat units of either medium band habitats within the same broad habitat type (individual trees) or, any habitat from a higher band from any broad habitat type.
R2	After planning permission has been approved a Biodiversity Gain Plan needs to be produced and submitted to the Local Planning Authority to provide evidence for all BNG decisions and show how BNG will be achieved.
R3	A 30-year Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) should be produced to set out the detailed habitat creation and enhancement specifications and long-term management prescriptions, that will be required to ensure the scheme will achieve its conservation objectives over the lifespan of the project. The HMMP should also be inclusive of a long-term monitoring strategy to measure progress against conservation objectives and inform an adaptive approach to long-term management.

Quality Assurance

Date	Version	Author	Checked & Approved By
20/08/2025	Final	Ruby Hill MSc (Ecological Project Officer)	Paul Roebuck MSc MCIEEM (Regional Manager: South)
21/08/2025	Rev A	Amelia Collins BSc (Hons) (Senior Ecological Consultant)	Paul Roebuck MSc MCIEEM (Regional Manager: South)
03/02/2026	Rev B	Nick Davey MSc ACIEEM (Ecological Consultant)	Paul Roebuck MSc MCIEEM (Regional Manager: South)

Appendix 1

Drawings

Drawing C181336-01-01 – Phase 1 Habitat Survey

Drawing C181336-03-01-RevC – Drawing Adaptation of Landscape Proposal for Purposes of the BMA



C181336-01-01

Legend

Site boundary

Scattered broad-leaved tree

Scattered non-broad-leaved tree

Amenity grass

Bare ground

Building

Hardstanding

Tall ruderal

Target note - habitat parcel

Target note - feature

F1 - Brash pile

Project

Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent

Drawing

Phase 1 Habitat Map

Client

Gravesham Borough Council

Drawing Number

C181336-01-01

Revision

Rev B

Scale @ A3

1:400

Date

August 2025

Approved By

RS/ND

Drawn By

AW/CD

MIDDLEMARCH

Triumph House, Birmingham Road, Allesley, Coventry CV5 9AZ
T:01676 525880
E:admin@middlemarch-environmental.com

This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of His Majesty's Stationary Office. © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution of civil proceedings.

Licence Number: 100040518
© Crown copyright and database rights 2025 Ordnance Survey
Licence Number: 0100031673



C181336-03-01

Legend

Site boundary

Proposed urban tree

Retained tree

Removed tree

Proposed native hedgerow

Proposed artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface

Proposed brown roofs

Proposed developed land

Proposed introduced shrub

Proposed modified grassland

Proposed other neutral grassland

Retained habitat

Project

Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent

Drawing

Biodiversity Metric Assessment Plan

Client

Gravesham Borough Council

Drawing Number

C181336-03-01

Revision

Rev C

Scale @ A3

1:400

Date

February 2026

Approved By

RH/ND

Drawn By

CD/AW/VG



MIDDLEMARCH

Triumph House, Birmingham Road, Allesley, Coventry CV5 9AZ
T:01676 525880
E:admin@middlemarch-environmental.com

This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of The Controller of His Majesty's Stationary Office. © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution of civil proceedings.

Licence Number: 100040518

© Crown copyright and database rights 2025 Ordnance Survey

Licence Number: 0100031673

Appendix 2

Habitat Condition Assessment

Area Habitat				Condition Sheet Criteria Score																
Polygon / Line Ref.	Phase 1 Habitat Type	UK Hab Habitat Equivalent	Habitat Description	Condition Sheet Used	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	Total Score	Condition Assessment	
TN1	Buildings and hardstanding	Developed land; sealed surface	The hard landscaping on site comprised several residential houses, along with associated frontage, car parking, roads and public footpaths. These areas were devoid of vegetation and had no ecological value.	N/A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
TN2	Amenity grassland	Modified grassland	Several individual parcels of amenity grassland were present within the residential estate frontage. These parcels appeared to be subject to occasional management, with an average sward height of 5-10 cm, whilst early colonisation by scrub was noted. The grassland was dominated by perennial rye-grass <i>Lolium perenne</i> and also contained abundant common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> and bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg, frequent daisy <i>Bellis perennis</i> , crane's-bill <i>Geranium</i> sp., rose <i>Rosa</i> sp. and dandelion <i>Taraxacum officinale</i> and occasional ground-ivy <i>Glechoma hederacea</i> , mallow <i>Malva</i> sp. and wall barley <i>Hordeum murinum</i> .	Grassland low (5)	F	F	F	P	F	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Poor	
TN3	Amenity grassland	Modified grassland	Amenity grassland lawns were present within the front and rear gardens of several of the residential properties. These were managed to a short sward height of < 5 cm and appeared to be worn in places due to their amenity use. Species included dominant perennial rye-grass, abundant white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> and daisy, frequent crane's-bill and dandelion and occasional ground-ivy, mallow, common nettle and wall barley. A small brash pile was also present on one of the lawns.	Grassland low (5)	F	F	P	F	F	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Poor	
TN4	Amenity grassland	Modified grassland	One of the residential gardens contained a section of unmanaged amenity grassland with and a longer sward height of 10-15 cm, along with tall herb/ruderal and scrub colonisation. Species included dominant common nettle, abundant perennial rye-grass, sow thistle <i>Sonchus</i> sp., white clover, daisy and bramble, frequent crane's-bill, dandelion and creeping cinquefoil <i>Potentilla reptans</i> , occasional ground-ivy, mallow, wall barley and cleavers <i>Galium aparine</i> and rare annual mercury <i>Mercurialis annua</i> and spurge <i>Euphorbia</i> sp.	Grassland low (5)	F	F	F	P	F	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Poor	
TN6	Bare Ground	Bare Ground	A small area of bare ground was present within the north-western corner of the site.	Urban (22)	F	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Poor	
TN7	Tall Ruderal	Tall forbs	An area of dense vegetation cover was present on site, which comprised ruderal and scrub species including common nettle, sow thistle, and bramble.	Urban (22)	F	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Poor	
T1	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Semi-mature cabbage palm <i>Cordyline australis</i> , approximately 3 m tall and in overall good condition with no evidence of a pruning regime. The tree was set within a small area of managed amenity grassland. The tree had a stem diameter of below 30 cm and is therefore classified as 'small' sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	F	P	F	P	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Moderate	
T2	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Semi-mature silver birch <i>Betula pendula</i> , approximately 4 m tall and in overall good condition with no evidence of a pruning regime. The tree was set within a shallow grassland pit, surrounded by hardstanding. The tree had a stem diameter of below 30 cm and is therefore classified as 'small' sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	F	P	F	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Moderate	

Area Habitat				Condition Sheet Criteria Score																
Polygon / Line Ref.	Phase 1 Habitat Type	UK Hab Habitat Equivalent	Habitat Description	Condition Sheet Used	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	Total Score	Condition Assessment	
T3	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Mature cherry <i>Prunus</i> sp., approximately 4 m tall and in overall good condition with no evidence of a pruning regime. The tree was set within a shallow grassland pit, surrounded by hardstanding. The tree had a stem diameter of below 30 cm and is therefore classified as ‘small’ sized within the metric. The tree had a stem diameter of below 30 cm and is therefore classified as ‘small’ sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	P	P	F	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	Moderate	
T4	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Mature pear <i>Pyrus</i> sp., approximately 4 m tall and in overall good condition with no evidence of a pruning regime. The tree was set within a shallow grassland pit, surrounded by hardstanding. The tree had a stem diameter of below 30 cm and is therefore classified as ‘small’ sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	P	P	F	F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	Moderate	
T5	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Semi-mature elder <i>Sambucus nigra</i> , approximately 6 m tall and in overall good condition, albeit showing evidence of previous management. The tree was set within the boundary of an unmanaged residential garden. The tree had a stem diameter of between 30 and 60 cm and is therefore classified as ‘medium’ sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	F	F	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	Moderate	
T6	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Early mature elder, approximately 6 m tall and in overall good condition, albeit showing evidence of previous management. The tree also contained a bird box and was set along the boundary of an unmanaged residential garden. The tree had a stem diameter of between 30 and 60 cm and is therefore classified as ‘medium’ sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	P	F	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	Moderate	
T7	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Early mature cherry, 8m tall and in overall good condition, albeit showing evidence of previous management. The tree was set along the boundary of an unmanaged residential garden. The tree had a stem diameter of between 30 and 60 cm and is therefore classified as ‘medium’ sized within the metric.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	P	F	F	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	Moderate	
T8 (F1)	Scattered Tree	Urban Tree	Early-mature cherry <i>Prunus</i> sp stump. This tree appears to have been recently felled by the homeowner, with the logs laid at the base. However, in line with government guidance for recently cleared habitats, this tree has been included as an existing habitat within the Biodiversity Metric Assessment. Where the scores for individual condition assessment criteria prior to the felling of this tree are unknown, the criteria were assumed to be passed. Therefore, all criteria for this tree have been classified as being passed and the tree has been classified as being in good condition. Based on the size of the tree stump, the tree is likely to had had a stem diameter at breast height of between 30 and 60 cm. Therefore, the tree is considered to be ‘medium’ sized.	Individual trees (9)	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	Good	
Key: P – Criteria passed F – Criteria failed																				

Appendix 3

Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation

The Statutory Biodiversity Metric

Start page

Project details			
Planning authority:	Gravesham Borough Council		
Project name:	Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent		
Applicant:	Gravesham Borough Council		
Application type:			
Planning application reference:			
Completed by:	march). Rev B: Amelia Collins BSc (Hons) (Senior Ecological Consultant, Middlemarch) and Nick Davey MSc (Senior Ecological Consultant, Middlemarch)		
Date of metric completion:	19/08/2025. Latest revision: 02/02/2026		
Reviewer:	Paul Roebuck MSc MCIEEM (Regional Manager: South, Middlemarch)		
Calculation iteration:	ick Land Design. These include: Landscape Masterplan (Drawing no. SLD - HG114 - LM1, Rev C, January 2025)		
Planning authority reviewer:			
Date of planning authority review:			
Target % net gain:	10%		
Irreplaceable habitat present at baseline:	No ✓		
Total site area - including irreplaceable habitat area (hectares):	0.41	Irreplaceable habitat site area (hectares):	0.00
Total off-site area - including irreplaceable habitat area (hectares):	N/A	Irreplaceable habitat area off-site (hectares):	N/A

Cell style conventions	
⚠	Attention required
▲	Input error/rules and principles not met
	Use of this cell is not appropriate
	Enter data
	Automatic lookup
	Result

On-site baseline map

Insert

On-site post intervention map

Insert

On-site baseline map reference number

On-site post-intervention map reference number

Off-site baseline map

Insert

Off-site post intervention map

Insert

Off-site baseline map reference number

Off-site post-intervention reference number

Main menu

Results

View all

Reset view

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	Habitat units	1.16		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.91		
	Hedgerow units	0.19		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	-0.24	-20.91%	On-site net gain is less than target set ▲
	Hedgerow units	0.19	N/A	Zero baseline units - % cannot be calculated
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%	

Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%	
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%	

Combined net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-0.24		
	Hedgerow units	0.19		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		

FINAL RESULTS			
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-0.24	
	Hedgerow units	0.19	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	-20.91%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲
	Hedgerow units	N/A	0 baseline units - % cannot be calculated
	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲		

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	1.16	1.27	0.36	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓ No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Input errors/rule breaks present in metric ▲

Return to results menu Trading Summary help/glossary	Trading Summary		
	Dishciveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Status??
	Very High	Some habitat required - discipline compensation option A	Yes ✓
	High	Some habitat required +	Yes ✓
	Medium	Some limited compensation or buffer habitat required 1	Yes ✓
Low	Some limited compensation or buffer habitat required 2	No ✗	

Trading summary watercourses	Very High Distinctiveness					
	Habitat group	Group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project-wide unit change	Threat losses
	Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	On maritime Lowland meadows	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Grassland - Wetland low meadows	Grassland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Heathland and shrub - Moorland heath and yellow scrub	Heathland and shrub	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Lake - Boulder bed freshwater drainage river/ brook	Lake	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Heavily vegetated bank - Permanent use of agriculture	Heavily vegetated bank	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - vegetated bank - Permanent use of agriculture	Wetland - vegetated bank	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - blanket bog	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Lowland wet pool (not dry)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Fresh inland wetland	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Lowland wetland bog	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Transition moor and moorland heath (not dry)	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Woodland and heath - Wood-pasture and wet heath	Woodland and heath	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Rocky slopes - High moorland and moorland heath	Rocky slopes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Rocky slopes - Moorland wetland bog - on steep dry or chalk	Rocky slopes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Rocky slopes - Moorland wetland bog - on steep dry or chalk	Rocky slopes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Rocky slopes - Low moorland heath - on steep dry or chalk	Rocky slopes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Rocky slopes - Transition of rock - on steep dry or chalk	Rocky slopes	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	Wetland - Lowland wetland bog - on steep dry or chalk	Wetland	0.00	0.00	0.00	
			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Very High Distinctiveness Summary	
Very High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	0.00
Remaining losses: Like for like not satisfied	0.00

[illegible]

High Distinctiveness Summary	
High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	0.00
Remaining losses: Like for like not satisfied	0.00

[illegible]

Medium Distinctiveness Summary		
Medium Distinctiveness Units available to offset Lower Distinctiveness Deficit	0.15	✓
Medium Distinctiveness Broad Habitat losses to be offset by trading up	-0.20	▲
Higher Distinctiveness Surplus Units minus Medium Distinctiveness Broad Habitat Deficit	-0.05	▲
Cumulative surplus of units	-0.05	▲

[illegible]

Low Distinctiveness Summary		
Low Distinctiveness net change in units	-0.19	▲
Cumulative surplus of units	-0.19	▲

Return to results menu

Trading summary area habitats

Trading summary watercourses

Trading Summary		
Distinctiveness Group	Trading Rule	Trading Satisfied?
Very High	Same habitat required =	Yes ✓
High	Like for like or better	Yes ✓
Medium	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓
Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓
Very Low	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required	Yes ✓

Very High Distinctiveness			
Habitat group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project-wide unit change
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00

Very High Distinctiveness Summary	
Very High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	0.00
Remaining losses; Like for like not satisfied	0.00

High Distinctiveness			
Habitat group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.00	0.00	0.00
Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00

High Distinctiveness Summary	
High Distinctiveness Units available to offset lower distinctiveness deficit	0.00
High Distinctiveness losses to be offset by trading up	0.00
Higher Distinctiveness surplus units minus any high distinctiveness deficit	0.00

Medium Distinctiveness			
Habitat group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change
Species-rich native hedgerow	0.00	0.00	0.00
Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
Native hedgerow with trees	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ecologically valuable line of trees	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ecologically valuable line of trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00

Medium Distinctiveness Summary	
Units available from higher distinctiveness habitats	0.00
Medium Distinctiveness net change in units	0.00
Cumulative availability of units	0.00

Low Distinctiveness			
Habitat group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change
Native hedgerow	0.19	0.00	0.19 ✓
Line of trees	0.00	0.00	0.00
Line of trees - associated with bank or ditch	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.19	0.00	0.19

Low Distinctiveness Summary		
Low Distinctiveness net change in units	0.19	✓
Cumulative availability of units	0.19	✓

Very Low Distinctiveness			
Habitat group	On-site unit change	Off-site unit change	Project wide unit change
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00

Very Low Distinctiveness Summary	
Very Low Distinctiveness net change in units	0.00
Cumulative availability of units	0.19 ✓

Project Name: Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent

Map Reference:

A-1 On-Site Habitat Baseline

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	-0.24
Total Net % Change	-20.91%
Trading Rules Satisfied	No - check trading summaries ▲

	Existing area habitats				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance		Ecological baseline
Ref	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Irreplaceable habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Total habitat units
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	No	0.16	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.32
2	Urban	Bare ground	No	0.003	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.01
3	Urban	Developed land: sealed surface	No	0.05	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
4	Urban	Developed land: sealed surface	No	0.18	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Compensation Not Required	0.00
5	Sparsely vegetated land	Tall forbs	No	0.02	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.04
6									
7	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0041	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.04
8	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0041	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.04
9	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0041	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.04
10	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0041	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.04
11	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0163	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.14
12	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0163	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.14
13	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0163	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.14
14	Individual trees	Urban tree	No	0.0163	Medium	Good	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required (≥)	0.22
15									
16									
17									
18									
		Total habitat area		0.49					
		Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard structures)		0.41					

Project Name: Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent Map Reference:

A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	-0.24
Total Net % Change	-20.91%
Trading Rules Satisfied	No - check trading summaries ▲
Area Check	Area Acceptable ✓

	Post intervention habitats													
Ref	Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier	Difficulty	Habitat units delivered	Comments				
				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)		Final difficulty of creation	User comments	Planning authority comments	Habitat reference number	
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	0.05	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.10	Mapped as 'Proposed grass' within the Landscape Planting Masterplan . The grassland is anticipated to be managed as a close-mown lawn and therefore achieve 'poor' condition.			
2	Urban	Introduced shrub	0.03	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.06	Mapped as 'Proposed wildlife amenity planting' within the Landscape Planting Masterplan			
3	Urban	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.12	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Low	0.00	Mapped as 'Permeable paving (types 1-3)' within the Landscape Masterplan			
4	Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.15	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Low	0.00	Mapped as 'Sealed permeable paving' and 'Proposed buildings non permeable surface' within the Landscape Masterplan			
5	Individual trees	Urban tree	0.053	Medium	Moderate	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	27	Low	0.18	Mapped as 'Trees proposed' within the Landscape Planting Masterplan. Includes 13 native trees, including silver birch (Betula pendula), crab apple (Malus sylvestris), Scots pine (Pinus sylvestris) and hornbeam (Carpinus betulus). As these proposed trees will be native, they are anticipated to achieve 'moderate' condition.			
6	Individual trees	Urban tree	0.041	Medium	Poor	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	0.13	Mapped as 'Trees proposed' within the Landscape Planting Masterplan. Includes 10 non-native trees, including Callery pear (Pyrus calleryana 'Chanticleer'), common plum (Prunus domestica), double gleam (Prunus Avium 'Plena'), Kanzan cherry (Prunus serrulata 'Kanzan') and sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua). As these proposed trees will be non-native, they are anticipated to achieve 'poor' condition.			
7	Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.04	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	2	Low	0.15	Mapped as 'Meadow grass mix' within Landscape Planting Masterplan			
8	Urban	Other green roof	0.01	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.02	Mapped as 'Proposed brown roofs' on Landscape Planting Masterplan			
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
			Total habitat area	0.49							0.63			

Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees, green walls, intertidal hard structures)	0.40
---	------

M² to hectares conversion tool:	Select a unit	Hectares	M²

Project Name: Rose Avenue, Gravesend, Kent

Map Reference:

B-2 On-Site Hedge Creation

Hedgerow summary	
Total Net Unit Change	0.19
Total Net % Change	N/A
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

		Proposed habitats		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier		Difficulty risk multipliers	Hedge units delivered	Comments		
Ref	New hedge number	Habitat type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	Final difficulty of creation		User comments	Planning authority comments	Habitat reference number
1		Native hedgerow	0.1	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.19	Mapped as 'Native Hedgerow Mix' within the Landscape Planting Masterplan. The hedgerows will comprise native species, but are anticipated to receive formal management and therefore achieve 'poor' condition.		
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
			0.10							0.19			