The Statutory Biodiversity Metric -Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology

Version Number: July 2025 (v1.0.2)

Instructions

The method for assessing habitat condition is split into three main steps, outlined in detail below:
STEP 1: Considerations before assessing condition
STEP 2: Choosing the right condition sheet
STEP 3: Using condition sheets

Step 1: Considerations before assessing condition

The following points must be considered **before** undertaking a condition assessment:
1) Condition assessments must be undertaken by a competent person (hereafter referred to as assessors), as defined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
2) Condition assessments should be undertaken at the optimum time of year for the assessed habitat(s).
3) Assessors must have digital or hard copy access to condition sheets (see **Tabs 1-25**) and the survey cover sheet during the survey (see **SURVEY COVER SHEET** tab).
4) The habitat type of the parcel(s) to be assessed must be determined before consideration can be given to its condition as this enables the assessor to select the correct condition sheet (see **HABITAT DEF**
5) The location and extent of the habitat parcel(s) to be assessed must be mapped, either on digital or paper maps (mapped habitat parcels can later be split according to their condition).
6) Each habitat parcel to be assessed must be assigned a unique reference ID.

Step 2: Choosing the right condition sheet

See **SELECTING CONDITION SHEET** tab which lists the habitat types found in the biodiversity metric and indicates which condition sheet should be used for each habitat type.
1) Some condition sheets are unique to a single habitat type; others cover a range of habitat types within the same broad habitat category.
2) For each sheet there is version A and B.
   i. Sheet A can be used to record information for one habitat parcel
   ii. Sheet B can be used to record information for up two 10 habitat parcels
3) Each condition sheet is set to print at A4 and can be used as a paper form.

Step 3: Using condition sheets (Tabs 1-25)

The following instructions and points of clarification apply to most condition assessment sheets:

A) Assess the habitat parcel against each condition assessment criterion, recording a 'pass' or 'fail' for each criterion assessed, unless otherwise directed by categories available on the sheet.
B) If condition varies within a parcel during the assessment then start a new condition assessment. Split the original parcel to ensure that each individual parcel comprises an area of habitat of a consistent typ
C) Some condition assessment sheets have 'essential' criteria. Essential criteria must be passed to achieve a particular condition state.
D) Some condition assessment sheets list species that are indicative of suboptimal condition status. These lists are not exhaustive. An assessor may exercise professional judgement and consider additional s
   Report any high-risk non-native invasive species to the GG non-native species secretariat
E) Any relevant evidence for passing or failing criteria, or for a particular score, should be captured within the habitat survey notes and or by taking photographs. Photographs and notes should be referenced
F) Record any survey limitations on the condition sheet, such as access restrictions or timing restrictions. If survey limitations prevent any criteria from being confidently and accurately assessed, adopt a preca
   i. If a definitive pass or fail cannot be assigned through baseline survey, assume the criterion is passed.
   ii. When monitoring post-intervention habitat, fail criteria which cannot be assessed due to survey limitations.
G) Once all applicable condition criteria have been assessed, assign a result of Good, Moderate or Poor condition following instructions provided within the relevant condition sheet.
   i. The 'Fairly Good' or 'Fairly Poor' condition categories are intermediate categories for site-specific features of condition not captured in the standard condition assessment.
   ii. They should only be applied through application of professional judgement, and sound ecological evidence must be provided to justify the use of these categories.
   iii. If used, these categories can only be used to adjust the results of a standard metric condition assessment one condition category above or below its result (For example, you cannot go from a standard
   iv. Ensure any constraints are made clear in the 'Assessor's comments' box in the metric and associated reporting.
H) If a habitat parcel is failing all criteria, it may be that the habitat type has been recorded incorrectly and the wrong condition sheet is being used.

The condition assessment survey is a good opportunity to identify any potential opportunities for habitat restoration or enhancement. Note potential opportunities for these within the condition sheet.

The **CA SUMMARY SHEET** can be filled out after the survey to summarise information about the condition assessments, including:
   i. The site or location of the condition assessment survey
   ii. The number of condition sheets used
   iii. The number and type of habitat parcels surveyed and the condition they achieved

r').

Notes on Using Condition Sheets

Additional habitat-specific instructions for

Using the 'Woodland' condition sheetThe

Using the 'Lakes' condition sheetThe Fre

Using the 'Coastal' and 'Intertidal' habitat

Using the 'Hedgerow' condition sheetThe

r non-standard condition assessment sheets are provided below:
e Woodland condition sheet has been adapted from the 'Woodland Condition Survey' developed by the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG). All supplementary information needed to comp
shwater Biological Association's 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' (HNA) is used to assess the condition of a lake. All supplementary information needed to complete a HNA is provided within the La
condition sheetsFor most coastal and intertidal habitats, instead of allocating a 'pass' or 'fail' to each criterion, each of the criteria within the condition sheets are allocated a score. These scores are s
e condition sheet for hedgerows has been adapted from the Defra Hedgerow Survey Handbook. All supplementary information needed to complete a hedgerow condition assessment is provided withi

plete a Woodland condition assessment for the purpose of the biodiversity metric is provided or referenced within the Woodland condition sheet. Instead of allocating a pass or fail to each criterion, e
ake condition sheet. The average of the HNA scores is used to assign a final condition score.
summed, and the total sum is used to assign a final condition score.
ıin the Hedgerow condition sheet.Each condition criterion is assigned to one of five functional groups. The condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of criteria passed within these

each of the criteria within the woodland condition sheets are allocated a score. These scores are summed, and the total sum is used to assign a final condition score.

e functional groups.

Habitat Definitions

Links to habitat classification systems used by the Statutory Biodiversity Metric are below:

UK Habitat Classification System definitions

EUNIS habitat definitions

Water Framework Directive Lakes Typologies

Annex I habitats

Most (but not all) biodiversity metric terrestrial habitat types are described to Level 4 in UKHab, th equivalent habitat may need converting to a metric habitat type when using the metric, when ass type.

Statutory Biodiversity Metric broad habitat	Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat
Cropland	Arable field margins cultivated annually
	Arable field margins game bird mix
	Arable field margins pollen and nectar
	Arable field margins tussocky
	Cereal crops
	Winter stubble
	Horticulture
	Intensive orchards
	Non-cereal crops
	Temporary grass and clover leys
Grassland	Traditional orchards
	Bracken
	Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM
	Lowland calcareous grassland
	Lowland dry acid grassland
	Lowland meadows
	Modified grassland
	Other lowland acid grassland
	Other neutral grassland
	Tall herb communities (H6430)
	Upland acid grassland
	Upland calcareous grassland
	Upland hay meadows
Heathland and shrub	Blackthorn scrub
	Bramble scrub
	Gorse scrub
	Hawthorn scrub
	Hazel scrub
	Lowland heathland
	Mixed scrub
	Mountain heaths and willow scrub
	Rhododendron scrub
	Willow scrub
	Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)
	Other sea buckthorn scrub
	Upland heathland

Individual tree	Rural tree
	Urban tree
Lakes	Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies
	Ornamental lake or pond
	High alkalinity lakes
	Low alkalinity lakes
	Marl lakes
	Moderate alkalinity lakes
	Peat lakes
	Ponds (priority habitat)
	Ponds (non-priority habitat)
	Reservoirs
	Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)
Sparsely vegetated land	Calaminarian grasslands
	Coastal sand dunes
	Coastal vegetated shingle
	Ruderal/Ephemeral
	Tall forbs
	Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats
	Limestone pavement
	Maritime cliff and slopes
	Other inland rock and scree
Urban	Allotments
	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
	Bioswale
	Biodiverse green roof
	Built linear features
	Cemeteries and churchyards
	Developed land; sealed surface
	Biodiverse green roof
	Facade-bound green wall
	Ground based green wall
	Ground level planters
	Intensive green roof
	Introduced shrub
	Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land
	Other green roof
	Rain garden
	Actively worked sand pit quarry or open cast mine
	Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
	Unvegetated garden
	Vacant or derelict land
	Bare ground
	Vegetated garden
Wetland	Blanket bog
	Depressions on peat substrates (H7150)
	Fens (upland and lowland)
	Lowland raised bog
	Wetland – Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)
	Purple moor grass and rush pastures
	Reedbeds
	Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)
	Felled
	Lowland beech and yew woodland

Woodland and forest	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
	Native pine woodlands
	Other coniferous woodland
	Other Scot's pine woodland
	Other woodland; broadleaved
	Other woodland; mixed
	Upland birchwoods
	Upland mixed ashwoods
	Upland oakwood
	Wet woodland
	Wood-pasture and parkland
Coastal lagoons	Coastal lagoons
Coastal saltmarsh	Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds
	Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds
Rocky shore	High energy littoral rock
	High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
	Moderate energy littoral rock
	Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
	Low energy littoral rock
	Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
	Features of littoral rock
	Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Intertidal sediment	Littoral coarse sediment
	Littoral sand
	Littoral muddy sand
	Littoral mud
	Littoral mixed sediments
	Littoral seagrass
	Littoral seagrass on peat, clay or chalk
	Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels
	Littoral biogenic reefs - Sabellaria
	Features of littoral sediment
	Artificial littoral coarse sediment
	Artificial littoral muddy sand
	Artificial littoral mud
	Artificial littoral sand
	Artificial littoral mixed sediments
	Artificial littoral seagrass
	Artificial littoral biogenic reefs
Intertidal hard structures	Artificial hard structures
	Artificial features of hard structures
	Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)
Hedgerows and Lines of trees	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch
	Species-rich native hedgerow with trees
	Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
	Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch
	Species-rich native hedgerow
	Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
	Native hedgerow with trees
	Ecologically valuable line of trees
	Ecologically valuable line of trees - associated with bank or ditch
	Native hedgerow
	Line of trees
	Line of trees - associated with bank or ditch

	Non-native and ornamental hedgerow
Watercourse	Priority habitat
	Other rivers and streams
	Ditches
	Canals
	Culvert
	Watercourse footprint

herefore some metric habitats encompass UKHa
essing its condition the most accurate descriptio

Source Material
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
Annex 1 / UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
Annex 1 / UKHab
UKHab
UKHab

See notes
See notes
UKHab
UKHab
WFD
WFD
WFD
WFD
WFD
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab and WFD
Annex 1 / UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
Annex 1 / UKHab
Annex 1
UKHab
UKHab
EUNIS
UKHab
UKHab
Annex 1 / UKHab
UKHab
UKHab

UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
EUNIS
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab
UKHab

UKHab
See notes
See notes
See notes
See notes
See notes
See notes

ab Level 5 sub-divisions. When classifying a habitat, the assessor sh
n should be used. Using professional judgement, this may include th

Classification habitat name in UKHab / EUNIS / Annex 1
Arable field margins cultivated annually
Arable field margins wild bird mix
Arable field margins pollen and nectar
Arable field margins tussocky
Cereal crops
Winter stubble
Horticulture
Intensive orchards
Non-cereal crops
Temporary grass and clover leys
Traditional orchards
Bracken
Floodplain wetland mosaic
Lowland calcareous grassland
Lowland dry acid grassland
Lowland meadows
Modified grassland
Other lowland acid grassland
Other neutral grassland
Tall herb communities (H6430)
Upland acid grassland
Upland calcareous grassland
Upland hay meadows
Blackthorn scrub
Bramble scrub
Gorse scrub
Hawthorn scrub
Hazel scrub
Lowland heathland
Mixed scrub
Mountain heaths and willow scrub
Rhododendron scrub
Willow scrub
Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)
Other sea buckthorn scrub
Upland heathland

N/A
N/A
Aquifer-fed naturally fluctuating water bodies
Ornamental lakes or ponds
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
Ponds (priority habitat)
Pond (non-priority)
Reservoir
Mediterranean temporary ponds (H3170)
Calaminarian grasslands
Sand dunes
Coastal vegetated shingle
Ruderal or ephemeral
Tall forbs
Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats
Limestone pavement
Maritime cliff and slopes
Other inland rock
Allotments
Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface
Bioswale
Biodiverse green roof
Built linear features
Cemeteries and churchyards
Developed land; sealed surface
Biodiverse green roof
Facade-bound green wall
Ground-based green wall
Ground level planters
Intensive green roof
Introduced shrub
Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land
Other green roof
Rain garden
Active sand pit or quarry or open cast mine
Sustainable drainage system
Unvegetated garden
Vacant or derelict land
Bare ground
Vegetated garden
Blanket bog
Depressions on peat substrates (H7150)
Lowland fens; Upland flushes fens and swamps; Other wetlands
Lowland raised bog
Oceanic valley bog
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures
Reedbeds
Transition mires and quaking bogs - lowland (H7140) / upland
Felled
Lowland beech and yew woodland

Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
Native pine woodlands
Other coniferous woodland
Other Scot’s pine woodland
Other broadleaved woodland
Other woodland; mixed
Upland birchwoods
Upland mixed ashwoods
Upland oakwood
Wet woodland
Wood-pasture and parkland
Saline coastal lagoons
Coastal saltmarshes and saline reedbeds
-
High energy littoral rock
High energy littoral rock
Moderate energy littoral rock
Moderate energy littoral rock
Low energy littoral rock
Low energy littoral rock
Features of littoral rock
Features of littoral rock
Littoral coarse sediment
Littoral sand and muddy sand
Littoral sand and muddy sand
Littoral mud
Littoral mixed sediments
Littoral sediments dominated by aquatic angiosperms
Littoral sediments dominated by aquatic angiosperms
Littoral biogenic reefs
Littoral biogenic reefs
Features of littoral sediment
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
Species-rich native hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow
Native hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow
Native hedgerow
Native hedgerow
Ecologically valuable line of trees
Ecologically valuable line of trees
Native hedgerow
Line of trees
Line of trees

Non-native and ornamental hedgerow
-
-
-
-
-
-

hould classify and record it to the most accurate and appropriate level. Although a Level 5, or
:he Level 5 UKHab description, as well as the Level 4 description, depending on the habitat

Other definition or notes
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name.
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
As defined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
Record all other sea buckthorn scrub as ‘Other sea buckthorn scrub’
None
None

As defined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
As defined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
None
None
≥ 2ha
≥ 2ha
≥ 2ha
≥ 2ha
≥ 2ha
< 2ha
< 2ha
Some larger reservoirs are covered by the WFD Lakes typology.
Record temporary water bodies not meeting this definition as another pond or lake habitat type
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name.
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name
None
None
None
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
This classification relates to non-vegetated working areas only.
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name
None
None
None
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name
None
None

None
None
None
None
The metric habitat type differs from the UKHab name
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
None
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
None
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate
None
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate
None
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate
None
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate
None
None
None
None
None
None
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on reef forming species
Subset of EUNIS habitat based on reef forming species
None
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
see tab G1 in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Adapted from EUNIS)
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
None
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes
Use combined UKHab codes

None
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide. Do not use JNCC definitions to determine this Priority Habitat habita type.
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
As detailed in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.

Selecting Condition Sheet Instructions:

The table below sets out which condition sheet to use for each habitat type. Locate the relevant habitat type in the first column (l
(Condition sheet) to determine which habitat condition sheet should be used to assess that particular habitat type. The third and
can be clicked on to navigate directly to the required condition sheet, for ease of navigation.

Some habitats are allocated a fixed condition score in the biodiversity metric and do not require a condition assessment for the r
medium distinctiveness habitats there is a fixed option in the metric - 'Condition Assessment N/A'; for very low distinctiveness ha

Habitat type	Condition sheet
	Area habitats
Broad habitat type: Cropland	
Cropland - Arable field margins cultivated annually	Condition Assessment N/A
Cropland - Arable field margins game bird mix	
Cropland - Arable field margins pollen and nectar	
Cropland - Arable field margins tussocky	
Cropland - Cereal crops	
Cropland - Winter stubble	
Cropland – Horticulture	
Cropland - Intensive orchards	
Cropland - Non-cereal crops	
Cropland - Temporary grass and clover leys	
Broad habitat type: Grassland	
Grassland - Bracken	Condition Assessment N/A
Grassland - Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM	See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for details on recording.
Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland	
Grassland - Lowland meadows	
Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland Low distinctiveness
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	
Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430)	
Grassland - Traditional orchards	Orchard
Grassland - Upland acid grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland	
Grassland - Upland hay meadows	
Broad habitat type: Heathland and scrub	
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Condition Assessment N/A
Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub	
Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub	
Heathland and shrub - Lowland heathland	Heathland
Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Mountain heaths and willow scrub	Use Heathland condition sheet for Mountain heaths OR
	Scrub condition sheet for Willow scrub
Heathland and shrub - Rhododendron scrub	Condition Assessment N/A
Heathland and shrub – Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)	Scrub
Heathland and shrub – Other sea buckthorn scrub	Condition Assessment N/A
Heathland and shrub - Upland heathland	Heathland
Heathland and shrub – Willow scrub	Scrub
Broad habitat type: Lakes	
Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	Lakes
Lakes - High alkalinity lakes	
Lakes - Low alkalinity lakes	
Lakes - Marl lakes	
Lakes - Moderate alkalinity lakes	
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond	Lakes OR
	Ponds

Lakes - Peat lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)	Ponds
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)	
Lakes - Reservoirs	Lakes
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170)	Use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes OR
	Pond condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools
Broad habitat type: Sparsely vegetated land	
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grasslands	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes	Coastal
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle	
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral	Urban
Sparsely vegetated land – Tall forbs	
Sparsely vegetated land - Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats	Sparsely vegetated land
Sparsely vegetated land - Limestone pavement	Limestone pavement
Sparsely vegetated land - Maritime cliff and slopes	Coastal
Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree	Sparsely vegetated land
Broad habitat type: Urban	
Urban - Allotments	Urban
Urban - Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	N/A - Other
Urban - Bioswale	Urban
Urban - Biodiverse green roof	
Urban - Built linear features	N/A - Other
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards	Use Urban condition sheet as default.
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other
Urban - Facade-bound green wall	Urban
Urban - Ground based green wall	
Urban - Ground level planters	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban - Intensive green roof	Urban
Urban - Introduced shrub	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land	Urban
Urban - Other green roof	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban - Rain garden	Urban
Urban - Actively worked sand pit, quarry or open cast mine	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)	Urban
Urban - Unvegetated garden	N/A - Other
Urban – Vacant or derelict land	Urban
Urban – Bare ground	
Urban - Vegetated garden	Condition Assessment N/A
Broad habitat type: Wetland	
Wetland - Blanket bog	Wetland
Wetland - Depressions on peat substrates (H7150)	
Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)	
Wetland - Lowland raised bog	
Wetland – Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)	
Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures	
Wetland – Reedbeds	
Wetland - Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)	
Broad habitat type: Woodland	
Woodland and forest - Felled	No assessment required - condition fixed at Good
Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands	
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland	
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland	
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods	
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods	
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood	
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland	
Woodland and forest - Wood-pasture and parkland	Wood-pasture and parkland
Broad habitat type: Coastal lagoons	
Coastal lagoons - Coastal lagoons	Coastal lagoons
Broad habitat type: Coastal saltmarsh	

Coastal saltmarsh - Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds	Coastal saltmarsh
Coastal saltmarsh - Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds	
Broad habitat type: Intertidal hard structures	
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures	Intertidal hard structures
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial features of hard structures	
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)	
Broad habitat type: Intertidal sediment	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal sediment
Intertidal sediment - Littoral sand	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral muddy sand	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral mud	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral mixed sediments	
Intertidal sediment - Features of littoral sediment	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral coarse sediment	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral mixed sediments	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral mud	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral muddy sand	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral sand	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass	Intertidal seagrass
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass - on peat, clay or chalk	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass	
Intertidal sediment - Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels	Intertidal biogenic reefs
Intertidal sediment - Littoral biogenic reefs – Sabellaria	
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral biogenic reefs	
Broad habitat type: Rocky shore	
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock	Rocky shore
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock	
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock	
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock	
Rocky Shore - Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	
Broad habitat type: Individual trees	
Individual trees – Rural tree	Individual trees
Individual trees – Urban tree	
	Hedgerows and Lines of trees habitats
Broad habitat type: Hedgerows and lines of trees	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Line of trees	Line of trees
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Line of trees - associated with bank or ditch	
Hedgerows and lines of trees – Ecologically valuable line of trees	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Ecologically valuable line of trees - associated with bank or ditch	
Hedgerows and lines of trees – Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	No assessment required - condition fixed at Poor
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow with trees	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Species-rich native hedgerow	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	
	Watercourse habitats

Broad habitat type: Watercourse	
Watercourse – Ditches	Ditches
Watercourse – Culvert	No assessment required - condition fixed at Poor
Watercourse – Priority habitat, Other rivers and streams, Canals	River Condition Assessment required

(Habitat type), then refer to the second column
d fourth columns (Link to sheet) contain links which

metric to be completed. For certain low and
abitats the fixed option is 'N/A - Other'.

Link to sheet (1 habitat parcel)	Link to sheet (up to 10 habitat parcels)
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
Tab 23A	Tab 23B
Tab 6A	Tab 6B
Tab 5A	Tab 5B
Tab 6A	Tab 6B
Tab 17A	Tab 17B
Tab 6A	Tab 6B
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
N/A	N/A
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
Tab 7A	Tab 7B
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
Tab 7A	Tab 7B
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
N/A	N/A
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
N/A	N/A
Tab 7A	Tab 7B
Tab 20A	Tab 20B
Tab 14A	Tab 14B
Tab 14A	Tab 14B
Tab 18A	Tab 18B

Tab 14A	Tab 14B
Tab 18A	Tab 18B
Tab 14A	Tab 14B
Tab 18A	Tab 18B
Tab 6A	Tab 6B
Tab 1A	Tab 1B
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
Tab 21A	Tab 21B
Tab 15A	Tab 15B
Tab 1A	Tab 1B
Tab 21A	Tab 21B
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 22A	Tab 22B
N/A	N/A
Tab 23A	Tab 23B
N/A	N/A
Tab 24A	Tab 24B
Tab 25A	Tab 25B
Tab 2A	Tab 2B

Tab 3A	Tab 3B
Tab 11A	Tab 11B
Tab 13A	Tab 13B
Tab 12A	Tab 12B
Tab 10A	Tab 10B
Tab 19A	Tab 19B
Tab 9A	Tab 9B
Tab 16A	Tab 16B
N/A	N/A
Tab 8A	Tab 8B

Tab 4A	Tab 4B
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

Survey Cover Sheet			
Survey date/s	12/01/2026	**Site name or location**	St Andrews Gardens, Gravesend
Weather conditions	Dry and clear	**Project or development name**	St Andrews Gardens, Gravesend
Surveyor name	Ruth Testa MCIEEM	**On-site or off-site**	On-Site
Survey reference		**Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)**	
Notes			

Site or location	Condition sheets	Total number of condition sheets used, or habitat parcels	Number of parcels of each condition achieved					Notes
			Good	Fairly Good	Moderate	Fairly Poor	Poor	
	Coastal							
	Coastal lagoons							
	Coastal saltmarsh							
	Ditches							
	Grassland low distinctiveness	5					5	
	Grassland medium, high, very high distinctiveness							
	Heathland							

	Hedgerow							
	Individual trees	6	3		3			
	Intertidal biogenic reefs							
	Intertidal hard structures							
	Intertidal seagrass							
	Intertidal sediment							
	Lakes							

	Limestone pavement							
	Line of trees							
	Orchard							
	Ponds							
	Rocky shore							
	Scrub							
	Sparsely vegetated land							

	Urban							
	Wetland							
	Woodland							
	Wood-pasture and parkland							

Condition Sheet: COASTAL Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes **Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle** **Sparsely vegetated land - Maritime cliff and slopes**
Habitat Description
See UKHab

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Condition Assessment Criteria		Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its 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.[1] **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[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]). Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] 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.		
	Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**
Passes 7 or 8 criteria including essential criterion A	Good (3)	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria; OR Passes 7 criteria excluding essential criterion A	Moderate (2)	
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 - General coastal species indicative of suboptimal condition: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, bramble, white willow *Salix alba* hybrids, sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* (only outside its restricted native range) and non-native garden plants.

Grassland species indicative of suboptimal condition: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*.

Heathland species indicative of suboptimal condition: bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*.

There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: COASTAL Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle
Sparsely vegetated land - Maritime cliff and slopes

Habitat Description

See UKHab

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
		Habitat parcel reference	
		Grid reference	

Condition Assessment Criteria		**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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.[1] **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[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]). Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] 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.											
	Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓										
Passes 7 or 8 criteria including essential criterion A	Good (3)											
Passes 5 or 6 criteria; OR Passes 7 criteria excluding essential criterion A	Moderate (2)											
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Notes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 - General coastal species indicative of suboptimal condition: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, bramble, white willow *Salix alba* hybrids, sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* (only outside its restricted native range), and non-native garden plants.

Grassland species indicative of suboptimal condition: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*.

Heathland species indicative of suboptimal condition: bracken *Pteridium aquilinum.*

There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: COASTAL LAGOONS Habitat Type			
EUNIS Habitat Type			
Coastal lagoons			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

The coastal lagoons EUNIS habitat description is available here:
EUNIS -Factsheet for Coastal lagoons (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Extent of lagoon waterbody[1];
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition[2];
- Salinity in parts per thousand (ppt);
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter;
- Visual record of water clarity;
- Observations of the functioning and state of the isolating barrier; and
- Observations of the functioning and state of the lagoon banks.

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion	Notes (such as justification)
A	**Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species**	Not more than one invasive non-native species is 'Occasional' on the SACFOR scale[3]; or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present, see Footnote 4.	No invasive non-native species are present above 'Frequent' on the SACFOR scale[3]; or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present, see Footnote 4.	One or more invasive non-native species 'Abundant' on the SACFOR scale[3]; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 4.		
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[5].	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[5].	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[5].		
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 6 for details.	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 100 m per hour. See Footnote 6 for details.	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 100 m per hour. See Footnote 6 for details.		
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[7].	Only small, isolated patches of physical damage present[7].	Evidence of significant physical damage[7].		
H	**Water clarity**	Water is clear.	Water clarity is reduced.	Water is turbid and water clarity is poor (not just after heavy rain).		
				Total Score (out of a possible 24)		

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 18-24 (75-100%) **= GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 12-17** (50-75%) **= MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 8-11** (0-50%) **= POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – The extent of the lagoon waterbody should be recorded at high tide. This should be assessed at the end of the summer (late August – early September) and gives an indication of the amount of water that is present at all times of year. It should be noted that some lagoons are naturally very shallow.

Footnote 2 - Examples of species adapted to lagoons can be found in Bamber (2010): BAMBER, R.N. (2010) *Coastal saline lagoons and the Water Framework Directive* [online]. Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 039. Available from:
Coastal saline lagoons and the Water Framework Directive - NECR039

For assessment of species characteristic of anoxic environments, for example presence of Capitellid worms, further information on the SACFOR scale can be found on the JNCC website at: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:

sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)

Footnote 3 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List (updated 2020)* [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

Footnote 4 - High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* -Trumpet tube worm
• *Styela clava* - Asian tunicate; leathery sea squirt, club tunicate
• *Corella eumyota* - Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* - Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Undaria pinnatifida* - Asian kelp, wakame
• *Schizoporella japonica* - Orange ripple bryozoan
•*Sargassum muticum* - Wire weed
• *Hemigrapsus sanguineus* - Asian shore crab

Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 5 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 6 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of the Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al. (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines*. EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Footnote 7 - Sources of physical damage include: excessive poaching, damage from machinery use, damaging management or public access activities.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: COASTAL LAGOONS Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Type

Coastal lagoons

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Habitat Description

The coastal lagoons EUNIS habitat description is available here:
EUNIS -Factsheet for Coastal lagoons (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Extent of lagoon waterbody[1];
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition[2];
- Salinity in parts per thousand (ppt);
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter;
- Visual record of water clarity;
- Observations of the functioning and state of the isolating barrier; and
- Observations of the functioning and state of the lagoon banks.

Habitat parcel reference									
Grid reference									

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per criterion**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	**Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species**	Not more than one invasive non-native species is 'Occasional' on the SACFOR scale[3]; or is occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present, see Footnote 4.	No invasive non-native species are present above 'Frequent' on the SACFOR scale[3]; or they occupy between 1-10% of the habitat. No high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition present, see Footnote 4.	One or more invasive non-native species 'Abundant' on the SACFOR scale[3]; they occupy more than 10% of the habitat; or a high-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition is present – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 4.											
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[5].	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[5].	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[5].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 6 for details.	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 100 m per hour. See Footnote 6 for details.	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 100 m per hour. See Footnote 6 for details.											
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[7].	Only small, isolated patches of physical damage present[7].	Evidence of significant physical damage[7].											

H	**Water clarity**	Water is clear.	Water clarity is reduced.	Water is turbid and water clarity is poor (not just after heavy rain).											
				Total Score (out of a possible 24)											
Condition Assessment Result					**Result Achieved**										
TOTAL SCORE 18-24 (75-100%) **= GOOD CONDITION**															
TOTAL SCORE 12-17 (50-75%) **= MODERATE CONDITION**															
TOTAL SCORE 8-11 (0-50%) **= POOR CONDITION**															
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score															

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – The extent of the lagoon waterbody should be recorded at high tide. This should be assessed at the end of the summer (late August – early September) and gives an indication of the amount of water that is present at all times of year. It should be noted that some lagoons are naturally very shallow.

Footnote 2 - Examples of species adapted to lagoons can be found in Bamber (2010): BAMBER, R.N. (2010) *Coastal saline lagoons and the Water Framework Directive* [online]. Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 039. Available from:
Coastal saline lagoons and the Water Framework Directive - NECR039 (naturalengland.org.uk)
For assessment of species characteristic of anoxic environments, for example presence of Capitellid worms, further information on the SACFOR scale can be found on the JNCC website at: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)

Footnote 3 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List (updated 2020)* [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

Footnote 4 - High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* -Trumpet tube worm
• *Styela clava* - Asian tunicate; leathery sea squirt, club tunicate
• *Corella eumyota* - Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* - Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Undaria pinnatifida* - Asian kelp, wakame
• *Schizoporella japonica* - Orange ripple bryozoan
•*Sargassum muticum* - Wire weed
• *Hemigrapsus sanguineus* - Asian shore crab

Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 5 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 6 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of the Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al. (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines

Footnote 7 - Sources of physical damage include: excessive poaching, damage from machinery use, damaging management or public access activities.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: COASTAL SALTMARSH Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Types

Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds
Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

EUNIS -Factsheet for Coastal saltmarshes and saline reedbeds (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- List of biological communities and species - including whether they are representative or characteristic of disturbance and or pollution;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Observations on zonation and transitions to other habitats, including variations in vegetation structure and sward height[1];
- Observations of naturally open ground or bare surfaces such as creeks or pans being present in a mosaic with vegetated areas;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Assessment of litter; and
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment.

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 2 for details.		
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[3].	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[3].	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[3].		
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 4.	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. See Footnote 4.	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. See Footnote 4.		
F	**Zonation and transition to other habitats**	Zonation of vegetation or communities is clear and continuous[5]. 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[5].	Zonation of vegetation or communities is not clearly visible or is significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline[5]. Or transitions to other habitats are restricted in more than 20% of the habitat boundaries.		
					Total score (out of a possible 18)	

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 14 - 18 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 9 - 13 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 6 - 8 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Assessment of grazing levels:
• Light grazing - most of the standing crop is not removed
• Moderate grazing - standing crop almost completely removed
• Heavy grazing - height < 10 cm, all standing crop removed
• Abandoned grazing – tall, matted vegetation, no standing crop removed

Footnote 2 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 3 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 4 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery/ceramic) using to MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. Science of the Total Environment [online], 579. Available from:

(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Footnote 5 - Vegetation zones can be described differently but these are the most likely to be found (seaward to landward):
1. Pioneer – open communities with one or more of the following – *Spartina* spp., *Salicornia* spp. and / or *Aster tripolium*. Zone covered by all tides except the lowest neap tides. 290-c.600 submersions per year.
2. Low marsh – generally closed communities with at least *Puccinellia maritima* and *Atriplex portulacoides* as well as the previous species; zone covered by most tides. 350-400 submergences per year. Middle marsh – generally closed communities with *Limonium* spp. and / or *Plantago maritima*, as well as low marsh species; zone covered only by spring tides. 150 to 220 submergences per year.
4. High marsh – generally closed communities with one or more of the following – *Festuca rubra*, *Armeria maritima*, *Elytrigia* spp., as well as the middle marsh species. Zone covered only by highest spring tides. Minimum 25 submergences, maximum 150 submergences per year.
5. Transition zone – vegetation intermediate between the high marsh and adjoining non-halophytic areas. Zone covered only occasionally during extreme storm events but can have salt spray influence from strong onshore winds.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: COASTAL SALTMARSH Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Types

Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds
Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Habitat Description

EUNIS -Factsheet for Coastal saltmarshes and saline reedbeds (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- List of biological communities and species - including whether they are representative or characteristic of disturbance and or pollution;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Observations on zonation and transitions to other habitats, including variations in vegetation structure and sward height[1];
- Observations of naturally open ground or bare surfaces such as creeks or pans being present in a mosaic with vegetated areas;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Assessment of litter; and
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment.

Habitat parcel reference										
Grid reference										

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per indicator**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 2 for details.											
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[3].	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[3].	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[3].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 4.	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. See Footnote 4.	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. See Footnote 4.											
F	**Zonation and transition to other habitats**	Zonation of vegetation or communities is clear and continuous[5]. 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[5].	Zonation of vegetation or communities is not clearly visible or is significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline[5]. Or transitions to other habitats are restricted in more than 20% of the habitat boundaries.											
				Total score (out of a possible 18)											

Condition Assessment Result

	Result Achieved										
TOTAL SCORE 14 - 18 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 9 - 13 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 6 - 8 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Assessment of grazing levels:
• Light grazing - most of the standing crop is not removed
• Moderate grazing - standing crop almost completely removed
• Heavy grazing - height < 10 cm, all standing crop removed
• Abandoned grazing – tall, matted vegetation, no standing crop removed

Footnote 2 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:

sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 3 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 4 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. Science of the Total Environment [online], 579. Available from:

(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:

(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Footnote 5 - Vegetation zones can be described differently but these are the most likely to be found (seaward to landward):
1. Pioneer – open communities with one or more of the following – *Spartina* spp., *Salicornia* spp. and / or *Aster tripolium*. Zone covered by all tides except the lowest neap tides. 290-c.600 submersions per year.
2. Low marsh – generally closed communities with at least *Puccinellia maritima* and *Atriplex portulacoides* as well as the previous species; zone covered by most tides. 350-400 submergences per year. Middle marsh – generally closed communities with *Limonium* spp. and / or *Plantago maritima*, as well as low marsh species; zone covered only by spring tides. 150 to 220 submergences per year.
4. High marsh – generally closed communities with one or more of the following – *Festuca rubra*, *Armeria maritima*, *Elytrigia* spp., as well as the middle marsh species. Zone covered only by highest spring tides. Minimum 25 submergences, maximum 150 submergences per year.
5. Transition zone – vegetation intermediate between the high marsh and adjoining non-halophytic areas. Zone covered only occasionally during extreme storm events but can have salt spray influence from strong onshore winds.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: DITCH Habitat Type			
Habitat Type			
Watercourses - Ditches			
Habitat Description			
See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The 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 aquatic 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[1].		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 8 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 6 or 7 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – This includes any species listed on the Water Framework Directive UKTAG GB High Impact Species List: Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:
UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)

• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides*, Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii*, parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum*, floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides*, Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* and giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).

• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus*, zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*, killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus*, demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes*, and carp *Cyprinus carpio*.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: DITCH Habitat Type

Habitat Type

Watercourses - Ditches

Habitat Description

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
		Habitat parcel reference	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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 aquatic 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[1].											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										
Passes 8 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 6 or 7 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – This includes any species listed on the Water Framework Directive UKTAG GB High Impact Species List: Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:
UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)

• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides*, Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii*, parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum*, floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides*, Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* and giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).

• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus*, zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*, killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus*, demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes*, and carp *Cyprinus carpio*.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Modified grassland			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	
Habitat Description			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2 present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.** Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m^2 (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.		
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.		
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 is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].		
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.		
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).		
		Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)	
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)	

Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Yes	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major*, white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Grassland - Modified grassland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location	On-site, St Andrews Gardens	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	12/01/2026 Ruth Testa
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	1	2	3	4	5						**Notes (such as justification)**
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2 present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.** Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m^2 (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	No	No	No	No	No						Average of 2 species per m2. Although the survey took place in the winter months, the current use of the Site and regularity of management make it unlikely to contain over 6 species per m2 on average.
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						Currently meets this condition, however likely to be more uniformly managed
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.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	No	No	No	No	No						large areas of bare ground due to access by foot traffic
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].	No	No	No	No	No						Over 10% bare ground across the Site.
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
	Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)	No	No	No	No	No						
	Number of criteria passed	4	4	4	4	4						

Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**									
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)										
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)										
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes					

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major*, white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland
Grassland - Lowland meadows
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland
Grassland - Other neutral grassland
Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430) [Not to be confused with the Tall forbs secondary code – see UKHab guidance for details.]
Grassland - Upland acid grassland
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Upland hay meadows
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type (and relative to Footnote 3 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description).[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**		
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.		
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens[2].		
D	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) is less than 5%.		
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.		

Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types			
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m^2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 3 and 5 cannot contribute towards this count). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**		
	Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Acid grassland types (Result out of 5 criteria)		
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Non-acid grassland types (Result out of 6 criteria)		
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F.	Good (3)	
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A.	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Notes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing for plant colonisation, or localised patches not exceeding 5% cover.

Footnote 3 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major*, white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high and very high distinctiveness)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland
Grassland - Lowland meadows
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland
Grassland - Other neutral grassland
Grassland - Tall herb communities (H6430) [Not to be confused with the Tall forbs secondary code – see UKHab guidance for details.]
Grassland - Upland acid grassland
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland
Grassland - Upland hay meadows
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)										Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type (and relative to Footnote 3 suboptimal species which may be listed in the UKHab description).[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**											
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.											
C	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens[2].											
D	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg.) is less than 5%.											
E	Combined cover of species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] and physical damage (such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities) accounts for less than 5% of total area. If any invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) are present, this criterion is automatically failed.											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for all non-acid grassland types												
F	There are 10 or more vascular plant species per m^2 present, including forbs that are characteristic of the habitat type (species referenced in Footnote 3 and 5 cannot contribute towards this count). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition for non-acid grassland types only.**											
	Essential criterion for Good condition achieved (for non-acid grassland) (Yes or No)											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓									
Acid grassland types (Result out of 5 criteria)											
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)										
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)										
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)										
Non-acid grassland types (Result out of 6 criteria)											
Passes 5 or 6 criteria, including essential criterion A and additional criterion F.	Good (3)										
Passes 3 - 5 criteria, including essential criterion A.	Moderate (2)										
Passes 2 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 3 or 4 criteria excluding criterion A and F.	Poor (1)										

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Notes

Footnote 1 - Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing for plant colonisation, or localised patches not exceeding 5% cover.

Footnote 3 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, greater plantain *Plantago major*, white clover *Trifolium repens* and cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Condition Sheet: HEATHLAND Habitat Type			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types			
Heathland and shrub - Lowland heathland **Heathland and shrub - Mountain heaths and willow scrub** **Heathland and shrub - Upland heathland**			
Habitat Description			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present.[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.**		
B	There are at least two dwarf shrub species Frequent[2], 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 vulgaris* 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[3] and shallon *Gaultheria shallon*[4]. **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.**		
F	No signs of disturbance of sensitive areas[5], including managed burns.		
G	No more than 33% of heather shoots have been recently grazed, or flowering heather plants are at least Frequent[2] 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%[6].		
K	No signs of any damaging activities[7] or contamination to the habitat such as: artificial drains, peat extraction, silt, leachate or eutrophication.		
Essential criteria for achieving Good condition achieved (Yes or No)			
Number of criteria passed			

Condition Assessment Result (out of 11 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**
Passes 9 - 11 criteria including all essential criteria A - E.	Good (3)	
Passes 7 or 8 criteria; OR Passes 9 - 10 criteria but fails any essential criteria (criteria A - E).	Moderate (2)	
Passes 6 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Professional judgement should be used to assess this and evidence should be provided according to the INSTRUCTIONS Tab of this spreadsheet.
Definition of sensitive areas:
(a) Vegetation severely wind-clipped, mostly forming a mat less than 10 cm thick.
(b) Areas where soils are thin and less than 5 cm deep.
(c) Hill slopes greater than 1 in 2 (26°), and all the sides of gullies.
(d) Ground with abundant, and or an almost continuous carpet of Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp., bilberry *Vaccinium myrtillus*, liverworts and or lichens.
(e) Areas with noticeably uneven structure, at a spatial scale of around 1 m^2 or less. The unevenness (more commonly found in very old heather stands) will relate to distinct, often large, spreading dwarf shrub bushes. The dwarf shrub canopy will not be completely continuous, and some of its upper surface may be twice as high as other parts. Layering is likely to be present and may be common.
(f) Pools, wet hollows, peat haggs and erosion gullies within 10 m of the edge of watercourses.

Footnote 6 – Cover of bracken may exceed 5% where there is an identified biodiversity benefit, for example bracken beds in the South Pennines as nesting sites for twite *Linaria flavirostris*.

Footnote 7 – Damaging activities include: accidental or unmanaged fires; managed fires on wet heath; excessive poaching; damage from machinery use or storage; and damaging levels of public access resulting in trampling and or litter.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: HEATHLAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Heathland and shrub - Lowland heathland
Heathland and shrub - Mountain heaths and willow scrub
Heathland and shrub - Upland heathland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with vascular and non-vascular characteristic indicator species consistently present.[1] **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.**											
B	There are at least two dwarf shrub species Frequent[2], 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 vulgaris* 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[3] and shallon *Gaultheria shallon*[4]. **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Good condition.**											
F	No signs of disturbance of sensitive areas[5], including managed burns.											
G	No more than 33% of heather shoots have been recently grazed, or flowering heather plants are at least Frequent[2] 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%[6].											
K	No signs of any damaging activities[7] or contamination to the habitat such as: artificial drains, peat extraction, silt, leachate or eutrophication.											
	Essential criteria for achieving Good condition achieved (Yes or No)											
	Number of criteria passed											
Condition Assessment Result (out of 11 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										

Passes 9 - 11 criteria including all essential criteria A - E.	Good (3)											
Passes 7 or 8 criteria; OR Passes 9 - 10 criteria but fails any essential criteria (criteria A - E).	Moderate (2)											
Passes 6 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Professional judgement should be used to assess this and evidence should be provided according to the INSTRUCTIONS Tab of this spreadsheet.
Definition of sensitive areas:
(a) Vegetation severely wind-clipped, mostly forming a mat less than 10 cm thick.
(b) Areas where soils are thin and less than 5 cm deep.
(c) Hill slopes greater than 1 in 2 (26°), and all the sides of gullies.
(d) Ground with abundant, and or an almost continuous carpet of Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp., bilberry *Vaccinium myrtillus*, liverworts and or lichens.
(e) Areas with noticeably uneven structure, at a spatial scale of around 1 m^2 or less. The unevenness (more commonly found in very old heather stands) will relate to distinct, often large, spreading dwarf shrub bushes. The dwarf shrub canopy will not be completely continuous, and some of its upper surface may be twice as high as other parts. Layering is likely to be present and may be common.
(f) Pools, wet hollows, peat haggs and erosion gullies within 10 m of the edge of watercourses.

Footnote 6 – Cover of bracken may exceed 5% where there is an identified biodiversity benefit, for example bracken beds in the South Pennines as nesting sites for twite *Linaria flavirostris*.

Footnote 7 – Damaging activities include: accidental or unmanaged fires; managed fires on wet heath; excessive poaching; damage from machinery use or storage; and damaging levels of public access resulting in trampling and or litter.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Types

Habitat Type

Native hedgerow
Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
Native hedgerow with trees
Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch
Species-rich native hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Condition Assessment Details

A series of ten attributes, representing key physical characteristics are used for this assessment. Each attribute is assigned to one of five functional groups (A – E) and the condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of attributes from these functional groups which pass or fail the 'favourable condition' criteria.

This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook[1] and Favourable Conservation Status document[2]. For further clarification please refer to the Hedgerow Survey Handbook.

Best practice would be to record the species, age, spacing and other key information about all trees present along a hedgerow within the 'Habitat Description' box, as well as other key features of the hedgerow.

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes

Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D and E)		Criteria - the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Criteria description	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core groups - applicable to all hedgerow types					
A1.	Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of the shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is >1.5 m height).		
A2.	Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (such as blackthorn *Prunus spinosa* suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they are >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).		
B1.	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).		
B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).		
C1.	Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m 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 hedgerow (at least).	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedgerow. Undisturbed ground is present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1 m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedgerow. This criterion recognises the value of the hedgerow base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.		

C2.	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	The indicator species used are nettles *Urtica* spp., cleavers *Galium aparine* and docks *Rumex* spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.		
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[3]) and recently introduced species.	Recently introduced species refer to plants that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives. For information on archaeophytes and neophytes see the JNCC website[4], as well as the BSBI website[5] where the 'Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora'[6] contains an up-to-date list of the status of species. For information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website[7].		
D2.	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (for example, excessive hedgerow cutting).		
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only					
E1.	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient[8]), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	This criterion addresses if there are a range of age-classes or morphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide opportunities for different species.		
E2.	Tree health	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.	This criterion identifies if the trees are subject to damage which compromises the survival and health of the individual specimens.		

The hedgerow condition assessment generates a weighting (score) ranging from 1 - 3, which is used within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The scores for each are set out in the tables below.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees		
Category	**Category Requirements**	**Metric Score**
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; **AND** No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3
Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total; **AND** Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes; **OR** Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1
	Score achieved:	

Condition categories for hedgerows with trees		
Category	**Category Requirements**	**Metric score**
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; **AND** No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3
Moderate	No more than 5 failures in total; **AND** Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 and E1 = Moderate condition).	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; **OR** Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1
	Score achieved:	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook. A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.* [online] Available on: layout (hedgelink.org.uk)

Footnote 2 – STALEY, J.T. ET AL. (2020) *Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows.* [online] Available on: Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows - RP2943 (naturalengland.org.uk)

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – CHEFFINGS, C. M. et al. (2005) *The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain.* Species Status 7: 1-116. [online] Available on: The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain (Species Status No. 7) | JNCC Resource Hub

Footnote 5 – BOTANICAL SOCIETY OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND (BSBI). *Definitions: wild, native or alien?* [online] Available on: Definitions: wild, native or alien? – Botanical Society of Britain & Ireland (bsbi.org)

Footnote 6 – BSBI and Biological Records Centre (BRC) (2022) *Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora.* [online] Available on:

Acknowledgements | Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora (brc.ac.uk)
Footnote 7 – GB NON-NATIVE SPECIES SECRETARIAT (GBNNSS) (2022) Available on:
Home » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
F**ootnote 8** – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition sheet: HEDGEROW Habitat Types

Return to "Selecting condition sheet" tab

Habitat Type

Native hedgerow
Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
Native hedgerow with trees
Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch
Species-rich native hedgerow
Species-rich native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees
Species-rich native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Condition Assessment Details

A series of ten attributes, representing key physical characteristics are used for this assessment. Each attribute is assigned to one of five functional groups (A – E) and the condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of attributes from these functional groups which pass or fail the 'favourable condition' criteria.

This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook[1] and Favourable Conservation Status document[2]. For further clarification please refer to the Hedgerow Survey Handbook.

Best practice would be to record the species, age, spacing and other key information about all trees present along a hedgerow within the 'Habitat Description' box, as well as other key features of the hedgerow.

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes

Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D and E)		Criteria - the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition'	Criteria description	Habitat parcel reference									Notes (such as justification)
				Grid reference									
Core groups - applicable to all hedgerow types				**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**									
A1.	Height	>1.5 m average along length	The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of the shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is >1.5 m height).										
A2.	Width	>1.5 m average along length	The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (such as blackthorn *Prunus spinosa* suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they are >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).										
B1.	Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length	This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).										
B2.	Gap - hedge canopy continuity	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m	This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).										
C1.	Undisturbed ground and perennial vegetation	>1 m 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 hedgerow (at least).	This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedgerow. Undisturbed ground is present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1 m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedgerow. This criterion recognises the value of the hedgerow base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.										
C2.	Nutrient-enriched perennial vegetation	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground.	The indicator species used are nettles *Urtica* spp., cleavers *Galium aparine* and docks *Rumex* spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.										
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[3]) and recently introduced species.	Recently introduced species refer to plants that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives. For information on archaeophytes and neophytes see the JNCC website[4], as well as the BSBI website[5] where the 'Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora'[6] contains an up-to-date list of the status of species. For information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website[7].										
D2.	Current damage	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities.	This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (for example, excessive hedgerow cutting).										
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only													
E1.	Tree class	There is more than one age-class (or morphology) of tree present (for example: young, mature, veteran and or ancient[8]), and there is on average at least one mature, ancient or veteran tree present per 20 - 50m of hedgerow.	This criterion addresses if there are a range of age-classes or morphologies which allow for replacement of trees and provide opportunities for different species.										
E2.	Tree health	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.	This criterion identifies if the trees are subject to damage which compromises the survival and health of the individual specimens.										

The hedgerow condition assessment generates a weighting (score) ranging from 1 - 3, which is used within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. The scores for each are set out in the tables below.

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees			Score achieved							
Category	**Category Requirements**	**Metric Score**								
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; **AND** No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3								
Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total; **AND** Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and C2 = Moderate condition).	2								
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes; **OR** Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1								
		Score achieved:								

Condition categories for hedgerows with trees			Score achieved							
Category	**Category Requirements**	**Metric score**								
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; **AND** No more than 1 failure in any functional group.	3								
Moderate	No more than 5 failures in total; **AND** Does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 and E1 = Moderate condition).	2								
Poor	Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; **OR** Fails both attributes in more than one functional group (for example, fails attributes A1, A2, B1 and B2 = Poor condition).	1								
		Score achieved:								

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes
Footnote 1 – DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook. A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK*. [online] Available on: layout (hedgelink.org.uk) **Footnote 2** – STALEY, J. T. ET AL. (2020) *Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows*. [online] Available on: Definition of Favourable Conservation Status for Hedgerows - RP2943 (naturalengland.org.uk) **Footnote 3** – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). **Footnote 4** – CHEFFINGS, C. M. et al. (2005) *The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain*. Species Status 7: 1-116. [online] Available on: The Vascular Plant Red Data List for Great Britain (Species Status No. 7)	JNCC Resource Hub **Footnote 5** – BOTANICAL SOCIETY OF BRITAIN AND IRELAND (BSBI). *Definitions: wild, native or alien?* [online] Available on: Definitions: wild, native or alien? - Botanical Society of Britain & Ireland (bsbi.org) **Footnote 6** – BSBI and Biological Records Centre (BRC) (2022) *Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora*. [online] Available on: Acknowledgements	Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora (brc.ac.uk) **Footnote 7** – GB NON-NATIVE SPECIES SECRETARIAT (GBNNSS) (2022) Available on: Home a NNSS (nonnativespecies.org) **Footnote 8** – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from: Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk) and Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Individual trees – Urban trees
Individual trees – Rural trees
Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.

Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment):
Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.

Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):
Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 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)[1].		
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.		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INDIVIDUAL TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Individual trees – Urban trees
Individual trees – Rural trees
Complete a condition sheet for each tree or block of trees.

Please see the separate Line of trees condition sheet for a line of rural trees. You should only use the Line of trees condition assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

T1 - Norway Maple small. T2 - Norway Maple medium, T3 - willow, large, heavily pollarded, T4/T5/T7/T8 silver birch, small. T6 Norway Maple, medium

Individual trees (description applied to the urban or rural environment):
Young trees over 7.5 cm in diameter at breast height whose canopies are not touching.

Urban Perimeter / Linear Blocks and Groups (description applied to the urban environment only):
Groups or stands of trees (size requirement as defined above) within and around the perimeter of urban land. This includes those along urban streets, highways, railways and canals, and also former field boundary trees incorporated into developments. Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously. Groups of urban trees that don't match the descriptions for woodland may be assessed within this category.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8			
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature)[1].	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No			
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No			
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
	Number of criteria passed	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4			

Condition Assessment Result (out of 6 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**									
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Good (3)	Yes	Yes	Yes							
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)										

Note that 'Fairly Good and Fairly Poor' condition categories are not available for this broad habitat type.

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score[2]

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 - Enhancement of this habitat type is only possible by improving the habitat so that it meets all Criteria B, D and F. It is not possible or appropriate to enhance individual tree/s through meeting just one or two of those Criteria, nor by meeting Criteria A, C or E.

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL BIOGENIC REEFS Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Types

Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels
Littoral biogenic reefs - Sabellaria
Artificial littoral biogenic reefs

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
Littoral biogenic reefs - JNCC Marine Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Percentage cover of recognisable biogenic reef structures across the bed;
- Distribution of the habitat seaward and landward limits and extent;
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter;
- Whether the habitat distribution is constrained by human modification; and
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water.

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.		
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].		

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 (when examining a beach strandline / mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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 per person per 100 m per hour. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.		
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)		

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of the Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL BIOGENIC REEFS Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Types

Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels
Littoral biogenic reefs - Sabellaria
Artificial littoral biogenic reefs

Habitat Description

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
Littoral biogenic reefs - JNCC Marine Habitat Classification

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Percentage cover of recognisable biogenic reef structures across the bed;
- Distribution of the habitat seaward and landward limits and extent;
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter;
- Whether the habitat distribution is constrained by human modification; and
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water.

Habitat parcel reference										
Grid reference										

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion										Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.											
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline / mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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 per person per 100 m per hour. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.											
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)											

Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**	

TOTAL SCORE 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**

TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:

sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)

Use the non-native species list available here:

Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)

DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:

Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:

• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt

• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)

Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:

Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:

NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of the Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:

(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:

(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL HARD STRUCTURES Habitat Type

Artificial Habitat Types

Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial features of hard structures
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water; and
- Assessment of litter.

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.		
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].		

D	**Litter (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.		
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.		
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)		

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE** 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm
• *Corella eumyota* – Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* – Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Schizoporella japonica* – Orange ripple bryozoan
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery/ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL HARD STRUCTURES Habitat Type

Artificial Habitat Types

Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial features of hard structures
Intertidal hard structures - Artificial hard structures with integrated greening of grey infrastructure (IGGI)

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)		**Limitations (if applicable)**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric.

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water; and
- Assessment of litter.

Habitat parcel reference										
Grid reference										

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per criterion**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.											
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].											
D	**Litter (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.											
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.											
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)											

Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**										
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm
• *Corella eumyota* – Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* – Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Schizoporella japonica* – Orange ripple bryozoan
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:

(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEAGRASS Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass - on peat, clay or chalk
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
JNCC littoral seagrass bed habitat description

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Percentage cover of seagrass across the bed;
- Distribution of the seagrass landward, seaward and extent should be recorded;
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter; and
- Evidence of visible rhizomes

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for list.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.		

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[2].	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[2].	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[2].		
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.		
				Total score (out of a possible 15)		

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 12 - 15 (75-100%) **= GOOD CONDITION**	
TOTAL SCORE 8 - 11 (50-75%) **= MODERATE CONDITION**	
TOTAL SCORE 5 - 7 (0-50%) **= POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Eriocheir sinensis* – Chinese mitten crab
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:

NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:

(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEAGRASS Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass - on peat, clay or chalk
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
JNCC littoral seagrass bed habitat description

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Percentage cover of seagrass across the bed;
- Distribution of the seagrass landward, seaward and extent should be recorded;
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter; and
- Evidence of visible rhizomes.

Habitat parcel reference									
Grid reference									

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per criterion**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for list.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.											
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.											
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)											

Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**										
TOTAL SCORE 12 - 15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 8 - 11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 5 - 7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from: sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)

Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)

DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include:
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Eriocheir sinensis* – Chinese mitten crab
Please check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:

NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)

The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:

(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEDIMENT Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Littoral coarse sediment
Littoral sand
Littoral muddy sand
Littoral mud
Littoral mixed sediments
Features of littoral sediment
Artificial littoral coarse sediment
Artificial littoral mixed sediments
Artificial littoral mud
Artificial littoral muddy sand
Artificial littoral sand

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
EUNIS littoral sediment description

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
• Description of sediment character;
• Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
• Description of species diversity and community composition;
• Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
• Observations on transitions to other habitats;
• Assessment of litter;
• Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
• Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water; and
• Description of zonation.

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per criterion	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.		

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[2].	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[2].	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[2].		
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.		
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)		

Condition Assessment Result	Result Achieved
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 8-11** (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 5-7** (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

- *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm
- *Styela clava* - Asian tunicate; leathery sea squirt, club tunicate
- *Corella eumyota* - Orange-tipped sea squirt
- *Grateloupia turuturu* - Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide

Intertidal mixed sediment A2.4

- *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm

Always check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:

NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.

VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEDIMENT Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Littoral coarse sediment
Littoral sand
Littoral muddy sand
Littoral mud
Littoral mixed sediments
Features of littoral sediment
Artificial littoral coarse sediment
Artificial littoral mixed sediments
Artificial littoral mud
Artificial littoral muddy sand
Artificial littoral sand

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Habitat Description

See tab G1 of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and the below:
EUNIS littoral sediment description

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Description of sediment character;
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes;
- Description of species diversity and community composition;
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Observations on transitions to other habitats;
- Assessment of litter;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water; and
- Description of zonation.

Habitat parcel reference									
Grid reference									

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per criterion**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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, see Footnote 1 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 1 for details.											
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[2].	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[2].	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[2].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.	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. See Footnote 3 for details.											
				Total Score (out of a possible 15)											

Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**										
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.or

- *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm
- *Styela clava* - Asian tunicate; leathery sea squirt, club tunicate
- *Corella eumyota* - Orange-tipped sea squirt
- *Grateloupia turuturu* - Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide

Intertidal mixed sediment A2.4

- *Ficopomatus enigmaticus* - Trumpet tube worm

Always check for updates of high-risk species.

Footnote 2 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 3 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:

(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LAKE Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental lakes, or use Pond condition sheet for Ornamental ponds and pools]
Lakes - High alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Low alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Marl lakes
Lakes - Moderate alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Peat lakes
Lakes - Reservoirs
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170) [Use this condition sheet for Temporary lakes, or use Pond condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools]

Habitat Description

See Water Framework Directive:
WFD Lakes typologies description
For 'Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies', 'Reservoirs' and 'Temporary lakes, ponds and pools' see UK Habitat Classification:
UKHab

Condition Assessment Criteria

The Freshwater Biological Association 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' is used to assess the condition of lakes. Scores for four attributes (physical, hydrological, chemical, and biological naturalness) are averaged to generate an overall 'habitat naturalness assessment score' which can then be translated into a condition score for use in the metric (see below).

There are other elements considered in the lake naturalness assessment, but these are not included when calculating the condition assessment score.

Details of the methodology for assessing naturalness of lakes are available at:
Contribute naturalness data – Discovering Priority Habitats in England

The key documents are:
Lake naturalness assessment – guidance document (PDF)
Annex I – Printable lake naturalness survey form to use in field (PDF)
Annex II – Physical naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex-III - Hydrological naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex IV – Chemical naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex V – Plant functional group photographs (PDF)
Annex VI – Further species recording (PDF)

We encourage recording of data on lakes on the Freshwater Biological Association 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' website portal:
Contribute data – Discovering Priority Habitats in England (wpengine.com)

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Average 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' Class	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved
1 Natural	Good (3)	
2	Fairly good (2.5)	
3	Moderate (2)	
4	Fairly poor (1.5)	
5 Least natural	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LAKE Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental lakes, or use Pond condition sheet for Ornamental ponds and pools]
Lakes - High alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Low alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Marl lakes
Lakes - Moderate alkalinity lakes
Lakes - Peat lakes
Lakes - Reservoirs
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170) [Use this condition sheet for Temporary lakes, or use Pond condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools]

Habitat Description

See Water Framework Directive:
WFD Lakes typologies description
For 'Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies', 'Reservoirs' and 'Temporary lakes, ponds and pools' see UK Habitat Classification:
UKHab

Condition Assessment Criteria

The Freshwater Biological Association 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' is used to assess the condition of lakes. Scores for four attributes (physical, hydrological, chemical, and biological naturalness) are averaged to generate an overall 'habitat naturalness assessment score' which can then be translated into a condition score for use in the metric (see below).

There are other elements considered in the lake naturalness assessment, but these are not included when calculating the condition assessment score.

Details of the methodology for assessing naturalness of lakes are available at:

Contribute naturalness data – Discovering Priority Habitats in England

The key documents are:

Lake naturalness assessment – guidance document (PDF)
Annex I – Printable lake naturalness survey form to use in field (PDF)
Annex II – Physical naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex - III Hydrological naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex IV – Chemical naturalness photographs (PDF)
Annex V – Plant functional group photographs (PDF)
Annex VI – Further species recording (PDF)

We encourage recording of data on lakes on the Freshwater Biological Association 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' website portal:
Contribute data – Discovering Priority Habitats in England (wpengine.com)

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**									
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)									
		Habitat parcel reference									
Limitations (if applicable)											
		Grid reference									
Average 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' Class	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved**									
1 Natural	Good (3)										
2	Fairly good (2.5)										
3	Moderate (2)										
4	Fairly poor (1.5)										
5 Least natural	Poor (1)										

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LIMESTONE PAVEMENT Habitat Type			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Sparsely vegetated land - Limestone pavement			
Habitat Description			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		Survey date and Surveyor name	
Limitations (if applicable)		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Grid reference		Habitat parcel reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	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)[1] is less than 1%. Non-native species in this instance include beech *Fagus sylvatica* and sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*[2].		
C	Species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] 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.		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Criterion passed (Yes or No)
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 3 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes
Footnote 1 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). **Footnote 2** – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. **Footnote 3** – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: perennial rye-grass *Lolium perenne*, false oat-grass *Arrhenatherum elatius*, crested dog's-tail *Cynosurus cristatus*, bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg., creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, other pernicious perennial species. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LIMESTONE PAVEMENT Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Sparsely vegetated land - Limestone pavement

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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)[1] is less than 1%. Non-native species in this instance include beech *Fagus sylvatica* and sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*[2].											
C	Species indicative of suboptimal condition[3] 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.											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 4 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 3 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: perennial rye-grass *Lolium perenne*, false oat-grass *Arrhenatherum elatius*, crested dog's-tail *Cynosurus cristatus*, bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg., creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, other pernicious perennial species. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Line of trees
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch
Ecologically valuable line of trees
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch

Please see the separate Individual trees condition sheet for linear blocks and groups of trees in an urban setting. You should only use this Line of trees condition assessment and record this habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook[1]. For further clarifications please refer to the Handbook.
Where ancient and veteran trees are present within the line of trees, see Footnote 2 for standing advice.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	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[2].		
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.		
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook: A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.* 2nd ed [online]. Defra, London. PB1195. Available from: Hedgerow Survey Handbook (publishing.service.gov.uk).

Footnote 2 – Where ancient and veteran trees are present, see gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from: Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)

and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Line of trees
Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch
Ecologically valuable line of trees
Ecologically valuable line of trees – associated with bank or ditch

Please see the separate Individual trees condition sheet for linear blocks and groups of trees in an urban setting. You should only use this Line of trees condition assessment and record this habitat type in rural locations.

Habitat Description

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
This assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook[1]. For further clarifications please refer to the Handbook.
Where ancient and veteran trees are present within the line of trees, see Footnote 2 for standing advice.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

Condition Assessment Criteria		**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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[2].											
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.											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook: A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.* 2nd ed [online]. Defra, London. PB1195. Available from: Hedgerow Survey Handbook (publishing.service.gov.uk).

Footnote 2 – Where ancient and veteran trees are present, see gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: ORCHARD Habitat Type			
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type			
Grassland - Traditional orchard			
Habitat Description			
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification			
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**	**Notes (such as justification)**
A	Presence of ancient[1] and or veteran[1] 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 plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 10% of ground cover.		
	Essential criteria achieved (required for good condition - Yes or No)		

	Number of criteria passed		
Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**	
Passes 6- 8 criteria, including essential criteria A and B.	Good (3)		
Passes 4 or 5 criteria; OR Passes 6 or 7 criteria but fails an essential criterion.	Moderate (2)		
Passes 3 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, by applying professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* and common nettle *Urtica dioica*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: ORCHARD Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Grassland - Traditional orchard

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	Presence of ancient[1] and or veteran[1] 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 plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 10% of ground cover.											
	Essential criteria achieved (required for Good condition - Yes or No)											
	Number of criteria passed											
Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										

Passes 6- 8 criteria, including essential criteria A and B.	Good (3)											
Passes 4 or 5 criteria; OR Passes 6 or 7 criteria but fails an essential criterion.	Moderate (2)											
Passes 3 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, curled dock *Rumex crispus*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* and common nettle *Urtica dioica*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type

Habitat Type

Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170) [Use this condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools, use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes]
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental ponds, use Lake condition sheet for Ornamental lakes]

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - applicable to all ponds (woodland[1] and non-woodland):			
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[2], pumps or pipework.		
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species[3].		
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.		
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for all non-woodland ponds:			

H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)[4] cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.		
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Results for woodland ponds which require assessment of 7 core criteria		
Passes 7 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	
Results for non-woodland ponds which require assessment of 9 criteria		
Passes 9 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 6 to 8 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat.

Footnote 2 – This excludes natural dams such as those created by Eurasian beaver *Castor fiber*.

Footnote 3 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent: WFD UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:
UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)
• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides*, Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii*, parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum*, floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides* and Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica*, giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).
• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus*, zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha*, killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus*, demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes*, carp *Cyprinus carpio*.

Footnote 4 - If the pond is seasonal (as in, it dries out in most summers) then emergent species alone are likely to be found.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type

Habitat Type

Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)
Lakes - Temporary lakes ponds and pools (H3170) [Use this condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools, use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes]
Lakes - Ornamental lake or pond [Use this condition sheet for Ornamental ponds, use Lake condition sheet for Ornamental lakes]

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)										Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - applicable to all ponds (woodland[1] and non-woodland):												
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[2], pumps or pipework.											
F	There is an absence of listed non-native plant and animal species[3].											
G	The pond is not artificially stocked with fish. If the pond naturally contains fish, it is a native fish assemblage at low densities.											
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for all non-woodland ponds:												
H	Emergent, submerged or floating plants (excluding duckweed)[4] cover at least 50% of the pond area which is less than 3 m deep.											
I	The pond surface is no more than 50% shaded by adjacent trees and scrub.											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓										
Results for woodland ponds which require assessment of 7 core criteria												
Passes 7 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 5 or 6 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Results for non-woodland ponds which require assessment of 9 criteria											
Passes 9 criteria	Good (3)										
Passes 6 to 8 criteria	Moderate (2)										
Passes 5 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)										

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat.

Footnote 2 – This excludes natural dams such as those created by Eurasian beaver *Castor fiber*.

Footnote 3 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive (WFD) UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent: WFD UKTAG (2021) *Classification of aquatic alien species according to their level of impact* [online]. Available from:
UKTAG classification of alien species working paper v8.pdf (wfduk.org)
• Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern *Azolla filiculoides*, Australian swamp stonecrop *Crassula helmsii*, parrot's feather *Myriophyllum aquaticum*, floating pennywort *Hydrocotyle ranunculoides* and Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica*, giant hogweed *Heracleum mantegazzianum* (on the bank).
• Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish *Pacifastacus leniusculus*, zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha*, killer shrimp *Dikerogammarus villosus*, demon shrimp *Dikerogammarus haemobaphes*, carp *Cyprinus carpio*.

Footnote 4 - If the pond is seasonal (as in, it dries out in most summers) then emergent species alone are likely to be found.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: ROCKY SHORE Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Habitat Description

EUNIS -Factsheet for Features of littoral rock (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
• Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes across the full vertical extent of the shore[1];
• Description of species diversity and community composition across the full vertical extent of the shore[1];
• Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
• Presence and abundance of non-native species;
• Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
• Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
• Assessment of litter; and
• Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water.

Condition Assessment Criteria

Indicator		Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 point)	Poor (1)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 2 for details.		
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[3].	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[3].	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[3].		
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 4 for details.	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. See Footnote 4 for details.	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. See Footnote 4 for details.		

Total score (out of a possible 15)	
Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) **= GOOD CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 8-11** (50-75%) **= MODERATE CONDITION** **TOTAL SCORE 5-7** (0-50%) **= POOR CONDITION**	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Distribution patterns of rocky shore communities are shaped by environmental stress gradients, in particular the vertical gradient from the low tide line up to terrestrial conditions at the top of the shore. This results in species being present in clearly conspicuous zones. Other environmental stresses, like exposure to wave action, also impact distribution patterns. This results in differing zonation patterns in either sheltered or wave-exposed shores, and in rocky shores often being temporally and spatially highly variable at a local scale. Surveys should therefore record all condition assessment criteria across the full vertical and horizontal extent of the shore. Reference: BURROWS, M.T., ET AL. (2014) *Marine Strategy Framework Directive Indicators for UK rocky Shores Part 1: Defining and validating the indicators.* JNCC Report, No. 522, SAMS/MBA/NOCS for JNCC, JNCC Peterborough. Available from:
Marine Strategy Framework Directive Indicators for UK Rocky Shores - Part 1: Defining and validating the indicators (jncc.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 - Details on abundances estimated using SACFOR scale available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include (please check for updates of high-risk species):
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Corella eumyota* – Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* – Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Schizoporella japonica* – Orange ripple bryozoan

Footnote 3 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 4 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. *Science of The Total Environment* [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: ROCKY SHORE Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	

Habitat Description

EUNIS -Factsheet for Features of littoral rock (europa.eu)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment sheet:
- Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes across the full vertical extent of the shore[1];
- Description of species diversity and community composition across the full vertical extent of the shore[1];
- Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present;
- Presence and abundance of non-native species;
- Percentage cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment;
- Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts;
- Assessment of litter; and
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) classification of overlying water.

Habitat parcel reference									
Grid reference									

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 point)**	**Poor (1)**	**Score per indicator**										**Notes (such as justification)**
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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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, see Footnote 2 for details.	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 – GB Non-native Species Secretariat should be notified, see Footnote 2 for details.											
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[3].	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[3].	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[3].											
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 (when examining a beach strandline, mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)**	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. See Footnote 4 for details.	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. See Footnote 4 for details.	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. See Footnote 4 for details.											
				Total score (out of a possible 15)											

Condition Assessment Result	**Result Achieved**										
TOTAL SCORE 12-15 (75-100%) = **GOOD CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 8-11 (50-75%) = **MODERATE CONDITION**											
TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = **POOR CONDITION**											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Distribution patterns of rocky shore communities are shaped by environmental stress gradients, in particular the vertical gradient from the low tide line up to terrestrial conditions at the top of the shore. This results in species being present in clearly conspicuous zones. Other environmental stresses, like exposure to wave action, also impact distribution patterns. This results in differing zonation patterns in either sheltered or wave-exposed shores, and in rocky shores often being temporally and spatially highly variable at a local scale. Surveys should therefore record all condition assessment criteria across the full vertical and horizontal extent of the shore.
Reference: BURROWS, M.T., ET AL. (2014) *Marine Strategy Framework Directive Indicators for UK rocky Shores Part 1: Defining and validating the indicators.* JNCC Report, No. 522, SAMS/MBA/NOCS for JNCC, JNCC Peterborough. Available from:
Marine Strategy Framework Directive Indicators for UK Rocky Shores - Part 1: Defining and validating the indicators (jncc.gov.uk)

Footnote 2 - Details on abundances estimated using SACFOR scale available here: JNCC (No date) *SACFOR abundance scale used for both littoral and sublittoral taxa from 1990 onwards* [online]. Available from:
sacfor.pdf (jncc.gov.uk)
Use the non-native species list available here:
Microsoft Word - UK_Marine_NIS_priority_list_2020 (nonnativespecies.org)
DEFRA (2022) *UK Marine Non-Indigenous Species Priority List* (updated 2020) [online]. Available on:
Marine Pathways Group » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
High-risk species indicative of suboptimal condition at time of publication include (please check for updates of high-risk species):
• *Didemnum vexillum* – Carpet sea squirt
• *Hemigrapsus* spp. – Asian Shore crabs (*H. sanguineus*, *H. takanoi* or *H. penicillatus*)
• *Corella eumyota* – Orange-tipped sea squirt
• *Grateloupia turuturu* – Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide
• *Schizoporella japonica* – Orange ripple bryozoan

Footnote 3 - Peak bloom time is July – September.

Footnote 4 - Please use the method as set out in Nelms et al (2017) to identify litter m^{-1} min^{-1} $person^{-1}$, which is summarised below:
Collect litter along a linear transect parallel with the strandline, located between the back of the beach and the strandline. The transect should be 100 m long. Assign gathered items of litter to one of 101 item categories, and further classify them into 12 material groups (plastic, polystyrene, rubber, cloth, metal, medical, sanitary, faeces, paper, wood, glass, pottery or ceramic) using MCS classifications. Following this, record and sum all anthropogenic litter items and remove them from the beach. Litter identification guides may be useful, please see Nelms et al (2017) for more details on the method:
NELMS, S.E. ET AL. (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data. Science of The Total Environment [online], 579. Available from:
(PDF) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data (researchgate.net)
The indicator thresholds for litter are based on the methods in Van Loon et al (2020), which is guidance developed within the Common Implementation Strategy for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD) by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.
VAN LOON, W. ET AL. (2020). *A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines.* EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg. [online] Available from:
(PDF) A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines (researchgate.net)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: SCRUB Habitat Type			
Habitat Types			
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub **Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub** **Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub** **Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub** **Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub** **Heathland and shrub - Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)** **Heathland and shrub - Willow scrub**			
Habitat Description			
For Dunes with sea buckthorn see:	Dunes with sea-buckthorn (Dunes with Hippophae rhamnoides) - Special Areas of Conservation (jncc.gov.uk)		
For other scrub types see:	ukhab – UK Habitat Classification		
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description (where in its natural range).[1] - At least 80% of scrub is native, - There are at least three native woody species[2], - No single species comprises more than 75% of the cover (except hazel *Corylus avellana*, common juniper *Juniperus communis*, sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* (only in its restricted native range), or box *Buxus sempervirens*, which can be up to 100% cover).		
B	Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran[3]) shrubs are all present.		
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[6] make up less than 5% of ground cover.		
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.		
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)	

Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)		

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Native woody species as defined and listed in the Hedgerow Survey Handbook: DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook: A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.* 2nd ed. [online]. Defra, London. PB1195. Available from: Hedgerow Survey Handbook (publishing.service.gov.uk).

Footnote 3 – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran species. Available from:

Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk) and

Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 6 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type may include: non-native conifers, tree-of-heaven *Alianthus altissima*, holm oak *Quercus ilex*, European turkey oak *Quercus cerris*, cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, snowberry *Symphoricarpos* spp., shallon *Gaultheria shallon*, American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*, buddleia *Buddleja* spp., cotoneaster *Cotoneaster* spp., Spanish bluebell *Hyacinthoides hispanica* and hybrid bluebells *Hyacinthoides x massartiana*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: SCRUB Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub
Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub
Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub
Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub
Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub
Heathland and shrub - Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)
Heathland and shrub - Willow scrub

Habitat Description

For Dunes with sea buckthorn see:	Dunes with sea-buckthorn (Dunes with Hippophae rhamnoides) - Special Areas of Conservation (jncc.gov.uk)
For other scrub types see:	ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)										Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description (where in its natural range).[1] - At least 80% of scrub is native, - There are at least three native woody species[2], - No single species comprises more than 75% of the cover (except hazel *Corylus avellana*, common juniper *Juniperus communis*, sea buckthorn *Hippophae rhamnoides* (only in its restricted native range), or box *Buxus sempervirens*, which can be up to 100% cover).											
B	Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature (or ancient or veteran[3]) shrubs are all present.											
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[4] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[5]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[6] make up less than 5% of ground cover.											
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.											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 5 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓										
Passes 5 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 3 or 4 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Native woody species as defined and listed in the Hedgerow Survey Handbook: DEFRA (2007) *Hedgerow Survey Handbook: A standard procedure for local surveys in the UK.* 2nd ed. [online]. Defra, London. PB1195. Available from: Hedgerow Survey Handbook (publishing.service.gov.uk).

Footnote 3 – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran species. Available from:

Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk) and
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Footnote 4 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 5 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 6 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type may include: non-native conifers, tree-of-heaven *Alianthus altissima*, holm oak *Quercus ilex*, European turkey oak *Quercus cerris*, cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, snowberry *Symphoricarpos* spp., shallon *Gaultheria shallon*, American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*, buddleia *Buddleja* spp., cotoneaster *Cotoneaster* spp., Spanish bluebell *Hyacinthoides hispanica* and hybrid bluebells *Hyacinthoides x massartiana*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: SPARSELY VEGETATED LAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Sparsely vegetated land - Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats
Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	The parcel represents a good example of its specific sparsely vegetated habitat type - the appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches its UKHab description, with characteristic indicator species consistently present.[1]		
B	The cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, scrub and trees is less than 25%.		
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover.		
D	Vegetation cover of vascular and non-vascular plants is between 5 and 50%.		
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result (out of 4 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓
Passes 4 criteria	Good (3)	
Passes 3 criteria	Moderate (2)	
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, docks *Rumex* spp., brambles *Rubus* spp., common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris* and common nettle *Urtica dioica*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: SPARSELY VEGETATED LAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Sparsely vegetated land - Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats
Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)										Notes (such as justification)
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.[1]											
B	The cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, scrub and trees is less than 25%.											
C	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover.											
D	Vegetation cover of vascular and non-vascular plants is between 5 and 50%.											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 4 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/ ✓										
Passes 4 criteria	Good (3)											
Passes 3 criteria	Moderate (2)											
Passes 2 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, docks *Rumex* spp., brambles *Rubus* spp., common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris* and common nettle *Urtica dioica*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral
Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs
Urban - Allotments
Urban - Biodiverse green roof
Urban - Bioswale
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards
Urban - Facade-bound green wall
Urban - Ground based green wall
Urban - Intensive green roof
Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land
Urban - Rain garden
Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
Urban - Vacant or derelict land
Urban - Bare ground

Habitat Description

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats:			UKHab – UK Habitat Classification
On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - must be assessed for **all urban habitat types**:			
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[1]) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement)[2] cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area[3]. **Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).**		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** only:			
D	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.		
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for **Bioswale and SuDS** habitat types only:			
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife[4].		
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Intensive green roofs** only:			

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).		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Biodiverse green roofs** only:			
G	The roof has a varied depth of 80 – 150 mm; at least 50% is at 150 mm 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.**		
		Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No)	
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**
Results for habitats requiring assessment of **3 core criteria** only **(all listed urban habitats except Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land, Bioswale, SuDS and Green roofs)**:		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Good (3)	
• Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria.	Poor (1)	
Results for **Green roofs** and **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** (requiring assessment of **4 criteria** only - core criteria plus additional criterion specified for habitat type):		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes additional criterion relevant to specific habitat type (D, F or G).	Good (3)	
• Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria.	Poor (1)	
Results for **Bioswale or SuDS** (requiring assessment of **5 criteria** - core criteria plus additional criteria specified for habitat type):		
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E)	Good (3)	
• Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR • Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)	
• Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 2 – Sources of information about detrimental non-native species can be found on the GB Non-native Species Secretariat (GBNNSS) website:
Home » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
and Natural England Access to Evidence page should also be checked for up-to-date information:
Horizon-scanning for invasive non-native plants in Great Britain - NECR053 (naturalengland.org.uk)
For criterion C – For green roof habitat types only – buddleia *Buddleja davidii* should be assessed alongside Schedule 9 species. This species impairs the health of the local ecosystem and reduces the biodiversity potential of the roof. It is also a sign that a roof has not been planted and seeded correctly in subsequent years.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Use professional judgement. Sources of information about non-native species that are not detrimental to native wildlife can be found on the GBNNSS website:
Alternative plants » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: URBAN Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/Ephemeral
Sparsely vegetated land - Tall forbs
Urban - Allotments
Urban - Biodiverse green roof
Urban - Bioswale
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards
Urban - Facade-bound green wall
Urban - Ground based green wall
Urban - Intensive green roof
Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land
Urban - Rain garden
Urban - Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
Urban - Vacant or derelict land
Urban - Bare ground

Habitat Description

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for green roofs, and UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) for other habitats: ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

Condition Assessment Criteria												
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										**Notes (such as justification)**
Core Criteria - must be assessed for **all urban habitat types**:												
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[1]) and others which are to the detriment of native wildlife (using professional judgement)[2] cover less than 5% of the total vegetated area[3]. **Note - to achieve Good condition, this criterion must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).**											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** only:												
D	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.											
Additional Criteria - must be assessed for **Bioswale and SuDS** habitat types only:												
E1	Plant species are mostly native. If non-native species are present, they should not be detrimental to the habitat or native wildlife[4].											
E2	The vegetation is comprised of plant species suited to wetland or riparian situations.											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Intensive green roofs** only:												
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).											
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Biodiverse green roofs** only:												

G	The roof has a varied depth of 80 – 150 mm; at least 50% is at 150 mm 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.**											
	Essential criteria relevant for habitat type achieved (Yes or No)											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**									
Results for habitats requiring assessment of **3 core criteria** only **(all listed urban habitats except Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land, Bioswale, SuDS and Green roofs)**:											
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Good (3)										
• Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)										
• Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria.	Poor (1)										
Results for **Green roofs** and **Open mosaic habitat on previously developed land** (requiring assessment of **4 criteria** only - core criteria plus additional criterion specified for habitat type):											
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes additional criterion relevant to specific habitat type (D, F or G).	Good (3)										
• Passes 2 or 3 of 4 criteria; OR • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)										
• Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria.	Poor (1)										
Results for **Bioswale or SuDS** (requiring assessment of **5 criteria** - core criteria plus additional criteria specified for habitat type):											
• Passes all 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for Good condition within criterion C; AND • Passes all additional criteria relevant to specific habitat type (Group E)	Good (3)										
• Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria; OR • Passes 5 of 5 criteria but does not meet the requirements for Good condition within criterion C.	Moderate (2)										
• Passes 2 or fewer of 5 criteria.	Poor (1)										

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 2 – Sources of information about detrimental non-native species can be found on the GB Non-native Species Secretariat (GBNNSS) website:
Home » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)
and Natural England Access to Evidence page should also be checked for up-to-date information:
Horizon-scanning for invasive non-native plants in Great Britain - NECR053 (naturalengland.org.uk)
For criterion C – For green roof habitat types only – buddleia *Buddleja davidii* should be assessed alongside Schedule 9 species. This species impairs the health of the local ecosystem and reduces the biodiversity potential of the roof. It is also a sign that a roof has not been planted and seeded correctly in subsequent years.

Footnote 3 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 4 – Use professional judgement. Sources of information about non-native species that are not detrimental to native wildlife can be found on the GBNNSS website:
Alternative plants » NNSS (nonnativespecies.org)

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: WETLAND Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Grassland - Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM - See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
Wetland - Blanket bog
Wetland - Depression on peat substrates (H7150)
Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)
Wetland - Lowland raised bog
Wetland - Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)
Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures
Wetland - Reedbeds
Wetland - Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)

Habitat Description

For Oceanic valley mires - see EUNIS

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for Floodplain wetland mosaic (FWM) and coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (CFGM). For CFGM also see the below:

Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh UK BAP Priority Habitat description
Priority Habitat Inventory (England) - data.gov.uk
All other wetland habitats - see UK Habitat Classification (UKHab):
UKHab

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
Core Criteria - must be assessed for **all wetland habitat types**:			
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.[1]		
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 plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 5% of ground cover.		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Fen and Purple moor grass and rush pasture** habitats only:			
G	No more than 25% of the habitat area has a continuous cover of litter (such as dead vegetation) preventing regeneration.		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Bog** habitats only:			
H	Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp. and cottongrasses *Eriophorum* spp. are at least Frequent[5]. Cover of ericaceous dwarf shrubs[6] is less than 75%.		

Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Reedbed** habitats only:			
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[7] and or wet woodland.		
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM** only:			
J	All ditches recorded within the habitat achieve Good condition as assessed using the Ditch condition sheet.		
		Essential criterion achieved (required for Good condition) Yes or No:	
		Number of criteria passed	

Condition Assessment Result	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 6 criteria (Depression on peat substrates (H7150) and Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)):		
•Passes 5 or 6 core criteria, including criterion A.	Good (3)	
•Passes 3 or 4 core criteria; OR •Passes 5 core criteria but fails criterion A.	Moderate (2)	
•Passes 2 or fewer core criteria.	Poor (1)	
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 7 criteria - core criteria and additional criterion specified for habitat type - all habitat types except Depression on peat substrates (H7150) and Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1):		
•Passes 5 or 6 core criteria including criterion A; AND •Passes additional criterion G, H, I or J (choose the one specified for the habitat type).	Good (3)	
•Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria; OR •Passes 6 of 7 criteria but fails criterion A or additional criterion G, H, I or J (choose the one specified for the habitat type).	Moderate (2)	
•Passes 3 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, docks *Rumex* spp., and common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 5 – According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 6 – Ericaceous dwarf shrubs include: crowberry *Empetrum nigrum*, cowberry *Vaccinium vitis-idaea*, bilberry *Vaccinium myrtillus*, cranberry *Vaccinium oxycoccos*, heather *Calluna vulgaris*, cross-leaved heath *Erica tetralix*, and bell heather *Erica cinerea*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 7 – For fens, specify what fen type is present using base-status and trophic status - alkaline, neutral, or acidic; eutrophic, mesotrophic or oligotrophic.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: WETLAND Habitat Type

Habitat Types

Grassland - Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM - See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.
Wetland - Blanket bog
Wetland - Depression on peat substrates (H7150)
Wetland - Fens (upland and lowland)
Wetland - Lowland raised bog
Wetland - Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)
Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures
Wetland - Reedbeds
Wetland - Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)

Habitat Description

For Oceanic valley mires - see EUNIS

See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide for Floodplain wetland mosaic (FWM) and coastal and floodplain grazing marsh (CFGM). For CFGM also see the below:

Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh UK BAP Priority Habitat description
Priority Habitat Inventory (England) - data.gov.uk
All other wetland habitats - see UK Habitat Classification (UKHab):
UKHab

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

Condition Assessment Criteria		**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**											**Notes (such as justification)**
Core Criteria - must be assessed for **all wetland habitat types**:													
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.[1]												
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 plant species[2] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[3]) and species indicative of suboptimal condition[4] make up less than 5% of ground cover.												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Fen and Purple moor grass and rush pasture** habitats only:													
G	No more than 25% of the habitat area has a continuous cover of litter (such as dead vegetation) preventing regeneration.												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Bog** habitats only:													
H	Sphagnum moss *Sphagnum* spp. and cottongrasses *Eriophorum* spp. are at least Frequent[5]. Cover of ericaceous dwarf shrubs[6] is less than 75%.												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Reedbed** habitats only:													

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[7] and or wet woodland.												
Additional Criterion - must be assessed for **Floodplain wetland mosaic and CFGM** only:													
J	All ditches recorded within the habitat achieve Good condition as assessed using the Ditch condition sheet.												
Essential criterion achieved (required for Good condition) Yes or No:													
Number of criteria passed													

Condition Assessment Result	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/ ✓**										
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 6 criteria (Depression on peat substrates (H7150) and Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)):												
•Passes 5 or 6 core criteria, including criterion A.	Good (3)											
•Passes 3 or 4 core criteria; OR •Passes 5 core criteria but fails criterion A.	Moderate (2)											
•Passes 2 or fewer core criteria.	Poor (1)											
Results for habitats requiring assessment of 7 criteria - core criteria and additional criterion specified for habitat type - all habitat types except Depression on peat substrates (H7150) and Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1):												
•Passes 5 or 6 core criteria including criterion A; AND •Passes additional criterion G, H, I or J (choose the one specified for the habitat type).	Good (3)											
•Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria; OR •Passes 6 of 7 criteria but fails criterion A or additional criterion G, H, I or J (choose the one specified for the habitat type).	Moderate (2)											
•Passes 3 or fewer criteria.	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – Professional judgement should be used alongside the UKHab description.

Footnote 2 – Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement.

Footnote 3 – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 4 – Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type include: creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, common nettle *Urtica dioica*, docks *Rumex* spp., and common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 5 – According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 6 – Ericaceous dwarf shrubs include: crowberry *Empetrum nigrum*, cowberry *Vaccinium vitis-idaea*, bilberry *Vaccinium myrtillus*, cranberry *Vaccinium oxycoccos*, heather *Calluna vulgaris*, cross-leaved heath *Erica tetralix*, and bell heather *Erica cinerea*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Footnote 7 – For fens, specify what fen type is present using base-status and trophic status - alkaline, neutral, or acidic; eutrophic, mesotrophic or oligotrophic.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland
Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification
This condition sheet is based on the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG) Woodland Condition Survey Method, available here: Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)

IMPORTANT: This biodiversity metric woodland condition assessment must be used to assess woodland being input into the biodiversity metric. The outputs of this condition assessment are not equivalent to, nor are they comparable with the scores from the EWBG condition assessment, because the EWBG assessment has been adapted for the biodiversity metric, including the removal of EWBG Indicator 7 (Proportion of favourable land cover around woodland) and Indicator 14 (Size of woodland), and minor changes to other indicators.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator	Notes (such as justification)
A	**Age distribution of trees**	Three age-classes[1] present.	Two age-classes[1] present.	One age-class[1] present.		
B	**Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage**	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in less than 40% of whole woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland[2].		
C	**Invasive plant species**	No invasive species[3] present in woodland.	Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* or cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* not present, and other invasive species[3] <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species[3] ≥10% cover.		
D	**Number of native tree species**	Five or more native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species[4] across woodland parcel.		
E	**Cover of native tree and shrub species**	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native[5].		

F	**Open space within woodland**	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted[7].	21 - 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6].	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category[7].		
G	**Woodland regeneration**	All three classes present in woodland[8]; trees 4 - 7 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth.	One or two classes only present in woodland[8].	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland[8].		
H	**Tree health**	Tree mortality 10% or less, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback[9].	11% to 25% tree mortality and or crown dieback or low-risk pest or disease present[9].	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high-risk pest or disease present[9].		
I	**Vegetation and ground flora**	Recognisable NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.		
J	**Woodland vertical structure**	Three or more storeys across all survey plots, or a complex woodland[11].	Two storeys across all survey plots[11].	One or less storey across all survey plots[11].		
K	**Veteran trees**	Two or more veteran trees[12] per hectare.	One veteran tree[12] per hectare.	No veteran trees[12] present in woodland.		
L	**Amount of deadwood**	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].		
M	**Woodland disturbance**	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident[14].	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area, and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground[14].	1 hectare or more of nutrient enrichment, and or 20% or more of woodland area has damaged ground[14].		
				Total Score (out of a possible 39)		

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Result Achieved
Total score >32 (33 to 39)	Good (3)	
Total score 26 to 32	Moderate (2)	
Total score <26 (13 to 25)	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnotes below refer to the EWBG woodland condition assessment details: EWBG (No date). *Assessing your Woodland's Condition* [online]. Available from:

Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)

The woodland condition assessment survey methodology is outlined in the EWBG toolkit. However the criteria on this sheet are those specific to the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and must be used when assessing woodland condition.

Footnote 1 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 1 for more information. If tree species is not a birch *Betula* sp., cherry *Prunus* sp. or *Sorbus* sp.: 0 – 20 years (Young); 21 - 150 years (Intermediate); and >150 years (Old). For birch, cherry or *Sorbus* species; 0 - 20 years = Young; 21 - 60 years =Intermediate; >60 years = Old. A recognisable age-class should be a consistent recognisable layer across the woodland or stand being assessed. Presence of a few saplings would not indicate that the woodland has an 'age-class' of young trees.

Footnote 2 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 2 for more information. Browsing pressure is considered to be significant where >20% of vegetation visible within each survey plot shows damage from any type of browsing pressure listed.

Footnote 3 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 3 for more information. Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly.

Check for the presence of all plant species listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), particularly the following invasive non-native species: American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*; Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera*; Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica*; cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*; shallon *Gaultheria shallon*; snowberry *Symphoricarpos albus*; variegated yellow archangel *Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. argentatum*; rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum*; and tree-of-heaven *Alianthus altissima*.

Footnote 4 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 4 and Table 2 for more information. The number of different native tree or shrub species including young trees and shrubs. A list of commonly found native tree and shrub species is provided in Table 2. Not all species listed are native to all parts of the UK. Note a list of commonly found non-native tree species are also included and should be recorded if present.

Footnote 5 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 5 and for more information. The abundance of native tree species in upper (>5 m) and understorey (up to 5 m) layers including young trees and shrubs.

Footnote 6 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 6 for more information. Open space within woodland in this context is temporary open space in which trees can be expected to regenerate (for example, glades, rides, footpaths, areas of clear-fell). This differs from permanent open space where tree regeneration is not possible or desirable (for example, tarmac, buildings, rivers). Area is at least 10 m wide with less than 20% covered by shrubs or trees.

Footnote 7 – Given the increased ratio of edge habitat to woodland where the woodland is <10ha.

Footnote 8 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 8 for more information. This indicator measures regeneration potential of the woodland by considering three classes: seedlings; saplings; and young trees of 4-7 cm DBH. All three classes would fall in the 'young' category of the 'age distribution of trees' indicator, but the regeneration indicator gathers additional information by considering regeneration potential - if seedlings, saplings and young trees are all present that means natural regeneration processes are happening.

Footnote 9 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 9 for more information and Table 3 for a list of diseases and pests and their risk level.

Footnote 10 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 10 directing to NVC key for more information. The 'UKHab to NVC translation table' in the UK Habitat Classification resources may also be useful to assess this.

Footnote 11 – This criterion looks at structural diversity and is useful to understand in conjunction with the age of trees in a woodland. Vertical structure is defined as the number of canopy storeys present. Possible storey values are: 1) Upper; 2) Complex: recorded when the stand is composed of multiple tree heights that cannot easily be stratified into broad height bands (such as upper, middle or lower); 3) Middle; 4) Lower; and 5) Shrub layer. There might be no storeys where the woodland has been felled. See EWBG INDICATOR 11 for more information.

Footnote 12 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 12 for more information. See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:

Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
EWBG INDICATOR 12 is the relevant indicator.

Footnote 13 – See EWBG method INDICATOR 13 for more information. This includes logs, large dead branches on the forest floor and stumps (<1 m tall) >20 cm diameter at narrowest point and >50 cm long. Also includes standing dead trees (>1 m tall) and also deadwood on standing live trees. Diameter is measured at the narrowest point on the stem. Minimum diameter of 20 cm.

Footnote 14 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 15 for more information. Examples of disturbance are: significant nutrient enrichment; soil compaction from trampling, machinery, animal poaching or litter.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Types

Woodland and forest - Lowland beech and yew woodland
Woodland and forest - Lowland mixed deciduous woodland
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification
This condition sheet is based on the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG) Woodland Condition Survey Method, available here:
Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)

IMPORTANT: This biodiversity metric woodland condition assessment must be used to assess woodland being input into the biodiversity metric. The outputs of this condition assessment are not equivalent to, nor are they comparable with the scores from the EWBG condition assessment, because the EWBG assessment has been adapted for the biodiversity metric, including the removal of EWBG Indicator 7 (Proportion of favourable land cover around woodland) and Indicator 14 (Size of woodland), and minor changes to other indicators.

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**		**Habitat parcel reference**										
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**		**Grid reference**										

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	**Good (3 points)**	**Moderate (2 points)**	**Poor (1 point)**	**Score per indicator**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	**Age distribution of trees**	Three age-classes[1] present.	Two age-classes[1] present.	One age-class[1] present.											
B	**Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage**	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in less than 40% of whole woodland[2].	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland[2].											
C	**Invasive plant species**	No invasive species[3] present in woodland.	Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* or cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus* not present, and other invasive species[3] <10% cover.	Rhododendron or cherry laurel present, or other invasive species[3] ≥10% cover.											
D	**Number of native tree species**	Five or more native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Three to four native tree or shrub species[4] found across woodland parcel.	Two or less native tree or shrub species[4] across woodland parcel.											
E	**Cover of native tree and shrub species**	>80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	50 - 80% of canopy trees and 50 - 80% of understory shrubs are native[5].	<50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native[5].											
F	**Open space within woodland**	10 - 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. Unless woodland is <10ha, in which case 0 - 20% temporary open space is permitted[7].	21 - 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6].	<10% or >40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space[6]. But if woodland <10ha has <10% temporary open space, please see Good category[7].											
G	**Woodland regeneration**	All three classes present in woodland[8]; trees 4 - 7 cm Diameter at Breast Height (DBH), saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth.	One or two classes only present in woodland[8].	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland[8].											

H	**Tree health**	Tree mortality 10% or less, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback[9].	11% to 25% tree mortality and or crown dieback or low-risk pest or disease present[9].	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high-risk pest or disease present[9].											
I	**Vegetation and ground flora**	Recognisable NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present, strongly characterised by ancient woodland flora specialists.	Recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.	No recognisable woodland NVC plant community[10] at ground layer present.											
J	**Woodland vertical structure**	Three or more storeys across all survey plots, or a complex woodland[11].	Two storeys across all survey plots[11].	One or less storey across all survey plots[11].											
K	**Veteran trees**	Two or more veteran trees[12] per hectare.	One veteran tree[12] per hectare.	No veteran trees[12] present in woodland.											
L	**Amount of deadwood**	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, branch stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have deadwood, such as standing and fallen deadwood, large dead branches and or stems, stubs and stumps, or an abundance of small cavities[13].											
M	**Woodland disturbance**	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident[14].	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area, and or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground[14].	1 hectare or more of nutrient enrichment, and or 20% or more of woodland area has damaged ground[14].											
				Total Score (out of a possible 39)											

Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Result Achieved										
Total score >32 (33 to 39)	Good (3)											
Total score 26 to 32	Moderate (2)											
Total score <26 (13 to 25)	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnotes below refer to the EWBG woodland condition assessment details: EWBG (No date). *Assessing your Woodland's Condition* [online]. Available from: Woodland Wildlife Toolkit (sylva.org.uk)

The woodland condition assessment survey methodology is outlined in the EWBG toolkit. However the criteria on this sheet are those specific to the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and must be used when assessing woodland condition.

Footnote 1 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 1 for more information. If tree species is not a birch *Betula* sp., cherry *Prunus* sp. or *Sorbus* sp.: 0 - 20 years (Young); 21 - 150 years (Intermediate); and >150 years (Old). For birch, cherry or *Sorbus* species; 0 - 20 years = Young; 21 - 60 years =Intermediate; >60 years = Old. A recognisable age-class should be a consistent recognisable layer across the woodland or stand being assessed. Presence of a few saplings would not indicate that the woodland has an 'age-class' of young trees.

Footnote 2 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 2 for more information. Browsing pressure is considered to be significant where >20% of vegetation visible within each survey plot shows damage from any type of browsing pressure listed.

Footnote 3 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 3 for more information. Assess this for each distinct habitat parcel. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, split into parcels accordingly.

Check for the presence of all plant species listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), particularly the following invasive non-native species: American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*; Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera*; Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica*; cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*; shallon *Gaultheria shallon*; snowberry *Symphoricarpos albus*; variegated yellow archangel *Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. argentatum*; rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum*; and tree-of-heaven *Alianthus altissima*.

Footnote 4 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 4 and Table 2 for more information. The number of different native tree or shrub species including young trees and shrubs. A list of commonly found native tree and shrub species is provided in Table 2. Not all species listed are native to all parts of the UK. Note a list of commonly found non-native tree species are also included and should be recorded if present.

Footnote 5 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 5 and for more information. The abundance of native tree species in upper (>5 m) and understorey (up to 5 m) layers including young trees and shrubs.

Footnote 6 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 6 for more information. Open space within woodland in this context is temporary open space in which trees can be expected to regenerate (for example, glades, rides, footpaths, areas of clear-fell). This differs from permanent open space where tree regeneration is not possible or desirable (for example, tarmac, buildings, rivers). Area is at least 10 m wide with less than 20% covered by shrubs or trees.

Footnote 7 – Given the increased ratio of edge habitat to woodland where the woodland is <10ha.

Footnote 8 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 8 for more information. This indicator measures regeneration potential of the woodland by considering three classes: seedlings; saplings; and young trees of 4-7 cm DBH. All three classes would fall in the 'young' category of the 'age distribution of trees' indicator, but the regeneration indicator gathers additional information by considering regeneration potential - if seedlings, saplings and young trees are all present that means natural regeneration processes are happening.

Footnote 9 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 9 for more information and Table 3 for a list of diseases and pests and their risk level.

Footnote 10 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 10 directing to NVC key for more information. The 'UKHab to NVC translation table' in the UK Habitat Classification resources may also be useful to assess this.

Footnote 11 – This criterion looks at structural diversity and is useful to understand in conjunction with the age of trees in a woodland. Vertical structure is defined as the number of canopy storeys present. Possible storey values are: 1) Upper; 2) Complex: recorded when the stand is composed of multiple tree heights that cannot easily be stratified into broad height bands (such as upper, middle or lower); 3) Middle; 4) Lower; and 5) Shrub layer. There might be no storeys where the woodland has been felled. See EWBG INDICATOR 11 for more information.

Footnote 12 - See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:

Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

EWBG INDICATOR 12 is the relevant indicator.

Footnote 13 – See EWBG method INDICATOR 13 for more information. This includes logs, large dead branches on the forest floor and stumps (<1 m tall) >20 cm diameter at narrowest point and >50 cm long. Also includes standing dead trees (>1 m tall) and also deadwood on standing live trees. Diameter is measured at the narrowest point on the stem. Minimum diameter of 20 cm.

Footnote 14 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 15 for more information. Examples of disturbance are: significant nutrient enrichment; soil compaction from trampling, machinery, animal poaching or litter.

Return to ‘Selecting condition sheet’ tab

Condition Sheet: WOOD-PASTURE AND PARKLAND Habitat Type

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Woodland and forest - Wood-pasture and parkland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)**	
Grid reference		**Habitat parcel reference**	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	Criterion passed (Yes or No)	Notes (such as justification)
A	Presence of ancient and or veteran trees[1]. **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[1] 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[2].		
D	Frequent[3] 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. See Footnote 4 for details.		
H	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[5] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[6]), and species indicative of suboptimal condition[7] make up less than 5% cover (this excludes ancient and veteran trees).		
	Number of criteria passed		

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score	Score Achieved ×/✓
Passes 7 or 8 criteria and meets criterion A	Good (3)	
Passes 5 or 6 criteria OR Passes 7 criteria but fails criterion A	Moderate (2)	
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)	

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
'Veteran' is not an age-class of tree, but in a habitat context refers to those trees having veteran characteristics, but which may be any age.

Footnote 2 - The composition of native scrub provides opportunities for natural tree regeneration and tree protection without affecting the integrity of the habitat mosaic.

Footnote 3 - According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 4 - Examples evidencing a management regime that creates open habitat ground cover with varied structure may include: grassland with varied sward height, or heathland with a range of age-classes of heather *Calluna vulgaris* or other dwarf shrubs.

Footnote 5 - Assess this for each distinct habitat block. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, define blocks accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. Since wood-pasture and parkland is a mosaic habitat comprising a variety of plant structures and heights, careful consideration should be used when splitting a habitat into parcels; moreover, splitting a habitat into blocks does not change its habitat type.

Footnote 6 - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 7 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type may include: non-native conifers, tree-of-heaven *Ailanthus altissima*, *Ailanthus* spp., holm oak *Quercus ilex*, European turkey oak *Quercus cerris*, cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, shallon *Gaultheria shallon*, American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*, snowberry *Symphoricarpos* spp., buddleia *Buddleja* spp., cotoneaster *Cotoneaster* spp., Spanish bluebell *Hyacinthoides hispanica* and hybrid bluebells *Hyacinthoides x massartiana*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Condition Sheet: WOOD-PASTURE AND PARKLAND Habitat Type

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Woodland and forest - Wood-pasture and parkland

Habitat Description

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location		**Survey date and Surveyor name**	
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	
Limitations (if applicable)		**Habitat parcel reference**	
		Grid reference	

	Condition Assessment Criteria	**Criterion passed (Yes or No)**										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	Presence of ancient and or veteran trees[1]. **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[1] 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[2].											
D	Frequent[3] 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. See Footnote 4 for details.											
H	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[5] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[6]), and species indicative of suboptimal condition[7] make up less than 5% cover (this excludes ancient and veteran trees).											
	Number of criteria passed											

Condition Assessment Result (out of 8 criteria)	**Condition Assessment Score**	**Score Achieved ×/✓**										
Passes 7 or 8 criteria and meets criterion A	Good (3)											
Passes 5 or 6 criteria OR Passes 7 criteria but fails criterion A	Moderate (2)											
Passes 4 or fewer criteria	Poor (1)											

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Footnotes

Footnote 1 – See gov.uk standing advice on ancient and veteran trees. Available from:
Keepers of time: ancient and native woodland and trees policy in England (publishing.service.gov.uk)
and:
Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)
'Veteran' is not an age-class of tree, but in a habitat context refers to those trees having veteran characteristics, but which may be any age.

Footnote 2 - The composition of native scrub provides opportunities for natural tree regeneration and tree protection without affecting the integrity of the habitat mosaic.

Footnote 3 - According to the relative abundance DAFOR scale – Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional or Rare.

Footnote 4 - Examples evidencing a management regime that creates open habitat ground cover with varied structure may include: grassland with varied sward height, or heathland with a range of age-classes of heather *Calluna vulgaris* or other dwarf shrubs.

Footnote 5 - Assess this for each distinct habitat block. If the distribution of invasive non-native species varies across the habitat, define blocks accordingly, applying a buffer zone around the invasive non-native species with a size relative to its risk of spread into adjacent habitat, using professional judgement. Since wood-pasture and parkland is a mosaic habitat comprising a variety of plant structures and heights, careful consideration should be used when splitting a habitat into blocks; moreover, splitting a habitat into parcels does not change its habitat type.

Footnote 6 - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Footnote 7 - Species indicative of suboptimal condition for this habitat type may include: non-native conifers, tree-of-heaven *Ailanthus altissima*, *Ailanthus* spp., holm oak *Quercus ilex*, European turkey oak *Quercus cerris*, cherry laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*, shallon *Gaultheria shallon*, American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*, snowberry *Symphoricarpos* spp., buddleia *Buddleja* spp., cotoneaster *Cotoneaster* spp., Spanish bluebell *Hyacinthoides hispanica* and hybrid bluebells *Hyacinthoides x massartiana*. There may be additional relevant species local to the region and or site.

Return to 'Selecting condition sheet' tab

Condition + Encroachment Reporting Sheet: RIVERS and STREAMS		
River Condition Assessment (RCA) + Encroachment results for: Priority rivers,		
Site name/location:		Unique river section reference:
GPS of MoRPh5 midpoint		River section length:
Rivers and streams form naturally draining networks within the wider landscape.		
RCA River Type and Habitat Description for full river section (from walkover su		
THE RESULTS OF THE 32 RCA INDICATORS FOR EACH RIVER SECTION SHOULD BE INSERTED		
Condition Assessment Criteria		RCA Index values
RCA INDEX ID	RCA INDEX NAME	Insert values -4 to 0 OR 0 to 4; Highlight those >2 OR <-2
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 richness	
C6	Bank face bare sediment extent	
C7	*Bank face artificial bank profile extent*	
C8	*Bank face reinforcement extent*	
C9	*Bank face reinforcement material severity*	
C10	*Bank face NNIPS cover*	
CHANNEL MARGIN		
D1	Channel margin aquatic vegetation extent	
D2	Channel margin aquatic morphotype richness	
D3	Channel margin physical feature extent	
D4	Channel margin physical feature richness	
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 natural features extent	
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*	

Overview of RCA and river section assessment

River Condition Assessment PRELIMINARY SCORE:		**River Type and class bands:**
River Shape index:		**Is the river channel OVERDEEP?** *If yes, what supporting evidence is provided?*
River Condition Assessment FINAL CLASS:		**IS THE RCA FINAL CLASS MODIFIED ?** *If yes, why and what supporting evidence is provided?*

Summary of RCA results (and Encroachment where applicable) with recommen

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve the river condition score

Other rivers and streams, Canals

rvey)

BELOW WITH NOTES TO EXPLAIN

Notes / Justification

Explain where significant, the influence of high/low RCA indices on overall river condition

t

ndations for improvements

Version
Version 1.0.0
Version 1.0.1
Version 1.0.2

Changes made
Initial draft statutory version
Individual trees tab – added wording to say *'Please see the separate Line of Trees condition sheet for rural trees. You should on* *assessment and record that habitat type in rural locations.'* Individual trees tab – Changed *'Canopies must overlap continuously'* to *'Canopies should predominantly overlap continuously'* Coastal tab – wording added to the list of 'General coastal species indicative of suboptimal condition' to say *'sea buckthorn (on* Scrub tab – wording added to Criterion A to say sea buckthorn can be 100% cover *'(only in its restricted native range)'* Instructions tab – changed date at top of sheet from 'November 2023' to 'February 2024' Habitat definitions tab – removed reference to 'see Technical Annex 2' from the table. Cells C11, C131 – C140. Hedgerow tab – 'See the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2 and UK Habitat Classification' removed, leaving just tl Intertidal biogenic reefs tab – changed 'see the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2' to say 'see tab G1 of the Statu Intertidal hard structures tab – changed 'see the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2' to say 'see tab G1 of the Stat Intertidal seagrass tab– changed 'see the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2' to say 'see tab G1 of the Statutory Bi Intertidal sediment tab– changed 'see the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2' to say 'see tab G1 of the Statutory B Pond tab– removed 'For ponds (non-priority) – see the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Technical Annex 2.' Habitat Definitions tab – cell E48 – removed reference to '<2ha' for Ornamental lake or pond. Habitat Definitions tab – cell E54, E55 – changed '<=2ha', from Ponds (priority) and Ponds (non-priority) to '<2ha'. Habitat Definitions tab - row 55 – removed references to Ponds (non-priority) having a definition different to that in UKHab.
Formatting corrections to sheet 8B Reformatting of instructions and habitat definition sheets Clarification of information in the habitat definitions sheet Addition of the RCA form Amended references in habitat definition sheet

Date released
29th November 2023
12th February 2024
3rd July 2025