Technical Note

E: enquiries@croftecology.co.uk

Project: Land South of Fillongley Road, Meriden	**Our Reference:** 260715.EcologyReview.v1
To: Meriden Parish Council	**Date:** 21 October 2026
Subject: Botanical Assessment and Technical Ecological Review	**Prepared by:** Jeff Grant MCIEEM CEnv and Anna Scott-Swift MCIEEM

Introduction

Croft Ecology was commissioned by Meriden Parish Council to undertake a detailed botanical assessment of an area of land south of Fillongley Road, Meriden; and a technical review of ecological information submitted to Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) as part of planning application PL/2026/00900/PPOL. Reports reviewed included:

- EDP (2026). Land South of Fillongley Road Meriden. Interim Ecological Appraisal.
- EDP (2026). Land South of Fillongley Road Meriden. Ecological Appraisal -
- EDP (2026) BNG Metric, reference PL_2026_00900_PPOL-BNG-2454852
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council Consultation response dated 28th September, reference PL_2026_00900_PPOL-SMBC_ECOLOGY_CONSULTATION_RESPONSE-2532958
- Documentation provided by local residents relating to species activity at and around the site.
- Tree Preservation order (TPO) 2026 (No 01435)

The assessment and document review was requested by the Parish Council to provide an independent review of the Site and documentation to assess whether the ecological survey work undertaken as part of the application was appropriate for the scale and nature of the development and satisfies the requirements of the local plan and national planning policy.

This Technical Note details the botanical survey undertaken and its findings, and details the findings of the document review, noting whether the submitted reporting meets with recommended survey guidance and, if not, highlighting gaps in the survey effort or recommendations which may need to be addressed.

Personnel

The survey was undertaken by Jeff Grant CEnv MCIEEM, Associate Ecologist at Croft Ecology. Jeff has over 14 years of experience working in ecology and has undertaken and reviewed dozens of PEAs and Ecological Impact Assessments (EcIA) for projects across a range of scales; including large housing developments, utilities infrastructure and road developments. Jeff holds a Level 2 protected species survey licences for bats, a level 2 licence for great crested newts, and has held badger sett closure licence in his name.

Methodology

A UK Habitat (UKHab) [1] Field Survey was undertaken in accordance with the methodology described within v2.0 documentation (2023) and was used as the basis for subsequent assessment in line with the standards and methods described within the Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM), 2018) and Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (CIEEM, 2017).

A fine-scale minimum mapping unit (of 25m2 or 5m) was deemed appropriate for use at the Site given its relatively small scale, consequently, only habitats with an area of 25m2 or greater, or linear features 5m in length or greater, were mapped.

The UKHab uses primary codes whereby habitats are categorised by an increasingly detailed hierarchy until a match is discovered. Secondary codes describe environmental factors that provide additional information such as management regime, hydrology or similar. In this case, each habitat was assigned a Primary Code at the Level 4 hierarchy and secondary codes were applied where these could provide greater context1.

During the field survey, the habitats of F1 and F6 were thoroughly observed, described, and mapped. A DAFOR abundance (D = dominant, A = abundant, F = frequent, O = occasional, R = rare) was assigned to each botanical species identified in each habitat and nomenclature followed Stace (Stace, 2019). A general walkover of the wider site was undertaken to obtain a general ecological picture of the Site.

Quadrat sampling was also undertaken within habitat F6 to provide a more detailed assessment of botanical composition and species diversity. A total of five 1m × 1m quadrats were surveyed within each habitat, with locations selected using systematic sampling. Within each quadrat, all vascular plant species were identified and their percentage cover estimated, with the results used to inform habitat classification and condition assessment.

Survey Limitations

The intention of the detailed botanical survey was to undertake quadrat surveying of fields F1 and F6. Quadrat surveying of F6 was undertaken in line with National Vegetation Classification guidance (JNCC,2006); with five quadrats, each measuring 1m by 1m in size, sampled within the field. At the time of the survey field F1 comprised a dog walking field to which no access was available, and as such the area could only be surveyed from the boundary fence. While this prevented a detailed survey of the whole area, based on the habitat and species identified within a robust comparison to the previous ecological survey could be made.

In addition, the survey was undertaken during a period of prolonged dry weather/drought conditions. As a result, areas of grassland were desiccated, with some herbaceous species having died back or become dormant earlier than would typically be expected, potentially limiting the identification of certain plant species. Despite this, sufficient indicator species remained identifiable to allow the habitats to be classified confidently and their condition assessed in accordance with UKHab guidance.

[1] *UKHab Ltd (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at https://www.ukhab.org/)*

Site Survey Date and Conditions

The Site was visited on 4 August 2026 and included fields F1, F6 and a brief walkover of the key boundaries of the remainder of the Site. Weather conditions at the time of survey were dry, cloudy and hot, with a temperature of 26°C.

Technical Review of the EDP Reporting

1.1 Botanical Survey

F1

EDP Assessment

The EDP Assessment found F1 to be modified grassland in good condition (see sections 3.7 to 3.10 of the Ecological Appraisal – Addendum). The field was surveyed on 09 June 2026.

Croft Ecology Assessment

An area of modified grassland which was in use as a dog walking field. The sward height was very short. The area was fenced and no access was available, so the field was surveyed from the boundary. Species present included abundant false oat-grass *Arrhenatherum elatius* and perennial rye-grass *Lolium perenne*, with occasional cock's-foot *Dactylis glomerata*, dandelions *Taraxacum* spp. and common mouse-ear *Cerastium fontanum*, and rare occurrences of hogweed *Heracleum sphondylium*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, bristly oxtongue *Helminthotheca echioides* and Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus*.

The Croft Ecology survey was limited by access, and a period of drought prior to the survey. As such, the grassland was under much more stress than at the time of the EDP survey. The EDP survey has been undertaken using an appropriate methodology and their justification of good quality modified grassland is justified appropriately in section 3.12. While the results of the Croft survey differ somewhat, this is considered to be due to access and preceding weather. The EDP results are considered correct for that habitat type based on the species mix recorded and comparison between their results and the limited Croft survey.



Figure 1 Dog walking field F1

F6

EDP Assessment

The EDP Assessment found F6 to be modified grassland in poor condition (see sections 3.12 to 3.19 of the Ecological Appraisal – Addendum). The field was surveyed on 09 June 2026.

Croft Ecology Assessment

F6 comprised an area of modified grassland in poor condition. The area was an unmanaged field, through which several footpaths passed, with a varying sward height ranging from short and worn in proximity of the paths, to 1.2m high stands in the unmanaged sections. Five quadrats were assessed within this field, as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 2 Field F6, looking north.



Figure 3 Quadrat survey locations within Field 6

Quadrat 1 was dominated by rough meadow-grass *Poa trivialis*, with abundant perennial rye grass.

Quadrat 2 had abundant Yorkshire fog, frequent rough meadow-grass and creeping buttercup; and rare occurrences of field wood-rush *Luzula campestris*.

Quadrat 3 was dominated by false oat-grass, with occasional rough meadow-grass and rare occurrences of creeping buttercup and Yorkshire fog.

Quadrat 4 was dominated by Yorkshire fog, with rare occurrences of curled dock *Rumex crispus* and common sorrel *Rumex acetosa.*

Quadrat 5 had abundant Yorkshire fog, frequent rough meadow-grass, and rare occurrences of creeping buttercup, white clover *Trifolium repens* and meadow buttercup *Ranunculus acris*.

Condition Assessment sheets for F1 and F6 are included in Appendix A.

An average of less than five plant species per m^2 was recorded and did not meet a moderate or good condition assessment due to the poor species diversity (<6-8 species/m^2). While the period of drought limited the species identification somewhat during the Croft Ecology survey, the species identified are typical of a modified grassland that is unmanaged. EDP noted red fescue *Festuca rubra* and meadow fescue *Festuca pratensis* within the field , which were not recorded by Croft Ecology, but these are typical species of a modified grassland and likely to be found at the time of June survey when still in flower. In addition, these were noted as rare or occasional abundances which may just have been missed due to not occurring in the quadrats surveyed by Croft Ecology. Variation between

the EDP and Croft Ecology results could be explained by the differing locations of quadrats and period of drought preceding the Croft Ecology survey.

Conclusion

The EDP results are considered to identify an appropriate habitat type based on the species mix recorded and comparison between their results and the Croft Ecology botanical survey. The EDP survey was undertaken on 09 June 2026, within the optimal survey window for botanical surveys. The report confirms the results detailed in the Interim Ecological Appraisal, and this aligns with the conclusion of the Croft Ecology survey of the Site.

Wider Habitat Assessment

The EDP reporting assesses the Site appropriately, using UK Habitat Classification guidance and was undertaken in a suitable seasonal window. The reporting considers the West Midlands Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Solihull Local Plan (in particular Policy P10 which is pertinent to the Natural Environment) and draws on this to inform the recommendations for the scheme design. While the EDP ecology reports do not form an arboricultural assessment of the site, the interim ecological appraisal sets out the need to protect trees on the Site and that an Arboricultural Method Statement would set out these protections. The TPO for the Site notes a number of protected trees, and protection measures should be considered for these; with appropriate advice and guidance sought from an arboriculturalist. From a brief walkover of the Site, Croft Ecology found the habitats present to be as per the EDP report and the EDP assessment of condition and Ecological Importance to be appropriate.

1.2 Protected Species surveys

Breeding and Wintering Birds

A suitable methodology and survey effort has been implemented for the scale of Site and nature of the development. The report details the finding of these surveys in appropriate depth; draws reasonable conclusions from them regarding the ecological implications for the Site, and makes appropriate recommendations for mitigation and compensation within the report.

Croft Ecology consider the approach suitable and in line with current guidance, and as such no additional survey is required.

Bats

A suitable methodology and survey effort has been implemented for the scale of Site and nature of the development. The Interim Eco Appraisal suggested moderate suitability for the stream, ditch, woodland and hedgerow with the August Addendum assessing the bat assemblage recorded during the surveys as up to a County Importance. The Interim Ecological Appraisal assessed the Site overall a as having low suitability for foraging and commuting bats, but noting the higher value of the woodland and stream. The Interim Ecological Appraisal notes the retention of higher value woodland and streams; and as the majority of arable land and grassland was considered by to have low suitability for foraging and commuting bats this overall classification is considered appropriate by Croft Ecology, and a survey effort reflective of this has been undertaken in line with the Bat Survey Guidelines 4th edition (Collins, 2023). The report details the finding of these surveys in appropriate depth, has analysed the data obtained, and draws reasonable conclusions from them regarding the

ecological implications for the Site. While targeted emergence surveys have not been undertaken, the proposals retain the three veteran trees of the Site (T70, T71 and T73) along with those 11 trees identified as having potential roost features for bats, and it would not be typical to undertake emergence surveys of such trees unless they were impacted directly (through removal/pruning works or lighting) or indirectly (via proximity to noise and vibration for instance). This does not appear to be the case here, and as such the approach taken is considered appropriate. The report goes on to make appropriate recommendations for mitigation and compensation within the report noting the improvement for bats introduced with the proposed planting; as well as mitigating impacts from lighting through suggestions of lighting design.

Croft Ecology consider the approach suitable and in line with current guidance; and as such no additional survey is required.

Otter and Water Vole

A suitable methodology and survey effort has been implemented for the scale of site and nature of the development, and based on the lack of data records and nature of the Site habitats the survey effort is arguably above and beyond what may typically be required. This therefore provides the development with a robust set of survey data for riparian mammals which notes the absence of otter and water vole.

The report details the finding of these surveys in appropriate depth and has used these to refine the original approach set out in the Interim Ecological Appraisal. It notes the need for an updated check prior to works commencing but this is a standard recommendation and would be expected for such a site.

Croft Ecology consider the approach suitable and in line with current guidance, and as such no additional survey is required.

Great Crested Newts

A suitable methodology and survey effort has been implemented for the scale of site and nature of the development. The addendum notes and surveys additional ponds which had not been covered in the original survey effort, a welcome addition. Surveys have been undertaken within the correct seasonal window (mid-April to end of June); and analysis undertaken by a reputable laboratory (Surescreen Scientific). A justification is provided for not surveying ponds between 250m and 500m from the Site; with the reasoning that the survey of nearer waterbodies is sufficient to identify the likelihood of presence on-site and assess local population impacts. While surveying all ponds within 500m may be undertaken on a site of this scale, access constraints typically make this unfeasible and many are ruled out due to broken connectivity. Therefore, the eDNA survey of ponds within 250m is considered appropriate in this instance, whilst the inclusion of pond 10a just outside the 250m and with connectivity to pond 10 shows EDP have taken a considered approach to the survey effort.

The report details the finding of these surveys in appropriate depth and has drawn reasonable conclusions about the presence of great crested newt at and around the Site. The report recommends precautionary working methods appropriate for the features on site including pre-commencement checks, directional cutting of vegetation, and dismantling of potential refuges, noting that the proposed habitat creation would enhance the Site overall.

Croft Ecology consider the approach suitable and in line with current guidance, and as such no additional survey is required.

Protected Species surveys scoped out

Invertebrates and hazel dormouse surveys were scoped out by EDP due to habitats present on site, and the lack of known records within the area respectively. While the veteran trees may have the potential to support notable invertebrates, the lack of invertebrate records combined with the fact that the veteran trees are to be retained within the proposals, mean that the recommendation of no further surveys is considered appropriate.

Croft Ecology consider the approach suitably justified, and as such no additional survey is required.

1.3 Biodiversity Net Gain

Drawing on the information outlined in the Ecological Appraisal – Addendum and from the metric dated May 2026 on the planning portal the assessment makes appropriate classifications of the conditions of the habitats on site, uses the latest version of the statutory metric for the assessment, and has been informed by the BNG User guide regarding appropriate division of areas where full plans are not available (in this case, using the ratio of developed land to vegetated garden as 70% developed and 30% garden for the areas to be residential development). It is noted that as this is at outline stage only an estimate can be provided, with a revised BNG assessment needed pre-commencement once a detailed design is available. This is a standard process for this type of development. The 'start' page of the metric should be completed with details of the application and assessor, as it is currently blank.

At the time of writing the latest BNG metric and condition assessment sheets were not available to review. The SMBC ecologist specifically notes a minor discrepancy in the BNG figures submitted, noting:

"There is, however, a minor discrepancy requiring reconciliation. The August 2026 Ecological Appraisal Addendum reports an area-habitat net gain of +6.26 units / +12.04%, whereas the separately submitted BNG spreadsheet calculates +5.9785 units / +11.62%. The hedgerow and watercourse percentages are consistent at approximately 16.02% and 16.06%. This discrepancy does not presently alter the conclusion that the proposal is capable of exceeding the statutory 10% requirement, but the final Biodiversity Gain Plan and metric should use a single reconciled set of figures."

A review of the latest BNG metric and condition assessment sheets – which are not currently available on the planning portal - would allow a deeper analysis, but on the basis of the available metric and wider assessment we would not expect this to notably alter our conclusions as it is anticipated that the discrepancies noted above correlates with the changes outlined as a result of the botanical surveys undertaken in the Ecological Appraisal Addendum.

The EDP reporting set out the baseline biodiversity net gain score in Table EDP 6.1. This identified a net gain in biodiversity based on the proposals for both habitat units, hedgerow units and watercourse units. The assessment in the Addendum updates the scoring from the Interim Ecological Appraisal following the botanical assessments of the Site.

Based on the Croft Ecology Site visit, the baseline score is considered to be appropriate and the gain noted is likely achievable – though as noted above a review of the latest metric document would

confirm this – through the proposed habitat retention and creation measures set out and the recommendations for long term management. The design has taken steps to deliver the required gain on site as possible; as shown with the mixture of woodland, wildflower meadow and orchard within the proposals.

1.4 Local Information

Croft Ecology welcome the provision of survey data from local residents. These note a number of bird and bat species which have been noted within the EDP surveys. Reports received included records and or photographs of the following from neighbouring properties: linnets *Linaria cannabina* and mistle thrush*Turdus viscivorus;* red kite *Milvus milvus*, buzzard *Buteo buteo*, sparrowhawk *Accipiter nisus*, greater spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopus major*, green woodpecker *Picus viridis*, goldcrest *Regulus regulus*, goldfinch *Carduelis carduelis*, spotted flycatcher *Muscicapa striata*, Eurasian bittern *Botaurus stellaris*, red-legged partridge *Alectoris rufa*, jay *Garrulus glandarius*, and tawny owl *Strix aluco*. These were noted in the data search of the EDP report but not recorded within the bird surveys undertaken. The other species noted by neighbours were also identified in the bird surveys undertaken by EDP and so are not included here.

These bird records would need independently verifying, but as the proposals retain the hedgerows and boundary habitats; as well as enhance areas of the Site for nature; their presence is not considered to materially alter the recommendations of the EDP reporting as the proposals still offer potential for the species to use the Site. While specifications for owls (such as owl boxes) could be included within the EDP reporting; these would be more typically recommended at the detailed design stage and the survey effort undertaken by EDP is considered appropriate for the scale and nature of the Site.

Records of bats using the southern boundary, gardens and watercourse were noted, with bat roosts noted in a residence property. The species identification of the bats has not been confirmed, though the species suggested are comparable to the EDP assessment; and the findings of the local residents does not materially impact the assessment by EDP.

The recommendations within the EDP reporting retain features of value for bat and bird species; and the enhancements proposed enhance the Site for a range of bat and bird species. Should the application be approved, consideration of these species within the management recommendations would be beneficial – such as varying the sward height to support small mammal populations which act as prey for owls. Such measures would be dealt with by condition via a Habitat management and maintenance plan (HMMP), Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) or similar.

Conclusion

The Ecological Appraisal – Addendum notes that EDP has provided iterative input through the design process so that the layout considered retention of existing ecological features, enhancement of features, and creation of new areas of open space. The report makes recommendations with regards to protected and notable species which are considered and appropriate, both in terms of protection, mitigation and enhancements. These include factors such as timing restrictions for nesting birds, appropriate planting, and inclusion of ecological protection zones for retained habitats.

For a project of this scale the involvement of ecologists early in the design phase is a positive, and the indicative gain plan shown is considered to be reasonable and appropriate. A number of key

features – such as the woodland – are retained, with the design including meadows, community allotments and drainage features that would improve the ecological diversity of the Site in the long term and limit any habitat fragmentation into the wider area. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment has used the habitat surveys to produce an appropriate baseline score and achievable net gain through the proposed habitat creation.

The EDP reporting assesses the habitats and protected species potential of the Site appropriately and has undertaken a suitable level of survey effort for the scale and nature of the Site and proposals drawing conclusions that take into account the results of the surveys and relevant legislation. This approach is considered appropriate by Croft Ecology and in line with national planning policy such as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Solihull Local Plan Policy P10 and the West Midlands Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

The EDP assessment of the Site is therefore considered, by Croft Ecology, to be appropriate and to provide a robust ecological backing for the application. In addition, the SMBC county ecologist has provided a consultation response to the EDP documents and concluded No Objection Subject to Conditions and the Croft Ecology findings are largely consistent with the council comments. The ecological information gathered to this point is considered sufficient for determination of the application; subject to appropriate conditions and subsequent approvals. These conditions would relate to factors such as detailed habitat design, management, lighting and construction safeguards; all of which are typically dealt with at full application or condition stage of the application.

In this instance, on the basis of the information gathered and reviewed and on the basis of the indicative site layout, a challenge or question of the ecological survey effort prior to determination is considered highly unlikely to be successful.

References

CIEEM (2017) ***Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd Edition.*** Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

CIEEM (2017) ***Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing, 2nd Edition.*** Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

CIEEM (2018) ***Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine.*** Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

EDP (2026). Land South of Fillongley Road Meriden. ***Interim Ecological Appraisal.*** The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd.

EDP (2026). Land South of Fillongley Road Meriden. ***Ecological Appraisal - Addendum.*** The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd.

IM LAND (2026). ***Illustrative Masterplan.*** *Land south of Fillongley Road, Meriden. Drawing number edp3698_d025f*

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2003). ***Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – a Technique for Environmental Audit*** **(revised reprint).** Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (2026) Consultation Response ***PL_2026_00900_PPOL-SMBC_ECOLOGY_CONSULTATION_RESPONSE-2532958 (1)*****UKHab Ltd (2023)** https://www.ukhab.org/

APPENDIX A – CONDITION ASSESSMENT SHEETS

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)

UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type

Grassland - Modified grassland

Habitat Description

F1 An area of modified grassland which was in use as a dog walking field. The sward height was very short. The area was fenced and no access was available, so the field was surveyed from the boundary. Species present included abundant false oat grass Arrhenatherum elatius and perennial rye grass Lolium perenne, with occasional cock's-foot Dactylis glomerata, dandelions Taraxacum spp. and common mouse-ear

ukhab – UK Habitat Classification

On-site or off-site, site name and location	Land south of Fillongley Road, Meriden	**Survey date and Surveyor name**	4 August 2026. J Grant
		Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)	F1 and F6
Limitations (if applicable)	Preceding drought limited the survey somewhat, as herbaceous species may have died off. Access to the dog walking field F1 was limited to the boundaries outside of the fenceline.		

Condition Assessment Criteria		**Habitat parcel reference**										
		32801255 - f1	32805181 - f6									
		Grid reference										
		SP 24724 82492	SP 24951 82045									
		Criterion passed (Yes or No)										**Notes (such as justification)**
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2 present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). **Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.** Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m^2 (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.	No	No									(32801255 - f1) Hard to assess from field boudary (32805181 - f6) Less than 6 8 species per m2 but may be impacted by drought.
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	No	Yes									(32801255 - f1) Trimmed or mown field (32805181 - f6) Pathways through but otherwise
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									(32801255 - f1) No scrub (32805181 - f6) No scrub
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	Yes									(32801255 - f1) Mown (32805181 - f6) Paths are the only disturbance
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens)[2].	No	No									(32801255 - f1) No bare ground (32805181 - f6) Paths about 10% of the field
F	Cover of bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* is less than 20%.	Yes	Yes									(32801255 - f1) No bracken (32805181 - f6) None
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species[3] (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA[4]).	Yes	Yes									(32801255 - f1) No invasives (32805181 - f6) None
	Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)	No	No									
	Number of criteria passed	3	5									

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									

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).