

The biodiversity metric 3.0: auditing and accounting for biodiversity

Condition assessment sheets (Excel format)

ISBN 978-1-78354-782-1

[Taken from *Biodiversity Metric 3.0: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity - Technical Supplement*

The method for assessing habitat condition is split into three main steps, all of which are 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 survey:

- a) Surveyors must have access to condition sheets (see **Tabs 1-25**) and sufficient copies of the condition assessment pro forma during the survey (see **ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA tab**).
- b) The habitat type of the parcel(s) to be assessed must be determined before consideration can be given to its condition as it enables the surveyor to select the correct condition sheet. See **HABITAT DEFINITIONS tab**

If habitat type cannot be accurately recorded, for example due to recent felling or intentional severe disturbance and extensive natural plant cover is present, this can be assessed (either on digital or paper maps). The extent of a habitat parcel may subsequently change if condition is found to vary within the parcel during the condition assessment.

- d) Each habitat parcel to be assessed must have been assigned a unique reference ID.

Step 2: Choosing the right condition sheet

See **SELECTING CONDITION SHEET tab** - The habitat types listed correspond with those found in the biodiversity metric 3.0 tool and indicates which condition sheet should be used for each habitat type.

How to use: Locate the relevant habitat type in habitat type, then refer to column of habitat type within habitat condition sheet should be used to assess that particular habitat type. Please note the following important points:

- Certain habitats are allocated a fixed condition score and do not need their condition to be assessed. These are marked 'No assessment required – condition fixed at 'Poor'' for some Low distinctiveness habitats, or 'No assessment required – condition N/A' for all Very Low distinctiveness habitats.
- Habitats descriptions in **bold** are Priority Habitats.

Step 3: Using condition sheets

The following instructions and points of clarification apply to most area-based habitat condition sheets. Additional habitat-specific instructions for **Woodland** and **Lake** condition sheets are provided separately below.

NOTE: These do not include the condition assessment for **Rivers and Streams (including canals)** which is described in Part 1c of the Technical Supplement

- a) Complete one condition assessment pro forma (either digital or hard copy) per habitat parcel. The pro forma template is a suggested format only and can be adapted to suit the needs and preferences of the user, provided the same parameters are captured.

b) The number of criteria varies between condition sheets. When using a condition sheet with fewer than the maximum of 13 criteria, 'N/A' should be entered against the additional criteria numbers.

c) Some condition sheets employ '**non-negotiable**' criteria. These are criteria which must be passed for the habitat parcel to achieve Good condition. If applicable, such criteria must be highlighted when completing the condition assessment proforma.

vi) Assess the habitat parcel against each condition assessment criterion for each indicator of condition, recording a result of 'pass' or 'fail' for each criterion assessed. Note that for woodland and intertidal habitats, assessing condition against each indicator will give a score of either 1, 2 or 3 (poor, moderate or 'borderline' condition). Assessment may then be applied to the habitat parcel to determine its overall condition. A change in condition should trigger a new condition assessment, with the original habitat type not normally being used until the next condition assessment (see step 1 above), but if a habitat parcel is failing all criteria it is possible that the habitat type has been recorded incorrectly and the wrong condition sheet is being used. Surveyors should refer to the HABITAT DEFINITIONS to check that the habitat type is correct. The habitat should be recorded as the habitat type(s) being assessed. The lists are not exhaustive and expert judgement by the ecological surveyor will be needed to assess whether other undesirable species are present. Any high risk invasive species

[GB non-native species secretariat](#).
vii) Once all applicable criteria have been assessed, assign a result of Good, Moderate or Poor based on the scoring instructions provided within the condition sheets. **An interim score of Fairly Poor or Fairly Good should only be used in exceptional circumstances where a habitat does not fit the standard outcome of Good, Moderate or Poor.** Justification for allocating an interim condition score must be

i) Any relevant evidence for passing or failing against criteria, or for a particular score, should be captured within the habitat survey target notes or by taking photographs. Photographs and target notes should then be referenced on the condition assessment proforma.

j) Any survey limitations must be detailed on the proforma. These may include areas of limited access or the survey being undertaken outside of the optimal survey season. If survey limitations prevent any criteria from being confidently and accurately assessed, then a precautionary approach is to be taken. For habitats other than woodland or intertidal habitats; if a definitive pass or fail cannot be assigned through baseline survey, assume the criterion is passed. For monitoring of post-development habitat condition a precautionary approach would be to assume fail (or 'poor' in the case of woodland and intertidal habitats) for any criteria which cannot be assessed due to survey limitations.

ix) The condition assessment survey is a good opportunity to identify any potential opportunities for habitat restoration or enhancement interventions. These should be noted on the condition assessment proforma.

Using the Woodland and intertidal condition sheets

The Woodland Condition Sheet has been adapted from the Woodland Condition Survey developed by the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG)[1]. However, all information needed to complete a Woodland Condition Survey is provided for the intertidal condition sheets, with the exception of Form D. Instead of allocating a pass or fail to each criterion, each of the 13 indicators in the Woodland condition sheet are allocated a score of 'good' (3 points) 'moderate' (2 points) or 'poor' (1 point). Once all 13 indicators have been scored, the points for each indicator are added to give a total score. The total score is then used to determine the overall condition of the habitat. The assessments for intertidal habitats adopt a similar approach.

Using the Lake condition sheet

The Freshwater Biological Association's 'Habitat Naturalness Assessment' is used to assess the condition of lakes.

<http://priorityhab.wpengine.com/contribute/>.

for use in Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Links to the key documents for undertaking a Habitat Naturalness Assessment, together with a conversion table for scores, are provided within the Lake condition sheet.

Who?

Condition assessments should be undertaken by an ecologist who is sufficiently skilled and experienced to identify and assess the condition of the habitat types used in this metric. They should be able to easily identify the positive and negative indicator species for the range of habitats likely to occur in a given

When?

Condition assessment surveys should be undertaken within the optimal survey season for habitats. For most habitats in the metric this is April to October inclusive. If a condition assessment survey is undertaken in sub-optimal survey season (November to March inclusive for most habitats) then a

CONDITION ASSESSMENT PROFORMA FOR USE WITH BIODIVERSITY METRIC 3.0 - AREA BASED HABITATS

Date		Metric 3.0 survey reference (if condition assessment of this polygon relates to a wider habitat survey)	
Weather conditions			
Surveyor name(s)		Unique polygon reference(s)	
Project / development name		Metric 3.0 habitat type	
Site name or location		Condition assessment required? (y/n)	
Onsite or offsite?		Condition sheet used	
Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)			
Limitations (if applicable)			

Habitat description

Allocate pass 'P' or fail 'F'. Allocate 'NA' to any irrelevant criteria numbers where condition sheet contains fewer than 13 criteria.
For Woodland & Intertidal condition sheets, allocate scores of '1' '2' or '3' against each criteria assessed.

Criterion	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	TOTAL
Result														
Photo ref														
Target note ref														

Are any criteria non-negotiable? (Y/N) If Yes are they passed?		Condition (Good/Moderate/Poor):	
---	--	---------------------------------	--

Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score

Links to definitions of habitats found in biodiversity metric 3.0:

[UK Habitat Classification System definitions](#)

[EUNIS Habitat definitions](#)

[Water Framework Directive Lakes Typologies](#)

KEY:

Italics denotes habitat name in Biodiversity metric 3.0 does not correspond exactly to that used in source classification

BOLD denotes definition is specific to Biodiversity metric 3.0

Biodiversity metric 3.0 Broad Habitat	Biodiversity metric 3.0 Habitat	Classification where definition derived	UKHab/EUNIS name	Other definition/Notes
Cropland	<i>Arable field margins cultivated annually</i>	UKHab	<i>Arable field margins cultivated annually with an annual flora</i>	
	<i>Arable field margins game bird mix</i>	UKHab	<i>Game bird mix strips and corners Game bird mix fields</i>	
	<i>Arable field margins pollen & nectar</i>	UKHab	<i>Arable field margins sown with wild flowers or a pollen and nectar mix</i>	
	<i>Arable field margins tussocky</i>	UKHab	<i>Arable field margins sown with tussocky grasses</i>	
	Cereal crops	UKHab	Cereal crops	
	Cereal crops other	UKHab	Other cereal crops	
	Cereal crops winter stubble	UKHab	Winter stubble	
	Horticulture	UKHab	Horticulture	
	Intensive orchards	UKHab	Intensive orchards	
	Non-cereal crops	UKHab	Non-cereal crops	
	Temporary grass and clover leys	UKHab	Temporary grass and clover leys	
	Grassland	Traditional orchards	UKHab	Traditional orchards
Bracken		UKHab	Bracken	

	Floodplain Wetland Mosaic (CFGM)	Definition based on Priority Habitat Inventory maps*	Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	<p>*Where an area is included within the (soon to be published) “Floodplain Wetland Mosaic Habitat Inventory” as <u>extant habitat</u> OR included within the “Floodplain with potential for restoration to Wetland Mosaic” layer it should be recorded within the metric as FWM habitat. In these cases the ditches form an integral part of the habitat and should <u>not</u> be recorded separately as linear features in the Rivers & Streams part of the metric.</p> <p>If it is NOT included within either layer of the inventory it should be assessed, and entered into the metric, as the appropriate habitat (e.g. modified grassland, cereal crop, temporary lakes, ponds and pools). Any ditches should be recorded separately within the River and Streams part of the metric.</p> <p>Until this new inventory is published, you should use existing inventories for floodplain habitats, including the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh layer of the Priority Habitat Inventory (England) and any local habitat data.</p> <p>https://data.gov.uk/dataset/4b6ddab7-6c0f-4407-946e-d6499f19fcde/priority-habitat-inventory-england</p>
	Lowland calcareous grassland	UKHab	Lowland calcareous grassland	
	Lowland dry acid grassland	UKHab	Lowland dry acid grassland	
	Lowland meadows	UKHab	Lowland meadows	
	Modified grassland	UKHab	Modified grassland	
	Other lowland acid grassland	UKHab	Other lowland acid grassland	
	Other neutral grassland	UKHab	Other neutral grassland	
	Tall herb communities	UKHab*	Tall herb communities (H6430)	*All Tall herb not meeting this definition should be recorded as "Other neutral grassland"
	Upland acid grassland	UKHab	Upland acid grassland	
	Upland calcareous grassland	UKHab	Upland calcareous grassland	
	Upland hay meadows	UKHab	Upland hay meadows	
Heathland and shrub	Blackthorn scrub	UKHab	Blackthorn scrub	
	Bramble scrub	UKHab	Bramble scrub	
	Gorse scrub	UKHab	Gorse scrub	
	Hawthorn scrub	UKHab	Hawthorn scrub	
	Hazel scrub	UKHab	Hazel scrub	
	Lowland Heathland	UKHab	Lowland Heathland	
	Mixed scrub	UKHab	Mixed scrub	
	Mountain heaths and willow scrub	UKHab	Mountain heaths and willow scrub	
	Rhododendron scrub	UKHab	Rhododendron scrub	
	Sea buckthorn scrub (Annex 1)	Use Habitats Directive Annex 1 definition - https://sac.jncc.gov.uk/habitat/H2160/ All other sea buckthorn scrub should be recorded as Sea buckthorn scrub (other)	Dunes with sea buckthorn (H2160)	

	Sea buckthorn scrub (other)	UKHab	Other sea buckthorn scrub	
	Upland Heathland	UKHab	Upland Heathland	
Lakes	Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	UKHab	Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	
	<i>Ornamental lake or pond</i>	<i>UKHab</i>	<i>Artificial lake or pond</i>	
	High alkalinity lakes	WFD Lakes typology	N/A	
	Low alkalinity lakes	WFD Lakes typology	N/A	
	Marl Lakes	WFD Lakes typology	N/A	
	Moderate alkalinity lakes	WFD Lakes typology	N/A	
	Peat Lakes	WFD Lakes typology	N/A	
	Ponds (Priority Habitat)	UKHab	Ponds (Priority Habitat)	
	Ponds (Non-Priority Habitat)	Ponds which do not meet either the definition of (i) priority habitat ponds or (ii) ornamental ponds	N/A	
	Reservoirs	UKHab/WFD Lakes typology*	Reservoir	*Some larger reservoirs are covered by the WFD Lakes typology
<i>Temporary lakes, ponds and pools</i>	<i>UKHab*</i>	<i>Mediterranean temporary ponds (H3170)</i>	<i>*All Temporary water bodies not meeting this definition should be recorded as the appropriate pond or lake habitat</i>	
Sparsely vegetated land	Calaminarian grasslands	UKHab	Calaminarian grasslands	
	Coastal sand dunes	UKHab	Coastal sand dunes	
	Coastal vegetated shingle	UKHab	Coastal vegetated shingle	
	Ruderal/Ephemeral	UKHab	Ruderal/Ephemeral	
	Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats	UKHab	Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats	
	Limestone pavement	UKHab	Limestone pavement	
	Maritime cliff and slopes	UKHab	Maritime cliff and slopes	
	Other inland rock and scree	UKHab	Other inland rock and scree	
Urban	Allotments	UKHab	Allotments	
	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	UKHab	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	
	Bioswale	UKHab	Bioswale	
	Brown roof	UKHab	Brown roof	
	Built linear features	UKHab	Built linear features	
	Cemeteries and churchyards	UKHab	Cemetery	
	Developed land; sealed surface	UKHab	Developed land; sealed surface	
	Extensive green roof	UKHab	Extensive green roof	
	Façade-bound green wall	UKHab	Façade-bound green wall	
	Ground based green wall	UKHab	Ground based green wall	
	Ground level planters	UKHab	Ground level planters	
	Intensive green roof	UKHab	Intensive green roof	
	Introduced shrub	UKHab	Introduced shrub	
	Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land	UKHab	Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land	
	Rain garden	UKHab	Rain garden	

	Sand pit quarry or open cast mine	UKHab	Sand pit quarry or open cast mine	
	Urban Tree	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 7.1)	N/A	
	Sustainable urban drainage feature	UKHab	Sustainable urban drainage feature	
	<i>Un-vegetated garden</i>	<i>UKHab</i>	<i>Garden</i>	
	Vacant/derelict land/ bare ground	UKHab	Vacant/derelict land	
	<i>Vegetated garden</i>	<i>UKHab</i>	<i>Garden</i>	
Wetland	Blanket bog	UKHab	Blanket bog	
	Depressions on Peat substrates (H7150)	UKHab	Depressions on Peat substrates (H7150)	
	<i>Fens (upland and lowland)</i>	<i>UKHab</i>	<i>Lowland fens Upland flushes, fens and swamps</i>	
	Lowland raised bog	UKHab	Lowland raised bog	
	<i>Wetland – Oceanic Valley Mire[1] (D2.1)</i>	<i>EUNIS</i>	<i>Oceanic valley bog</i>	
	Purple moor grass and rush pastures	UKHab	Purple moor grass and rush pastures	
	Reedbeds	UKHab	Reedbeds	
	Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)	UKHab	Transition mires and quaking bogs; lowland (H7140)	
Woodland and forest	Felled	UKHab	Felled	
	Lowland beech and yew woodland	UKHab	Lowland beech and yew woodland	
	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	UKHab	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	
	Native pine woodlands	UKHab	Native pine woodlands	
	Other coniferous woodland	UKHab	Other coniferous woodland	
	Other Scot's Pine woodland	UKHab	Other Scot's Pine woodland	
	Other woodland; broadleaved	UKHab	Other woodland; broadleaved	
	Other woodland; mixed	UKHab	Other woodland; mixed	
	Upland birchwoods	UKHab	Upland birchwoods	
	Upland mixed ashwoods	UKHab	Upland mixed ashwoods	
	Upland oakwood	UKHab	Upland oakwood	
	Wet woodland	UKHab	Wet woodland	
	Wood-pasture and parkland	UKHab	Wood-pasture and parkland	
	Coastal lagoons	<i>Coastal lagoons</i>	<i>EUNIS</i>	<i>Saline coastal lagoons</i>
Coastal saltmarsh	<i>Saltmarshes and saline reedbeds</i>	<i>EUNIS</i>	<i>Coastal saltmarshes and saline reedbeds</i>	
	<i>Artificial saltmarshes and saline reedbeds</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
Rocky shore	High energy littoral rock	EUNIS	High energy littoral rock	
	<i>High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate</i>	<i>High energy littoral rock</i>	
	Moderate energy littoral rock	EUNIS	Moderate energy littoral rock	

	<i>Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate</i>	<i>Moderate energy littoral rock</i>	
	<i>Low energy littoral rock</i>	EUNIS	<i>Low energy littoral rock</i>	
	<i>Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate</i>	<i>Low energy littoral rock</i>	
	<i>Features of littoral rock</i>	EUNIS	<i>Features of littoral rock</i>	
	<i>Features of littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate</i>	<i>Features of littoral rock</i>	
Intertidal sediment	<i>Littoral coarse sediment</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral coarse sediment</i>	
	<i>Littoral sand</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral sand and muddy sand</i>	
	<i>Littoral muddy sand</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral sand and muddy sand</i>	
	<i>Littoral mud</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral mud</i>	
	<i>Littoral mixed sediments</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral mixed sediments</i>	
	<i>Littoral seagrass</i>	EUNIS	<i>Littoral sediments dominated by aquatic angiosperms</i>	
	<i>Littoral seagrass on peat, clay or chalk</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on substrate</i>	<i>Littoral sediments dominated by aquatic angiosperms</i>	
	<i>Littoral biogenic reefs - Mussels</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on reef forming species</i>	<i>Littoral biogenic reefs</i>	
	<i>Littoral biogenic reefs - Sabellaria</i>	<i>Subset of EUNIS habitat based on reef forming species</i>	<i>Littoral biogenic reefs</i>	
	<i>Features of littoral sediment</i>	EUNIS	<i>Features of littoral sediment</i>	
	<i>Artificial littoral coarse sediment</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral muddy sand</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral mud</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral sand</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral mixed sediments</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral seagrass</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial littoral biogenic reefs</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
Intertidal Hard Structures	<i>Artificial hard structures</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial features of hard structures</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
	<i>Artificial hard structures with Integrated Greening of Grey Infrastructure (IGGI)</i>	<i>Adapted from EUNIS -see table TS2-2</i>		
Hedgerows and Lines of Trees	Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees - Associated with bank or ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Species Rich Hedgerow with trees	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		

	Native Species Rich Hedgerow - Associated with bank or ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Hedgerow with trees - Associated with bank or ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Species Rich Hedgerow	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Hedgerow - Associated with bank or ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Hedgerow with trees	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Line of Trees (Ecologically Valuable)	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Line of Trees (Ecologically Valuable) - with Bank or Ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Native Hedgerow	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Line of Trees	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	Line of Trees - Associated with bank or ditch	Metric specific (see User Guide Table 8.1)		
	<i>Hedge Ornamental Non Native</i>	UKHab	<i>Other hedgerows</i>	
Rivers and Streams	Priority Habitat	UKHab	Rivers (priority habitat)	
	Other Rivers and Streams	UKHab	Other Rivers and Streams	
	Ditches	Metric specific (see User Guide 8.xx)	Ditch	Artificially created, linear water-conveyancing features that are less than 5 m wide and likely to retain water for more than 4 months of the year. Their hydraulic function is primarily for land drainage, and although partially or fully connected to a river system, they would not have been present without human intervention' [Note: some heavily engineered ditches may actually be part of the river system (usually part of the headwater system). If there is uncertainty, consult historic maps, LIDAR data and riverine specialists]
	Canals	UKHab	Canals	
	Culvert	From s.39 Flood and Water Management Act (2010): A covered channel or pipe designed to prevent the obstruction of a watercourse or drainage path by an artificial construction	N/A	

Habitat Type	Condition Sheet
Broad habitat type: Coastal Lagoons	
Coastal Lagoons - Coastal lagoons	Coastal Lagoons
Broad habitat type: Coastal Saltmarsh	
Coastal Saltmarsh - Coastal saltmarshes and saline reed beds	Coastal Saltmarsh
Coastal Saltmarsh - Artificial coastal saltmarshes and saline reed beds	Coastal Saltmarsh
Broad habitat type: Cropland	
Cropland - Arable field margins cultivated annually	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Arable field margins game bird mix	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Arable field margins pollen & nectar	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Arable field margins tussocky	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Cereal crops	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Cereal crops other	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Cereal crops winter stubble	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Horticulture	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Intensive orchards	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Non-cereal crops	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Cropland - Temporary grass and clover leys	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Broad habitat type: Grassland	
Grassland - Traditional orchards	Orchard
Grassland - Bracken	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Grassland - Floodplain Wetland Mosaic (CFGM)	Use Wetland condition sheet (plus Ditch condition sheet for any ditches), unless associated with a species rich grassland sward, reedbed or fen, in which case record and assess as the relevant habitat type
Grassland - Lowland calcareous grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Lowland dry acid grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Lowland meadows	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Modified grassland	Grassland Low distinctiveness
Grassland - Other lowland acid grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Other neutral grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Tall herb communities	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Upland acid grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Grassland - Upland hay meadows	Grassland Medium/High/Very High distinctiveness
Broad habitat type: Heathland and scrub	
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub	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	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Heathland and shrub - Sea buckthorn scrub (Annex 1)	Scrub
Heathland and shrub - Sea buckthorn scrub (other)	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Heathland and shrub - Upland Heathland	Heathland
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	Line of trees
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Line of trees (ecologically valuable)	Line of trees
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Line of trees (ecologically valuable) - associated with bank or ditch	Line of trees
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Hedge ornamental non-native	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	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow with trees	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native species rich hedgerow	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native species rich hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native species rich hedgerow with trees	Hedgerow
Hedgerows and lines of trees - Native species rich hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch	Hedgerow
Broad habitat type: Intertidal Hard Structures	
Intertidal Hard Structures - Intertidal artificial hard structures	Intertidal Hard Structures
Intertidal Hard Structures - Intertidal artificial features of hard structures	Intertidal Hard Structures
Intertidal Hard Structures - Intertidal artificial hard structures with Integrated Greening of Grey Infrastructure (IGGI)	Intertidal Hard Structures
Broad habitat type: Intertidal Sediments	
Intertidal Sediment - Littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Littoral sand	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Littoral muddy sand	Intertidal Sediment

Intertidal Sediment - Littoral mud	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Littoral mixed sediments	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Features of littoral sediment	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral coarse sediment	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral mixed sediments	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral mud	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral muddy sand	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral sand	Intertidal Sediment
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass	Intertidal Seagrass
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass - on peat, clay or chalk	Intertidal Seagrass
Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass	Intertidal Seagrass
Intertidal Sediment - Littoral biogenic reefs	Intertidal Biogenic Reefs
Intertidal Sediment - Artificial littoral biogenic reefs	Intertidal Biogenic Reefs
Broad habitat type: Lakes	
Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating water bodies	Lakes
Lakes - High alkalinity lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Low alkalinity lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Marl lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Moderate alkalinity lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Peat lakes	Lakes
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat)	Ponds
Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Ponds
Lakes - Reservoirs	Lakes
Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools [C1.6]	Use Lake condition sheet for Temporary lakes OR Pond condition sheet for Temporary ponds and pools
Broad habitat type: Rivers and streams	
Rivers and streams - Ditches	Ditches
Broad habitat type: Rocky shore	
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - Features of littoral rock	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - High energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - Moderate energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky Shore
Rocky shore - Low energy littoral rock - on peat, clay or chalk	Rocky Shore
Broad habitat type: Sparsely vegetated land	
Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grasslands	Grassland
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes	Coastal
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle	Coastal
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/ephemeral	Urban
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	Urban
Urban - Bioswale	Urban
Urban - Brown roof	Urban
Urban - Built linear features	No assessment required - condition N/A
Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards	Use Urban condition sheet as default. Where there are areas of grassland, woodland or scrub above the minimum mappable area, record and assess these as the relevant habitat type.
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	No assessment required - condition N/A
Urban - Extensive green roof	Urban
Urban - Façade-bound green wall	Urban
Urban - Ground based green wall	Urban
Urban - Ground level planters	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Urban - Intensive green roof	Urban
Urban - Introduced shrub	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Urban - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land	Urban
Urban - Ornamental lake or pond	Pond
Urban - Rain garden	Urban
Urban - Sand pit, quarry or opencast mine	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Urban - Urban trees	Urban trees
Urban - Sustainable urban drainage feature	Urban
Urban - Un-vegetated garden	No assessment required - condition N/A
Urban - Vacant/derelict land/ bare ground	Urban
Urban - Vegetated garden	No assessment required - condition fixed at 'Poor'
Broad habitat type: Wetland	
Wetland - Blanket bog	Wetland
Wetland - Depressions on peat substrates (H7150)	Wetland
Wetland - Fens (upland & lowland)	Wetland
Wetland - Lowland raised bog	Wetland

Wetland – Oceanic valley mire [1] (D2.1)	Wetland
Wetland - Purple moor grass and rush pastures	Wetland
Wetland - Reedbeds	Wetland
Wetland - Transition mires and quaking bogs (H7140)	Wetland
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
Woodland and forest - Native pine woodlands	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Other coniferous woodland	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Other Scot's pine woodland	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; broadleaved	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Other woodland; mixed	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Upland birchwoods	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Upland mixed ashwoods	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Upland oakwood	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Wet woodland	Woodland
Woodland and forest - Wood-pasture and parkland	Wood-pasture and parkland

Condition Sheet: COASTAL Habitat Type		
UKHab Habitat Type(s)		
Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal sand dunes Sparsely vegetated land - Coastal vegetated shingle Sparsely vegetated land - Maritime cliff and slopes		
Habitat Description		
See UKHab		
Condition Assessment Criteria		
1	The vegetation composition is formed of native species typical of the relevant habitat and present in the typical successional stages, transitions and/or mosaics, at sufficient cover and frequency to meet the definition for the relevant habitat. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.	
2	Vegetation structure (sward height variation, zonation) is varied and not uniform.	
3	Naturally open ground or bare surfaces are present as part of a sequence of colonisation and succession.	
4	Coastal processes needed to support the habitat are functional and are not modified by hard engineering or other forms of negative intervention.	
5	The landform reflects the interaction of coastal processes and geology, and there is a varied topography present supporting the relevant range of habitat types.	
6	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981). Combined cover of undesirable species ¹ 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.	
7	Some scattered scrub (including bramble) may be present, but scrub should be less than 10% of area within the grassland/bare substrate matrix. Blocks of scrub or woodland, which might be desirable in their own right, should be classified and mapped separately.	
8	Water quality and quantity (e.g. seasonal fluctuations in dune slacks or seepages on cliff slopes) is sufficient to support the range of water-dependent parts of the habitat.	
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score
Passes 7 or 8 of 8 criteria including non-negotiable criterion 1		Good (3)
Passes 5 or 6 of 8 criteria; OR Passes 7 of 8 criteria excluding non-negotiable criterion 1		Moderate (2)
Passes 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 of 8 criteria.		Poor (1)
Notes		
<p>Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General coastal undesirable species: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> , white willow <i>Salix alba</i> hybrids, garden plants. • Grassland undesirable species: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> , cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> . • Heathland undesirable species: bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>. 		

Condition Sheet: COASTAL LAGOONS Habitat Type					
EUNIS Habitat Type(s)					
Coastal lagoons					
Habitat Description					
<p>The coastal lagoons EUNIS habitat description is available here: https://eunis.eea.europa.eu/habitats/10007#:~:text=Lagoons%20are%20expanses%20of%20shallow,%2C%20less%20frequently%2C%20by%20rocks.</p>					
Habitat Attributes to Record					
<p>The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of lagoon water body¹ • Description of presence of typical communities and biotopes • Description of species diversity and community composition² • Salinity in parts per thousand (ppt) • Presence and abundance of non-native species • Observations on coastal process functioning and any human physical modifications present • % 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 • 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 indicator
1	Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species³	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see foot note.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
2	Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	
3	Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	

4	Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment 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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment 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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ⁴ .	
5	Salinity	Salinity is between 15 - 40 ppt	Salinity values are at the ends of range acceptable for lagoons measured in ppt	Salinity values are either hypersaline >40 ppt or hyposaline <15 ppt	
6	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.	
7	Physical damage of lagoon banks ⁵	No physical damage present	Only small isolated patches of physical damage present	Evidence of significant physical damage	
8	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)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >18 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION					
TOTAL SCORE 12 - 17 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION					
TOTAL SCORE 8 - 11 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					

Footnote 1 - The extent of the lagoon water body 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 the year. It should be noted that some lagoons are naturally very shallow.

Footnote 2 - Examples of species adapted to lagoons can be found in the Bamber (2010): BAMBER, RN (2010) Coastal saline lagoons and the Water Framework Directive. Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 039.

<http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/44008>.

For assessment of species characteristic of anoxic environment, e.g presence of Capitellid worms, further information on the SACFOR scale can be found on the Joint Nature Conservation Committee website at <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2684>.

Footnote 3 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf

Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here:

<https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518>

High risk undesirable species 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 4 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter $\text{m}^{-1} \text{min}^{-1} \text{person}^{-1}$.

Condition Sheet: COASTAL SALTMARSH Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Type(s)

Coastal saltmarshes and saline reed beds
Artificial coastal saltmarshes and saline reed beds

Habitat Description

The coastal saltmarsh EUNIS habitat description is available here: <https://mhc.jncc.gov.uk/biotopes/jnccmncr00001526>

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:

- 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/sward height¹
- 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
- % 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
1 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	
2 Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species ²	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see foot note.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3 Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	
4 Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	
5 Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ³ .	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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ³ .	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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ³ .	

6	Zonation and transition to other habitats³	Zonation of vegetation/ communities is clear and continuous. Distribution of the feature and transition to other habitats, including associated transitional habitats, within the site is reflective of expected natural distribution seaward and landward	Up to 2 of the expected zones are absent or significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline and transitions to other habitats are restricted in less than 20% of the habitat boundaries.	Zonation of vegetation/ communities is not clearly visible or is significantly impacted by human modification of the shoreline. Or transitions to other habitats are restricted in more than 20% of the habitat boundaries.	
Total score (out of a possible 18)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >14 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 9 - 13 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 6 - 8 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					
<p>Footnote 1 - Assessment of grazing levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>Footnote 2 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Hemigrapsus</i> spp. – Asian Shore crabs (<i>H. sanguineus</i>, <i>H. takanoi</i> or <i>H. penicillatus</i>) <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 3 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data <i>Science of The Total Environment</i>, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p> <p>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 by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.</p> <p>Van Loon, W., Hanke, G., Fleet, D., Werner, S., Barry, J., Strand, J., Eriksson, J., Galgani, F., Gräwe, D., Schulz, M., Vlachogianni, T., Press, M., Blidberg, E. & Walvoort, D., 2020. A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines. EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, ISBN 978-92-76-21444-1, doi:10.2760/54369, JRC121707 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344340540_A_European_Threshold_Value_and_Assessment_Method_for_Macro_Litter_on_Coastlines</p>					

Condition Sheet: DITCH Habitat Type	
UKHab Habitat Type(s)	
Rivers and streams - Ditches	
Habitat Description	
Artificially created, linear water-conveyancing features that are less than 5 m wide and likely to retain water for more than 4 months of the year. Their hydraulic function is primarily for land drainage, and although partially or fully connected to a river system, they would not have been present without human intervention' [Note: some heavily engineered ditches may actually be part of the river system (usually part of the headwater system). If there is uncertainty, consult historic maps, LIDAR data and riverine specialists]	
Condition Assessment Criteria	
1	The ditch is of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution.
2	A range of emergent, submerged and floating leaved plants are present. As a guide >10 species of emergent, floating or submerged plants in a 20 m ditch length.
3	There is less than 10% cover of filamentous algae and/or duckweed (these are signs of eutrophication).
4	A fringe of marginal vegetation is present along more than 75% of the ditch.
5	Physical damage evident along less than 5% of the ditch, such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, or any other damaging management activities.
6	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.
7	Less than 10% of the ditch is heavily shaded.
8	There is an absence of non-native plant and animal species ¹ .
Condition Assessment Result	
Passes 8 of 8 criteria	
Condition Assessment Score	
Good (3)	
Passes 6 or 7 of 8 criteria	
Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 8 criteria	
Poor (1)	
Notes	
<p>Footnote 1 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern <i>Azolla spp.</i>, Australian swamp stonecrop <i>Crassula helmsii</i>, parrot's feather <i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>, floating pennywort <i>Hydrocotyle ranunculoides</i>, Japanese knotweed <i>Fallopia japonica</i> and giant hogweed <i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i> (on the bank). • Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish <i>Pacifastacus leniusculus</i>, zebra mussels <i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>, killer shrimp <i>Dikerogammarus villosus</i>, demon shrimp <i>Dikerogammarus haemobaphes</i>, carp <i>Cyprinus carpio</i>. 	

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)		
UKHab Habitat Type(s)		
Grassland - Modified grassland		
Habitat Description		
See UKHab		
Condition Assessment Criteria		
1	There must be 6-8 species per m ² . Note - if a grassland has 9 or more species per m ² it should be classified as a moderate distinctiveness grassland habitat type. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.	
2	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.	
3	Some scattered scrub (including bramble) may be present, but scrub accounts for less than 20% of total grassland area. Note - patches of shrubs with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	
4	Physical damage evident in less than 5% of total grassland area, such as excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	
5	Cover of bare ground between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.	
6	Cover of bracken less than 20%.	
7	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ¹ make up less than 5% of ground cover.	
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score
Passes 6 or 7 of 7 criteria including non-negotiable criterion 7		Good (3)
Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria; OR Passes 6 of 7 criteria excluding non-negotiable criterion 7		Moderate (2)
Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 7 criteria		Poor (1)
Notes		
<p>Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i>, white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> , cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> .</p>		

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (medium, high & very high distinctiveness)	
UKHab Habitat Type(s)	
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* Grassland - Upland acid grassland Grassland - Upland calcareous grassland Grassland - Upland hay meadows Sparsely vegetated land - Calaminarian grassland	
Habitat Description	
See UKHab * Note Tall herb habitat that does not meet the definition of Annex 1 habitat 'Tall herb communities (H6430)' should be recorded as "Other neutral grassland"	
Condition Assessment Criteria	
1	The appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches characteristics of the specific grassland habitat type (see UKHab definition). Wildflowers, sedges and indicator species for the specific grassland habitat type are very clearly and easily visible throughout the sward.
2	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20 per cent is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.
3	Cover of bare ground between 1% and 5%, including localised areas, for example, rabbit warrens.
4	Cover of bracken less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble) less than 5%.
5	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981). Combined cover of undesirable species ¹ 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.
Condition Assessment Result	
Passes 5 of 5 criteria	
Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria	
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 5 criteria	
Condition Assessment Score	
Good (3)	
Moderate (2)	
Poor (1)	
Notes	
Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: Creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i> , broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , creeping buttercup <i>Ranunculus repens</i> , greater plantain <i>Plantago major</i> , white clover <i>Trifolium repens</i> , cow parsley <i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i> .	

Condition Sheet: HEATHLAND Habitat Type									
UKHab Habitat Type(s)									
Heathland and shrub - Lowland heathland Heathland and shrub - Mountain heaths and willow scrub Heathland and shrub - Upland heathland									
Habitat Description									
See UKHab									
Condition Assessment Criteria									
1	The appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches characteristics of the specific heathland habitat type (see UKHab definition linked above). Indicator shrubs, grasses, herbs and lower plants for the specific heathland habitat type are very clearly and easily visible. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.								
2	There are at least two dwarf shrub species frequent, and cover of dwarf shrubs is between 25-75% for lowland heathland, 50-75% for upland dry heath, or >20% for upland wet heath. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.								
3	All age classes (pioneer, degenerate and mature) present with at least 10% pioneer heather in the lowlands or at least 10% degenerate/mature in the uplands. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.								
4	Unshaded bare ground is between 1-10%. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.								
5	No signs disturbance of sensitive areas ¹ , including managed burns.								
6	No more than 33% of heather shoots should be grazed, or flowering heather plants are at least frequent in autumn.								
7	Less than 1% cover of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) or shallon <i>Gaultheria shallon</i> . Less than 5% cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> ² .								
8	Cover of scattered trees and/or scrub ³ should be less than 20% for upland heaths; less than 15% for lowland dry heaths; and less than 10% for lowland wet heaths.								
9	No signs of any damaging activities ⁴ or contamination to the habitat such as: artificial drains, peat extraction, silt, leachate or eutrophication.								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Condition Assessment Result</th> <th>Condition Assessment Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Passes 8 or 9 of 9 criteria including all non-negotiable criteria 1-4</td> <td>Good (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 6 or 7 of 9 criteria; OR Passes 8 of 9 criteria excluding any of the non-negotiable criteria 1-4</td> <td>Moderate (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria</td> <td>Poor (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	Passes 8 or 9 of 9 criteria including all non-negotiable criteria 1-4	Good (3)	Passes 6 or 7 of 9 criteria; OR Passes 8 of 9 criteria excluding any of the non-negotiable criteria 1-4	Moderate (2)	Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria	Poor (1)
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score								
Passes 8 or 9 of 9 criteria including all non-negotiable criteria 1-4	Good (3)								
Passes 6 or 7 of 9 criteria; OR Passes 8 of 9 criteria excluding any of the non-negotiable criteria 1-4	Moderate (2)								
Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria	Poor (1)								
Notes									
<p>Footnote 1 - Sensitive areas definition:</p> <p>(a) Vegetation severely wind-clipped, mostly forming a mat less than 10 cm thick.</p> <p>(b) Areas where soils are thin and less than 5 cm deep.</p> <p>(c) Hill slopes greater than 1 in 2 (26°), and all the sides of gullies.</p> <p>(d) Ground with abundant, and/or an almost continuous carpet of sphagnum, bilberry, liverworts and/or lichens.</p> <p>(e) Areas with noticeably uneven structure, at a spatial scale of around 1 m² or less. The unevenness (e.g. more commonly found in very old heather stands³) 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</p> <p>(f) Pools, wet hollows, hags and erosion gullies, and within 10 m of the edge of watercourses.</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> may exceed 5% where there is an identified biodiversity benefit e.g. bracken beds in the South Pennines as nesting sites for Twite <i>Linaria flavirostris</i>.</p> <p>Footnote 3 - N.B. Total <i>Ulex</i> spp. cover should be less than 50%, with common gorse <i>Ulex europaeus</i> less than 25% in the lowland heaths.</p> <p>Footnote 4 - Damaging activities include: accidental or unmanaged fires, managed fires on wet heath, excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, damaging levels of-public access resulting in trampling and/or litter.</p>									

Part 1b - Condition assessment of hedgerows

UKHab Habitat Type
Native hedgerow Native hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Native hedgerow with trees Native hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch Native species rich hedgerow Native species rich hedgerow - associated with bank or ditch Native species rich hedgerow with trees Native species rich hedgerow with trees - associated with bank or ditch
Habitat Description
See Chapter 8 of User Guide
Condition Assessment Criteria

A series of ten attributes, representing key physical characteristics, are used for this assessment. The attributes, and the minimum criteria for achieving a favourable condition in each, are defined. The attributes use similar favourable condition criteria to the Hedgerow Survey Handbook and the handbook is the recommended source of reference for assessing individual hedgerow attributes.

Hedgerow favourable condition attributes		
Attributes and functional groupings (A, B, C, D & E)	Criteria (the minimum requirements for 'favourable condition')	Description
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 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 (e.g. blackthorn suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they >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 ⁴).
B1. Gap - hedge base	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length (unless 'line of trees')	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	<input type="checkbox"/> Gaps make up <10% of total length and <input type="checkbox"/> 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: <input type="checkbox"/> measured from outer edge of hedgerow, and <input type="checkbox"/> is present on one side of the hedge (at least)	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).
C2. Undesirable 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 (<i>Urtica</i> spp.), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and docks (<i>Rumex</i> spp.). Their presence, either singly or together, should not exceed the 20% cover threshold.
D1. Invasive and neophyte species	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native and neophyte species	Neophytes are plants that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500. For information on neophytes see the JNCC website and for information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website.
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 (e.g. excessive hedge cutting).
Additional group - applicable to hedgerows with trees only		
E1. Tree age	At least one mature tree per 30m stretch of hedgerow. A mature tree is one that is at least 2/3 expected fully mature height for the species.	This criterion addresses if there are sufficient mature trees (within the scope of planning timescales) which are of higher value to biodiversity.
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.

Each attribute is assigned to one of five functional groups (A – E), as indicated in Table TS1-2 and the condition of a hedgerow is assessed according to the number of

The hedgerow condition assessment generates a weighting (score) ranging from 1-3, which is used within the biodiversity metric 3.0. The scores for each are set out i

TABLE TS1-3: Hedgerow condition assessment and weighting

Condition categories for hedgerows without trees		
Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (score)
Good	No more than 2 failures in total; AND No more than 1 in any functional group.	3

Moderate	No more than 4 failures in total; AND <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1 & C2 = Moderate condition).	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 4 attributes; OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1 & B2 = Poor condition).	1
Condition categories for hedgerows with trees		
Category	Maximum number of attributes that can fail to meet 'favourable condition' criteria in Table TS1-2	Weighting (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 <u>Does not fail both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1, C2 & E1 = Moderate condition).	2
Poor	Fails a total of more than 5 attributes; OR <u>Fails both attributes</u> in more than one functional group (e.g. fails attributes A1, A2, B1 & B2 = Poor condition).	1

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL BIOGENIC REEFS Habitat Type					
EUNIS Habitat Type(s)					
Littoral biogenic reefs Artificial littoral biogenic reefs					
Habitat Description					
The biotope description for this habitat type is available here: https://mhc.jncc.gov.uk/biotopes/jncmncr00000198					
Habitat Attributes to Record					
The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % cover of recognisable biogenic reef structures across the bed • Distribution of the habitat seaward and landward limits 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 • % 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 • Is the habitat distribution constrained by human modification? • WFD classification of overlying water 					
Condition Assessment Criteria					
	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator
1	Coastal processes	Coastal processes are functioning naturally. No evidence of human physical modifications which are 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	
2	Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species¹	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see foot note.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3	Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	
4	Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	

5	Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	
Total score (out of a possible 15)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >12 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 8 - 12 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					
<p>Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> – Carpet sea squirt • <i>Hemigrapsus spp.</i> – Asian Shore crabs (<i>H. sanguineus</i>, <i>H. takanoi</i> or <i>H. penicillatus</i>) <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data <i>Science of The Total Environment</i>, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p> <p>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 by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.</p> <p>Van Loon, W., Hanke, G., Fleet, D., Werner, S., Barry, J., Strand, J., Eriksson, J., Galgani, F., Gräwe, D., Schulz, M., Vlachogianni, T., Press, M., Blidberg, E. & Walvoort, D., 2020. A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines. EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, ISBN 978-92-76-21444-1, doi:10.2760/54369, JRC121707 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344340540_A_European_Threshold_Value_and_Assessment_Method_for_Macro_Litter_on_Coastlines</p>					

Condition Sheet: ARTIFICIAL HARD STRUCTURES Habitat Type				
ARTIFICIAL Habitat Type(s)				
Intertidal artificial hard structures Intertidal artificial features of hard structures Intertidal artificial hard structures with Integrated Greening of Grey Infrastructure (IGGI)				
Habitat Description				
Artificial hard structures are man-made structures fulfilling a range of functions (e.g. coastal defences, port, harbour and marina installations, energy infrastructure, aquaculture). They can be made of various hard materials (artificial or natural rock, wood, plastics, metal) that would not normally be found in the area they are being deployed.				
Habitat Attributes to Record				
The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • % cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment • WFD classification of overlying water • Assessment of litter 				
Condition Assessment Criteria				
Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator
1 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.	
2 Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species¹	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see footnote.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list.	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3 Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	

4	Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	
5	Amount of colonisation	More than three different faunal and floral communities present.	Two or three different faunal/flora communities present.	One or no faunal/flora communities present.	
Total score (out of a possible 15)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >12 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 8 - 12 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					
<p>Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> – Carpet sea squirt • <i>Hemigrapsus spp.</i> – Asian Shore crabs (<i>H. sanguineus</i>, <i>H. takanoi</i> or <i>H. penicillatus</i>) • <i>Ficopomatus enigmaticus</i> Trumpet tube worm • <i>Corella eumyota</i> – Orange-tipped sea squirt • <i>Grateloupia turuturu</i> – Devil’s tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide • <i>Schizoporella japonica</i> – Orange ripple bryozoan <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data Science of The Total Environment, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p> <p>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 by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.</p> <p>Van Loon, W., Hanke, G., Fleet, D., Werner, S., Barry, J., Strand, J., Eriksson, J., Galgani, F., Gräwe, D., Schulz, M., Vlachogianni, T., Press, M., Blidberg, E. & Walvoort, D., 2020. A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines. EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, ISBN 978-92-76-21444-1, doi:10.2760/54369, JRC121707 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344340540_A_European_Threshold_Value_and_Assessment_Method_for_Macro_Litter_on_C</p>					

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEAGRASS Habitat Type					
UKHab Habitat Type(s)					
Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass Intertidal sediment - Littoral seagrass - on peat, clay or chalk Intertidal sediment - Artificial littoral seagrass					
Habitat Description					
The littoral seagrass JNCC biotope description is available here: https://mhc.jncc.gov.uk/biotopes/jnccmncr00001525					
Habitat Attributes to Record					
The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % 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 • % cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment • WFD classification of overlying water • Presence and density of non-natural structures and direct human impacts • Assessment of litter • Evidence of visible rhizomes 					
Condition Assessment Criteria					
	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator
1	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	
2	Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species ¹	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see foot note.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3	Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	

4	Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	
5	Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	
Total score (out of a possible 15)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >12 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 8 - 12 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					
<p>*non-negotiable attribute the habitat overall cannot score higher than it does for this attribute.</p> <p>Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> – Carpet sea squirt • <i>He migrapsus spp.</i> – Asian Shore crabs (<i>H. sanguineus</i>, <i>H. takanoi</i> or <i>H. penicillatus</i>) • <i>Eriocheir sinensis</i> – Chinese mitten crab <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 1 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data <i>Science of The Total Environment</i>, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p> <p>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 by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.</p> <p>Van Loon, W., Hanke, G., Fleet, D., Werner, S., Barry, J., Strand, J., Eriksson, J., Galgani, F., Gräwe, D., Schulz, M., Vlachogianni, T., Press, M., Blidberg, E. & Walvoort, D., 2020. A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Macro Litter on Coastlines. EUR 30347 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, ISBN 978-92-76-21444-1, doi:10.2760/54369, JRC121707 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344340540_A_European_Threshold_Value_and_Assessment_Method_for_Macro_Litter_on_Coastlines</p>					

Condition Sheet: INTERTIDAL SEDIMENT Habitat Type					
EUNIS Habitat Type(s)					
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					
Habitat Description					
The littoral sediment EUNIS habitat description is available here: https://eunis.eea.europa.eu/habitats/425					
Habitat Attributes to Record					
The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • % cover of algal growths that could be attributed to nutrient enrichment • WFD classification of overlying water • Description of zonation 					
Condition Assessment Criteria					
	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator
1	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	
2	Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species¹	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see footnote.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list.	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3	Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	

4	Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	
5	Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)	Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment ² .	
Total score (out of a possible 15)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
TOTAL SCORE >12 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 8 - 12 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION					
Notes					
<p>Footnote 1 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <p>Intertidal coarse sediment A2.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ficopomatus enigmaticus</i> Trumpet tube worm • <i>Styela clava</i> Asian tunicate; leathery sea squirt, club tunicate • <i>Corella eumyota</i> Orange-tipped sea squirt • <i>Grateloupia turuturu</i> Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide <p>Intertidal mixed sediment A2.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ficopomatus enigmaticus</i> Trumpet tube worm <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data Science of The Total Environment, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p> <p>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 by the MSFD Technical Group on Marine Litter.</p> <p>Van Loon, W., Hanke, G., Fleet, D., Werner, S., Barry, J., Strand, J., Eriksson, J., Galgani, F., Gräwe, D., Schulz, M., Vlachogianni, T., Press, M., Blidner, E., Wolcott, D. 2020. A European Threshold Value and Assessment Method for Marine Litter. Conditions. EUP 20217 EN</p>					

Condition Sheet: LAKE Habitat Type

UKHab Habitat Type(s)

Lakes - Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies
 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 [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:
[http://wfduk.org/sites/default/files/Media/Characterisation of the water environment/Lakes typology_Final_010604.pdf](http://wfduk.org/sites/default/files/Media/Characterisation%20of%20the%20water%20environment/Lakes%20typology_Final_010604.pdf)
 Other than for 'Aquifer fed naturally fluctuating waterbodies', 'Reservoirs' and 'Temporary lakes, ponds and pools' - For these see:
[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 Biodiversity Metric 3.0 (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:

<http://priorityhab.wpengine.com/contribute/>

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:

<http://priorityhab.wpengine.com/contribute/>

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

Condition Sheet: LIMESTONE PAVEMENT Habitat Type			
UKHab Habitat Type(s)			
Sparsely vegetated land - Limestone pavement			
Habitat Description			
See UKHab			
Condition Assessment Criteria			
1	Cover of typical emergent pavement flora and clint-top vegetation should account for at least 25% of total vegetation cover (i.e. excluding bare rock).		
2	Cover of undesirable species less than 1%.		
3	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ¹ make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover.		
4	Less than 25% of live leaves (broadleaved plants), fronds (ferns) or shoots (dwarf shrubs) show signs of grazing or browsing.		
5	There should be no evidence of damage to the pavement surface.		
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	
Passes 5 of 5 criteria		Good (3)	
Passes 4 of 5 criteria		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 5 criteria		Poor (1)	
Notes			
<p>Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: perennial rye grass <i>Lolium perenne</i>, false oat-grass <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i>, crested dog's-tail <i>Cynosurus cristatus</i>, bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i>, creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i>, spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i>, curled dock <i>Rumex crispus</i>, broad-leaved dock <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>, common ragwort <i>Jacobaea vulgaris</i>, common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i>, other pernicious perennial species.</p>			

Condition Sheet: LINE OF TREES Habitat Type			
UKHab Habitat Type(s)			
Line of trees Line of trees – associated with bank or ditch Line of trees (ecologically valuable) Line of trees (ecologically valuable) – associated with bank or ditch			
Habitat Description			
See Chapter 8 of User Guide			
Condition Assessment Criteria			
1	More than 70% of trees are native species.		
2	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.		
3	Includes one or more mature ¹ or veteran ² tree.		
4	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 anthropogenic operations.		
5	At least 95% of the 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.		
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	
Passes 5 of 5 criteria		Good (3)	
Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 5 criteria		Poor (1)	
Notes			
<p>Footnote 1 - A mature tree in this context is one that is at least 2/3 expected fully mature height for the species.</p> <p>Footnote 2 - All ancient trees are veteran trees, but not all veteran trees are ancient. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its biodiversity, cultural and heritage value. Veteran trees can be classified if they have four out of the five following features:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rot sites associated with wounds which are decaying >400 cm²; 2. Holes and water pockets in the trunk and mature crown >5 cm diameter; 3. Dead branches or stems >15 cm diameter; 4. Any hollowing in the trunk or major limbs; 5. Fruit bodies of fungi known to cause wood decay. 			

Condition Sheet: ORCHARD Habitat Type		
UKHab Habitat Type		
Grassland - Traditional orchard		
Habitat Description		
See UKHab		
Condition Assessment Criteria		
1	Presence of ancient ¹ and / or veteran ² trees. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.	
2	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 should occupy less than 10% of ground cover.	
3	There is evidence of formative and/or restorative pruning to maintain longevity of trees.	
4	Presence of standing and/or fallen dead wood: all mature trees have standing or fallen branches, stems and stumps greater than 10 cm diameter associated with them.	
5	At least 95% of the trees are free from damage caused by humans or animals e.g. browsing, bark stripping or rubbing on non-adjusted ties.	
6	Sward height is varied (between 5 cm and 30 cm) and small patches of bare ground are present creating structural diversity. Up to 10% cover of patches of tall herb vegetation may be present.	
7	Species richness of the grassland is equivalent to a medium, high, or very high distinctiveness grassland.	
8	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ³ make up less than 10% of ground cover.	
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score
Passes 6, 7 or 8 of 8 criteria, including non-negotiable criterion 1		Good (3)
Passes 4 or 5 of 8 criteria; OR Passes 6 or 7 of 8 criteria, excluding non-negotiable criterion 1		Moderate (2)
Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 8 criteria		Poor (1)
Notes		

Footnote 1 - Ancient trees are exceptionally valuable. Attributes can include: its great age in comparison with other trees of the same species; size, especially very wide trunk; condition; biodiversity value as a result of significant wood decay and the habitat created from the ageing process; and cultural and heritage value. Very few trees of any species become ancient.

Ancient trees can be classified using the following girth guide at 1.5 m from the ground:

- >2.5m for field maple, rowan, yew, birch, holly and other smaller tree species;
- >4m for oaks, ash, Scot's pine, alder;
- >4.5m for sycamore, lime, horse chestnut, sweet chestnut, elm species, poplar species, beech, willows, other pines and exotics.

Footnote 2 - All ancient trees are veteran trees, but not all veteran trees are ancient. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its biodiversity, cultural and heritage value. Veteran trees can be classified if they have four out of the five following features:

1. Rot sites associated with wounds which are decaying >400 cm²;
2. Holes and water pockets in the trunk and mature crown >5 cm diameter;
3. Dead branches or stems >15 cm diameter;
4. Any hollowing in the trunk or major limbs;
5. Fruit bodies of fungi known to cause wood decay.

Footnote 3 - Species considered undesirable 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*.

Condition Sheet: POND Habitat Type																			
UKHab Habitat Type(s)																			
Lakes - Ponds (priority habitat) Lakes - Ponds (non-priority habitat) Lakes - Temporary lakes, ponds and pools [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																			
See UKHab other than for non-priority ponds, which are those which do not meet either the definition of (i) priority habitat ponds or (ii) ornamental ponds																			
Condition Assessment Criteria																			
CORE CRITERIA - applicable to all ponds (woodland¹ and non-woodland):																			
1	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.																		
2	There is semi-natural habitat (i.e. moderate distinctiveness or above) for at least 10 m from the pond edge.																		
3	Less than 10% of the pond is covered with duckweed or filamentous algae.																		
4	The pond is not artificially connected to other waterbodies, either via streams, ditches or artificial pipework.																		
5	Pond water levels should be able to fluctuate naturally throughout the year. No obvious dams, pumps or pipework.																		
6	There is an absence of non-native plant and animal species ² .																		
7	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 - only applicable to non-woodland ponds:																			
8	In non-woodland ponds, plants, be they emergent, submerged or floating (excluding duckweeds) ³ , should cover at least 50% of the pond area that is less than 3 m deep.																		
9	The surface of non-woodland ponds is no more than 50% shaded by woody bankside species.																		
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Condition Assessment Result</th> <th>Condition Assessment Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">If 8 criteria assessed (woodland ponds):</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 7 of 7 criteria</td> <td>Good (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 5 or 6 of 7 criteria</td> <td>Moderate (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 of 7 criteria</td> <td>Poor (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">If 10 criteria assessed (non-woodland ponds):</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 9 of 9 criteria</td> <td>Good (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 6, 7 or 8 of 9</td> <td>Moderate (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria</td> <td>Poor (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score	If 8 criteria assessed (woodland ponds):		Passes 7 of 7 criteria	Good (3)	Passes 5 or 6 of 7 criteria	Moderate (2)	Passes 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 of 7 criteria	Poor (1)	If 10 criteria assessed (non-woodland ponds):		Passes 9 of 9 criteria	Good (3)	Passes 6, 7 or 8 of 9	Moderate (2)	Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria	Poor (1)
Condition Assessment Result	Condition Assessment Score																		
If 8 criteria assessed (woodland ponds):																			
Passes 7 of 7 criteria	Good (3)																		
Passes 5 or 6 of 7 criteria	Moderate (2)																		
Passes 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 of 7 criteria	Poor (1)																		
If 10 criteria assessed (non-woodland ponds):																			
Passes 9 of 9 criteria	Good (3)																		
Passes 6, 7 or 8 of 9	Moderate (2)																		
Passes 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of 9 criteria	Poor (1)																		
Footnote 1 - A woodland pond will be surrounded on all sides by woodland habitat. Footnote 2 - Any species included on the Water Framework Directive UKTAG GB High Impact Species List should be absent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently occurring non-native plant species include water fern <i>Azolla spp.</i>, Australian swamp stonecrop <i>Crassula helmsii</i>, parrot's feather <i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>, floating pennywort <i>Hydrocotyle ranunculoides</i> and Japanese knotweed <i>Fallopia japonica</i>, giant hogweed <i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i> (on the bank). Frequently occurring non-native animals include signal crayfish <i>Pacifastacus leniusculus</i>, zebra mussels <i>Dreissena polymorpha</i>, killer shrimp <i>Dikerogammarus villosus</i>, demon shrimp <i>Dikerogammarus haemobaphes</i>, carp <i>Cyprinus carpio</i>. Footnote 3 - If the pond is seasonal (i.e. dries out in most summers) then emergent species alone are likely to be found.																			

Condition Sheet: ROCKY SHORE Habitat Type

EUNIS Habitat Type(s)

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

Habitat Description

[Use EUNIS littoral rock habitat description.](#)

Habitat Attributes to Record

The following information should be recorded within the condition assessment proforma:

- 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
- % 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
- Habitat zonation¹
- WFD classification of overlying water

Condition Assessment Criteria

	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 point)	Poor (1)	Score per indicator
1	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.	
2	Presence and abundance of invasive non-native species²	Not more than 1 invasive non-native species is present at a level of occasional on the SACFOR scale or occupying more than 1% of the habitat. No high risk undesirable species present, see footnote.	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 undesirable species present, see footnote for list.	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 undesirable species is present – GBNNSS should be notified, see footnote for details.	
3	Water Quality	No visual evidence of pollution. There are no nuisance algal growths that are likely to be attributable to nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September	Visual evidence of low to moderate levels of pollution. elevated algal growth with increases in cover that may indicate nutrient enrichment. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	Visual evidence of high algal growth that is indicative of nutrient enrichment. Signs of eutrophication that would impede bird feeding. Seasonality of the assessment should be considered, peak bloom time is July – September.	
4	Non-natural structures and direct human impacts	No evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars) or they occupy <1% of the habitat area.	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying up to 10% of the habitat area.	Some evidence of impacts from direct human activities (including pontoons, moorings, boats, crab tiles, bait digging or anchoring scars), occupying over >10% of the habitat area.	

5	<p>Litter (when examining a beach strandline /mean high water line or intertidal rocky shore)</p>	<p>Following the 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 21 items per person per 100m per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment³.</p>	<p>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 20 and 47 items of litter per 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment³.</p>	<p>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 100m survey per person per hour. See Nelms 2017 <i>et al</i> and the link to the MSFD threshold value assessment³.</p>	
Total score (out of a possible 15)					0
Condition Assessment Result					
<p>TOTAL SCORE >12 (75-100%) = GOOD CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 8 - 12 (50--75%) = MODERATE CONDITION TOTAL SCORE 5-7 (0-50%) = POOR CONDITION</p>					
Notes					
<p>Footnote 1 - The rocky shore macroalgal index enables an assessment of the condition of the rocky shore by looking at the macroalgal taxonomic composition and cover. WFD's Reduced Species List for the Macroalgae Tool. https://www.wfduk.org/sites/default/files/Media/Environmental%20standards/Annex%2015%20Transitional%20and%20coastal%20waters%20opportunistic%20macroalgal%20blooming%20tool.pdf</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Abundances estimated using SACFOR scales details available here: http://archive.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/04_05_introduction.pdf</p> <p>Use MSFD non-native species list for up to date list of species available here: https://secure.fera.defra.gov.uk/nonnativespecies/downloadDocument.cfm?id=1518</p> <p>High risk undesirable species at time of publication include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> – Carpet sea squirt • <i>Hemigrapsus spp.</i> – Asian Shore crabs (<i>H. sanguineus</i>, <i>H. takanoi</i> or <i>H. penicillatus</i>) • <i>Corella eumyota</i> – Orange-tipped sea squirt • <i>Grateloupia turuturu</i> – Devil's tongue weed, gracie, red menace and red tide • <i>Schizoporella japonica</i> – Orange ripple bryozoan <p>Please check for updates of high risk species</p> <p>Footnote 3 - Please see Nelms et al (2017) for methodological details to identify litter m⁻¹ min⁻¹ person⁻¹.</p> <p>Nelms, Coombes, Foster, Galloway, Godley, Lindeque & Witt (2017) Marine anthropogenic litter on British beaches: A 10-year nationwide assessment using citizen science data Science of The Total Environment, Volume 579, 1 February 2017, p. 1399-1409 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969716325918?via%3Dihub</p>					

Condition Sheet: SCRUB Habitat Type	
UKHab Habitat Type	
Heathland and shrub - Blackthorn scrub Heathland and shrub - Bramble scrub Heathland and shrub - Gorse scrub Heathland and shrub - Hawthorn scrub Heathland and shrub - Hazel scrub Heathland and shrub - Mixed scrub Heathland and shrub - Sea buckthorn scrub (Annex 1)	
Habitat Description	
See UKHab	
For sea buckthorn scrub use Habitats Directive Annex 1 definition	
Condition Assessment Criteria	
1	Habitat is representative of UKHab description (where in its natural range). There are at least three woody species, with no one species comprising more than 75% of the cover (except common juniper, sea buckthorn or box, which can be up to 100% cover).
2	There is a good age range – all of the following are present: seedlings, young shrubs and mature shrubs.
3	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ¹ make up less than 5% of ground cover.
4	The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and/or herbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat(s).
5	There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges.
Condition Assessment Result	
Condition Assessment Score	
Passes 5 of 5 criteria	Good (3)
Passes 3 or 4 of 5 criteria	Moderate (2)
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 5 criteria	Poor (1)
Notes	
Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> , snowberry <i>Symphoricarpos</i> spp., buddleia <i>Buddleja</i> spp., cotoneaster <i>Cotoneaster</i> spp., Spanish bluebell <i>Hyacinthoides hispanica</i> (or hybrids).	

Condition Sheet: SPARSELY VEGETATED LAND Habitat Type			
UKHab Habitat Type(s)			
Sparsely vegetated land - Inland rock outcrop and scree habitats Sparsely vegetated land - Other inland rock and scree			
Habitat Description			
See UKHab			
Condition Assessment Criteria			
1	The appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches characteristics of the specific sparsely vegetated habitat type (see UKHab definition linked above). Indicator species for the specific sparsely vegetated habitat type are very clearly and easily visible.		
2	Cover of bracken, scrub and trees less than 25%.		
3	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ¹ make up less than 5% of vegetated ground cover.		
4	Vegetation cover of vascular and non-vascular plants between 5 and 50%.		
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score	
Passes 4 of 4 criteria		Good (3)	
Passes 3 of 4 criteria		Moderate (2)	
Passes 0, 1, or 2 of 4 criteria		Poor (1)	
Notes			
Footnote 1 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> , docks <i>Rumex</i> spp., brambles <i>Rubus</i> spp., common ragwort <i>Jacobaea vulgaris</i> , common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> .			

Condition Sheet: URBAN - NON PRIORITY Habitat Type		
UKHab Habitat Type		
Sparsely vegetated land - Ruderal/ephemeral Urban - Allotments Urban - Bioswale Urban - Brown roof Urban - Cemeteries and churchyards [Use Urban condition sheet as default. Where there are areas of grassland, woodland or scrub above the minimum mappable area, record and assess these as the relevant habitat type] Urban - Extensive green roof Urban - Façade-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 urban drainage feature [in the context of the Biodiversity Metric, this habitat type refers to open SUDS with vegetation and/or open water] Urban - Vacant / derelict land / bare ground		
Habitat Description		
See UKHab		
Condition Assessment Criteria		
CORE CRITERIA - applicable to all urban habitat types :		
1	Vegetation structure is varied, providing opportunities for insects, birds and bats to live and breed. A single ecotone (i.e. scrub, grassland, herbs) should not account for more than 80% of the total habitat area.	
2	There is a diverse range of flowering plant species, providing nectar sources for insects. These species may be either native, or non-native but beneficial to wildlife. NB - To achieve GOOD condition, criterion 2 must be satisfied by native species only (rather than non-natives beneficial to wildlife).	
3	Invasive non-native species (Schedule 9 of WCA) cover less than 5% of total vegetated area. NB - To achieve GOOD condition, criterion 3 must be satisfied by a complete absence of invasive non-native species (rather than <5% cover).	
ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Open mosaic on previously developed land habitat type:		
4a	The site shows spatial variation, forming a mosaic of at least four early successional communities (a) to (h) PLUS bare substrate AND pools. (a) annuals; (b) mosses/liverworts; (c) lichens; (d) ruderals; (e) inundation species; (f) open grassland; (g) flower-rich grassland; (h) heathland.	
ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Bioswale and SUDS habitat types:		
4b	The water table is at or near the surface throughout the year. This could be open water or saturation of soil at the surface.	
Condition Assessment Result		Condition Assessment Score
If 3 criteria assessed:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for good condition within criteria 2 and 3 		Good (3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 2 of 3 core criteria; OR • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria but does not meet the requirements for good condition within criteria 2 and 3 		Moderate (2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 0 or 1 of 3 core criteria 		Poor (1)
If 4 criteria assessed:		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 3 of 3 core criteria; AND • Meets the requirements for good condition within criteria 2 and 3; AND • Passes additional criterion 4a or 4b 	<p style="text-align: center;">Good (3)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 2 of 3 of 4 criteria; OR • Passes 4 of 4 criteria but does not meet the requirements for good condition within criteria 2 and 3 	<p style="text-align: center;">Moderate (2)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passes 0 or 1 of 4 criteria 	<p style="text-align: center;">Poor (1)</p>
Notes	

Condition Sheet: URBAN TREES (INCLUDING STREET TREES) Habitat Type	
UKHab Habitat Type(s)	
Urban - Urban tree	
Habitat Description	
Covers the following topographical formations most commonly found in urban areas [†] : Individual Trees: Young trees over 75mm in diameter measured at 1.5m from ground level and individual semi-mature and mature trees of significant stature and size that dominant their surroundings whose canopies are not touching but that are in close proximity to other trees. Perimeter Blocks: Groups or stands of trees within and around boundaries of land, former field boundary trees incorporated into developments, individual trees in gardens whose canopies overlap continuously Linear Blocks: Lines of trees along streets, highways, railways and canals whose canopies may or may not overlap continuously.	
Condition Assessment Criteria	
1	More than 70% of trees are native species.
2	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.
3	More than 50% of trees are mature ² or veteran ³ .
4	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by anthropogenic activities such as vandalism or herbicide use. There is no current regular pruning regime so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.
5	Management regime has encouraged micro habitat sites for birds, mammals and insects e.g. presence of deadwood, cavities or loose bark etc.
6	Trees are immediately adjacent to other vegetation, and tree canopies are oversailing vegetation beneath.
FC	Condition Assessment Score
Passes 5 or 6 of 6 criteria	Good (3)
Passes 3 or 4 of 6 criteria	Moderate (2)
Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 criteria	Poor (1)
Notes	

Footnote 1 - This covers all trees in artificial urban habitats such as private gardens, private land, institutional land and land used for transport functions; roads, streets, canals, rail, footpaths etc. Trees in urban areas can under the right conditions provide a large range of habitat opportunities, supporting lichens, invertebrates and birds. Tree planting in urban areas has for over two hundred years also introduced non-native species into towns and cities. In the context of biodiversity native species are the preferred option. However, non-native tree species can contribute positively to biodiversity richness particularly in relation to providing a seasonal food source for nectar feeders and other invertebrates as well as supporting vertebrates that feed on species that are hosted by non-native trees. Examples are early and late flowering species of *Prunus* and aphids on varieties of *Acer* providing food for species higher up the food chain. The species of trees (native or non-native) together with the intensity and type of management they are subject to will determine the biodiversity value of the trees in question. Trees in urban areas provide opportunistic sites for biodiversity to colonise and re-colonise, increasing connectivity and contributing to biodiversity critical mass between already established patches or sites. This is especially so where transport corridors are populated with mixed native species

Footnote 2 - A mature tree in this context is one that is at least 2/3 expected fully mature height for the species.

Footnote 3 - All ancient trees are veteran trees, but not all veteran trees are ancient. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its biodiversity, cultural and heritage value. Veteran trees can be classified if they have four out of the five following features:

1. Rot sites associated with wounds which are decaying >400cm²;
2. Holes and water pockets in the trunk and mature crown >5 cm diameter;
3. Dead branches or stems >15 cm diameter;
4. Any hollowing in the trunk or major limbs;
5. Fruit bodies of fungi known to cause wood decay.

Condition Sheet: WETLAND Habitat Type

UKHab Habitat Type(s)

Grassland - Floodplain wetland mosaic (CFGM) [Use this condition sheet unless associated with a species rich grassland sward, reedbed or fen, in which case record and assess as the relevant habitat type (plus Ditch condition sheet for any ditches)].

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](#)

Floodplain wetland mosaic (CFGM) - Where an area is included within the (soon to be published) "Floodplain Wetland Mosaic Habitat Inventory" as extant habitat OR included within the "Floodplain with potential for restoration to Wetland Mosaic" layer it should be recorded within the metric as FWM habitat. In these cases the ditches form an integral part of the habitat and should not be recorded separately as linear features in the Rivers & Streams part of the metric.

If it is NOT included within either layer of the inventory it should be assessed, and entered into the metric, as the appropriate habitat (e.g. modified grassland, cereal crop, temporary lakes, ponds and pools). Any ditches should be recorded separately within the River and Streams part of the metric.

Until this new inventory is published, you should use existing inventories for floodplain habitats, including the Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh layer of the Priority Habitat Inventory (England) and any local habitat data.

<https://data.gov.uk/dataset/4b6ddab7-6c0f-4407-946e-d6499f19fcde/priority-habitat-inventory-england>

For all other wetland habitats see

[UKHab](#)

Condition Assessment Criteria

CORE CRITERIA - Applicable to all wetland habitat types:

1	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. NB - this criterion is non-negotiable for achieving good condition.
2	The appearance and composition of the vegetation closely matches characteristics of the specific wetland habitat type (see definitions and links above). Indicator species for the specific wetland habitat type ¹ are very clearly and easily visible.
3	The water supplies (groundwater, surfacewater and/or rainwater) to the wetland are of good water quality, with clear water (low turbidity) indicating no obvious signs of pollution.
4	Cover of scrub and scattered trees less than 10%.
5	Cover of bare ground less than 5%.
6	There is an absence of invasive non-native species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA, 1981) and undesirable species ¹ make up less than 5% of ground cover.

ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Fen and Purple moor grass and rush pasture habitat type:	
7a	No more than 25% of the fen area has a continuous cover of litter (i.e. dead vegetation) preventing regeneration.
ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Bog habitat type:	
7b	Sphagnum and cottongrasses are at least frequent. Cover of ericaceous dwarf-shrubs ² is less than 75%.
ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Reedbed habitat type:	
7c	The reedbed has a diverse structure with between 60 and 80% reeds. Other areas may include open water (at least 10%), species-rich fen and/or wet woodland.
ADDITIONAL CRITERION - only applicable to Floodplain wetland mosaic (CFGM) habitat type:	
7d	All ditches recorded within the habitat achieve Good condition as assessed using the Ditch condition sheet.
Condition Assessment Result	
Condition Assessment Score	
If 6 criteria assessed:	
• Passes 5 or 6 of 6 core criteria, INCLUDING non-negotiable core criterion 1	Good (3)
• Passes 3 or 4 of 6 core criteria; OR • Passes 5 of 6 core criteria EXCLUDING non-negotiable core criterion 1	Moderate (2)
• Passes 0, 1 or 2 of 6 core criteria	Poor (1)
If 7 criteria assessed:	
• Passes 5 or 6 of 6 core criteria, INCLUDING non-negotiable core criterion 1; AND • Passes additional criterion 7a, 7b, 7c OR 7d where applicable	Good (3)
• Passes 4 or 5 of 7 criteria; OR • Passes 6 of 7 criteria EXCLUDING either non-negotiable core criterion 1 or additional criterion 7a, 7b, 7c OR 7d	Moderate (2)
• Passes 0, 1, 2 or 3 of 7 criteria	Poor (1)
Notes	
<p>Footnote 1 - For fens, specify what fen type is present - alkaline, neutral, acidic/eutrophic, mesotrophic, oligotrophic.</p> <p>Footnote 2 - Species considered undesirable for this habitat type include: creeping thistle <i>Cirsium arvense</i> , spear thistle <i>Cirsium vulgare</i>, common nettle <i>Urtica dioica</i> , docks <i>Rumex</i> spp., cherry laurel <i>Prunus laurocerasus</i> , common ragwort <i>Jacobaea vulgaris</i> .</p> <p>Footnote 3 - Ericaceous dwarf shrubs include: crowberry <i>Empetrum nigrum</i> , cowberry <i>Vaccinium vitis-idaea</i> , bog bilberry <i>Vaccinium uliginosum</i> , cranberry <i>Vaccinium oxycoccos</i> , heather <i>Calluna vulgaris</i> , cross-leaved heath <i>Erica tetralix</i> , bog-rosemary <i>Andromeda polifolia</i> , bog myrtle <i>Myrica gale</i>.</p>	

These fens are found throughout the country with particularly important areas in Norfolk and Suffolk.

- Outside flood plains, on fens fed by nutrient-poor water or overlying acid substrates, the vegetation may be shorter and is more likely to be dominated by bog-mosses and bottle sedge and/or other sedges. On more base-enriched sites, very species-rich vegetation may develop, with high cover of brown mosses, small sedges and species such as common butterwort, marsh valerian and marsh arrowgrass. These fen types tend to be much less common. They are concentrated in the north and west of the country, but Norfolk, Dorset and the New Forest, Devon and Cornwall, the White Peak and the Surrey Heaths are also important for them.
- Fen often occurs in association with other semi-natural habitats, especially lowland raised bog, reedbeds, wet woodland, wet grassland (including purple moor-grass and rush pasture), lowland heath and open water. These areas of fen should always be

recorded separately.

Reedbeds

- Dominated by common reeds being an early successional, less developed stage in the development of fens habitats. In the UK we separate them out as a separate habitat in our classification system.

Floodplain Wetland Mosaic (previously Coastal Floodplain Grazing Marsh)

The new Priority Habitat 'Floodplain Wetland Mosaic' (FWM) including some or all of the following river and coastal floodplain habitats is defined as:

- a) Mosaics of priority wetland habitats with natural / near-natural hydrological function and/or water quality
- b) Floodplain areas providing important refuges for wetland wildlife whose natural habitats have been lost including:
 - i. Land with breeding waders and/or wintering waterbirds, or other terrestrial wetland priority species or assemblages.
 - ii. Species currently dependent on ditches and other seasonal or permanent standing water within, or surrounding the land.

Condition Sheet: WOODLAND Habitat Type					
UKHab Habitat Type(s)					
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					
See UKHab					
This condition sheet is based on the England Woodland Biodiversity Group (EWBG) Woodland Condition Survey Method, available here: https://woodlandwildlifetoolkit.sylva.org.uk/assess					
Condition Assessment Criteria					
	Indicator	Good (3 points)	Moderate (2 points)	Poor (1 point)	Score per indicator
1	Age distribution of trees ¹	Three age classes present	Two age classes present	One age class present	
2	Wild, domestic and feral herbivore damage	No significant browsing damage evident in woodland ²	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or less of whole woodland	Evidence of significant browsing pressure is present in 40% or more of whole woodland	
3	Invasive plant species ³	No invasive species present in woodland	Rhododendron or laurel not present, other invasive species < 10% cover	Rhododendron or laurel present, or other invasive species > 10% cover	
4	Number of native tree species	Five or more native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel	Three to four native tree or shrub species found across woodland parcel	None to two native tree or shrub species across woodland parcel	
5	Cover of native tree and shrub species	> 80% of canopy trees and >80% of understory shrubs are native	50-80% of canopy trees and 50-80% of understory shrubs are native	< 50% of canopy trees and <50% of understory shrubs are native	
6	Open space within woodland ⁴	10 – 20% of woodland has areas of temporary open space, unless woodland is <10ha in which case lower threshold of 10% does not apply	21- 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space	More than 40% of woodland has areas of temporary open space	
7	Woodland regeneration ⁵	All three classes present in woodland; trees 4-7cm dbh, saplings and seedlings or advanced coppice regrowth	One or two classes only present in woodland	No classes or coppice regrowth present in woodland	
8	Tree health	Tree mortality less than 10%, no pests or diseases and no crown dieback	11% to 25% mortality and/or crown dieback or low risk pest or disease present	Greater than 25% tree mortality and or any high risk pest or disease present	
9	Vegetation and ground flora	Ancient woodland flora indicators present	Recognisable NVC plant community present	No recognisable NVC community	
10	Woodland vertical structure ⁶	Three or more storeys across all survey plots or a complex woodland	Two storeys across all survey plots	One or less storey across all survey plots	

11	Veteran trees⁷	Two or more veteran trees per hectare	One veteran tree per hectare	No veteran trees present in woodland	
12	Amount of deadwood	50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have standing deadwood, large dead branches/ stems and stumps	Between 25% and 50% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have standing deadwood, large dead branches/ stems and stumps	Less than 25% of all survey plots within the woodland parcel have standing deadwood, large dead branches/ stems and stumps	
13	Woodland disturbance⁸	No nutrient enrichment or damaged ground evident	Less than 1 hectare in total of nutrient enrichment across woodland area and/or less than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground	More than 1 hectare of nutrient enrichment and/or more than 20% of woodland area has damaged ground	

Total score (out of a possible 39)

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

Notes

Footnote 1 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 1 for more information. If tree species is not a birch, cherry or Sorbus: 0 – 20 years (Young); 21-150 years (Intermediate); and >150 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. Check for presence of the following invasive non-native species: American skunk cabbage *Lysichiton americanus*; Himalayan balsam *Impatiens glandulifera*; Japanese knotweed *Fallopia japonica*; Cherry Laurel *Prunus laurocerasus*; Shallon *Gaultheria shallon*; Snowberry *Symphoricarpos albus*; Variegated yellow archangel *Lamiastrum galeobdolon subsp. argentatum*; and Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum*.

Footnote 4 - 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 (e.g. glades, rides, footpaths, areas of clear-fell). This differs from permanent open space where tree regeneration is not possible or desirable (e.g. tarmac, buildings, rivers). Area is at least 10m wide with less than 20% covered by shrubs or trees.

Footnote 5 - 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, the regeneration indicator is gathers additional information by considering regeneration potential i.e. if seedlings, saplings and young trees are all present that means natural regeneration processes are happening.

Footnote 6 - This indicator is looking 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.

Footnote 7 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 12 for more information. All ancient trees are veteran trees, but not all veteran trees are ancient. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its

ancient. A veteran tree may not be very old, but it has decay features, such as branch death and hollowing. These features contribute to its biodiversity, cultural and heritage value. Veteran trees can be classified if they have four out of the five following features:

1. Rot sites associated with wounds which are decaying $>400 \text{ cm}^2$;
2. Holes and water pockets in the trunk and mature crown $>5 \text{ cm}$ diameter;
3. Dead branches or stems $>15 \text{ cm}$ diameter;
4. Any hollowing in the trunk or major limbs;
5. Fruit bodies of fungi known to cause wood decay.

Footnote 8 - See EWBG method INDICATOR 15 for more information. Examples of disturbance are: significant nutrient enrichment; soil compaction from trampling, machinery or animal poaching; litter.