Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Almondbury School Site

Presented to: Frank Shaw Associates Ltd.

Issued: March 2025

Lucion Delta-Simons Project No: 90653.625993

Protecting people and planet

Report Details

Client	Franke Shaw Associates Ltd.
Report Title	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment
Site Address	Almondbury School, Fernside Avenue, Huddersfield, HD5 8PQ
Project No.	90653.625993
Lucion Delta-Simons Contact	

Quality Assurance

Issue No.	Status	Issue Date	Comments	Author	Technical Review	Authorised
2	Final	17th March 2025	Updated Site plans	Craig Dickson Senior Ecologist	Jonathan Spencer Associate Ecologist	Jonathan Spencer Associate Ecologist

About us

Lucion Delta-Simons is a trusted, multidisciplinary environmental consultancy, focused on delivering the best possible project outcomes for customers. Specialising in Environment, Health & Safety and Sustainability, Lucion Delta-Simons provide support and advice within the property development, asset management, corporate and industrial markets. Operating from across the UK we employ over 180 environmental professionals, bringing experience from across the private consultancy and public sector markets.

As part of Lucion Services, our combined team of 500 in the UK has a range of specialist skill sets in over 50 environmental consultancy specialisms including asbestos, hazardous materials, ecology, air and water services, geo-environmental and sustainability amongst others.

Lucion Delta-Simons is a 'Beyond Net-Zero' company. We have set a Science-Based Target to reduce our Scope 1 and Scope 2 carbon emissions in line with the Paris Agreement and are committed to reducing Scope 3 emissions from our supply chain. Every year we offset our residual emissions by 150% through verified carbon removal projects linked to the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Our consultancy services to you are climate positive.

If you would like support in understanding your carbon footprint and playing your part in tackling the global climate crisis, please get in touch with your Lucion Delta-Simons contact above who will be happy to help.

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

Drawings

Appendices

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Context and Purpose

Lucion Delta-Simons Ltd ("Lucion Delta-Simons") was instructed by Frank Shaw Associates Ltd. ("the Applicant") to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment to determine whether redevelopment of Almondbury School ("the Proposed Development"), located off Fernside Avenue, in Huddersfield (hereafter referred to as "the Site") can achieve a net gain in biodiversity.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2023) states, "*Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the local environment by…(d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures…",* it also places greater emphasis on achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity.

This assessment was carried out in adherence to the four rules contained within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (DEFRA, 2024):

- Rule 1: The trading rules of this biodiversity metric must be followed.
- Rule 2: Biodiversity unit outputs, for each type of unit, must not be summed, traded, or converted between types. The requirement to deliver at least a 10% net gain applies to each type of unit.
- Rule 3: To accurately apply the biodiversity metric formula, you must use the biodiversity metric calculation tool or small sites biodiversity metric tool (SSM) for small sites.
- The tools remove the need for a user to manually calculate the change in biodiversity value.
- The tool will summarise the results of the calculation and inform a user whether the biodiversity net gain objective has been met.
- Rule 4: In exceptional ecological circumstances, deviation from this biodiversity metric methodology may be permitted by the relevant planning authority.

In addition, use of the metric during this assessment was informed by the nine principles as contained within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide (DEFRA, 2024):

- Principle 1: The metric assessment should be completed by a competent person.
- Principle 2: The use of this biodiversity metric does not override existing biodiversity protections, statutory obligations, policy requirements, ecological mitigation hierarchy or any other requirements. This includes consenting or licensing processes, for example woodlands.
- Principle 3: This biodiversity metric should be used in accordance with established good practice guidance and professional codes.
- Principle 4: This biodiversity metric is not a complex or comprehensive ecological model and is not a substitute for expert ecological advice.
- Principle 5: Biodiversity units are a proxy for biodiversity and should be treated as relative values.
- Principle 6: This biodiversity metric is designed to inform decisions in conjunction with locally relevant evidence, expert input, or guidance.
- Principle 7: Habitat interventions need to be realistic and deliverable within a relevant project timeframe.
- Principle 8: Created and enhanced habitats should be, where practical and reasonable, local to any impact and deliver strategically important outcomes for nature conservation.
- Principle 9: This biodiversity metric does not enforce a minimum habitat size ratio for compensation of losses. Proposals should aim to:

- Maintain habitat extent - supporting more, bigger, better and more joined up ecological networks; and
- Ensure that proposed or retained habitat parcels are of sufficient size for ecological function.

1.2 Proposed Development

The Proposed Development will comprise a new school facility with associated hard and soft landscaping (Drawing 1).

The construction phase will comprise:

- Clearance of existing on-Site habitats; and
- Construction of the new school facility with associated soft landscaping.

The operational phase will comprise the new school and landscape management.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Overview

The approach used to assess biodiversity impacts resulting from the proposed development is detailed below. This assessment has been based on the Statutory Metric (the Metric), the Landscape Proposal Plan provided by the Client in an email on 17th June 2024 and the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) undertaken in February 2024.

2.2 Biodiversity Metric

The quantitative assessment is based on the Metric to provide a transparent and repeatable measure of biodiversity at each of the stages identified above. The biodiversity score considers a number of factors including:

- Habitat distinctiveness;
- Habitat condition;
- Temporal risk: time required to reach target condition;
- Difficulty to create/restore;
- Connectivity; and
- Spatial area of loss/gain of each habitat.

The pre-development value is compared to the proposed habitat composition post development to assess the change in biodiversity value using biodiversity units as a proxy numeric value.

The Metric only considers habitats and does not take protected and notable species or associated enhancement measures such as bird/bat boxes into account.

2.3 Habitat Distinctiveness

Distinctiveness refers to the relative scarcity of the habitat and its importance for nature conservation. Habitats are assigned to distinctiveness bands. These are based on an assessment of the distinguishing features of a habitat or linear feature, including the consideration of species richness, rarity (at local, regional, national and international scales), and the degree to which a habitat supports species rarely found in other habitats.

The distinctiveness band of each habitat is preassigned in the Metric. The bands are based upon the UK habitat classification system. Where no directly comparable Defra habitat type was available to match the vegetation recorded by Phase 1 Habitat survey, the closest approximation was selected.

The Defra habitat typologies are split into five distinctiveness bands:

- **Very High** - Priority habitats as defined in Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 that are highly threatened, internationally scarce, and require conservation action;
- **High** - Priority habitats as defined in Section 41 of the NERC Act requiring conservation action;
- **Medium** - Semi-natural habitats not classed as Priority Habitat;
- **Low** – Habitat of low biodiversity value; and
- **Very low** – Little or no biodiversity value.

Under the supplementary habitat calculations for linear habitats, hedgerows are assigned a distinctiveness weighting based on their physical structure and the species composition of the woody element of the

hedgerow, and their association with physical features (ditches and banks) that may enhance their ecological value by providing additional niches or enhanced capacity to provide habitat connectivity.

2.4 Habitat Condition

The condition of a habitat is defined by its particular quality. For example, a habitat is in poor condition if it fails to support the notable/protected species for which it is valued, or if it is in unfavourable condition due to degradation from external factors, such as pollution, erosion or invasive species. Condition assessment criteria is based on Common Standards Monitoring of protected sites in the UK where key attributes and positive and negative indicators are used. Habitat condition categories are as follows:

- Good;
- Fairly good;
- Moderate;
- Fairly poor;
- Poor;
- N/A – Agricultural; and
- N/A – other.

For linear features, condition assessment is based on the dimensions and other physical characteristics of a hedgerow or line of trees against a set of minimum requirements for the feature to be considered in a 'favourable' condition. The condition assessment is based on the Hedgerow Survey Handbook.

2.5 Baseline Assessment

The baseline biodiversity score for the Site has been determined using the PEA of the Site undertaken by Lucion Delta-Simons in February 2023. The baseline habitats are shown in Figure 1.

The baseline assessment for the Site has now been established and will not change throughout the development period. This is the baseline from which future audits can be compared.

2.6 Post Development Biodiversity Unit Calculation

Biodiversity Units and Linear Units resulting from ecological mitigation for the Scheme to compensate for potential losses are referred to as post-development Biodiversity Units/Linear Units (BUs/LUs).

To calculate the BUs which may be achieved post-development, risk factors are introduced. The aim of a risk factor is to correct for a disparity or risk, associated with the uncertainty surrounding the creation of habitats. There are three main types of risk that are accounted for within the Metric. These are categorised as follows:

- **Spatial Risk** – these reflect ecological risks deriving from the change in location of the habitat or resource. By way of example, it may be that recreating a habitat in a new location distant from the area of loss could reduce its biodiversity value, through reduced connectivity and a decrease in habitat availability for the species affected by the development;
- **Temporal Risk** – the risk associated with the time required for created habitats to reach their target suitability and for the functionality of the habitat to be restored; and
- **Delivery Risk** – the risks associated with the actual delivery of the offset due to, for instance, uncertainty in the effectiveness of habitat creation/management.

Each risk multiplier is assigned a numerical score which enables post development Biodiversity Units to be calculated.

2.7 Proposed Scheme

In order to calculate the post-intervention score, the Landscape Proposal Plans (Drawing 1) have been used as well as assumptions for targeted habitat conditions as set out in Section 3.1.

2.8 Future Auditing

This Report sets out the predicted biodiversity impacts of the scheme based on a set of assumptions and professional judgement for target habitat conditions post-development. In order to ensure the development achieves the targets set out below, the scheme should be accompanied by an appropriate Landscape and Ecology Management and Monitoring Plan (LEMMP). The LEMMP should allow for regular monitoring of the habitat establishment and their progression to the desired condition target, allowing for changes to management regimes as necessary to achieve the targets set.

3.0 Assumptions and Application of Professional Judgement

3.1 Baseline Habitats

Professional judgement has been made in relation to the baseline habitats and their conditions based on the criteria provided within the Defra Metric Technical Supplement and User Guide.

3.2 Future Habitats

Assumptions and professional judgement have been applied in relation to the habitat target condition. These judgements are based on realistic targets according to the location and context of the development. Future management of the landscaping at the Site should be informed by an appropriate management and monitoring plan to achieve these target conditions.

4.0 Results

4.1 Baseline

Baseline habitats are shown in Figure 1 and consist of predominantly developed land, including footpaths, playgrounds, carparks and the existing buildings, the boundaries of the Site were defined by modified grassland, with scattered trees of varying species, ages and conditions, in addition to areas of ornamental shrubs. Overall, the baseline for the Site is calculated to provide 9.63 area BUs.

Table 1, below, provides a summary of the baseline habitats, areas and biodiversity units for the Site.

Table 1 – On-Site Area Habitat Baseline Score

Existing Habitats (Area)	Condition	Area (ha)	Biodiversity Units
c Modified grassland	Poor	1.62	3.24
Urban - Introduced shrub	Condition Assessment N/A	0.07	0.14
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	1.30	0.00
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	0.82	0.00
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	0.684*	5.47
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	0.0814*	0.65
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	0.0163*	0.13
Total		**3.81**	**9.63**

*As trees do not provide a groundcover area, their areas are not included in the total within this table, meaning that the total areas presented remain the same as the area of the Site. Within the calculator, however, they are included in addition to the ground vegetation areas.

4.2 Proposed Scheme

Post-development habitat compositions are shown in Drawing 1 and detailed in Table 2, below. The majority of the Site post-development will include the new school building, with associate hard landscaping, in addition to the retention of some of the trees. Newly planted habitats will include ornamental planting, with modified and neutral grasslands, swale planting, and new tree planting across the Site. Woodland whip barrier planting will define the boundaries of the Site, providing a visual buffer to the Site.

Table 2, below, provides a summary of the post-development habitats, areas and baseline biodiversity units for the Site.

Table 2 – Post-Development Area Habitat Score

Proposed Habitats (Area)	Target Condition	Area (ha) Retained	Area (ha) Created	Biodiversity Units Delivered
Urban - Introduced shrub	Condition Assessment N/A	-	0.01	0.02

Proposed Habitats (Area)	Target Condition	Area (ha) Retained	Area (ha) Created	Biodiversity Units Delivered
Urban - Introduced shrub	Condition Assessment N/A	-	0.01	0.02
Urban - Developed land; sealed surface	N/A - Other	-	2.28	0.00
Urban - Modified grassland	Moderate	-	0.48	1.66
Urban - Other neutral grassland	Poor	-	0.27	1.01
Urban - Introduced shrub	Condition Assessment N/A	-	0.02	0.04
Urban - Sustainable drainage system	Poor	-	0.02	0.03
Mixed scrub	Poor	-	0.72	2.78
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	-	0.4845*	1.48
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	-	0.1546*	0.47
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	0.5049*	-	4.04
Individual tree - Urban tree	Moderate	0.0326*	-	0.26
Total		**0.00**	**3.81**	**11.81**

*As trees do not provide a groundcover area, their areas are not included in the total within this table, meaning that the total areas presented remain the same as the area of the Site. Within the calculator, however, they are included in addition to the ground vegetation areas.

Table 3, below, provides a summary of the proposed linear habitats on Site (i.e. hedgerows).

Table 3 – Post-Development Linear Habitat Score

Proposed Habitats (Linear)	Target Condition	Length (km) Created	Linear Units Delivered
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	Poor	0.365	0.35
Total		**0.365**	**0.35**

All of the hedgerows to be delivered on-Site have been combined to provide the above length measurement. These hedgerows are planned to be a combination of native and non-native species but will be over 50% native species.

5.0 Conclusions

The above assessment results in a total net unit change of:

Area Units = +2.17 **Total net % change = +22.56%**

Linear Units = +0.35 **Total net % change = N/A**

See the attached completed Defra Metric for detailed results (Appendix A).

Based on the information currently available, this assessment indicates that the development will achieve a net gain in biodiversity over 10%. The main contributor to this is the retention of trees, in addition of new scrub planting, additional tree planting and grassland planting and the creation of new areas of hedgerow.

The trading rules for the development have been satisfied.

It should be noted that any habitat creation is required to be managed in perpetuity to ensure habitats meet the target conditions (which for the purposes of BNG is considered to be 30 years). Monitoring of this should be implemented through an appropriate LEMMP.

The requirement for further consideration of Biodiversity Net Gain will depend on the current approach and requirements of the LPA.

6.0 Disclaimer

The recommendations contained in this Report represent Lucion Delta-Simons' professional opinions, based upon the information referred to in Section 1.0 of this Report, exercising the duty of care required of an experienced Ecology Consultant. Lucion Delta-Simons does not warrant or guarantee that the Site is free of Bats or other protected species.

This Report was prepared by Lucion Delta-Simons for the sole and exclusive use of the Client and for the specific purpose for which Lucion Delta-Simons was instructed as defined in Section 1.0 of this Report. Nothing contained in this Report shall be construed to give any rights or benefits to anyone other than the Client and Lucion Delta-Simons, and all duties and responsibilities undertaken are for the sole and exclusive benefit of the Client and not for the benefit of any other party. In particular, Lucion Delta-Simons does not intend, without its written consent, for this Report to be disseminated to anyone other than the Client or to be used or relied upon by anyone other than the Client. Use of the Report by any other person is unauthorised and such use is at the sole risk of the user. Anyone using or relying upon this Report, other than the Client, agrees by virtue of its use to indemnify and hold harmless Lucion Delta-Simons from and against all claims, losses and damages (of whatsoever nature and howsoever or whensoever arising), arising out of or resulting from the performance of the work by the Consultant.

Figure 1 – Baseline Habitats

Legend

- Site boundary
- g4 - modified grassland
- u - urban, ornamental shrub
- u1b - developed land, sealed surface
- u1b5 - buildings
- Fence
- Broadleaved scattered tree
- Coniferous scattered tree
- Target notes

0 10 20 30 40 Meters

N

Figure	Baseline Habitats		
Job	Almondbury School Site		
Client	Frank Shaw Associates Ltd.		
Figure No. 1	Revision A	Date 13/06/2024	
Drawn BB	Checked CD	Scale 1:1,250 @ A3	
Job No. 90653.625993		Central GR 416919E 415841N	

DO NOT SCALE.
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.

DeltaSimons

Figure 1 – Baseline Habitats

Legend

- Site boundary
- Amenity planting semi-shade mix
- Amenity planting shade mix
- Grass turf lawn
- Meadow planting
- Swale meadow planting
- Woodland whip barrier planting
- Sensory planting
- Built
- Hedgerows
- Retained tree
- Proposed tree

0 10 20 30 40 Meters

N

Figure	Proposed Habitats		
Job	Almondbury School Site		
Client	Frank Shaw Associates Ltd.		
Figure No. 2	Revision A	Date 13/06/2024	
Drawn BB	Checked CD	Scale 1:1,250 @ A3	
Job No. 90653.625993		Central GR 416919E 415841N	

DO NOT SCALE.
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION.

DeltaSimons

Drawing 1 – Landscape Proposal Plans

Note

1. Do not scale from this drawing
2. To be read in conjunction with Project Risk Register REF: XXX
3. To be read in conjunction with all other Landscape Architect's drawings

KEY

- Existing Tree
- Existing Tree to be Removed
- Proposed Feature Tree
- Proposed Feature Multistem Tree
- Proposed Standard Boundary Tree
- Proposed Feathered Boundary Tree
- Proposed Woodland Tree
- Proposed Woodland Multistem Tree
- Woodland Whip Barrier Planting *WW1*
- Meadow Seed Mix *MS1*
- Meadow Turf *MT1*
- Swale Meadow Planting *MS2*
- Amenity Lawn Seed Mix *AL1*
- Reinforced Grass Turf Lawn *RL1*
- Hedge Planting A *H1*
- Hedge Planting B *H2*
- Amenity Planting Shade Mix *SA1*
- Amenity Planting Semi-shade Mix *SSA1*
- Sensory Planting *SP1*
- Shade Sensory Planting *SP2*

*For Planting Schedule refer to drawing 22315-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0032

DATE	REV	DESCRIPTION OF REVISION	DRAWN BY	APPROVED BY
28/02/2025	P11	Re-issued for planning following Sport England objection withdrawal. Changes as follows: 1. Updated to align with changes to GA. 2. Shade sensory planting mix added to central courtyard. 3. Tree species labels added. 4. Entrance meadow seed amended to amenity lawn.	MG	MM

REVISIONS

STATUS

S2 - *For Planning*

ares LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

Ares Landscape Architects LTD
Gatecrasher,
51 Eyre Lane
Sheffield
S1 4RB

t: 0114 276 2000
e: hello@aresdesign.co.uk
w: aresdesign.co.uk

CLIENT :

Kirklees Council

PROJECT TITLE :

Woodley School and College

DRAWING TITLE :

Planting Plan

DRAWING SCALE :	DRAWN BY :	DRAWN DATE :
1:500	AT	08/11/2024
PAPER SIZE :	APPROVED BY :	ALA PROJECT CODE:
A1	RS	ALA 823

DRAWING NUMBER : **22315-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0030** STATUS : **S2** REVISION : **P11**

PLANT SCHEDULE

Feature Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	Form	Age	Girth/Dia.(cm)	Height(cm)	Clear Stem(cm)	Root Type	Container Size	Habit	Min.no.ofBreaks	Comments
ACE KIN	*Acer campestre 'Streetwise'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	450-625	min 200	RB		/	/	/
ACE SEN	*Acer platanoides 'Crimson Sentry'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	450-625	min 200	RB		/	/	/
BET FAS	*Betula albosinensis 'Fascination'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
CAR FON	*Carpinus betulus 'Frans Fontaine'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
LIR TUL	*Liriodendron tulipifera*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
PRU PLE	*Prunus avium 'Plena'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
PRU ACC	*Prunus 'Accolade'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
PYR CHA	*Pyrus calleryana 'Chanticleer'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/
ULM HOR	*Ulmus 'New Horizon'*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	3x	16-18	400-450	min 200	RB		/	/	/

Feature Multistem Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	CommonName		Heightcm	Root Condition / Container Size		Specification
ACE CAM	*Acer campestre*	Common Maple		300-350	RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm; 5 brks
AME LAM	Amelanchier lamarckii	Juneberry		300-350	RB		3x; Multi-stem; bushy; 3 stems min.
BET JAC	Betula utilis jacquemontii	White-barked Himalayan Birch		300-350	RB		Multi-stem; bushy; 3 stems min.

Standard Boundary Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	Form	Age	Girth/Dia.(cm)	Height(cm)	Clear Stem(cm)	Root Type	Container Size	Habit	Min.no.ofBreaks	Comments
PIN NIG	*Pinus nigra*	Standard (Extra Heavy)	5x	25-30	500-550	min 200	RB		Leader with laterals; clear stem 150-175cm	/	/

Feathered Boundary Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	Form	Age	Girth/Dia.(cm)	Height(cm)	Clear Stem(cm)	Root Type	Container Size	Habit	Min.no.ofBreaks	Comments
BET NIG	*Betula nigra*	Standard (Extra Heavy); Feathered; 7 breaks	3x	16-18	400-450	/	RB		Leader with laterals; clear stem 150-175cm	/	/

Woodland Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	CommonName		Girth/Dia.cm	Heightcm		Root Condition / Container Size		Specification
ACE CAM	*Acer campestre*	Common Maple		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm; 5 brks
BET PEN	*Betula pendula*	Common Silver Birch		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm
BET PUB	*Betula pubescens*	Downy Birch		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; Large Feathered
CAR BET	*Carpinus betulus*	Common Hornbeam		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm
SOR AUC	*Sorbus aucuparia*	Rowan		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm
PIN SYL	*Pinus sylvestris*	Scots Pine		16-18	400-450		RB		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm

Woodland Multistem Trees

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	CommonName		Heightcm	Root Condition / Container Size		Specification
ACE CAM	*Acer campestre*	Common Maple		16-18	400-450		3x; EHS; clear stem min. 200cm; 5 brks

Woodland Whip Barrier Planting Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Form	Age	Heightcm	Root Condition / Container Size	Comments
15	*Acer campestre*	Common Maple		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	Rabbit guards with canes to be used for all whips. Chestnut cleft post with wire and mesh fencing to run along east facing boundary of east Woodland Whip Barrier Planting area.
10	*Betula pubescens*	Common Silver Birch		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	
15	*Corylus avellana*	Hazel		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	
10	*Malus sylvestris*	Crab Apple		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	
10	*Prunus avium*	Wild Cherry		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	
10	*Prunus padus*	Bird Cherry		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	
10	*Quercus robur*	English Oak		Transplant - seed raised	1+1	60-80	RB	

Woodland Understorey Meadow Seed Mix

ID Code	Seed Mixture Product Name	Supplier		Sowing Rate
EH1	Hedgerow Mixture	Emorsgate Seeds		5gr/ sqm

Instant Hedging A

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	CommonName		Heightcm	Root Condition / Container Size		Specification		Density (no./ linear m)
GRI LIT	*Griselinia littoralis*	Kapuka		100-120	76L		Readyhedge instant hedging; 35cm wide x 100cm long; pre-formed with continuous root-strip, dense, straight-sided, feathered to base, neatly clipped		1

Instant Hedging B

Abbrev.	BotanicalName	CommonName		Heightcm	Root Condition / Container Size		Specification		Density (no./ linear m)
FAG SYL	*Fagus sylvatica*	Common Beech		180	76L		Readyhedge instant hedging; 35cm wide x 100cm long; pre-formed with continuous root-strip, dense, straight-sided, feathered to base, neatly clipped		1

Sensory Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Root Condition / Container Size	Specification		Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
10	*Alchemilla mollis*	Lady's Mantle		2L	Full pot		7		3 or 5
15	*Geranium macrorrhizum 'White-ness'*	Big-root Cranesbill 'White-Ness'		2L	Full pot				
10	*Lavandula angustifolia 'Hidcote'*	English Lavender 'Hidcote'		2L	Full pot				
20	*Persicaria affinis 'Darjeeling Red'*	Knotweed 'Darjeeling Red'		2L	Branched; 2 brks				
15	*Sedum spectabile 'Autumn Joy'*	Stonecrop 'Herbstfreude'		2L	Full pot				
15	*Vinca minor 'Gertrude Jekyll'*	Lesser Periwinkle 'Gertrude Joy'		2L	Full pot				
15	*Stipa tenuifolia*	Mexican Feather Grass		2L	Full pot				

Shade Sensory Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Root Condition / Container Size	Specification		Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
5	*Anemone hybrida 'September Charm'*	Japanese Anemone 'September Charm'		2L	Full pot		7		3 or 5
5	*Astrantia major 'Burgundy Manor'*	Masterwort 'Burgundy Manor'		2L	Full pot				
10	*Dryopteris erythrosora*	Copper Shield Fern		2L	Full pot				
15	*Dryopteris wallichiana*	Alpine Wood Fern		2L	Full pot				
20	*Hakonechloa macra*	Japanese Forest Grass		2L	Full pot				
15	*Luzula nivea*	Snow Rush		2L	Full pot				
15	*Pachysandra terminalis*	Japanese Spurge		2L	Full pot				
5	*Pulmonaria officinalis 'sissinghurst white'*	Lungwort 'Sissinghurst white'		2L	Full pot				
10	*Tiarella cordifolia 'Pink Bouquet'*	Foam Flower 'Pink Bouquet'		2L	Full pot				

Semi-shade Amenity Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Root Condition / Container Size	Specification		Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
5	*Alchemilla mollis*	Lady's Mantle		2L	Full pot		7		5 or 7
10	*Asplenium scolopendrium*	Hart's Tongue Fern		2L	Full pot				
8	*Aster x frikartii 'Mönch'*	Michaelmas Daisy 'Mönch'		2L	Full pot				
10	*Brunnera macrophylla 'Jack Frost'*	Siberian bugloss 'Jack Frost'		2L	Full pot				
8	*Calamagrostis × acutiflora 'Karl Foerster'*	Feather reed grass		2L	Full pot				
8	*Geranium pheum 'Semophore'*	Dusky Cranesbill		2L	Full pot				
10	*Geranium 'Rozanne'*	Cranesbill 'Rozanne'		2L	Full pot				
18	*Hakonechloa macra*	Japanese Forest Grass		2L	Full pot				
5	*Pulmonaria officinalis 'Sissinghurst White'*	Lungwort 'Sissinghurst White'		2L	Full pot				
10	*Sarcococca confusa*	Sweet Box		2L	Bushy; 4 brks				
8	*Verbena bonariensis*	Argentinian Vervain		2L	Full pot				

Semi-shade Amenity - Bulb Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Specification	Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
30	*Chionodoxa forbesii*	Forbes' Glory of the Snow		Grade 5/6	12		5 or 7
40	*Crocus chrysanthus 'Snow Bunting'*	Golden Crocus 'Snow Bunting'		Grade 7/+			
30	*Muscari armeniacum*	Armenian Grape Hyacinth		Grade 8/9			

Shade Amenity Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Root Condition / Container Size	Specification		Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
15	*Brunnera macrophylla*	Siberian Bugloss		2L	Full pot		7		5 or 7
15	*Geranium x oxonianum 'Wargrave Pink'*	French Cranesbill 'Wargrave Pink'		2L	Full pot				
15	*Liriope muscari*	Big Blue Lilyturf		2L	Full pot				
15	*Luzula sylvatica*	Great Wood-rush		2L	Full pot; Sept to April planting; British native-origin				
20	*Pachysandra terminalis*	Japanese Spurge		2L	Several shoots; 7 brks				
20	*Polypodium vulgare*	Common Polypody		2L	Full pot				

Shade Amenity - Bulb Mix

Mix%	BotanicalName	CommonName		Specification	Density (no./ m²)		Groupings
30	*Chionodoxa forbesii*	Forbes' Glory of the Snow		Grade 5/6	12		5 or 7
40	*Crocus chrysanthus 'Snow Bunting'*	Golden Crocus 'Snow Bunting'		Grade 7/+			
30	*Muscari armeniacum*	Armenian Grape Hyacinth		Grade 8/9			

Meadow Seed Mix

ID Code	Seed Mixture Product Name	Supplier		Sowing Rate
EM2	Standard General Purpose Meadow Mixture	Emorsgate Seeds		5gr/ sqm

Swale Meadow Seed Mix

ID Code	Seed Mixture Product Name	Supplier		Sowing Rate
EM8	Meadow mixture for wetlands	Emorsgate Seeds		5gr/ sqm

Amenity Lawn Seed Mix

ID Code	Seed Mixture Product Name	Supplier		Sowing Rate
A19	A19 All Purpose Landscaping	Germinal Amenity		50g/ sqm

Meadow Turf

PRODUCT	SPECIFICATION (in accordance with NPS)	DENSITY no./sqm	NOTES
WFT-Landscape-34 by WildFlowerTurf.co.uk or equal and approved	To suppliers recommendations		Install as per supplier recommendations. To have plastic free reinforcement meshing.

Reinforced Grass Turf Lawn

PRODUCT	SPECIFICATION (in accordance with NPS)	DENSITY no./sqm	NOTES
Golpa Grass & Gravel Reinforcement by Geosynthetics or equal and approved	To suppliers recommendations		Install as per supplier recommendations. To have plastic free reinforcement meshing.

Note

1. Do not scale from this drawing
2. To be read in conjunction with Project Risk Register REF: XXX
3. To be read in conjunction with all other Landscape Architect's drawings

KEY

*For Planting Plan refer to drawing 22315-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0030

DATE	REV	DESCRIPTION OF REVISION	DRAWN BY	APPROVED BY
28/02/2025	P07	Re-issued for planning following Sport England objection withdrawal. Changes as follows: 1. Shade sensory planting mix added to schedule.	MG	MM

REVISIONS

STATUS

S2 - *For Planning*

Ares Landscape Architects LTD
Gatecrasher,
51 Eyre Lane
Sheffield
S1 4RB
t: 0114 276 2000
e: hello@aresdesign.co.uk
w: aresdesign.co.uk

CLIENT :

Kirklees Council

PROJECT TITLE :

Woodley School and College

DRAWING TITLE :

Planting Schedule

DRAWING SCALE :	DRAWN BY :	DRAWN DATE :
NTS	AT	07/03/2024
PAPER SIZE :	APPROVED BY :	ALA PROJECT CODE:
A1	RS	ALA 823

DRAWING NUMBER : **22315-ALA-00-XX-DR-L-0032** STATUS : **S2** REVISION : **P07**

Appendix A – Statutory Metric Calculation Tool (Issued Separately)