



FUTURESECOLOGY

Broadleaf Properties Management Ltd

Brown Hill Farm, Russell Grove, Birkenshaw

BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIA) REPORT

Report Reference Number: FE694/BIA01

May 2026

Futures Ecology Ltd

Carrwood Park, Swillington Common Farm, Selby Rd, Leeds LS15 4LG

Company Number: 12125083

This report is the property of Futures Ecology Limited and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without the written consent of Futures Ecology Limited.

This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the express written agreement of Futures Ecology Limited. The use of this report by unauthorised third parties is at their own risk and Futures Ecology Limited accepts no duty of care to any such third party.

Futures Ecology Limited assumes no liability for any loss resulting from errors, omissions or misrepresentation made by others. Any recommendation, opinion or finding stated in this report is based on conditions as they existed at the time that Futures Ecology Limited undertook the work. Nothing in this report constitutes legal opinion.

REV	Issue Status	Notes	Author or Reviewer	Name & Qualifications	Position	Date
-	Draft 1	-	Author	K. Haymes BSc (Hons) MCIEEM	Senior Ecologist	30.04.2026
			Reviewer	M. Baker BSc (Hons), MSc, MCIEEM	Senior Ecologist	05.05.2026

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

2.0 METHODOLOGY 1

3.0 BASELINE ECOLOGY 3

4.0 BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT 4

TABLES

- Table 1: Summary of Baseline Habitats
- Table 2: Soil Type Information
- Table 3: Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles for Development Summary

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM)
- Appendix B: Habitat Condition Assessment (HCA)

FIGURES

- Figure 1: Baseline Habitat Plan
- Figure 2: Proposed Habitat Plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following report has been prepared by Futures Ecology Ltd. on behalf of Broadleaf Properties Management Ltd. This summary report presents the results of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) calculations using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) Calculation Tool produced in respect of proposals for the development of land Brown Hill Farm, Russell Grove, Birkenshaw (grid reference: SE 20741 28577).

SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT

- 1.2 The Site is approximately 0.27ha in extent and comprises five agricultural buildings associated with Brown Hill Farm, with areas of hardstanding, poor semi-improved grassland and scattered scrub. The main farmhouse is located south and west of the redline boundary and the immediate surrounding landscape comprises largely of pastoral fields. The residential area of Birkenshaw is located to the north, south and west.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

- 1.3 The proposals are for the demolition of the existing barns and the erection of four detached dwellings (Planning Reference: 2025/62/93514/E, Kirklees Council).

2.0 METHODOLOGY

FIELD SURVEY – HABITATS

Personnel

- 2.1 The extended Phase 1 Habitat survey and preliminary protected species survey was conducted by K. Haymes MCIEEM, BSc (Hons). K. Haymes has over 10 years' experience in ecological consultancy, including external and internal assessments for roosting bats and holds a Level 2 bat licence (2025-85857-CL18-BAT). K. Haymes is also registered to use a great crested newt (GCN) *Triturus cristatus* licence (2025-82135-SCI-CL08) and a barn owl *Tyto alba* licence (2026-87985-CL29-OWL). K. Haymes was certified in May 2021 to conduct River Condition Assessments (RCA).

Habitat Appraisal

- 2.2 A Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the Site undertaken on 22nd April 2026, during weather conditions that were dry and sunny.
- 2.3 Survey methodology followed guidance from Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) 2016¹ comprising a walkover of the survey area mapping (using JNCC standard habitat codes) and broadly describing and classifying the principal habitat types and identifying the dominant plant species present within each habitat type, noting any features of interest. The frequencies at which plant species occurred were noted using

¹ JNCC (2016) *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – a technique for environmental audit*. ISBN 0 86139 636 7

the DAFOR² method³. Whilst the plant species lists obtained should not be regarded as exhaustive, sufficient information was obtained to determine broad habitat types.

- 2.4 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric works best where habitat types are classified using the UK Habitats Classification methodology (UKHab Ltd., 2023)⁴. Therefore, habitats were also described and evaluated in accordance with the UK Habitats Classification methods aligning the assessed habitats with the Biodiversity Metric habitat types.
- 2.5 The surveys used were sufficient to determine the Statutory Biodiversity Metric habitat types present onsite and to fully inform the Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM). This information was used to adequately map the onsite habitats to inform the BIA.
- 2.6 A summary of the habitats present onsite is provided within the report including the UK Hab equivalent habitats for the purpose of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA).

Habitat Condition Assessment

- 2.7 Habitat condition was assessed and assigned during the Phase 1 assessment following the guidance from the 'The Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Technical Annex 1: Condition Assessment Sheets and Methodology' excel document (Natural England, July 2025) which accompanies the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. Assessment criteria were followed for each broad habitat type, to determine the condition of each habitat.

Soil Type

- 2.8 Soil type was determined from Land Information System (LandIS)⁵.

Strategic Significance

- 2.9 Strategic significance is the local significance of the habitat based on its location and habitat type.
- 2.10 The Statutory Biodiversity Metric assigns strategic significance based on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and descriptions set out in table 7 of the Statutory Metric User Guide (July 2025)⁶.
- 2.11 In the absence of an LNRS, the relevant planning authority should specify alternative documents for assigning strategic significance whilst an LNRS is put in place. The strategic significance is then based on the alternative documents and the descriptions set out in table 8 of the Statutory Metric User Guide (July 2025)⁶. If no alternative documents are specified by the relevant planning authority medium strategic significance can be assigned when the criteria in table 8 are met.

² DAFOR: D - Dominant (>75%), A – Abundant (51 – 75%), F – Frequent (26 – 50%), O – Occasional (11 – 25%), R – Rare (1-10%), L - Locally

³ WJ Sutherland (August 2006) Ecological Census Techniques. A Handbook, 2nd Edition. ISBN: 9780521606363

⁴ UKHab Ltd. (July 2023) UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 <https://ukhab.org/>

⁵ <https://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/>

⁶ DEFRA (February 2024) The Statutory Biodiversity Metric. User Guide.

- 2.12 West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) has been appointed by DEFRA to be the Responsible Authority⁷ to lead on the development of the LNRS for West Yorkshire.
- 2.13 The Site falls outside any areas of particular importance for biodiversity or any areas that could become important for biodiversity according to the West Yorkshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy: Local Habitat Map⁸.

BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT (BIA)

- 2.14 To quantify deliverable net gain for the Site, the baseline value of the habitats within the Site have been calculated utilising the Statutory Biodiversity Metric⁹.

Survey Limitations

- 2.15 The survey was undertaken during the optimal survey period for habitats, between March – October therefore no limitations are anticipated.

3.0 BASELINE ECOLOGY

- 3.1 The baseline habitats are shown on Figure 1.
- 3.2 A summary of the habitats present is provided in Table 1 below. This includes the Biodiversity Metric Habitat Type and the equivalent Phase 1 habitats, as well as a brief description of the habitats and the condition assessments for the purpose of the BIA.
- 3.3 The habitat condition assessment sheets are provided in Appendix B.

Table 1: Summary of Habitats

Phase 1 Habitat	UK Hab Code	Biodiversity Metric Habitat Type	Brief Description and Habitat Condition Assessment (HCA)
Buildings / Hardstanding	u1b	Developed land; sealed surface	Five agricultural buildings / barns, with associated hardstanding and tarmac track, Russell Grove, running from the Site to the adopted highway, Old Lane. Condition Assessment: N/A
Poor Semi-improved Grassland	g4	Modified grassland	Parcel of poor semi-improved grassland (G1) located in the northeastern corner of Site. Passes B, C, F and G. Fails: A (essential criterion), D and E. Condition Assessment: Poor
Poor Semi-improved Grassland	g4	Modified grassland	Parcel of poor semi-improved grassland (G2) located in the southeastern corner of Site.

⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/local-nature-recovery-strategies-areas-and-responsible-authorities#full-publication-update-history>

⁸ <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/b7f3b8fb2c9a4bca9f3d7b29e741ce03/page/Introduction> accessed 30.04.2026

⁹ Statutory Biodiversity Metric. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides> Accessed: May 2026

Phase 1 Habitat	UK Hab Code	Biodiversity Metric Habitat Type	Brief Description and Habitat Condition Assessment (HCA)
			Passes B, C, F and G. Fails: A (essential criterion), D and E. Condition Assessment: Poor
Scattered Scrub	10	N/A part of wider habitat parcels	Small areas of scattered scrub were present in association with the hardstanding and buildings onsite.

Soil Type

- 3.4 The entirety of the Site is located within a parcel mapped as Soilscape 6; this is described as freely draining slightly acid loamy soils. This information was provided by LandIS¹⁰ and broader details of the soil structure can be found below:

Table 2: Soil Type

Property	Soilscape 6
Drainage	Freely draining slightly acid loamy soils
Fertility	Low
Landcover	Arable and grassland
Habitats	Neutral and acid pastures and deciduous woodlands; acid communities such as bracken and gorse in the uplands
Carbon	Low

Strategic Significance

- 3.5 No onsite habitats fell within any of the strategic significance criteria set out in the methodology. As such, all habitats are considered to have a low strategic significance.

Baseline Summary

- 3.6 From the completed Statutory Biodiversity Metric, the value of the existing onsite habitats is **0.03 Area Habitat Units** (see Appendix A).

4.0 BIODIVERSITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 In accordance with the NPPF (December 2024)¹¹ the aim is to generate a measurable net gain for biodiversity.

¹⁰ <https://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/>

¹¹ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (December 2024). National Planning Policy Framework. London

- 4.2 Policy LP30 Biodiversity & Geodiversity of the Kirklees Local Plan (adopted 27 February 2019)¹², states the aim is to generate a net gain for biodiversity.
- 4.3 The Environment Act 2021¹³ became mandatory on 12th February 2024 and requires a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity units.
- 4.4 Figure 2 outlines the habitat areas post development across the Site.
- 4.5 The proposed habitats are based on the 'Block Plan, Rev A, December 2025' produced by jg-d Architecture and Design.

Lost Habitats

- 4.6 All onsite habitats will be lost. These are of low distinctiveness / ecological value.

Created Habitats

- 4.7 The proposals for the Site include four residential units [Urban: Developed land; sealed surface] with associated gardens [Urban: Vegetated gardens] and parking as well as road infrastructure [Urban: Developed land; sealed surface].
- 4.8 Within the private gardens there will also be ten trees and 40m of hedgerow planted, however this has been excluded from the metric as per the User Guide.

Post Development Summary

- 4.9 Post development, the onsite habitat creation (Figure 2) with long-term management (for a minimum of 30 years) will achieve **0.10 Habitat Units**. This is a **total net unit change of +0.08 Habitat Units**, which equates to a **+264.25% net gain**.
- 4.10 The proposals for the Site do satisfy the area habitat trading rules.

Additional Enhancements

- 4.11 The above calculation does not account for the following additional enhancement measures that will be provided within the development as these cannot be quantified using the BM calculator. The inclusion of the following biodiversity enhancements with what has already been outlined above would be considered a benefit to biodiversity.
- Provision of ten trees within the private gardens (excluded from metric);
 - Provision of approximately 40m of hedgerow within the private gardens (excluded from metric);
 - Provision of bat and bird boxes on the new dwellings; &
 - Installation of gaps for hedgehogs within boundary treatments.

¹² <https://www.wakefield.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/wakefield-district-local-plan/>

¹³ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted>

Good Practice Principles for Development

- 4.12 The CIEEM Good Practice Principles for Development¹⁴ provide an industry-standard to demonstrate that development projects have followed best practice. Table 2 below provides a summary of how these principles have been followed throughout this project.

Table 3: Biodiversity Net Gain Good Practice Principles for Development¹⁵ Summary

Principle	Justification of measures in place to achieve each Principle
<p>Principle 1: Apply the Mitigation Hierarchy Do everything possible to first avoid and then minimise impacts on biodiversity. Only as a last resort, and in agreement with external decision-makers where possible, compensate for losses that cannot be avoided. If compensating for losses within the development footprint is not possible or does not generate the most benefits for nature conservation, then offset biodiversity losses by gains elsewhere.</p>	Habitats onsite were of low distinctiveness / ecological value; therefore, no specific habitats were recommended for retention.
<p>Principle 2: Avoid losing biodiversity that cannot be offset by gains elsewhere Avoid impacts on irreplaceable biodiversity - these impacts cannot be offset to achieve No Net Loss or Net Gain.</p>	There are no irreplaceable habitats on-site, all baseline habitats can be offset.
<p>Principle 3: Be inclusive and equitable Engage stakeholders early, and involve them in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the approach to Net Gain. Achieve Net Gain in partnership with stakeholders where possible, and share the benefits fairly among stakeholders.</p>	The metric results were provided as soon as available and disseminated to all relevant parties.
<p>Principle 4: Address risks Mitigate difficulty, uncertainty and other risks to achieving Net Gain. Apply well-accepted ways to add contingency when calculating biodiversity losses and gains in order to account for any remaining risks, as well as to compensate for the time between the losses occurring and the gains being fully realised.</p>	Risk is low, all habitat provision assumed to be within private ownership e.g. trees and hedges excluded from metric.
<p>Principle 5: Make a measurable Net Gain contribution Achieve a measurable, overall gain¹ for biodiversity and the services ecosystems provide while directly contributing towards nature conservation priorities.</p>	There is currently a large gain in Habitat Units +264.25% net gain.

¹⁴ <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf>

<p>Principle 6: Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity Achieve the best outcomes for biodiversity by using robust, credible evidence and local knowledge to make clearly-justified choices when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering compensation that is ecologically equivalent in type, amount and condition, and that accounts for the location and timing of biodiversity losses • Compensating for losses of one type of biodiversity by providing a different type that delivers greater benefits for nature conservation • Achieving Net Gain locally to the development while also contributing towards nature conservation priorities at local, regional and national levels • Enhancing existing or creating new habitat • Enhancing ecological connectivity by creating more, bigger, better and joined areas for biodiversity 	<p>The large net gain in Area Habitat Units will have a benefit for biodiversity and incorporate habitats which will have benefits for local wildlife populations, such as bats, nesting birds, hedgehogs, invertebrates etc.</p>
<p>Principle 7: Be additional Achieve nature conservation outcomes that demonstrably exceed existing obligations (i.e. do not deliver something that would occur anyway).</p>	<p>The net gains in Area Habitat Units would not occur in the absence of this exercise.</p>
<p>Principle 8: Create a Net Gain legacy Ensure Net Gain generates long-term benefits by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging stakeholders and jointly agreeing practical solutions that secure Net Gain in perpetuity¹⁶ • Planning for adaptive management and securing dedicated funding for long-term management • Designing Net Gain for biodiversity to be resilient to external factors, especially climate change • Mitigating risks from other land uses • Avoiding displacing harmful activities from one location to another • Supporting local-level management of Net Gain activities 	<p>Given the low distinctiveness of created habitats, which will be within private ownership this will fit under “not-significant enhancements”. These enhancements do not normally require maintenance provisions, so for non-significant enhancements, you do not need to have an HMMP, legal agreement or commitment to maintain them for 30 years¹⁷.</p>
<p>Principle 9: Optimise sustainability Prioritise Biodiversity Net Gain and, where possible, optimise the wider environmental benefits for a sustainable society and economy</p>	<p>The net gains in Area Habitat Units will have a benefit for biodiversity and residents.</p>
<p>Principle 10: Be transparent Communicate all Net Gain activities in a transparent and timely manner, sharing the learning with all stakeholders</p>	<p>Net gain information has been communicated in a transparent and timely manner.</p>

¹⁶ Biodiversity compensation should be planned for a sustained Net Gain over the longest possible timeframe. For development in the UK, the expectation is that compensation sites will be secured for at least the lifetime of the development (e.g. often 25-30 years) with the objective of Net Gain management continuing in the future.

¹⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/make-on-site-biodiversity-gains-as-a-developer#significant-on-site-enhancements>

APPENDIX A: STATUTORY BIODIVERSITY METRIC (SBM)

The headline results are provided below. Please see the accompanying SBM (excel document) for further details.

Brown Hill Farm, Russell Grove, Birkenshaw		<div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 10px; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">Return to results menu</div>		
Headline Results				
Scroll down for final results ▲				
On-site baseline	Area habitat units	0.03		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site post-intervention <small>(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Area habitat units	0.10		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
On-site net change <small>(units & percentage)</small>	Area habitat units	0.08		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site baseline	Area habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site post-intervention <small>(Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Area habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Off-site net change <small>(units & percentage)</small>	Area habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Combined net unit change <small>(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Area habitat units	0.08		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Area habitat units	0.00		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change <small>(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Area habitat units	0.08		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	0.00		
Total net % change <small>(Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)</small>	Area habitat units	264.25%		
	Hedgerow units	0.00%		
	Watercourse units	0.00%		
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓			
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Area habitat units	10.00%	0.03	0.03	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

APPENDIX B: HABITAT CONDITION ASSESSMENT (HCA)

Survey Cover Sheet			
Survey date/s	22.04.2026	Site name or location	Brown Hill Farm, Birkenshaw
Weather conditions	Dry, sunny	Project or development name	Brown Hill Farm, Birkenshaw
Surveyor name	K. Haymes	On-site or off-site	Onsite
Survey reference	extended Phase 1 Habitat survey	Reason for assessment (if not baseline condition survey)	
Notes			

Condition Sheet: GRASSLAND Habitat Type (low distinctiveness)												
UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Habitat Type												
Grassland - Modified grassland												
Habitat Description												
ukhab – UK Habitat Classification												
On-site or off-site, site name and location	Onsite		Survey date and Surveyor name	22.04.2026; K. Haymes								
			Survey reference (if relating to a wider survey)									
Limitations (if applicable)			Habitat parcel reference									Notes (such as justification)
			G1	G2								
				Grid reference								
Condition Assessment Criteria			Criterion passed (Yes or No)									Notes (such as justification)
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs (these may include those listed in Footnote 1). Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition. Where the vascular plant species present are characteristic of medium, high or very high distinctiveness grassland, or there are 9 or more of these characteristic species per m ² (excluding those listed in Footnote 1), please review the full UKHab description to assess whether the grassland should instead be classified as a higher distinctiveness grassland. Where a grassland is classed as medium, high, or very high distinctiveness, please use the relevant condition sheet.		N	N								
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.		Y	Y								
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.		Y	Y								
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.		N	N								
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens) ² .		N	N								
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.		Y	Y								
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species ³ (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA ⁴).		Y	Y								
Essential criterion achieved (Yes or No)			N	N								
Number of criteria passed			4	4								
Condition Assessment Result (out of 7 criteria)	Condition Assessment Score		Score Achieved ×/√									
Passes 6 or 7 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Good (3)											
Passes 4 or 5 criteria including passing essential criterion A	Moderate (2)											
Passes 3 or fewer criteria; OR Passes 4 - 6 criteria (excluding criterion A)	Poor (1)		Poor	Poor								
Suggested enhancement interventions to improve condition score												

Footnotes

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

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

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

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



FUTURESECOLOGY

Carrwood Park, Swillington Common Farm, Selby Road, Leeds, LS15 4LG

Telephone: 01133 372185

Unit 9, The Tangent Business Hub, Weighbridge Road, Shirebrook, Mansfield, Derbyshire, NG20 8RX

Telephone: 01623 749709

Key

Site Boundary

Pre-development Habitats

- Buildings
[Urban: Developed land; sealed surface]
- Hardstanding
[Urban: Developed land; sealed surface]
- Poor semi-improved grassland
[Grassland: Modified grassland]



Client: **Broadleaf Properties Management Ltd**
 Project: **Brown Hill Farm, Russell Grove, Birkenshaw**
 Title: **Figure 1 - Baseline Habitat Plan**

Plan Reference: **FE694/BIA01_01**
 Project Reference: **FE694**
 Report Reference: **FE694/BIA01**

Author: **KEH**
 Date: **30/4/2026**
 Scale: **1:1,000**



C:\Users\kate.haymes\OneDrive - Futures Ecology Ltd\Projects\FE694 Brown Hill Farm, Birkenshaw\QGIS\1_Plans\FE694_Biodiversity Net Gain Plan.qgs
 Copyright © Futures Ecology
 No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing. All dimensions must be checked on site. Any measurements are for indicative purposes.
 This drawing may contain: © OpenStreetMap contributor or Map data © 2026 Google



FUTURES ECOLOGY

Carrwood Park, Swillington Common Farm, Selby Road, Leeds, LS15 4LG

Telephone: 01133 372185

Unit 9, The Tangent Business Hub, Weighbridge Road, Shirebrook, Mansfield, Derbyshire, NG20 8RX

Telephone: 01623 749709

Key

Site Boundary

Post-development Habitats

Buildings
[Urban: Developed land; sealed surface]

Hardstanding
[Urban: Developed land; sealed surface]

Gardens (lawn and planting)
[Urban: vegetated garden]

Small individual tree
[Within private garden: excluded from metric]

Native Hedgerow
[Within private garden: excluded from metric]



Client: Broadleaf Properties Management Ltd
Project: Brown Hill Farm, Russell Grove, Birkenshaw
Title: Figure 2 - Proposed Habitat Plan

Plan Reference: FE694/BIA01_02
Project Reference: FE694
Report Reference: FE694/BIA01

Author: KEH
Date: 30/4/2026
Scale: 1:1,000



C:\Users\kate.haymes\OneDrive - Futures Ecology Ltd\Projects\FE694 Brown Hill Farm, Birkenshaw\QGIS\1_Plans\FE694_Biodiversity Net Gain Plan.qgs
Copyright © Futures Ecology
No dimensions are to be scaled from this drawing. All dimensions must be checked on site. Any measurements are for indicative purposes.
This drawing may contain: © OpenStreetMap contributor or Map data © 2026 Google