



GOMERSAL ST MARY'S PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ecological Impact Assessment

KPS – Key Property Solutions

2489777 (00)

SRP1134-ADA-XX-XX-T-O-0001

www.rskbiocensus.com

RSK
biocensus
EXPERTS IN ECOLOGY

General Notes

Document ref.: 2489777 (00)

Title: Gomersal St Mary's Primary School – Ecological Impact Assessment

Client: Key Property Solutions

Date: 07 November 2025

Office: Leeds

Status: Final

Revision	Date	Comments/amendments	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
00P01	07/11/2025		CA42	EC22	WH09

Executive Summary

1. RSK Biocensus was commissioned by Key Property Solutions (KPS) to produce an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) in relation to the proposed primary school works at Gomersal St Mary's Primary school in Gomersal, Cleckheaton, West Yorkshire, BD19 4NA. The assessment has been carried out to support a planning application for the proposed demolition and re-build of the school, see proposed layout in Appendix A.
2. The c. 0.8 ha Site is located on the suburban town of Gomersal in Kirklees, West Yorkshire. The site is an active school, mainly comprising school buildings, hardstanding and an area of modified grassland with scattered trees, scrub and hedgerows also present. The proposals involve the demolition of most of the buildings on the site and the construction of one large, new school building and associated sports courts, amenity grassland and hard and soft landscaping. All habitats and plants recorded on the site are relatively common and widespread in the surrounding area.
3. There are 11 buildings present on the site, but only three buildings were assessed as suitable to support roosting bats in 2022. Two of the buildings (Building EFAA and Surestart Children's Centre) have been assessed as moderate for roosting bats and Building 2 has been assessed as low. Bat emergence surveys have been conducted in 2023 for Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre and Building 2, and no bats were recorded roosting within the buildings.
4. The assessment for building 2 was updated in October 2025 during a walkover survey by RSK Biocensus, and the building was found to be negligible to support bats. The assessment for all other buildings on the site was the same as in 2022.
5. Building EFAA will be demolished as part of the proposed development, but the Surestart Children's Centre and Building 2 will be retained and will not be directly impacted by the proposed works.. Therefore, precautionary working measures should be implemented during the construction phase of the development to protect any potential roosting features. These measures should be outlined within a precautionary working method statement (PWMS).
6. The trees, scrub hedgerows, and buildings within the site support nesting birds. Therefore, work to remove vegetation or to demolish buildings should ideally be performed outside of the main nesting season for birds (which is March to August inclusive).
7. The site has suitability to support common amphibians and hedgehogs, as such precautionary working measures should be implemented during the construction phase of the development. These measures should be outlined within a PWMS.
8. In summary, **no significant effects** on wildlife or biodiversity are expected from the development assuming the following surveys and mitigation are completed/implemented:
 - Updated bat emergence survey for Building EFAA to confirm conditions on the site are the same. The survey should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist during the peak bat survey season (May – August inclusive).
 - Provision of CEMP and PWMS to outline mitigation measures to protect bats, nesting birds, common amphibians and hedgehogs.
 - The provision of a suitable lighting plan for bats.
9. In addition, *Cotoneaster sp.* (Cotoneaster) and *Crococsmia × crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia) are present in areas of introduced shrub around the buildings on the site. These species are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 (as amended) making it illegal to aid their spread into the wild. The removal of these plants should be dealt with by a suitably qualified and experienced contractor.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this report	1
1.2	Site overview	1
1.3	Development proposals	1
2	Methods	3
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	PEA.....	3
2.3	Habitat survey	5
2.4	Protected and priority species surveys.....	5
2.5	Invasive non-native species	9
2.6	Survey limitations.....	9
2.7	Ecological Impact Assessment.....	10
3	Ecological Baseline.....	13
3.1	Designated sites	13
3.2	Strategic Significance	13
3.3	Protected Habitats	13
3.4	UKHAB survey.....	14
3.5	Invasive non-native species	33
4	Ecological Impact Assessment.....	34
4.1	Scope of the assessment	34
5	Conclusions	41
6	References.....	42
	Figures	43
	Appendix A – Proposed Development Layout.....	44
	Appendix B – Target Notes.....	45
	Appendix C – NOTEWORTHY SPECIES RECORDS	46
	Appendix D – Abbreviations.....	48

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1.1 RSK Biocensus was commissioned by Key Property Solutions (KPS) to produce an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) for St Mary's Primary School, West Yorkshire (OS Grid Reference SE 20754 25726), hereafter referred to as the 'Site' (see Figure 1). The assessment has been carried out to support a planning application for the proposed demolition and re-build of the school, hereafter known as the 'Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2 The EclA report presents the scope of the assessment, the results of the evaluation of ecological features that may be affected, assessment and characteristics of impacts, and the identification of significant effects in the absence of mitigation. The EclA then goes on to consider measures to minimise, mitigate and compensate impacts, and identify significant residual ecological effects.
- 1.1.3 Specifically, the aims of this report are to:
- Identify the ecological features that may be impacted by the Proposed Development;
 - Identify legal and policy implications;
 - Describe the criteria used to evaluate the ecological baseline, and to undertake the impact assessment;
 - Identify the likely impacts of the Proposed Development, and the potential for significant on ecological features (including during the construction and operation phases), both in isolation and in combination with other development proposals;
 - Define the mitigation, compensation and or enhancement measures which will be implemented to avoid, minimise or offset potentially significant effects on ecological features and deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG); and
 - Provide an assessment of the significance of any residual effects.

1.2 Site overview

- 1.2.1 The c. 0.8 ha Site is located on the suburban town of Gomersal in Kirklees, West Yorkshire. It is south of Bradford, east of Cleckheaton and north of Heckmondwike. The Site is surrounded by residential dwellings with large, connected gardens and well-lit roads.
- 1.2.2 There are small patches of greenspace in the immediate surrounding area, such as Gomersal Cricket Club and Sugden Park. Habitats in the wider surrounding area are semi-rural with larger hedge-lined improved fields to the east and west. Church Beck and Church Wood are also located c. 680 m north-east of the site while Fusden Wood (an ancient, replanted woodland) is located c. 720 m north-west of the site.
- 1.2.3 The boundary of the Proposed Development is shown in the Site Location Plan (Figure 1) and development proposals are shown in Appendix A.

1.3 Development proposals

- 1.3.1 It is understood that the school has been selected for the governments School Rebuilding Programme (SRP). The development proposals on the site (as shown in *Appendix A*)

comprise the construction of a new primary school building, a hard sports court, two car parks, a cycle shelter, a turning head for emergency vehicles and soft landscaping.

Works programme

- 1.3.2 It is understood that works are scheduled to commence on the site in September 2026, but the existing school building (Building EFAA) will be demolished in March 2028.

2 Methods

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 The EclA has been undertaken in line with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2024). To support the EclA, the following surveys/assessments have been undertaken:

- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) undertaken by RSK Biocensus in 2022 (RSK Biocensus (2022)), including:
 - a desk study, which included a review of aerial photographs; obtaining information from the DEFRA and JNCC websites, and the local authority website; requesting data from the local records centre; and
 - a field survey that informed habitat mapping, an assessment of the possible presence of protected or priority species and the likely importance of habitat features.
- Emergence surveys of Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre and Building 2 undertaken by Indigo Surveys Ltd in 2023 (Indigo Surveys Ltd, 2023)¹
- Updated ecological walkover survey undertaken by RSK Biocensus in October 2025 to check conditions on site were the same.

2.2 PEA

2.2.1 The Phase 1 habitat survey was carried out on 10 November 2022 and updated to a UKHAB survey on 31 October 2025. Both surveys were undertaken by senior ecologist EC22, whom is a full member of CIEEM, holds level 4 field identification skills certificate (FISC) and is experienced in carrying out Preliminary Ecological Appraisals, and an assistant ecologist.

Background data search

2.2.2 A search was made in November 2022 for relevant reference materials. A list of sources is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Desk study information

Information obtained	Source	Search area
Locations/ citations of statutory designated sites of European and/or international importance for nature conservation: Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Ramsar sites - hereafter	Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website. MAGIC (the Multi-Agency Geographic Information website) www.magic.gov.uk	10 km

¹ Indigo services Ltd (2023) Nocturnal Bat Survey Report, Gomersal St Mary's C of E Primary, Shirley Avenue, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4NA

Information obtained	Source	Search area
collectively referred to as 'European sites' ² .		
Locations/ citations of statutory designated sites of national importance for nature conservation: Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) (including consideration of SSSI risk zones), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs).	Natural England website MAGIC www.magic.gov.uk	2 km
Non-statutory designated sites of importance for nature conservation: Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and Biodiversity Action Sites (BAS)	West Yorkshire Joint Services (WYJS) – records centre.	1 km
Records of protected and notable species of plants and animals (including invasive non-native species)	West Yorkshire Joint Services (WYJS) – records centre.	1 km
Records of European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licences granted (in England only). Great crested newt licence return information (in England only).	MAGIC www.magic.gov.uk	1 km
Priority habitats and ancient woodland.	MAGIC www.magic.gov.uk	1 km
Local planning guidance and policies.	Kirklees Council: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/local-plan-strategy-and-policies.pdf	N/A
Details of species and habitats listed on the Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan	Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/delivering-services/pdf/biodiversity-strategy.pdf Species list: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/delivering-services/pdf/biodiversity-species.pdf Habitat list: https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/delivering-services/pdf/biodiversity-habitats.pdf	N/A
Areas/habitats of strategic Significance	National Habitat Networks (https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/0ef2ed26-2f04-4e0f-9493-ffbdbfaeb159/habitat-networks-england) National Priority Focus Areas (https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/c20a40c5-c975-43e1-9abd-d1257aa58432/natural-england-national-priority-focus-areas)	1 km

² SACs and SPAs were formerly part of the Natura 2000 network; post-'Brexit', they are now considered part of the UK's 'national site network'. Ramsar sites are sites of international importance. Note that SPAs, SACs and Ramsar sites are also underpinned by SSSI designations which may have slightly different citations/ boundaries.

- 2.2.3 The search areas used have taken into account the potential distance/ area over which an impact could occur as a result of the proposed works.

2.3 Habitat survey

- 2.3.1 A survey of the Site was undertaken to identify and map all habitats present using the UK Habitats (UKHab) survey methodology (Version 2.01) (UKHab Ltd, 2023). The UKHab system is the habitat classification that underpins the Metric and is therefore the favoured habitat classification to use when surveys need to inform a biodiversity net gain (BNG) calculation. Secondary codes were allocated to help describe habitats, such as management and land use. Where possible, all habitats were mapped to a minimum of Level 5 within the classification hierarchy. The quality of habitats on Site were assessed following the Metric condition assessment sheets. Plant names follow Stace (2019) for native and naturalised species of vascular plant. The habitats are mapped on Figure 2, including 'target notes' to identify any habitats or features of particular interest.

Habitats of principal importance

- 2.3.2 An assessment of the likelihood of the Site to support habitats of principal importance was carried out.

2.4 Protected and priority species surveys

- 2.4.1 The suitability of the Site to support protected or otherwise notable plant and animal species was assessed. Target notes (see Figure 2, and Appendix B) were used to record suitable habitats, as well as any sightings or evidence of such species, where found.

Plants

- 2.4.2 Vascular plant species were recorded during the survey, although no attempt was made to produce an exhaustive species list.

Invertebrates

- 2.4.3 The Site was assessed to identify areas of potential value to terrestrial invertebrates, based on the extent and quality of the microhabitats present, but no specific surveys were undertaken. The habitat requirements of invertebrates are often species-specific, so consideration was given to the presence of features and habitats that might be suitable for the notable species identified in the BDS.

Amphibians

- 2.4.4 The Site was assessed for its suitability to support both terrestrial and breeding amphibians, including great crested newts (GCN). Aerial imagery and OS maps were reviewed to identify any ponds within 500 metres (m) of the Site boundary.
- 2.4.5 As GCN are terrestrial for most of the year, habitats on Site were also assessed for their potential to support the species, based on factors such as vegetation structure and composition, and the availability of shelter and foraging resources. The proximity of ponds and connectivity/ suitability of terrestrial habitats are an important factor in determining the likelihood of this species being present on Site.

Reptiles

- 2.4.6 The site was assessed for its suitability for the four most widespread reptile species, with particular attention given to those features that provide suitable basking areas (e.g. south-facing slopes), hibernation sites (e.g. banks, walls, piles of rotting vegetation) and opportunities for foraging (e.g. rough grassland and scrub).
- 2.4.7 Specific habitat requirements differ between species. Common lizards (*Zootoca vivipara*) and slow-worms (*Anguis fragilis*) favour rough grassland. Grass snakes (*Natrix helvetica*) have broadly similar requirements, with a greater reliance on ponds and wetlands. Adders (*Vipera berus*) use a range of fairly open habitats with some cover but are most often found in dry heath.

Birds

- 2.4.8 Birds nest, forage and roost in a wide variety of habitats including scrub, woodland, hedgerows and trees, wetland, arable and pastoral farmland and rough grassland. Some species also use open bare ground and man-made structures.
- 2.4.9 The site was assessed for its suitability to support diverse assemblages and/or uncommon species of breeding and non-breeding birds, with an emphasis on those species that are listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the red and amber lists of the RSPB's Birds of Conservation Concern 4 (Stanbury et al., 2021) and other notable species recorded in the BDS, including any species that are qualifying features of nearby designated sites. Consideration was given to the site's connectivity to landscape features that are likely to be of particular importance to birds, such as extensive areas of semi-natural woodland or wetlands. The presence of nests or signs of nest building were recorded, and buildings were surveyed for their suitability for barn owls and other species, with signs including nesting sites, feathers, droppings and pellets.

Bats

- 2.4.10 The Site was assessed for its suitability for use by roosting, foraging and commuting bats in line with the bat survey guidelines (Collins, 2023). Areas of particular interest vary between species, but generally include sheltered areas and habitats with good numbers of insects.

Preliminary roost assessment of built structures

- 2.4.11 The buildings within the Site was/were assessed externally and internally to ascertain suitability for roosting bats, taking account of the following factors that influence the likelihood of bats roosting:
- Surrounding habitat and land use.
 - Construction detail.
 - Structure condition.
 - Internal conditions.
 - Potential bat-access points.
 - Number and quality of potential roosting features (PRF).
- 2.4.12 Visual, systematic inspections were also made for bats and evidence of bats.

2.4.13 The potential of the buildings to support roosting bats was then categorised as defined in Table 2, based on guidance from the bat conservation trust (Collins, 2023).

Table 2: Categorisation of the suitability of structures for roosting bats and suitability of habitats for foraging and commuting bats (Collins, 2023)

Potential suitability	Description - Roosting habitats in structures
None	No habitat features on Site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/ suitable shelter at all ground/ underground levels).
Negligible suitability	No obvious habitat features on Site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.
Low suitability	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site but could be used by individual hibernating bats).
Moderate suitability	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but unlikely for a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only – the categorisation in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).
High suitability	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts e.g. maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation site.
Confirmed roost	Bats or evidence of bats recorded during the surveys. A confirmed record (supplied by records centre/local bat group) would also apply.

Ground-level tree assessment

2.4.14 Trees within the Site were surveyed from ground level using binoculars and a torch. Where possible, they were viewed from all elevations. PRFs were described and categorised as defined in Table 3, according to Bat Conservation Trust survey guidelines (Collins, 2023) based on their potential for roosting bats. Where a tree had multiple PRFs, it was classified according to the highest PRF value present. Trees may also be categorised as further assessment required (FAR) if the surveyor's view was obscured.

Table 3: Categorisation of the suitability of trees for roosting bats (Collins, 2023)

Tree category (Potential to support roosting bats)	Description
None	Either no PRFs in the tree or highly unlikely to be any.
FAR	Further assessment required to establish if PRF's are present in the tree.
PRF	A tree with at least one PRF, but the PRF(s) have not been/cannot be assessed for their suitability from ground level.

Tree category (Potential to support roosting bats)	Description
PRF-I	A tree with PRF(s) only suitable for individual bats or very small numbers of bats either due to size or lack of suitable surrounding habitats [likely to require aerial inspection to confirm].
PRF-M	A tree with PRF suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony [likely to require aerial inspection to confirm].
Confirmed roost	Bats or evidence of bats recorded during the surveys. A confirmed record (supplied by records centre/local bat group) would also apply.

Emergence and re-emergence surveys

- 2.4.15 RSK Biocensus assessed Building EFAA and Surestart Children's Centre as having moderate suitability to support roosting bats and Building 2 as having low suitability to support roosting bats, during the PEA survey in 2022 (RSK Biocensus, 2022). In line with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, 2016)³, the PEA report recommended that two presence / absence (emergence) surveys for moderate suitability buildings and one presence / absence (emergence) survey for low suitability buildings. These surveys should be undertaken during bat survey season (May – September inclusive), by suitably experienced ecologists, to determine whether bats are using the building to roost, and if so the species and number of bats present.
- 2.4.16 Indigo surveys Ltd were instructed to undertake the emergence surveys. An emergence of Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre and Building 2 was undertaken on 5 May 2025. A dawn re-entry survey of Building EFAA and Surestart Children's Centre was undertaken on 17 June 2023. The surveyors used bat detectors to record bat activity and made a note of any observations during the survey, e.g. species, number of bats, behaviour and any site observations. The surveys were undertaken in line with Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, 2016).
- 2.4.17 Further details of these surveys are provided in the Bat Activity Survey Report (Indigo Surveys Ltd, 2023⁴).

Water voles and otters

- 2.4.18 Waterbodies and watercourses and their surrounding habitats were assessed to determine whether they were suitable for water voles (*Arvicola amphibius*). Suitable habitats include vegetated earth banks, reed beds, flowing water and wet ditches. Incidental signs of water vole activity, including burrows, feeding platforms, food remains and latrines, were recorded if they were encountered.
- 2.4.19 Waterbodies and watercourses on the site were also assessed for their suitability for otters (*Lutra lutra*). Otters require clean rivers and associated waterbodies with an abundant, varied supply of food and plenty of bank-side vegetation, offering secluded sites for their holts. Other suitable habitats include reed beds and interconnected ditches

³ The most recent survey guidelines published at the time of the survey

⁴ Indigo Surveys Ltd (2023) Nocturnal Bat Survey Report, Gomersal St Marys C of E Primary, Shirley Avenue, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4NA

and streams. Incidental signs of otter activity, including holts, foraging signs, paths (runs), footprints and spraints, were recorded if they were encountered

Badgers

- 2.4.20 An initial assessment was carried out to identify areas that might be used by badgers (*Meles meles*) for commuting, foraging or setts within 30 m of all areas potentially affected by works (where access was possible). The area was systematically searched for signs of badgers including setts, foraging signs, paths (runs) and latrines where possible, and the category of sett and levels of activity visible at each sett was recorded.

Other species

- 2.4.21 The UK countries of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are obliged by their individual laws to maintain lists of species and habitats of principal importance for biodiversity conservation. In England, this obligation derives from the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. An assessment of the suitability and likelihood of the site supporting such species was made (for example, hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*)).

2.5 Invasive non-native species

- 2.5.1 Any incidental records of invasive non-native species (INNS) were noted and mapped during the survey.

2.6 Survey limitations

- 2.6.1 This assessment as to whether protected or otherwise notable species might occur on the site is based on the suitability of habitat, the known distribution of relevant species in the local area (from online sources and desk study), and any signs of the relevant species. It does not constitute a full and definitive survey of any protected species group.
- 2.6.2 Field signs for protected and valuable species are often difficult to find or absent from a site. The PEA and updated walkover survey conducted was not intended to be a comprehensive presence/absence survey for all species, but rather to provide an indication of the likely presence of such species based on the field signs found, and the nature of the habitats present.
- 2.6.3 The majority of land within 30 m was not surveyed for badgers as it was fenced off from the survey area and landowner identity was not known. However, peripheries of all such areas were, extensively searched, providing a high level of confidence in the results and assessment provided.
- 2.6.4 Less conspicuous species (including INNS) may have been missed as a result of the survey being undertaken outside of the optimal survey season (April to October). However, the majority of plants were confidently identified, and the survey was sufficient to make a broad assessment of the habitats present in the site.
- 2.6.5 All recommendations made in this report are based on the proposed site boundary provided and proposed development layout provided. If the plans change significantly then an ecologist must be consulted, and further surveys may be required.

- 2.6.6 Internal access was not granted for the buildings, but an external inspection for roosting bats was undertaken. This limitation has been taken into account when assessing the buildings suitability for roosting bats, with a precautionary approach adopted where necessary. Furthermore, this limitation has been taken into account within the recommendations for further survey, mitigation and compensation measures. Therefore, this is not considered to be a significant constraint within this report.

2.7 Ecological Impact Assessment

Overview

- 2.7.1 This ecological impact assessment (EclA) aims to identify, quantify and evaluate potential effects of the development on habitats, species and ecosystems. The EclA follows guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM, 2024).

Establishing the likely zone of influence

- 2.7.2 The zone of influence (ZOI) for a project is the area over which ecological features may be significantly affected as a result of the proposal. The zone of influence varies for different habitats and species and depends on several factors such as connectivity to the site and the details of construction methods (e.g. timing and seasonality). Where there are idiosyncrasies which relate to specific receptors, these are discussed in the relevant sections. However, in summary, the following zones were considered sufficient to identify features that could be subject to significant effects:
- International statutory nature conservation designations up to 10 km from the site;
 - National and local statutory nature conservation designations up to 2 km from the site;
 - Non-statutory locally designated wildlife sites up to 1 km from the site;
 - Protected and/or notable species up to 1 km from the site.

Determining significance, importance and the level of effect

- 2.7.3 The assessment of likely significant ecological effects as a result of the Proposed Development has considered both the construction and operational phases.
- 2.7.4 The duration of the effect has been assessed as either 'short-term', 'medium-term' or 'long-term'. Short-term is considered to be up to 1 year, medium-term is considered to be between 1 - 10 years and long-term is considered to be greater than 10 years.
- 2.7.5 Following the classification of an effect, a clear statement is made as to whether the effect is 'significant' or 'not significant'. The significance of the effect on the ecological features has been determined based on the analysis of the factors that characterise the impact. A significant effect is defined as *'an effect that either supports or undermines biodiversity conservation objectives for the ecological feature or for biodiversity in general'*.
- 2.7.6 Significant effects are identified with regard to an appropriate geographical scale; the geographical contexts used when determining importance are listed in
- 2.7.7 **Table 4.**

Table 4: Determining the importance of ecological receptors within a geographic context.

Ecological Importance	Qualifying Criteria	Relevant Significance
International	An internationally designated site or candidate/proposed site (Special Protection Area (SPA), potential SPA, Special Area of Conservation (SAC), candidate SAC and/or Ramsar site). A sustainable area of a habitat listed in Annex I of the Habitats Directive or smaller areas of such habitat which are essential to maintain the viability of the larger whole. Sustainable population of an internationally important species or site supporting such a species (or supplying a critical element of their habitat requirement) i.e.: IUCN Red List species that is listed as critically endangered, endangered, or vulnerable; or Species listed in Annex IV of the Habitats Directive; or Sites that support 1% or more of a biogeographic population of a species.	Europe
UK/National	A nationally designated site (Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), National Nature Reserve (NNR)) or a discrete area which meets the selection criteria for national designation (e.g. SSSI selection criteria). An area formally selected by Defra as a Nature Improvement Area. A sustainable area of a priority habitat identified in the UK BAP or of smaller areas of such habitat, which are essential to maintain the viability of the whole. Sustainable population of a nationally important species or site supporting such a species (or supplying a critical element of their habitat requirement) i.e.: • Species listed on Schedules 5 and 8 of the WCA (1981); • UK Red Data Book species; • Other species listed as occurring in 15 or fewer 10 km squares in the UK; or • Sites supporting 1% or more of a national population.	England
Regional	Sites/populations which exceed the county-level designations but fall short of SSSI selection guidelines, including the following: • Sustainable areas of key habitat identified in the Regional BAP or smaller areas of such habitat, which are essential to maintain the viability of the whole; • Population of a species listed as being nationally scarce which occurs in 16-100 10 km squares in the UK; • Population of a species listed in a Regional BAP or relevant Natural Area on account of its regional rarity or localisation; or • Sites likely to support 1% or more of a regional population.	Yorkshire and the Humber (i.e. Yorkshire and Humberside)
County	Some designated sites (including Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, County Wildlife Sites, Sites of Metropolitan Importance). A viable area of habitat identified in the County BAP. Sustainable populations of the following species: • Species listed in a County/Metropolitan 'red data book' or BAP on account of its rarity/localisation in a county context; or, • Sites supporting 1% or more of a county population.	West Yorkshire
Local	Very low importance and rarity, local scale. Areas of habitat considered to appreciably enrich the habitat resource within the ecological Study Area itself (e.g. matching some criteria for a local wildlife site). A small population of a species of conservation concern i.e., listed in the Local BAP.	c.1 km radius from the site boundary

- 2.7.8 Where the ecological importance of a receptor is less than Local importance (as defined above) it is considered to be of 'negligible' importance.

Identifying mitigation and assessing residual effects

- 2.7.9 It is not always possible to clearly separate mitigation, compensation and enhancement. However, these three terms are broadly defined and used as follows:
- 2.7.10 Mitigation is used to refer to measures to avoid or reduce a specific negative impact. Mitigation is relevant for negative impacts assessed as being potentially significant (before mitigation) or where required to ensure compliance with legislation.
- 2.7.11 Compensation is used to refer to additional measures that may be necessary to compensate for residual negative impacts once mitigation has been applied. Compensation is relevant for negative impacts assessed as being significant or where it is required to ensure compliance with legislation.
- 2.7.12 Enhancement is used to refer to measures that create positive ecological impacts, unrelated to negative impacts from the development. Regardless of any negative impacts, enhancements are increasingly used to provide net ecological gain.

3 Ecological Baseline

3.1 Designated sites

Statutory designated sites - European sites of importance for nature conservation

- 3.1.1 There are no European sites of importance for nature conservation within 10 km of the Site boundary.

Statutory designated sites - National importance for nature conservation

- 3.1.2 There is one statutory designated sites within 2km of the site boundary; Oakwell Park Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Oakwell Park is located c. 1.1km north-east of the site and is a country park containing mature broadleaved woodland, plantation woodlands, parkland, meadows and wetland areas.
- 3.1.3 There are no internationally designated sites within 10km of the proposed site, therefore these types of designation are not considered further in this report.

SSSI Impact Risk Zones

- 3.1.4 The site does not intersect with any site of special scientific interest (SSSI) impact risk zones (IRZs) and therefore SSSI IRZs are not considered further in this report.

Non-statutory designated sites of importance for nature conservation

- 3.1.5 There is one non-statutory designated site within 1 km of the site boundary: Oakwell Park Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The site is c. 1.1km north -east of the proposed site. The site is designated as it provides value for appreciation of nature. It contains areas of grassland, woodland, standing water and reedbed.

3.2 Strategic Significance

- 3.2.1 The site is within Kirklees Council biodiversity opportunity area, designated for the following habitats; grasslands, uplands, forest habitats, arable and pastoral areas, wetland and riverine habitats, urban areas and previously developed land.

3.3 Protected Habitats

- 3.3.1 The site is within Kirklees Council biodiversity opportunity area, designated for the following habitats; grasslands, uplands, forest habitats, arable and pastoral areas, wetland and riverine habitats, urban areas and previously developed land.
- 3.3.2 There is one area of replanted ancient woodland within 1 km of the site boundary and it is located at approximately 720 m west of the site boundary. Given the distance from site, intervening urban areas forming barriers and the scale of development, it is unlikely that the proposed development will have any direct or indirect impact on the ancient woodland.

- 3.3.3 There are no waterbodies or watercourses in the site. The closest watercourse is Church Beck which is c. 510 m north-east of the site. Church Beck is not hydrologically connected to the site.
- 3.3.4 There two hedgerows within the site boundary (H1 and H2) which may qualify as “important” for ecological reasons under the Hedgerow Regulations
- 3.3.5 However, the habitats present on site do not meet these criteria, are not species-rich, have little botanical value and are ubiquitous in the wider landscape.
- 3.3.6 However, the scattered trees and area of dense scrub are of inherent ecological value and should be retained where possible.

3.4 UKHAB survey

- 3.4.1 The UKHab map is provided as Figure 2 and shows the location of the target notes referred to in the text below. A description of each target note is given in Appendix B.
- 3.4.2 The site comprised predominantly modified grassland, urban trees, buildings, and developed land, sealed. There are smaller areas of other, neutral grassland and dense scrub and hedgerows.

Modified grassland (g4)

- 3.4.3 A large proportion of the site is amenity grassland which is subject to a high intensity mowing regime and is utilized as amenity lawn areas or playing fields (TN6). The most frequent species within the lawn include *Bellis perennis* (Daisy) and *Festuca rubra* (Red Fescue), *Lolium perenne* (Perennial Rye-grass), *Poa annua* (Annual Meadow-grass), *Ranunculus repens* (Creeping Buttercup), *Trifolium repens* (White Clover).



Plate 1 – View of modified grassland on site.

Other neutral grassland (g3c)

- 3.4.4 There is a small section of grassland in the north-eastern corner of the site which has experienced a lower intensity of grazing and has a longer sward than other grassland

areas on site (TN5). The most frequent grass species present is *Agrostis stolonifera* (Creeping Bent), but the other species present are similar to those found in the amenity grassland areas, but there is a greater diversity of species here and there are patches which are succeeding into ruderal and scrub habitats. Therefore, it can be considered to be semi-improved grassland. Other frequent species include: *Arrhenatherum elatius* (False Oat-grass), *Cirsium arvense* (Creeping Thistle), *Galium aparine* (cleavers), *Senecio jacobaea* (Common Ragwort), *Cirsium arvense* (Creeping Thistle), *Dactylis glomerata* (Cock's-foot), *Festuca rubra* (Red Fescue), *Holcus lanatus* (Yorkshire-fog), and *Lolium perenne* (Perennial Rye-grass).

- 3.4.5 It should be noted that the area of other neutral grassland was significantly smaller in 2025, compared to 2022. The majority of the area has been unmanaged and has developed into an area of dense mixed scrub, described in section below.
- 3.4.6 A small area around the conifer tree in the northern section of site there is a small area of other-neutral grassland with *Salix sp.* (Willow species) saplings.



Plate 2 - View of area of semi-improved grassland.



Plate 3 – View of other-neutral grassland with willow saplings around conifer tree

Mixed scrub (h3h)

- 3.4.7 There is an area of dense scrub within the north-eastern corner of the site. The area is dominated by tall *Rubus fruticosus* agg. (Bramble) and *Prunus spinosa* (Blackthorn), but also contains *Acer campestre* (Field Maple), *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Betula pendula* (Silver Birch), *Cirsium arvense* (Creeping Thistle), *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn), *Rosa canina* (Dog-rose), *Salix caprea* (Goat Willow), *Sambucus nigra* (Elder), *Urtica dioica* (Common Nettle), and piles discarded tree branches and other scrub species. This scrub has extended into the semi-improved

grassland since the previous PEA, creating a denser scrub area and reduced area of semi-improved grassland.

- 3.4.8 There is also an area of dense scrub immediately adjacent to the western site boundary and behind building EFAD. This area is inaccessible and as such has not been managed for a number of years.
- 3.4.9 An area of dense scrub along the northern site boundary may have historically been classified as a hedge but has been unmanaged for some time and has become overgrown. There are similar species present but additional species include *Acer campestre* (Field Maple), *Betula pendula* (Silver Birch), *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash), *Salix caprea* (Goat Willow), and *Tilia sp.* (Lime species).



Plate 4 - View of dense scrub within northeast corner.

Buildings (u1b5)

- 3.4.10 There are 11 buildings on the site, see UKHAB habitat map in *Figure 2* for locations. Where possible, buildings have been referenced as per Department for Education (DfE) plan titled CDC 17 – 19 (drawing number 107747-1). If buildings are not labelled on DfE plan they have been labelled B1 – B6.
- 3.4.11 The buildings were inspected externally for bats was undertaken at the same time as the UKHAB survey, but a full preliminary roost assessment is outside the current scope. Buildings were inspected externally for any features that would provide potential roosting features (PRFs) for bats or would allow bat or bird access into the buildings. Detailed building descriptions, photographs and further information regarding the buildings suitability to support roosting bats is provided within Section 3.4.57 of this report.

Built linear features (u1e)

- 3.4.12 Metal palisade or wooden fences demarcate the site boundaries.

Developed land (u1b6)

- 3.4.13 Surrounding the buildings is an area of hard standing. The areas are tarmacked and used as car parks, walkways and playgrounds.



Plate 4 – Example of area of developed land sealed surface within the site boundary.

Introduced shrub and vegetated garden (u1)

- 3.4.14 Around the main building on site (Building EFAA), there are scattered planted shrubs, the majority of which are non-native and ornamental. Species present include *Acer sp.* (Maple species), *Ceanothus sp.*, *Centranthus rubra* (Red Valarian), *Cotoneaster sp.* (Cotoneaster), *Crocasmia x crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia), *Lonicera nitida* (Box Honeysuckle), *Narcissus sp.* (Daffodil), and *Primula vulgaris* (Primrose).
- 3.4.15 A small area within the eastern section of the site is an Allotment. The area is a mixture of amenity grassland, gravel hardstanding pathways and raised beds which are used for planting vegetables, see Plate 5.



Plate 5 - Allotment within the eastern section of the site.



Plate 6 – Example of introduced vegetation planted around the buildings on site.

Mixed scrub, scattered (h3h,10)

- 3.4.16 There is an area of mixed, scattered scrub along the southern site boundary. The area may have historically been a defunct hedge, but it is leggy and approximately 5 - 7m high and less than 0.5 m wide so has been mapped as scattered scrub. Species present include; *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn), *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash), *Hedera helix* (Ivy), *Ilex aquifolium* (Holly), *Prunus avium* (Wild Cherry), *Prunus spinosa* (Blackthorn), *Rosa arvensis* (Field-rose), *Rosa canina* (Dog-rose), *Rubus fruticosus* agg. (Bramble), *Sambucus nigra* (Elder), and *Symphoricarpos albus* (Snowberry). There are a number of mature trees present but these are located immediately outside the site boundary and within residential gardens.

Species-rich native hedgerow (h2a5)

- 3.4.17 There are two hedgerows on site. Hedge 1 (H1) demarcates the western site boundary. The northern section of the hedge is regularly managed and has been trimmed and is approximately 2m high and 2m wide and contains one semi-mature *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn) tree. The central and southern sections of the hedge have not been managed and are leggy, approximately 8m in height and 1m wide. Woody species present include *Acer campestre* (Field Maple), *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn), *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash), *Prunus avium* (Wild Cherry), *Rosa canina* (Dog-rose), and *Sambucus nigra* (Elder).



Plate 7 - View of southern section of Hedge 1.



Plate 8 – View of northern section of hedge 1

- 3.4.18 Hedge 2 (H2) demarcates the northern site boundary. and is c.2 m high and 2m wide and is regularly managed and trimmed. The hedge contains *Acer campestre* (Field Maple), *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Crataegus monogyna*

(Hawthorn), *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash), *Prunus avium* (Wild Cherry), one mature *Prunus avium* (Wild Cherry) tree, *Prunus spinosa* (Blackthorn), *Rosa canina* (Dog-rose).



Plate 9 - View of Hedge 2.

- 3.4.19 A fence is located immediately adjacent to the hedgerows. As such the hedgerows are not considered to demarcate a residential dwelling and the hedgerow regulations will apply.

Urban trees

- 3.4.20 There are five areas with urban (scattered) trees on site. One area is located within the south-western section of the site (Target note (TN)1) which contains approximately 15 young – semi-mature scattered trees, species include *Betula pendula* (Silver Birch), *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash) and *Prunus avium* (Wild Cherry).



Plate 10 - View of scattered trees within south-western section of the site.

- 3.4.21 The second area is located adjacent to the eastern site boundary (TN2) and is dominated by fruit trees ((*Mallus sp.* (Apple) and *Prunus sp.* (Cherry)) and is considered to be small

orchard. The third area is also adjacent to the eastern site boundary but is dominated by *Salix viminalis* (Osier) and has been woven together to create a fence around the allotment area (TN3) on site. Other species present include *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Sambucus racemosa* (Red-berried Elder), and *Sorbus aucuparia* (Rowan).

- 3.4.22 The fourth area is located to the west of the allotment area and is a mix of mature, semi-mature and young scattered trees (TN4). Species include *Acer campestre* (Field Maple), *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore), *Alnus sp.* (Alder, ornamental variety), *Corylus avellana* (Hazel), *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn), *Prunus sp.* (Cherry), *Quercus robur* (Pedunculate Oak), and *Sorbus aucuparia* (Rowan).
- 3.4.23 Finally, there are several scattered trees within the north-eastern section of the site, including several Osier, Goat Willow and Ash trees.
- 3.4.24 There is one coniferous scattered tree located within the northern section of the site. It is an ornamental *Cupressus sp* (Cypress species).



Plate 11 - View of coniferous tree in the northern section of the site.

Invasive non-native species

- 3.4.25 *Cotoneaster sp.* (Cotoneaster species) and *Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia) were recorded within the areas of introduced shrub on site. The *Cotoneaster* plants are found adjacent to the southern aspect of Building EFAA (TN7) while the *Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia) plants are found along the northern aspect of Building EFAA (TN8). These species are INNS and are listed under schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1998.



Plate 12 - Example of *Cotoneaster* sp. (*Cotoneaster* species) adjacent the southern aspect of Building EFAA (TN7)



Plate 13 - Example of *Crocosmia x crocosmiiflora* (*Montbretia*) adjacent the northern aspect of Building EFAA (TN8).

Protected and priority species

Invertebrates

- 3.4.26 The BDS returned two protected or otherwise notable invertebrates within 1 km of the site, including wall butterfly (*Lasiommata megera*) and cinnabar moth (*Tyria jacobaeae*). The desk study did not return any records of protected or otherwise notable aquatic invertebrate species within 1 km of the Site boundary.
- 3.4.27 The site has some food plants within the areas of other neutral grassland and scrub to support the wall butterfly and cinnabar moth. These include Cocksfoot, Bent grasses (*Agrostis* spp), Yorkshire fog and Common Ragwort. However, these plants are only present in small numbers, therefore the habitats present are only likely to support a common assemblage of invertebrate species, typical of modified grassland, garden

ornamental species and scrub. There are no habitats on Site suitable for aquatic invertebrates. Therefore, invertebrates are not discussed further within this report.

Fish

- 3.4.28 The desk study did not return any records of fish within 1 km of the Site boundary. There are no habitats on Site suitable for fish and therefore are not discussed further within the report.

Amphibians

- 3.4.29 The BDS returned no records for GCNs from within 1 km, but eight records for other common amphibians (four for common frog (*Rana temporaria*) and four for smooth newt (*Lissotriton vulgaris*) were returned from within 1 km of the site boundary. All of which were located 470 m north of the site.
- 3.4.30 There are no mapped ponds within 250m of the proposed development site. There is one pond within 500 m of the site, located 280 m north-east of the site, but connectivity is limited due to the presence of residential housing and roads.
- 3.4.31 There are some terrestrial habitats within the development footprint are broadly suitable for GCNs and other common amphibians. The areas of urban trees, allotment areas, brash piles, other neutral grassland, hedgerows and scrub offer some small areas of foraging and commuting habitat for amphibians. However, most of the site is generally unsuitable, with large areas containing regularly mown modified grassland, buildings and developed land, sealed surface.
- 3.4.32 Therefore, considering the small, fragmented areas of the suitable habitat on the site, poor connectivity to suitable habitat in the wider landscape and lack of ponds within 250 m, GCNs are considered unlikely to be present within the proposed site boundary and are not discussed further within this report. Other common amphibians, if present, are only anticipated to be present in small numbers.

Reptiles

- 3.4.33 No records for reptiles were returned within 1 km of the site boundary.
- 3.4.34 Similar to amphibians, some terrestrial habitats within the development footprint are broadly suitable for reptiles. The areas of urban, scattered trees, other neutral grassland, hedgerows, brash piles and scrub offer some small, fragmented areas of foraging and commuting habitat. However, most of the site is generally unsuitable, with large areas containing modified, buildings and developed land, sealed surface. Furthermore, the connectivity to other habitats in the wider landscape is limited. Therefore, reptiles are considered unlikely to be present within the proposed site boundary and are not discussed further within this report.

Birds

- 3.4.35 The BDS returned one record for priority bird species from within 1 km of the site boundary; swift (*Apus apus*) located 850 m from the site. The site is generally considered unsuitable for this species.

- 3.4.36 The buildings, scrub and urban trees on site offer potential nesting habitat for bird species in the summer, including house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), robin (*Erithacus rubecula*) and wren (*Troglodytes troglodytes*).
- 3.4.37 The habitats on the site are unsuitable to support significant wintering bird assemblages due to the absence of waterbodies or ephemeral scrapes. Wintering species are only likely to use the site on an opportunistic basis. Therefore, wintering birds are not considered further within this report.

Bats

BDS

- 3.4.38 The BDS returned 39 records for bats within 1 km of the site:
- Eight records for bat species were returned, five of which were for roosts. The closest roost record was for a maternity roost with 202 individuals located 404m south. The closest field record is located 395m north-east of the site.
 - One record for brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*) was returned, the bat was recorded foraging 755m from the site.
 - 21 records for common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) were returned, eight of which were records for roosts. The closest record for a roost was a maternity roost located 590m north of the site boundary, but no other information was provided. The closest field record was 470m north of the site boundary.
 - One record for Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*) was returned, which was a field record located 650m south-east of the site boundary.
 - Three records for noctule bat (*Nyctalus noctula*) were returned, all of which were field records, and the closest was located 750m north-west of the site boundary.
 - Four soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) were returned, all of which were field records, and the closest was located 470m north of the site boundary.
- 3.4.39 The desk study returned no European Protected Species (EPS) licences for bats within 1 km of the Site.

Roosting – buildings – preliminary roost assessment

- 3.4.40 There are 11 buildings on the site, each of which was subject to a detailed external inspection (locations and building references are shown on *Figure 2*) in 2022 by RSK Biocensus. RSK Biocensus updated the survey in October 2025 and found that conditions on site were the same. Access was not granted to complete internal inspections at the time of the survey, see *Section 2.6* for further information.

Building EFAA

- 3.4.41 Building EFAA is a large single storey building in the centre of the site which is currently used as the main school building. The building is constructed from brick and has hipped roofs, clad with interlocking concrete roof tiles and concrete ridge tiles. The roof is generally in good condition, but several gaps were noted below the ridge tiles, where mortar was missing. Furthermore, mortar is missing from the end roof tiles on the northern aspect of the building (Plate 16). There are wooden soffit boxes on all aspects of the building, and there are gaps which lead behind the soffit boxes on most aspects of the building (Plate 17). The brickwork on the building is in excellent condition with no PRFs

noted. Furthermore, the windows and doors are also in excellent condition and the doors are covered with metal shutters at night, preventing bat access into these areas. There are also motion sensor lights present on all aspects of the building.

- 3.4.42 Overall, as the building was not inspected internally, the quality of roosting habitat within Building EFAA is considered to be moderate. There are a number of external PRFs present and internal features are assumed to be suitable.



Plate 14 – Southern aspect of Building EFAA



Plate 15 – View of gap in mortar on northern aspect of Building EFAA

Buildings EFAD, EFAC and EFAB

- 3.4.43 Buildings EFAD, EFAC and EFAB are prefabricated porta cabins which are all similar in design and construction. The buildings were constructed to provide temporary classrooms for the expanding school.
- 3.4.44 Building EFAD and Building EFAC are constructed from metal sheeting, while EFAB also has brick foundations. Building EFAD has a shallow pitched roof while Building EFAC

and Building EFAB have flat roofs. A small number of gaps were noted on the southern aspect of Building EFAD, where the metal sheeting has bowed, but these were all small and are considered to offer limited opportunities for roosting bats as they will experience high temperature fluctuations. Overall, the quality of roosting habitat within buildings EFAD, EFAC and EFAB is considered to be negligible.



Plate 16 - Eastern aspect of Building EFAD.

Surestart Children's Centre

- 3.4.45 Surestart Children's Centre is a newly constructed building which is in current use by the school. The building is single storey, constructed from brick with a pitched roof. The roof is clad with concrete interlocking roof tiles and concrete ridge tiles. There are plastic dry verge tiles present on the gable ends on the eastern and western aspects of the building. The roof and ridge tiles are in excellent condition and tightly sealed, however there are gaps behind the plastic dry verge tiles, and one is missing on the eastern aspect of the building. This provides access to a gap which leads over the wall plate, which will provide opportunities for roosting bats. There are wooden boxed soffits present on the northern and southern aspects of the building, but these are in excellent condition and tightly sealed. The windows are UPVC and also in excellent condition and tightly sealed. The brickwork is also in excellent condition, there are a number of weep holes present, but these are filled with plastic vents, preventing bat access. Overall, as the building was not inspected internally, the quality of roosting habitat within the building is considered to be moderate. There are a number of external PRFs present and internal features are assumed to be suitable.



Plate 17 – Southern and eastern aspect of Surestart Children's Centre



Plate 18 – View of missing dry verge tile on the eastern aspect of Surestart Children's Centre.



Plate 19 – View of gap to wall plate behind the missing dry verge tile on Surestart Children's Centre.

Building 1

- 3.4.46 Building 1 (B1) is an octagonal, gazebo with a roof, utilised for outdoor learning. It constructed from wood, is open sided and has a roof clad with wooden roof tiles. The building is considered to offer some suitability for use by bats as a feeding perch. However, the immediate surrounding habitat is of low quality and the building is relatively exposed as it is open sided. Therefore, it is considered reasonably unlikely that bats will

use the building as a feeding perch. No features were identified which could be used by bats as any other type of roost as the roof is in excellent condition. Furthermore, no evidence of use as a feeding perch was recorded during the survey. Taking this into account, the overall quality of roosting habitat within the building is negligible.



Plate 20 – View of Building 1.

Building 2

- 3.4.47 Building 2 (B2) is a brick-built electricity / gas unit located in the north-western corner of the site.
- 3.4.48 The building has a mono-pitched sloping roof which is lined with roofing felt. The roofing felt is in poor condition and is lifted in several places on the western aspect. There is also a wooden barge board on the western aspect of the building which is slightly lifted and provides opportunities for a small number of bats. The brickwork is in excellent condition with no PRFs noted. There are wooden doors on the eastern and western aspect of the building which are in poor condition and rotten.
- 3.4.49 However, since the survey in 2022, the vegetation surrounding the western aspect of the building has become overgrown, creating a cluttered flight path to the previous identified potential roosting features, therefore reducing the suitability of the building to negligible.



Plate 21 - View of Building 2

Buildings 3, 4, 5 and 6

- 3.4.50 Buildings 3, 4 (B3, B4; *Plate 22*) and B5, B6;) are wooden sheds while Building 5 (B5;) is a wooden greenhouse. The buildings are similar in design and construction with pitched roofs. B3, 4 and 6 do not have any windows while B5 has windows on the southern aspect. The roofs are lined with roofing felt but are in excellent condition. No PRFs suitable for roosting bats were noted and the quality of roosting habitat within the buildings is negligible.



Plate 22 – View of Building 3 and 4



Plate 23 – View of Building 5 and 6.

Roosting – buildings – emergence surveys

- 3.4.51 Emergence surveys of Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre) and Building 2 undertaken by Indigo Surveys Ltd in 2023 (Indigo Surveys Ltd, 2023). An emergence of Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre and Building 2 was undertaken on 5th May 2025. A dawn re-entry survey of Building EFAA and Surestart Children's Centre was undertaken on 17th June 2023.
- 3.4.52 Two species of bat were recorded during the surveys: common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) and noctule (*Nyctalus noctule*). Activity was generally low, with only occasional common pipistrelle and noctule passes recorded during the emergence survey and only occasional common pipistrelle passes recorded during the dawn survey.
- 3.4.53 Despite the favourable conditions, no bats were recorded roosting in the Building EFAA, Surestart Children's Centre) or Building 2 on the site. Further details of these surveys are provided in the Bat Activity Survey Report (Indigo Surveys Ltd, 2023).

Roosting – Trees

- 3.4.54 There are several mature trees within the proposed site boundary, all of which were subject to a detailed ground level tree assessment (GLTA) for roosting bats. No trees with PRFs were identified on site or within the immediate vicinity.

Foraging and commuting bats

- 3.4.55 The areas of other neutral grassland, hedgerows, scrub and urban trees on the site provide some suitable habitat for foraging and commuting bats. However, the site is within the suburban area of Gomersal, so the site is surrounded by residential dwellings with large, connected gardens and well-lit roads. There are small patches of greenspace in the immediate surrounding area, such as Gomersal Cricket Club and Sugden Park which will provide some foraging and commuting opportunities for bats.
- 3.4.56 Habitats in the wider surrounding area are semi-rural with larger hedge-lined improved fields to the east and west. Church Beck and Church Wood are also located c. 680 m north-east of the site while Fusden Wood (an ancient, replanted woodland) is located c. 720 m north-west of the site. These habitats will provide higher quality foraging and commuting opportunities for bats. Furthermore, connectivity between the site and these habitats is limited by well-lit busy roads and large urban areas.
- 3.4.57 Therefore, considering the small size of the suitable habitats on site and limited connectivity from the site, the site is considered to offer low quality habitat for foraging and commuting bats.
- 3.4.58 It is recommended that the areas of suitable habitat (trees, other neutral grassland, scrub and hedgerows) are retained as part of any development proposals.

Water vole and Otter

- 3.4.59 No records for water vole or otter were returned from within 1 km of the site boundary and there are no suitable habitats for these species on site.
- 3.4.60 The closest watercourse is Church Beck which is c. 510 m north-east of the site. Church Beck is not hydrologically connected to the site. Therefore, these species are considered to be absent from the site and are not discussed further within this report.

Badger

- 3.4.61 There are no badger records within 200 m of the proposed site boundary and the closest sett is over 1 km from the site boundary.
- 3.4.62 No badger setts, tracks, latrines, snuffle holes or other signs of badger activity were noted during the walkover survey. The buildings and areas of developed land, sealed surface are unsuitable for badgers, but the areas of modified grassland, scrub and urban trees will provide some limited foraging and commuting opportunities for badgers. However, the habitats in the immediate surrounding area are generally unsuitable for badger, with large residential housing estates and well-lit busy roads surrounding the site boundary this and the small size of the suitable habitat into account, badgers are considered to be absent from the site and are not discussed further within this report.

Other priority species or species of principal importance

- 3.4.63 The field survey did not record the presence of any other animals of nature conservation importance. However, habitats within the site, including areas of urban trees, scrub, vegetated gardens (introduced shrubs and allotment) and other neutral grassland are suitable for European hedgehog. Furthermore, two records for hedgehogs within 1 km of the site were returned, both of which are located 755 m north-west of the

site boundary. Hedgehogs occupy a range of lowland habitats with enough cover to allow nesting; they are common in parks in urban and suburban environments, farmland and gardens. Two brash piles observed on site could be potential hibernacula for hedgehogs.

3.5 Invasive non-native species

- 3.5.1 The desk study did not return any records of INNS within 1 km of the Site.
- 3.5.2 *Cotoneaster* sp. (*Cotoneaster* species) and *Crocosmia* x *crocosmiiflora* (*Montbretia*) are INNS and are listed under schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). It is illegal to cause the spread of these species in the wild. Whilst not a legal requirement it is recommended that these invasive species are treated and/or removed by a specialist contractor to eradicate them from site and prevent their spread.

4 Ecological Impact Assessment

4.1 Scope of the assessment

- 4.1.1 Scoping has been undertaken using the findings of the preliminary ecological appraisal report (RSK Biocensus, 2023⁵), bat emergence surveys (Indigo Surveys Ltd, 2023) and updated ecological walkover completed by RSK Biocensus in October 2025) and the details of the proposed development.
- 4.1.2 Table 5 lists all of the ecological features which were considered during scoping and whether they have been scoped out or if they are considered important ecological features (IEFs) of sufficient conservation value with a potential to be affected by the proposals, and have therefore been carried forward to a more detailed assessment.

Table 5 Ecological features scoped out of further assessment

Receptor	Brief justification (further details in previous section)	Scoped in or out
Designated sites (Statutory and non-statutory)	The sites identified during the desk study were cross-referenced with the survey area relevant to this report. The closest statutory protected site is Oakwell Park LNR and closest non-statutory site is Oakwell Park LWS, which is located c. 1.1km north-east of the site, Given the distances from site and the small scale of development, it is considered unlikely that the proposed development will have any direct or indirect impact on this or any other local designated sites.	Out
Habitats and plant species	Hedgerows on the site are habitats of principal importance listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006. Without mitigation, they could be indirectly impacted by the proposed mitigation. Other habitats present on site do not meet these criteria, are not species-rich, have little botanical value and are ubiquitous in the wider landscape. However, the urban trees and area of dense scrub are of inherent ecological value and should be retained where possible.	In (habitats, particularly hedgerows)
Invasive non-native species	At least two common invasive species present within ornamental planting – <i>Cotoneaster</i> sp. (Cotoneaster species) and <i>Crocodymia x crocosmiiflora</i> (Montbretia). However, neither species is widespread on the site and are located within areas of introduced shrub planting. Both plants will be removed as part of the development, but both species can be legally bought and planted on the site or in surrounding gardens. Recommendations will be given for these species in Section 5, but the risk of significant negative ecological effects arising from the proposals as a result of these species is negligible.	Out
Fish	There are no habitats on site or in the immediate surrounding area suitable to support fish.	Out
Invertebrates	The PEA assessed the habitats on site as likely to support only a common assemblage of invertebrate species typical of modified grassland, trees and hedgerows.	Out
Great crested newts	There are no ponds on the Site or within 250 m of the Site, and the desk study returned no records of GCN within 1km of the Site. The nearest potential breeding habitat for GCN is located 280 m north-east of the site, but connectivity is limited due to the presence of residential housing and roads.	Out
Common amphibians	There are no watercourses or waterbodies on the site, but there are some habitats, such as brash piles, dense scrub, urban trees and	In

⁵ RSK Biocensus (2023) 2484745 – Gomersal St Marys Primary School PEA REV01

	hedgerows, which offer some small areas of foraging and commuting habitat for amphibians.	
Reptiles	There are no records of reptiles within 1km of the site boundary and although terrestrial habitats are broadly suitable for reptiles, most of the site is generally unsuitable, with large areas containing modified grassland, buildings and developed land, sealed surface. Furthermore, the connectivity to other habitats in the wider landscape is limited.	Out
Birds	Buildings due to be demolished and any areas of scrub, trees and hedgerows which are to be removed provide nesting opportunities.	In
Bats (roosting)	Two buildings were assessed as having suitability to support roosting bats during the updated walkover survey in October 2025, the Building EFAA and Surestart Children's Centre. Building EFAA will be demolished and there is potential for indirect impacts to Surestart Children's Centre. No bats have been recorded roosting within the buildings during the emergence surveys in 2023, but these surveys are now out of date.	In
Bats (foraging and commuting)	The small size of the suitable habitats on site and limited connectivity from the site, the site is considered to offer low quality habitat for foraging and commuting bats. However, without mitigation, retained and created habitats could become unsuitable for foraging and commuting bats during the construction and operational phases of the development.	In
Water vole and otter	No records for water vole or otter were returned from within 1 km of the site boundary and there are no suitable habitats for these species on site.	Out
Badgers	There are no badger records within 200 m of the proposed site boundary. The habitats on site provide some opportunities for badgers (areas of dense scrub and hedgerows) but habitats in the immediate surrounding area are generally unsuitable for badger, with large residential housing estates and well-lit busy roads surrounding the site boundary. Taking this into account and the small size of the suitable habitat into account, badgers are considered to be absent from the site.	Out
Other priority species	Habitats within the site are suitable for European hedgehog, including areas of hedgerow, brash piles and dense scrub and two records for hedgehogs within 1 km of the site were returned.	In

4.2 Assessment

4.2.1 Given the relatively small scale of the works, the ecological impact assessment has been summarised into a single table; Table 6.

Table 6: Summary of the Ecological Impact Assessment for each receptor or feature.

Receptor	Scale of importance and justification	Assessment of impacts (without mitigation)	Mitigation measures	Proposed mechanism to secure	Residual effect
Habitats and plant species	Negligible Hedgerows are national and county priority habitats but the proposed development will retain all existing hedgerows. However, without mitigation, there is potential for indirect impacts. Habitats to be affected are species-poor and their collective value is less than local value.	Construction activities too close to the root protection areas of the retained hedgerows and trees could cause permanent damage.	A Landscape Strategy will be produced detailing the post-construction Site reinstatement plans and maintenance. The Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) will also be produced as a BNG requirement post-planning. These will include detailed drawings, timetables and management proposals to ensure habitats are created, developed and maintained in the designated condition, as well as a plan to define who is responsible for activities proposed in the design stage report. A Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) or equivalent will be developed (and agreed by the LPA) prior to construction commencement. The CEMP will outline measures to protect retained hedgerows and trees, including implementation of root protection zones during construction phase of the development.	Biodiversity net gain Pre-commencement planning condition to secure CEMP.	Not significant (a negligible long-term positive effect)
Common amphibians	Negligible Common amphibians (such as common toad (<i>Bufo bufo</i>) are a biodiversity priority species under the Natural	During vegetation removal, common amphibians could be directly harmed, injured and / or result in death to individuals.	The landscape design retains the areas of higher quality habitat (dense scrub) and CEMP will ensure protection of retained hedgerows and trees.	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure CEMP	Not significant

Receptor	Scale of importance and justification	Assessment of impacts (without mitigation)	Mitigation measures	Proposed mechanism to secure	Residual effect
	Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). The removal of habitats such as brash piles and scattered trees will result in loss of habitat. However, the areas to be impacted are small and the habitats are common and widespread in the local area.		A precautionary working method statement (PWMS) will be produced which outlines mitigation measures to protect common amphibians. These measures will include the covering of excavations overnight, ecological clerk of works (ECoW) during clearance of suitable habitats, recommended timings for vegetation clearance to avoid hibernation season, and implementational of phased vegetation clearance.	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure PWMS.	(a negligible long-term positive effect)
Birds	Negligible The areas of dense scrub, hedgerows, trees and buildings on site have the capacity to support a common assemblage of birds which will be important at a site level.	Tree felling, arboricultural works and vegetation removal and building demolition during the construction phase of the development could result in the direct loss of nests, any individuals within the nests and of available nesting territories if conducted during the breeding season.	A PWMS will be produced which outlines mitigation measures to protect nesting birds. This will include removal of vegetation and demolition of buildings outside of the bird breeding season of March – August inclusive. If this is not possible, an ECoW will undertake a nesting bird check prior to the removal of vegetation. If an active nest is found, a suitable buffer area around the nest will be retained and the vegetation in which the nest is located will not be removed until the nest is no longer in active use.	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure PWMS.	Not significant
Bats (roosting)	Negligible / local No bat roosts identified on site, but the survey data will be out of date when the building is scheduled to be demolished (March 2028). If any roosts are present, the type roost anticipated to be present would only be of local	If bats are roosting within the EFAA building during demolition, they are at risk of direct harm and disturbance and any roosts will be lost permanently. Inappropriate lighting on retained buildings (primarily during the operational phase) could have an	A PWMS will be produced which outlines mitigation measures to bats, which will include an updated bat emergence survey to be undertaken in May 2026. Additional measures will also include avoidance of night working, to prevent any unnecessary disturbance on bats. If night working is required, artificial lighting should be hooded to reduce spill and	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure PWMS. Pre-commencement planning condition to secure appropriate lighting plan.	Not significant

Receptor	Scale of importance and justification	Assessment of impacts (without mitigation)	Mitigation measures	Proposed mechanism to secure	Residual effect
	value (day roost) and used by common species only.	insignificant, long-term negative impact and reduce roosting opportunities on site.	should be directed away from retained buildings. If any bat roosts are identified within the updated survey, the provision of alternative roosts and survey/supervision of demolition by licenced ecologist prior to works will be included in the PWMS and licence application. A lighting plan for the site should ensure lighting avoids retained buildings and dark corridors are maintained along hedgerows surrounding the site.. Reference should be made to the relevant guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP 2023).	Natural England Licence (if required)	
Bats (foraging and commuting)	Negligible The grassland, scrub, hedgerows and trees on site provide some foraging and commuting opportunities for bats. The number of bats anticipated to use the site is considered to be low and species assemblage is widespread and common.	Long-term increase in quality of habitat on the site would have insignificant positive effect on local bats. Lighting on the site (primarily during the operational phase) could have an insignificant, long-term negative impact on bats.	A PWMS will be produced which outlines mitigation measures to bats, which will include avoidance of night working, to prevent any unnecessary disturbance on bats. If night working is required, artificial lighting should be hooded to reduce spill and should be directed away from any linear features that could be used for foraging and commuting bats. A lighting plan for the site should ensure dark corridors are maintained along hedges and woodland surrounding the site, as well as near any proposed roosts. Reference should be made to the relevant guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP 2023).	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure PWMS. Pre-commencement planning condition to secure appropriate lighting plan.	Not significant

Receptor	Scale of importance and justification	Assessment of impacts (without mitigation)	Mitigation measures	Proposed mechanism to secure	Residual effect
Other priority species (hedgehogs)	Negligible Hedgehogs are a priority species and removal of habitats such as brash piles and scattered trees will result in loss of habitat. However, the areas to be impacted are small and the habitats are common and widespread in the local area.	During vegetation removal, hedgehogs could be directly harmed, injured and / or result in death to individuals.	The landscape design retains the areas of higher quality habitat (dense scrub) and CEMP will ensure protection of retained hedgerows and trees. A precautionary working method statement (PWMS) will be produced which outlines mitigation measures to protect hedgehogs. These measures will include the covering of excavations overnight, ecological clerk of works (ECoW) during clearance of suitable habitats, no night time working, recommended timings for vegetation clearance to avoid hibernation season, and implementational of phased vegetation clearance.	Pre-commencement planning condition to secure CEMP Pre-commencement planning condition to secure PWMS.	Not significant (a negligible long-term positive effect)

Cumulative effects

- 4.2.2 A brief review of the relevant planning portal (Kirklees Council) suggests there are only relatively minor planning applications in the surrounding area (Gomersal). These applications are highly unlikely to affect the receptors or features discussed in the previous section to the extent of the effect becoming significant in combination with these proposals. Cumulative effects are therefore not discussed further.

Enhancement

- 4.2.3 The biodiversity net gain report will provide detail on the enhancement of habitats on the site. These enhancements will likely have some positive effects upon the receptors dealt with in this assessment; in particular, the enhancement in commuting and foraging habitat for bats from the introduction of a more hedgerows.
- 4.2.4 The incorporation of bat boxes and bird nest boxes into the development will also aim to increase the roost and nest resource on the site, rather than just mitigate for the losses.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1.1 As a result of biodiversity net gain requirements, the development should have a positive effect on habitats within the site, and therefore enhance the quality and quantity of habitat in the local area (albeit insignificant at this scale).
- 5.1.2 The presence of *Cotoneaster sp.* (Cotoneaster species) and *Crocasmia x crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia) in the areas of introduced shrub around the buildings is significant in some senses, as the species are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981 (as amended), making it illegal to aid their spread into the wild. However, as mentioned in Section 4, the risk of significant negative ecological effects arising from the proposals as a result of these species is negligible and it would arguably be disproportionate to enforce rigid or detailed method statements to control the species. However, if any of the plants need to be cut or removed to facilitate renovation works to the buildings, it is recommended that a suitably qualified and experienced contractor is employed to carry out the work.
- 5.1.3 As mentioned in Section 4, there should be no significant effects on protected or notable animal species assuming the following actions are taken:
- Provision of CEMP and PWMS are implemented during the construction phase of the development to protect retained habitats, common amphibians, bats, birds and hedgehogs.
 - An updated emergence survey for bats of Building EFAA is undertaken to confirm conditions on site are the same and bats are not using the building to roost.
 - The provision of bat and bird boxes to enhance roosting and nesting opportunities on site.
 - The provision of a sensitive lighting strategy to protect potential roosting, foraging and commuting resources both during the construction and operational phases.

Incomplete surveys

- 5.1.4 In the case of bats, it is considered unlikely that the results of the updated survey will change the overall assessment. Even if a bat roost is identified within EFAA building, suitable mitigation will have to be detailed within the application for a Natural England mitigation licence and will be outlined within PWMS documents. Based on the survey information gathered so far, any roost present would be of site importance and will be used by common and widespread species.

6 References

- Bat Conservation Trust (2023). Bats and Artificial Lighting Guidance Note 08/23.
- Beebee, T.J.C. & Griffiths, R.A. (2000), Amphibians and Reptiles – A Natural History of the British Herpetofauna. HarperCollins, London.
- Bright, P., Morris, P. and Mitchell-Jones, T. (2006). The Hazel Dormouse Conservation Handbook (2nd Edition). English Nature.
- Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. and Treweek, J. (2020), UK Habitat Classification – Habitat Definitions V1.1 Retrieved from <http://ukhab.org>
- Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2024) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Version 1.1 – Updated September 2019.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2019). Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports & Surveys. CIEEM, Winchester, Hampshire.
- Collins, J.(2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Froglife (1999). Reptile Survey: an introduction to planning, conducting and interpreting surveys for snake and lizard conservation. Froglife Advice Sheet 10. Froglife, Halesworth.
- Indigo services Ltd (2023) Nocturnal Bat Survey Report, Gomersal St Mary's C of E Primary, Shirley Avenue, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4NA
- One-Environment (2025) Gomersal St Mary's Primary School, Whole Site Plan (DWG No. SRP1134-ONE-ZZ-XX-D-L-0003)
- Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.
- RSK Biocensus (2022) Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA), Gomersal St Mary's Primary School

Figures

Figure 1. Site Location Plan

Figure 2. UKHab Habitats Map



Legend:

Site boundary

00	07/11/2025	2489777	LB	RG	EC
Rev	Date	Project Code	Drm	Chk	App

PEA BNG Gomersal St Marys School

TITLE: Figure 1:

Site Location Plan

0

25

50

75

Metres

SCALE: 1:2,000 @ A3

N

W

E

S

REV 00



Appendix A – Proposed Development Layout

- LEGEND**
- Asphalt Concrete [Vehicular Grade]
 - Asphalt Concrete [Pedestrian Grade]
 - Retained Existing Asphalt Concrete [Subject to condition/temporary works]
 - PCC Concrete Block Paving Type 1 [Permeable]
 - PCC Concrete Block Paving Type 2 [Permeable]
 - PCC Concrete Block Paving Type 3
 - Concrete Hardstand [Cycle Storage & Service Areas]
 - Asphalt Concrete Multi Use Games Area [Non-porous]
 - Hazard Warning Paving
 - 3x 10 Space Cycle Shelter [PCP Steel]
 - External Canopies [PCP Steel Frame]
 - 3.0m Games Court Fencing [with matching lockable gates where indicated]
 - 2.4m Secure Weldmesh Fencing [with matching lockable gates where indicated]
 - 1.8m Weldmesh Fencing [with matching lockable gates where indicated]
 - 1.2m Steel Bowtop Railing [with matching lockable gates where indicated]
 - 1.8m Close Board Timber Fence [with matching lockable gates where indicated]
 - 900mm Steel Pedestrian Guardrail
 - 600mm Timber Diamond Knee Rail
 - Existing Fence & Gates Retained [Subject to Condition]
 - 2x EV Charging Points [4 Active Bays]
 - Accessible Parking Bay Marker Post
 - Collapsible Bollard
 - Timber Benches [PCP Steel Frame]
 - Timber Raised Beds
 - Relocated Furniture [Subject to Condition]
 - Extent of Existing Buildings Demolished
 - Existing Trees & Vegetation Retained
 - Relocated Existing Memorial Tree
 - Proposed Tree Planting
 - Native Hedge Planting
 - Ornamental Planting
 - Species Rich Grass
 - Amenity Grass
 - SuDs Seed Mix
 - Existing Grass Retained [Subject to condition/temporary works]

REVISION | P03 DATE | 21.10.25 BY | GS CHECKED | KP
Revised in accordance with CEMS feedback. Building shifted north to accommodate drainage proposals.

CLIENT	Bowmer + Kirkland		
PROJECT	Gomersal St Mary's Primary School		
TITLE	Whole Site Plan		
DWG No.	SRP1134-ONE-ZZ-XX-D-L-0003	REV	P03
STATUS	PRELIMINARY		
SCALE	1:200	@ A1	DATE 30.09.25 DRN BY KP



0 2 4 8
metres 1:200



Appendix B – Target Notes

The locations of the following target notes are shown in *Figure 2*.

Target Note 1. Area of 15 young – semi-mature scattered trees, species include *Betula pendula* (Silver Birch) , *Fraxinus excelsior* (Ash) , *Prunus sp.* (Cherry). Trees do not contain any features suitable for roosting bats.

Target Note 2. Area if scattered trees which is dominated by fruit trees (*Mallus sp.* (Apple) and *Prunus sp.* (Cherry) and is considered to be small orchard.

Target Note 3. An allotment area with raised planting beds, small areas of amenity grassland, pathways and sheds. The area is bounded by Osier (*Salix viminalis*) which has been weaved together to create a fence around the allotment area. Other species present include *Sambucus racemosa* (Red-berried Elder) , *Sorbus aucuparia* (Rowan) and *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore) .

Target Note 4. An area of mature, semi-mature and young scattered trees. Species include *Acer pseudoplatanus* (Sycamore) , *Prunus sp.* (Cherry), *Alnus sp.* (ornamental variety (Alder)), *Crataegus monogyna* (Hawthorn) , *Corylus avellana* (Hazel) , *Quercus robur* (Pedunculate Oak) , *Acer campestre* (Field Maple) and *Sorbus aucuparia* (Rowan) .

Target Note 5. A small section of grassland in the north-eastern corner of the site which has experienced a lower intensity of grazing and has a longer sward than other grassland areas on site and as such is considered to be species poor semi-improved grassland. The most frequent grass species present is *Agrostis stolonifera* (Creeping Bent) , but the other species present are similar to those found in the amenity grassland areas, but there is a greater diversity of species here and there are patches which are succeeding into ruderal and scrub habitats. Other species include: *Holcus lanatus* (Yorkshire-fog) , *Dactylis glomerata* (Cock's-foot) , *Lolium perenne* (Perennial Rye-grass) , *Festuca rubra* (Red Fescue) , *Arrhenatherum elatius* (False Oat-grass) , *Cirsium arvense* (Creeping Thistle) and *Galium aparine* (Cleavers) , *Taraxacum* sect. *Ruderalia* (Common Dandelion) , *Vicia sepium* (Bush Vetch) , *Salix caprea* (Goat Willow) , *Prunus spinosa* (Blackthorn) , *Betula pendula* (Silver Birch) saplings and *Urtica dioica* (Common Nettle) .

Target Note 6: Amenity grassland playing field.

Target Note 7: *Cotoneaster sp.* (*Cotoneaster species*) plants

Target Note 8: *Crocsmia x crocosmiiflora* (Montbretia) plants

Appendix C – NOTEWORTHY SPECIES RECORDS

Table 7 displays protected species records that are within 1 km of the site boundary and Table 8 displays noteworthy species records that are within 1 km of the site boundary. These species records were obtained from West Yorkshire Joint Services. The scientific and common names for species are given as well as their level of designation. A glossary defining abbreviations used in the table is given in Table 9, Appendix D. If a species is not included in the table below it does not necessarily mean the species is absent from the search area, but that data-holding organizations do not have records of it in these locations.

Table 7: Protected species records within 2 km of the site boundary

Latin Name	Common Name	Designation	Most Recent	Within 100m
Mammals				
<i>Myotis</i>	Myotis Bat species	EPS(Sch2), WCA5	2018	
<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	Daubenton's Bat	EPS(Sch2), WCA5	2010	
<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>	Noctule Bat	EPS(Sch2), WCA5, S41	2020	
<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	Common Pipistrelle	EPS(Sch2), WCA5	2020	
<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	Soprano Pipistrelle	EPS(Sch2), WCA5, S41	2020	
<i>Plecotus auritus</i>	Brown Long-eared Bat	EPS(Sch2), WCA5, S41	2018	
<i>Vespertilionidae</i>	Bats	EPS(Sch2), WCA5	2009	

Table 8: Noteworthy species records within 1 km of the site boundary

Latin Name	Common Name	Designation
Amphibians		
<i>Rana temporaria</i>	Common Frog	WCA5
<i>Triturus vulgaris</i>	Smooth Newt	WCA5
Birds		
<i>Apus apus</i>	Swift	Red, GB RDB(EN)
<i>Columba palumbus</i>	Woodpigeon	Amber
<i>Strix aluco</i>	Tawny Owl	Amber
<i>Turdus viscivorus</i>	Mistle Thrush	Red, GB RDB(VU)
Invertebrates		

Latin Name	Common Name	Designation
<i>Lasiommata megera</i>	Wall	S41
<i>Tyria jacobaeae</i>	Cinnabar	S41
Mammals		
<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>	West European Hedgehog	S41, GB RDB(VU)
<i>Lepus europaeus</i>	Brown Hare	S41

Appendix D – Abbreviations

Table 9 displays abbreviations of protected species legislation.

Table 9 - Glossary of abbreviations used in this report

Code	Full Title	Explanation
Amber	Amber list	Amber listed species have a population status in the UK of medium conservation concern.
BAP	Biodiversity action plan	A plan that identifies threats to significantly important species and habitats, and sets out targets and actions to enhance or maintain biodiversity.
DA	The Deer Act 1991	All wild deer with the exception of Muntjac (<i>Muntiacus reevesi</i>) and Chinese Water deer (<i>Hydropotes inermis</i>) are protected by a closed season.
ENG BSBI RDB	A Vascular Plant Red List for England	A list published in 2014 by the Botanical Society of Britain and Ireland of the red list status of plants in England. Measured against standardised IUCN criteria.
ENG BSBI RDB(CR)	Critically endangered	A BSBI Red List designation for species at an extremely high risk of extinction.
ENG BSBI RDB(EN)	Endangered	A BSBI Red List designation for species at a very high risk of extinction.
ENG BSBI RDB(VU)	Vulnerable	A BSBI Red List designation for species at high risk of extinction.
EPS (Sch 2)	European protected species (Schedule 2)	European protected species of animals, listed on Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
EPS (Sch 5)	European protected species (Schedule 5)	European protected species of plants, listed on Schedule 5 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
GB RDB	Red data book species	Species identified in one of the UK Red Data 2001.
GB RDB(CR)	Critically endangered	An IUCN Red List designation for species at an extremely high risk of extinction.
GB RDB(EN)	Endangered	An IUCN Red List designation for species at a very high risk of extinction.
GB RDB(VU)	Vulnerable	An IUCN Red List designation for species at high risk of extinction.
HAP	Habitat action plan	A plan that identifies threats to a priority habitat and sets out targets and actions to enhance or maintain that habitat.
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	A worldwide partnership and conservation network to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.
LBAP	Local biodiversity action plan	A plan that identifies threats to locally important species and habitats, and sets out targets and actions in Species Action Plans and Habitat Action Plans to enhance or maintain biodiversity at the county or regional level.
Notable	Scarce and threatened invertebrates	Invertebrate species which are estimated to occur within the range of 16 to 100 10km squares but subdivision into Notable A and Notable B categories is not possible as there is insufficient information available).
Notable: A	Scarce and threatened invertebrates	Taxa which do not fall within Red Data Book categories but which are none-the-less uncommon in Great Britain and thought to occur in 30 or fewer 10km squares of the National Grid or, for less well-recorded groups, within seven or fewer vice-counties.
Notable: B	Scarce and threatened invertebrates	Taxa which do not fall within Red Data Book categories but which are none-the-less uncommon in Great Britain and thought to occur in between 31 and 100 10km squares of the National Grid or, for less-well recorded groups between eight and twenty vice-counties.
NN	Nationally notable	Designation for invertebrate taxa that are thought to be notably important in the UK.
NR	Nationally rare	Species in 15 or fewer hectads in Great Britain.
NS	National scarce	Species in 16-100 hectads in Great Britain.
OSPAR	OSPAR	Species listed on The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
Red	Red list	Red listed species have a population status in the UK with high conservation concern.

Code	Full Title	Explanation
SAP	Species action plan	A plan that identifies threats to significantly important species, and sets out targets and actions to prevent losing that species to extinction.
S41	Species of principal importance	Species of Principal Importance in England under The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006)
UKBAP	UK biodiversity action plan	A plan that identifies threats to locally important species and habitats, and sets out targets and actions in species action plans and habitat action plans to enhance or maintain biodiversity in the UK.
WCA	The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)	Containing 4 Parts and 17 Schedules, the Act covers protection of wildlife (birds, and some animals and plants), the countryside, National Parks, and the designation of protected areas, and public rights of way.



RSK
biocensus
EXPERTS IN ECOLOGY

www.rskbiocensus.com