

Biodiversity Impact Assessment

Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership), Buckingham Way, Aylesbury, HP19 9QH Ref: P.1647.22

April 2024

Rev	Date	Details
A	15 th June 2023	Updates following council comments
В	26 th June 2023	General updates
С	24 th July 2023	Updates following council comments and landscaping updates
D	23 rd August 2023	Updates following metric revisions
E	4 th April 2024	Updates following revised landscape plan

Ascerta Mere One, Mere Grange, Elton Head Road, St Helens, Merseyside WA9 5GG T: 0845 463 4404 E: info@landscapetreesecology.com www.landscapetreesecology.com

P.1647.22

Biodiversity Impact Assessment

of

Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership), Buckingham Way, Aylesbury, HP19 9QH

for

Lidl Great Britain Ltd

January 2023

Field Work by	Lizzie Atkinson MSc, CIEEM and Liz Kenyon BSc (Hons)		
Document Author	Natasha James, 2022, Liz Kenyon (Rev A, B & C 2023) and		
	Lizzie Atkinson (Rev E, 2024)		
Technical Review	Lizzie Atkinson		
QA Review & Approval	Ciaran Power – Operations Manager (2022, Rev B&C 2023) and		
	Danielle Wood – Commercial Manager (Rev A, 2023)		

Contents

EXECI	JTIVE SUMMARY 3 -
1.0	Introduction 4 -
1.1	Purpose of this report 4 -
2.0	Methods 7 -
2.1	Field Survey7 -
2.2	Biodiversity Baseline Methods 7 -
3.0	Biodiversity Baseline 9 -
3.1	Biodiversity Baseline for habitats on site 9 -
4.0	Impacts on Biodiversity 11 -
4.1	Post-development biodiversity value of the proposed development site 11 -
4.2	Change in biodiversity value 13 -
5.0	References 14 -

Appendix 1 Drawing P.1647.22.04 Baseline Condition Assessment

Appendix 2 Drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents an assessment study of effects on biodiversity in connection with the proposed development at Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership), Buckingham Way, Aylesbury, HP19 9QH.

This report calculates 'biodiversity units' using DEFRA's Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool, April 2022 and following the methods set out in the *The Biodiversity Metric 3.1: auditing and accounting for biodiversity value* (User guide 21st April 2022) and The *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* 21st April 2022. The units are calculated based on the area (or length), condition and distinctiveness of habitats found on the site. Pre-development and post-development biodiversity values are calculated and compared to identify any change in the biodiversity value of the site.

Mandatory biodiversity net gain is set out in the Environment Act 2021 and will apply in England and Wales as a requirement to demonstrate net gain as the result of a new development.

Based on the current proposals, there will be a loss of **-0.27 (-24.09%) habitat units and a gain of +0.71 (+2747.76%) hedgerow units** within the proposed development area, demonstrating that a net gain has not been achieved within the site in line with National Planning Policy (NPPF) and Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (adopted Sept 2021).

Post development biodiversity units with the proposed development site were calculated based on the habitats displayed on the landscape planting plan Drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001Detailed Planting Plan (P08), appendix 2.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this report

Ascerta has been instructed by Lidl Great Britain Ltd to carry out a Biodiversity Impact Assessment (BIA) of the land at Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership), Buckingham Way, Aylesbury, HP19 9QH. The site OS grid reference is SP 818 148 and the What3Words reference is slurs.usual.races. This assessment has been prepared to support a planning application for the proposed redevelopment of the site. The site boundary is shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1: Site boundary of the land at Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership), Buckingham Way

The BIA aims to:

- Provide baseline data to classify the type, distinctiveness, condition and strategic significance of habitats prior to and post development.
- Ensure that baseline habitat conditions are classified in a robust and consistent manner, and that classification is based on the best available data at the time of assessment.
- Clearly identify data collection methods and any limitations.
- Calculate baseline pre-development and post-development habitat units for the site based on current development proposals.
- Aim to achieve BNG on-site wherever possible; with off-site contribution measures being considered as an alternative option if required.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by inter alia, minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.

The Natural Environment Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) (updated June 2021) provides further explanation on how this should be done. In particular, it addresses principles across a broad spectrum of topics targeting biodiversity conservation, from individual site and species protection through to the supporting of ecosystem services, and the use of local ecological networks to support the national Nature Recovery Network. The PPG promotes the delivery of measurable Biodiversity Net Gain through the creation and enhancement of habitats alongside development.

The Government has confirmed its intention to mandate Biodiversity Net Gain at a minimum of 10%. This has now been enacted into UK law through the adoption of the Environment Act 2021. Whilst the Act has now received Royal Assent, there will be a two-year transition period to allow for the making of necessary secondary legislation before the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement is legally enforceable. Notwithstanding this, many Local Planning Authorities have started to include biodiversity net gain requirements into Local Plan policy.

The Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (adopted January 2004) and extracts policies from Conservation of the Natural Environment. The policies of relevance for the proposed site are GP.61, GP.62, GP.63, GP.64 and GP.65. The Local Plans Environmental Objective is as follows;

To protect and enhance the District's environmental heritage.

Within the general policies for the conservation of the natural environment, The District supports a rich variety of natural habitats. Numerous species of flora and fauna occur in the District, including many of regional importance and several which are nationally rare. The Council supports initiatives to protect and where possible enhance the natural environment of the District generally, and seeks to ensure by the application of development control policies that sites of nature conservation value are not harmed by development proposals.

The Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (adopted January 2004) will be superseded by the Adopted Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) where the policies of relevance are NE1, Biodiversity and Geodiversity and NE2, River and Stream Corridors.

"The VALP seeks to conserve and enhance Aylesbury Vale's biodiversity through the protection and improvement of the terrestrial and water environments and fauna and flora, relative to their importance. The VALP also seeks to protect Aylesbury Vale geodiversity, commensurate with the value and importance a site has". Sites will be protected from loss or damage taking account of:

The hierarchy of designations of international, national and local importance.

The irreplaceability of habitats, sites and/or features and contribution to the borough's ecological network of sites and features.

Impact on priority habitats and protected/ priority species.

Development should not result in any net loss of natural assets and should seek to provide net gains. Where there is unavoidable loss or damage to habitats, sites or features because of exceptional overriding circumstances, mitigation and compensation will be required to ensure there is no net loss of environmental value". Biodiversity net gain has been defined as 'development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before, and an approach where developers work with local governments, wildlife groups, landowners and other stakeholders in order to support their priorities for nature conservation' (Baker, 2016).

Good practice principles for biodiversity net gain are set out within Table 1.1 of Biodiversity Net Gain: Good practice principles for development (Baker et al., 2019).

The key principles include:

- Apply the 'Mitigation Hierarchy' (in line with CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA)) (CIEEM, 2018) and be 'additional' by achieving outcomes that exceed existing obligations.
- Avoid losing biodiversity which cannot be off-set elsewhere (e.g. irreplaceable habitats).
- Address risk (e.g. difficulty of achieving habitat creation / enhancement for net gain).
- Make a 'measurable' net gain contribution (e.g. calculated using an appropriate metric) and ensure that calculations consistent and transparent (i.e. limitations and assumptions are clearly identified).
- Ensure that net gain design achieves the best outcome for biodiversity (this may require both quantitative and qualitative assessment) and create a net gain legacy for long-term benefits.

The proposed development site has been subject to Ecological surveys. The surveys undertaken at this site are detailed below:

- P.1647.22A Ascerta Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Rev A. January 2023;
- P.1647.22 Ascerta Ecological Impact Assessment, April 2022.

The site comprises a former car dealership with associated showroom, offices and workshop buildings that have been unoccupied for approximately ten years. Hardstanding dominates the site and has become encroached with tall ruderal and short perennial vegetation. Areas of introduced shrubs lie within the western sector of the site and scattered trees are present throughout.

The site lies within Alyesbury, approximately one mile north of the town centre. The site is bound by Buckingham Road (A413) to the west, St Clare's RC Catholic Church to the north, residential dwellings and retail outlets to the south and east. The surrounding land use is predominately residential dwellings with pockets of open space. The River Thame Biological Notification Site (BNS) lies approximately 300m north of the site.

2.0 Methods

2.1 Field Survey

A walkover survey of the site was conducted on 13th April 2022, when the habitat types and features of ecological interest were identified and mapped. An extended phase one habitat survey was undertaken along with a habitat condition assessment (*Natural England Farm Environment Plan (FEP) Manual, 3rd Edition, March 2010*).

Information and Data Used to Inform the Biodiversity Net Gain Calculation

The following information was used to inform the Biodiversity Unit Calculations:

- GIS baseline map of the site (Appendix 1);
- The Landscape Development Proposal Drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08), (Appendix 2); and
- The baseline condition assessments.

2.2 Biodiversity Baseline Methods

To calculate a biodiversity baseline, this study used methods detailed within *The Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool*, July 2021 and following the methods set out in the *The Biodiversity Metric 3.0: auditing and accounting for biodiversity value* (User guide 21st April 2022) and *The Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (21st April 2022). Initially, habitats were digitised in GIS using field notes. Areas were measured in hectares and linear features in kilometres. The biodiversity unit value for each habitat was then calculated by multiplying the habitat area (or length) by its distinctiveness score and then by its condition score, both described below. The unit values for each habitat were then totalled to produce the biodiversity baseline. Linear habitats were assessed separately to areas.

2.2.1 Habitat distinctiveness

Habitats identified are entered into DEFRA's *Biodiversity Metric 3.1 Calculation Tool* which then assigns a pre-determined distinctiveness value. Habitat distinctiveness is a collective measure of biodiversity and includes parameters such as species-richness, diversity, rarity, and the degree to which a habitat supports species rarely found in other habitats.

2.2.2 Habitat Condition

The condition of the habitats present has been assessed during the site visits using *The Biodiversity Metric 3.1: auditing and accounting for biodiversity value* (User guide 21st April 2022) and *The Biodiversity Metric 3.0: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (21st April 2022).

The post-development biodiversity units were calculated using information from the landscape planting plan drawing number 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08) (Appendix 2). To calculate the post-development biodiversity units the habitat areas are multiplied by the distinctiveness and condition values and then divided by a multiplier based on the difficulty of creating the proposed habitat and the time needed to achieve the proposed condition. The baseline biodiversity units were then subtracted from the post development units to determine any change in biodiversity value of the site as a

result of the development. The target condition of the habitats is based on guidance set out within the *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: auditing and accounting for biodiversity value user guide* (21st April 2022) and the *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (21st April 2022) which may require ecological input and/or guidance to ensure the target conditions are achieved (Baseline Habitat Condition Sheets, Appendix 3).

2.2.23 Habitat Strategic Significance

A desk study was undertaken and presented within the Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) to see whether the development was within the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (adopted Sept 2021) Furthermore, Nature Recovery Areas, National Character Area objectives and green infrastructure strategies were also used to identify whether the site was as identified, desirable or not in the local strategy.

Trading Summary

'Trading Up' is a concept which requires 'conserving through offset components of biodiversity that are of a higher conservation priority (for example, because they are more irreplaceable and vulnerable) than those affected by the development project for which the offset is envisaged' (BBOP, 2018). For example, should non-irreplaceable habitats be lost / impacted as a result of the proposed development, offsets should be achieved through the creation / enhancement of habitat of the same or higher distinctiveness, where environmental conditions are appropriate and where it generates the greatest benefits for biodiversity.

2.4 Post Intervention Methods

The post-development biodiversity units were calculated using information from drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08) (Appendix 2). To calculate the post-development biodiversity units the habitat areas are multiplied by the distinctiveness and condition values and then divided by a multiplier based on the difficulty of creating the proposed habitat and the time needed to achieve the proposed condition. The baseline biodiversity units were then subtracted from the post development units to determine any change in biodiversity value of the site as a result of the development. The target condition of the habitats is based on guidance set out within the *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value user guide* (21st April 2022) and the *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (21st April 2022) which may require ecological input and/or guidance to ensure the target conditions are achieved.

2.5 Limitations and assumptions

Baseline habitat condition assessments areas and habitat type have been converted into a reasonable category using the assistance of *Biodiversity Metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement* (21st April 2022). Cross referencing of drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08) (appendix 2) the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and aerial imagery have been used to determine the metric calculations.

The completed metric for the site shows an error to check areas, however due to the retainment of onsite trees the footprint pre and post development correlates when subtracting the retained habitat. This limitation has been considered within the report.

3.0 Biodiversity Baseline

This section establishes the biodiversity baseline for the site based on the preliminary ecological appraisal of the proposed development site and the proposed compensatory site.

3.1 Biodiversity Baseline for habitats on site

The Baseline Condition Assessment, drawing P.1647.22.04 (Appendix 1) has been used to identify the habitat area types within the development site. The phase 1 habitat categories have translated into UKHab habitat classification (*UK Habitat Classification User Manual* 2018) using the UKHab/Phase 1 translation tool within the *Biodiversity Metric* 3.1 *Calculation Tool* (April 2022) and following the methods set out in the the *Biodiversity Metric* 3.1: auditing and accounting for biodiversity value (User guide 21st April 2022) and the *Biodiversity Metric* 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity value: technical supplement (21st April 2022) and biodiversity scores have been calculated and assessed, as displayed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Baseline Habitat Areas Biodiversity Calculation for onsite habitats

Phase 1/UK Hab Habitat	Total Area (ha)	Distinctiveness (score)	Condition	Score	Area retained
Urban-Developed land; sealed surface	0.67	V Low (0)	N/A Other	0	
Sparsely vegetation land – ruderal/ephemeral	0.07	Low (2)	Fairly Poor	1.5	
Sparsely vegetation land – ruderal/ephemeral	0.02	Low (2)	Poor	1	
Sparsely vegetation land – ruderal/ephemeral	0.02	Low (2)	Fairly Poor	1.5	
Sparsely Vegetated Land Ruderal/ephemeral	0.02	Low (2)	Fairly Poor	1.5	
Sparsely Vegetated Land Ruderal/ephemeral	0.01	Low (2)	Poor	1	
Urban – Introduced Shrub	0.01	Low (2)	Condition Assessment N/A	1	
Urban – Introduced Shrub	0.01	Low (2)	Condition Assessment N/A	1	
Urban – Introduced Shrub	0.02	Low (2)	Condition Assessment N/A	1	
Urban – urban tree	0.11	Medium (4)	Fairly Poor	1.5	0.02
Total Site Area (Ha)	0.96				

Table 2: Onsite Hedgerow Baseline

Phase 1/ UKHab Habitat	Total Length (km)	Distinctiveness (score)	Condition (score)	Score	Area retained (km)
Hedge Ornamental Non Native	0.026	V.Low (1)	Poor	1	0.026

The Urban trees within the site passes one of the habitat criteria when they were assessed on site, this has been slightly increased to fairly poor following the ecological and arboriculture assessments and site observations.

Two areas of tall ruderal vegetation have also been decreased to fairly poor following the ecological assessment of the site due to the species composition in comparison to the third area.

4.0 Impacts on Biodiversity

4.1 Post-development biodiversity value of the proposed development site

Drawing 10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Detailed Planting Plan (P08) (Appendix 2) has been used to identify the new habitat area types within the proposed development site. Habitat areas, distinctiveness and condition scores have been calculated and assessed and are displayed in Table 3 and Table 4 below.

Phase 1/ UKHab Habitat	Total Area (ha)	Distinctiveness (score)	Condition	Score
Grassland – Modified grassland	0.0195	Low (2)	Good	3
Developed land – sealed surface	0.7799	V. Low (0)	N/A-Other	0
Urban – urban tree	0.0629	Medium (4)	Poor	1
Urban - Introduced shrub	0.0097	Low (2)	Condition Assessment N/A	1
Heathland and Shrub – Mixed scrub	0.016	Medium (4)	Good	3
Urban Introduced shrub	0.0096	Medium (4)	Good	3
Grassland – other neutral grassland	0.0512	Medium (4)	Fairly poor	1.5
Urban – urban tree	0.0081	Medium (4)	Poor	1

The condition for the proposed urban trees has been assigned as poor, due to the area restrictions for growth, however they will over sail the proposed habitats beneath them, providing a biodiversity richness and a positive contribution to the local ecology by supporting species, such as vertebrates, invertebrates and birds with seasonal forage along with providing habitats for lichens. The mixed native scrub has also been assigned a good condition as a range of species will be present, the area will be free of invasive species and a good natural range will be created through the ongoing management of the habitats. The proposed wildflower planting has been categorised as modified grassland, that will reach a good condition, this is due to the poor soil conditions, and limited planting space available with the area subject to human disturbance.

Table 4: Post Development Hedgerow Lengths Biodiversity Calculation for Onsite Habitats

Phase 1/ UKHab Habitat	Total Length (km)	Distinctiveness (score)	Condition (score)	Score
Native Hedgerow	0.1183	Low (2)	Moderate	2
Native Hedgerow	0.0817	Low (2)	Moderate	2
Native Hedgerow	0.0684	Low (2)	Moderate	2
Native Hedgerow	0.0064	Low (2)	Moderate	2
Native Hedgerow	0.0183	Low (2)	Moderate	2

4.2 Change in biodiversity value

Based on the current proposals there will be a loss of **-0.27 (-24.09%) habitat units and a gain of +0.71 (+2747.76%) hedgerow units** within the proposed development area, demonstrating that a net gain has not been achieved within the site in line with National Planning Policy (NPPF) and Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (adopted Sept 2021).

The BNG Good Practice Principles, as outlined in 1.1 have been applied, however due to the nature of the proposals net gain has not been achieved on the proposed development site.

Avoid losing biodiversity which cannot be off-set elsewhere, applying the mitigation hierarchy, ensuring that net gain design achieves the best outcome for biodiversity and create a net gain legacy for long-term benefits.

Although there is a biodiversity loss on site, no irreplaceable habitats will be lost to accommodate the proposals, and it is considered that the biodiversity loss can be offset within the local council area. Through stakeholder engagement and design team meetings an avoidance for the biodiversity loss has been considered throughout the production of the proposals to minimize the loss by retaining habitats, where possible, such as individual trees on site whilst meeting the requirements for the change of use of the site to accommodate the proposals.

Addressing risk and applying the mitigation hierarchy.

The residual impacts will be short-term and landscape changes following re-vegetation would not be obvious or attract attention given the baseline habits and current use of the site. This meaning that although some of the proposed habitats neutral grassland, mixed scrub and individual trees require several years to reach their target condition, the implementation of a management plan will limit the risk of habitat failure and all the proposed habitats have a low difficulty of creation.

Make a 'measurable' net gain contribution.

Given the habitats that are present within the site, predevelopment of a measurable net gain contribution has not been achieved. It is considered that the proposed design achieves the best outcome for biodiversity. As the net gain has not been achieved within the site and it has been demonstrated that a gain is not possible to accommodate the proposals, the client will seek to secure a legal S106 agreement that will be put into place to achieve a gain within an offsetting site. The client has agreed to contribute 0.30 (25.78%) habitat units. Due to the size of the biodiversity loss within the site, it has been agreed with the LPA that a S106 agreement, in the form of a commuted sum can be agreed.

Due to the loss of high and medium distinctiveness habitats, the Trading Rules have not been satisfied, due to the avoidable habitats loss to accommodate the proposals. It is considered that these habitats can been created as part of the offsetting agreement to minimize the impact on the local biodiversity.

5.0 References

JNCC (2010), Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey - a technique for environmental audit. JNCC, Peterborough

STEPHEN PANKS A, NICK WHITE A, AMANDA NEWSOME A, MUNGO NASH A, JACK POTTER A, MATT HEYDON A, EDWARD MAYHEW A, MARIA ALVAREZ A, TRUDY RUSSELL A, CLARE CASHON A, FINN GODDARD A, SARAH J. SCOTT B, MAX HEAVER C, SARAH H. SCOTT C, JO TREWEEK D, BILL BUTCHER E AND DAVE STONE A 2022. *Biodiversity metric 3.1: Auditing and accounting for biodiversity – User Guide*. Natural England.

A – Natural England, B – Environment Agency, C – Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, D – Treework Environmental Consultants Ltd, E – eCountability Ltd

UK Habitat Classification Working Group (2018). UK Habitat Classification User Manual at http://ecountability.co.uk/ukhabworkinggroup-ukhab

UK Habitat Classification Working Group (2018). UK Habitat Classification – Habitat Definitions V1.0 at http://ecountability.co.uk/ukhabworkinggroup-ukhab



Appendix 1



KEY

- Survey area
- J3.6 Buildings
- J4 Bare ground
- C3.1 Other tall herb and fern ruderal
- x: J1.3 Cultivated/disturbed land - ephemeral/short perennial
- XX J1.4 Introduced shrub
- Scattered trees

DO NOT SCALE. ALL COORDINATES RELATED TO LOCAL GRID. LOCATED TO NG BY BEST FIT TO DETAI. EXTRACTED FROM OS DIGITAL DATA.

This drawing, including the design and technical information contained on it, is the property of Ascerta. The drawing may only be used for the specific purpose for which it has been intended and may not be reproduced or copied without prior permission.



t: 0845 463 4404 e: Info@landscapetreesecology.com www.landscapetreesecology.com

CLIENT: Lidl Great Britain Ltd

PROJECT:

Aylesbury (Former Range Rover Dealership)

DRAWING TITLE: **Baseline Habitats**

SCALE:	DRAWN BY:	DRAWING No:
NTS@A3	LK	P.1647.22.04
DATE:	CHKD BY:	REV:
07/11/2022	LA	-



Appendix 2



Stem	Girth	
	12-14cm	
		11

NOTES

This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.

Ordnance Survey base mapping - supplied by client.



Edges of the wildflower meadow to be regularly mown to create a tidy edge adjacent to hard standing.

		masterolanning		
rev	date	description	drn	chk
P04	01/12/2022	Change of layout	SDO	OFD
P05	25/01/2023	Added bigger grassland area	SDO	OFD
P06	16/02/2023	Changed Flower Mix, updated key.	SDO	OFD
P07	19/07/2023	Amendments based on client comments	ELH	OFD
P08	03/04/2024	Amendments based on new layout.	TIK	SLS





FPCR Environment and Design Ltd urban design
 Lockington Hall Lockington Derby

> t: 01509 672772 e: mail@fpcr.co.uk w: www.fpcr.co.uk

Lidl Great Britain Ltd

Buckingham Road, Aylesbury

drawing title Detailed Landscape Proposal

_{scale}	dm chk	date created
1:250 @ A1	ELH / OFD	19 JULY 2023
project number	status	issue
10946	S3	P08
document number		

10946-FPCR-ZZ-XX-DR-L-0001

File: L:\10900\10946\LANDS\Drawings\10946-FPCR-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 DETAILED PLANTING PLAN (P08).vwx