

DOE Appeal reference: APP/W9500/W/20/3246365

Representations on behalf of the CL162 Appleton Spaunton Common Protection Association.

Appeal Application NYM/2018/0787/FL

Appeal Application NYM/2018/0791/FL

Submission by Jonathan Allison as Chairman of the Association 2020

I am currently Chairman of the Appleton Spaunton Common Protection Association. I am a local land manager, and as such am based at Appleton Mill Farm. I have land adjoining Appleton Common and I am a Common Right holder with rights to graze 200 sheep.

Importance of this Public Enquiry

This is a critical moment for the future of Appleton Common, and in particular the whole of what was Spaunton Quarry. It is no secret that the applicant wishes to develop this part of the Common commercially, the more intense the better. The present applications have been well crafted by his consultants to neutralize the effect of the National Park's excellent and visionary 2003 Landscape Master Plan. The applications have the effect of inserting a small jemmy in the door for future development and so negating the Authority's original intentions, which admirably served the public interest.

These applications cannot be separated from the issue of Common Land.

This appeal, if granted, would seriously affect the integrity of Appleton Common as a historical, cultural and social artefact. The applicant's proposals, both in the short term, and the longer term, serve to promote his commercial interests at the expense of the wider interests of the local community, the commoners, and the public at large.

The Manor of Spaunton, and Appleton Common, of which Spaunton Quarry is an integral part, is of great antiquity. It is older than York Minster, and older than every Grade One listed buildings I can think of. The medieval Court Leet, which has its own officers, and twelve jurymen, and is appointed by and answers to the Lord of the Manor, helps to determine management matters. The Manor and its administration, and the accompanying common is a Feudal relic going back to the 12th century, and almost certainly with pre Norman origins. It seems that in

this early 12th century period there was a joint use practice of Appleton Common & Sinnington Common, known as ‘inter-commoning.’

It is astonishing that so much of this ancient landscape has survived, and that many of the feudal arrangements are still extant. The common is still grazed by commoners and graziers, common rights have survived, the practices on the common are still overseen by the Court Leet and its officers. My family has been fined for storing manure on the Common, and I objected successfully when my mother sought to enclose part of the common some sixty years ago.

The village of Appleton le Moors and its accompanying landscape is itself a twelfth-century artefact, a village layout planned by the agents of St Mary’s Abbey. Spaunton Manor seems to have survived the Conquest in 1066, and the subsequent ‘Harrying of the North’ in 1069, so that at Domesday in 1086 its value was given as the same as before the conquest.

My point is that this is an extremely valuable historical landscape rooted in the distant past and which has survived in recognizable form into the contemporary world. The Abbey of St Mary’s succumbed to social revolution in the 16th century after managing Spaunton Manor for almost 500 years, and George Winn Darley is their secular inheritor in the twenty first century. This extraordinary historic landscape is not a Grade One listed building. It is also not a scheduled ancient monument, meaning there is no designation to mark its extraordinary survival, historic significance, and value to the community. The one public recognition that it has is to be in the National Park on the lower slopes of the Tabular hills.

Although the broad structure and identity of the Common and the Appleton le Moors landscape has survived, it has been affected by critical events in our history, for example at the Reformation and the Dissolution of St Mary's abbey, and during the Second World War; also of course by the recent quarrying.

In 1940 large parts of the common were requisitioned by the State for ploughing out in the national emergency. Then in 1949 the land was sold back to the owner, and almost all common right holders signed an agreement accepting this loss of 'Common' (**Diagram 1**). The most serious loss was the frontage to the A170, a practical loss for graziers and commoners, and for the landscape, since now the experience of the Common is not felt until the first field is passed on the road up to Appleton, and therefore it is lost to travellers on the main road.

However the good fortune is that a direct access corridor has survived east of Catterbeck and the east boundary of the Common and so into the new quarry basin. This narrow but widening wedge into the gorge has now been returned to the Common and to full public access. Consequently people walking from the south up this entrance are on Common land and are faced with a spectacular and dramatic landscape and skyline to the moors as they walk up to Hutton le Hole, Spaunton, and Appleton. This scenic experience deserves to be cherished and further improved upon in the public interest. Indeed the National Park's approved 'Landscape Plan' was admirably contrived to achieve just this (**Diagram 2**).

It should be noted that the present application sites are shown on the 2003 Landscape Master Plan as to be restored as calcareous grassland, thus for sheep grazing, entirely suitable for the reclamation of Common Land.

Diagram 2: 2003 Landscape Masterplan



Legend

- Site Boundary
- Final Contours
- Existing Pasture
- Existing Calciocolous Grassland
- Existing Scrub
- Existing Woodland
- Proposed Calciocolous Grassland
- Proposed Pasture
- Proposed Woodland Planting
- Location of Wildflower Inoculation Plots (20 No. Plots of 20 No. Plugs Per Plot)

NYMNP
23 DEC 2002

Proposed New Grass Seeding Calciocolous Mix

Species	% Mix
Red Fescue	Festuca rubra 40%
Sheeps Fescue	Festuca ovina 30%
Common Bent	Agrostis capillaris 30%

(Sown at a rate of 2 g per square metre)

Ryegrass as Follows	% Mix
Premium Intermediate	20%
Napoleon Intermediate tetraploid	20%
Calbra intermediate tetraploid	20%
Alston late	20%
Milartum Late tetraploid	20%

(Rate 3.5 g per square metre)

Wildflower Inoculation Plots:

Species	No per Plot	Total No.
Bluebell	4	80
Primrose	4	80
Common Dog Violet	4	80
Bugle	4	80
Lesser Celandine	4	80

The above species of local provenance to be obtained from Gerald Towle at Hensell Farm, telephone (01527 477348). An order is required to be made with the supplier in January / February prior to planting.

The plugs are to be planted in May, evenly spaced and distributed across an appropriate plot area of 2m x 2m. Plugs to be watered in after planting, and RDOE fenced as necessary.

Proposed woodland planting
Cpts 1,2,3,5,6 and 7:

Species	% of Mix
Conifers	20
Norway Spruce (Picea abies)	5
Hybrid Larch (Larix x europaeis)	5
European Larch (Larix decidua)	5
Western Hemlock (Tsuga heterophylla)	5
Broadleaves	70
Common Alder (Alnus glutinosa)	20
Oak (Quercus robur)	15
Sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus)	15
Ash (Fraxinus excelsior)	12
Yew (Taxus baccata)	4
Birch (Betula pendula)	4
Shrubs	10
Field Maple (Acer campestre)	2
Hazel (Corylus avellana)	2
Hawthorn (Crataegus monogyna)	2
Holly (Ilex aquifolium)	1
Goat Willow (Salix caprea)	1
Guelder Rose (Viburnum opulus)	1
Dog Rose (Rosa canina)	1

- Cpt 4 - Conifers Only**
- Notes:**
- 1) All stock to be planted at 2.5m centres on a staggered grid
 - 2) All stock to be protected from both Rabbit and Deer browsing by either spiral guards/water guards or rabbit/deer proof fencing, whichever is the most cost effective option
 - 3) All broadleaf species to be 450-600mm transplants stock
 - 4) All coniferous/evergreen species to be 300-450mm cell-grown stock
 - 5) Weed free circles to be maintained around all stock for 3 years following planting

RMC Aggregates (UK) Limited

Planning Department
RMC House, Church Lane,
Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B91 8RA Telephone 01527 575 777
Facsimile 01527 577 342

Drawn By: JHICAW Company: RMC Aggregates (Northern) Limited

Date: October 2000 Site: Spawnton Quarry

Scale: 1:2500 Purpose: Proposed Restoration

Drawn By: A1 Title: Restoration Master Plan

File Reference: 1620 Drawing Number: SU 12 / 9 D

This vision set out by the National Park, which was made a planning condition of major quarry development, and which was agreed to by the owner and then incorporated in a Legal Agreement in 2003, should not now be trivialized by ‘catch penny’ development. Nor should the boundaries of this ancient Common have to be altered by this same ‘catch penny’ development.

The loss of the southern plateau, which is affected by the appeal proposals would result in the loss of some of the best potential grazing for sheep after reclamation, regeneration, and recovery. The recovery of mineral workings for subsequent grazing is now commonplace, and indeed the higher parts of the quarry are already testament to this. This restoration of the grazing is historically significant, as is the restoration of grazing to the commoners.

It was also fortunate for the historical record that that part of the Common to the south of the A170 survived, and remains common land, part of the Spaunton Estate, and under oversight by the Court Leet.

In November 2015 Defra published the document “Common Land Consents Policy” to assist the Planning Inspectorate, applicants for consent, and others with an interest in applications. Section 3 sets out the policy objectives for protecting Commons as follows:

3 Protecting commons — our policy objectives

3.1 The 2006 Act, along with earlier legislation on common land, enables government to:

- safeguard commons for current and future generations to use and enjoy;
- ensure that the special qualities of common land, including its open and unenclosed nature, are properly protected; and
- improve the contribution of common land to enhancing biodiversity and conserving wildlife.

3.2 To help us achieve our objectives, the consent process administered by the Planning Inspectorate seeks to achieve the following outcomes:

- our stock of common land and greens is not diminished so that any deregistration of registered land is balanced by the registration of other land of at least equal benefit;
- any use of common land or green is consistent with its status (as common land or green), so that...
- ...works take place on common land only where they maintain or improve the condition of the common or where they confer some wider public benefit and are either temporary in duration or have no significant or lasting impact.

Section 4 of the 2015 document deals with the question of what is the best approach to the land in question, the alternatives, assessment criteria, common

right holders interests, the interests of the neighbourhood, and the public interest. Under public interest the Advice document expects consideration to be given to 'Recreation and access', 'Nature conservation', 'Impact on the landscape', 'Protection of Archaeology', 'Local Heritage'.

The Association considers that no impartial study of the 2015 State document on Common Land Consents Policy would envisage consent being justified for the present appeal applications.

Also it is considered that the National Park Authority significantly failed in its duty to consider thoroughly, or seriously, or indeed at all, the type of criteria set out in the Defra document of Nov 2015, despite their rather unwilling acknowledgement that the applications being on Common Land, was a material consideration.

The Landscape Context

The National Park is best known for its moorland, but within the park are many wonderful contributing landscapes. One such comprises the down slopes of the Tabular hills between Helmsley and Pickering. The section between Kirkbymoorside and Wrelton, north of the A170 has largely survived the development pressures of the post war period. The character is formed by the sequence of deeply incised valleys, abundant woodland, and descent from the limestone plateau, which slopes south into the Vale of Pickering. It's inclusion within the National Park is only partially a recognition of its value. What is missing is a recognition of the value of this area for the natural world, as an ecological resource that has survived. Much is made of the devastating effect of population pressures on the natural world, the loss of species, the threat to what remains. This area of the Tabulars north of the A170 has come through largely intact, but the threats from development are always there. The area has what has come to be called 'connectivity'.

The 2010 Report for Defra called "Making Space for Nature: A review of England's wildlife sites and ecological network" was published. The Secretary of State had commissioned the report with these words: "With the effects of climate change and other pressures on our land, now is the time to see how we can enhance ecological England further. Linking together areas to make ecological corridors, and a connected network, could have real benefits in allowing nature to thrive"

Also in 2010 the report "Making Space for Nature" (The Lawson Report) was published. This stated that to reverse the decline of wildlife a step change in our

approach was necessary. We had to move beyond simply trying to hang on to what we had left, though that was critical, to large scale recreation and restoration. It was necessary to re-establish ecological processes and ecosystems, for the benefit of both people and wildlife.

Above all we needed a joined up network, hence the coining of the phrase ‘landscape connectivity’ or ecological connectivity’. This has now evolved into a guiding principle for the survival of nature. Then in 2018 the Government published “A Green Future. Our 25 Year Plan to improve the environment”. This is explicit in expressing the political aspiration to create “a nature recovery network” including the creation and restoration of wildlife rich habitats. This programme, in political terms, is very much in step with the desires of the younger generations. People want to see the restoration of the natural world.

The point is this: this area of the Tabular hills already has admirable ecological connectivity. The task is to do what we can to improve that, and especially to prevent all developments likely to erode what has survived of this ecological inheritance. This is outstandingly the case in a National Park, which was created for this very purpose: it was created not just because of the landscape, the land form, but to preserve the natural world within the envelope of the Park. It sometimes seems as though the National Park Authority is obsessed with the landscape’s scenic quality, but in the admirable landscape plan (Diagram 2) for the restoration of Spaunton Quarry in 2003, it negotiated with the owner a scheme which fulfilled the requirements of ecological and landscape connectivity. This new landscape is a most valuable part of the ecological jigsaw, and enhances the value to wildlife and plants of the lower Tabular valleys, and attendant corridors.

In the seventeen intervening years, what went wrong?

The Park Authority gave permission for the extension of Spaunton Quarry in 2003, subject to conditions and a Legal Agreement, guaranteeing the conditions. The critical condition was that the Landscape Scheme, (Diagram 2) should be completed by December 2007. It was not, and it still has not. Thirteen years have gone by in which the owner has prevaricated, and the National Park has vacillated and lacked the leadership to obtain that excellent vision embedded in the 2003 Landscape plan. (Diagram 2)

The owner has been discontented, because, contrary to his contractual agreement, and his acceptance and agreement to the conditions, he wanted to achieve commercial development on the site to replace the substantial income

stream he had derived over the years from the quarry. For this to be achieved he needed to alter the boundaries of the Common at the southern end.

In 2007 the owner put in an application for five log cabins on the site of the current appeal. It was recommended for approval by officers of the Park Authority to the planning committee. The officers had failed to notice that the application was on common land, and had notified the wrong Parish Council. This was drawn to their attention by Mrs Ann Taylor, my predecessor as the Chairman of the present Appleton Spaunton Common Protection Association. Unwillingly the officers took the application back to Committee as a minor hiccup and waved it through to approval. The Authority refused to accept that development on common land was a material consideration, and treated it as someone else's problem, in particular the Secretary of State. Thus they refused to attach any historical, community or public interest to Appleton Common. They regarded it as an administrative inconvenience, not as a National Park Heritage, community, and public asset. They have persisted in this mindset throughout the intervening years.

This undoubtedly influenced or compromised their attitude to the many proposals subsequently floated by the owner for development. The failure to notice that the five caravan application was on common land, and then to treat this fact as a tiresome triviality has been symptomatic of the Park's approach, leading directly to their contorted treatment of the present application. In all the sequence of meetings, and discussions with the owner over the years, including a proposal for an all singing all dancing holiday village in the spring of 2018, it is impossible to detect any interest in the issue of the common land; it simply did not appear on their mental tick sheet.

At this point it is important for the Association to offer the Inspector an alternative point of view. In the context of the foregoing evidence, we contend that the Common Land issue is indeed a material planning consideration in the determination of these appeals, and that it should be accorded significant weight in the decision making process. Clearly it is inextricably interwoven with the character and appearance of this particular part of the National Park, and its historical, community, and ecological value, and cannot be separated from them as conveniently as the Authority would suggest.

However in May 2017 the Authority started enforcement proceedings in order to prevent their ability to take enforcement proceedings running out of time in December 2017. This was a very welcome milestone from the point of view of the Appleton Spaunton Common Protection Association. In October 2017 Association members were able to see major reclamation works taking place to create the land modelling which should have been completed in 2007. Some 10%

of the reclamation was not completed, including the present appeal site. Although the Association welcomed the 2017 reclamation works, it regretted the loss of the natural regeneration that had taken place in the intervening years.

In 2018 the CL162 Common Protection Association pressed the Park Authority to proceed with their enforcement procedures in order to get the development completed as approved. In August 2018 the Authority delayed enforcement proceedings to allow the owner to submit alternative proposals by October. Then in December 2018 they agreed a further extension until February 2019. In February the Association was consulted on new applications.

The owner finally appealed the refusal of the applications in the dying days of 2019. However the reasons given for refusal in the case of Application NYM/2018/0791/FL were wholly inadequate (see below & passim).

The five chalet precedent

When treating the new applications for the extension of holiday development on the site in 2019 the Authority clearly felt itself constrained by the precedent and decision it made in 2007 to approve five chalets. It also continued to treat the new extension as falling within their policy for small development within the National Park. In other words it failed to consider the exceptional circumstances of the application site:

1. The applications are on Appleton Spaunton Common. As such it is the Authority's duty to treat development on common land as a material consideration, and to take account of its significance to the community and to the wider public interest. One would expect them at least to consider the exceptional circumstances justifying development on Common land set out in the 2006 Commons Act (Sections 38 & 39), and the Defra 2015 Document "Common Land Consents Policy". Chalet and Caravan development nowhere appears in the Commons Act as justifiable on Common Land.
2. The applications are contrary to the Authority's own landscape master plan of 2003.
3. The Authority did not consider whether the 2007 Five Chalet precedent was unjustified as a commitment because it had never been referred to the Secretary of State as a development on Common Land and so could not take place.

4. The Authority also excuses itself on the basis that the owner had started the development by digging trenches, which may well be interpreted as in breach of the 2006 Commons Act.

The Authority refused the applications without proper consideration to the above. Basically the Authority failed in the case of the application for the extension of caravan and chalet development to consider it as a new proposal in 2019 for development on Common Land and contrary to the terms of the 2003 planning conditions and Legal agreement.

The Commons Protection Association is therefore asking now that the appeals be refused.

The Commons Act 2006

The Sections to which I wish to refer are as follows:

Section 38: (2) which refers to works requiring consent. This includes “works which have the effect of preventing or impeding access to or over any land “– on the Common.

Section 38: (3) makes clear that the previous section refers to the erection of fencing: the construction of buildings and other structures: the digging of ditches and trenches and the building of embankments

Since it is argued that the owner has sealed his original five holiday units by digging out trenches for foundations, it may be that that did not have consent under the 2006 Commons Act and so cannot be used as a serious precedent for further development.

Section 39 (1) and (2) refer to general consent, as in the following excerpt:

1. In determining an application for consent under subsection 1 of Section 38 in relation to works on land to which that section applies, the appropriate national authority shall have regard to:
 - (a) the interests of persons having rights in relation to, or occupying, the land (and in particular persons exercising rights of common over it)
 - (b) the interests of the neighbourhood
 - (c) the public interest
 - (d) any other matter considered to be relevant.

2. The reference in subsection 1(c) to the public interest includes the public interest in:
 - (a) nature conservation
 - (b) the conservation of the landscape
 - (c) the protection of public rights of access to and area of land
 - (d) the protection of archaeological remains and features of historic interest.

Views of the Association on the Common land issue

The proposed development and attendant alteration of the boundaries of the Common are not in the interests of the common right holders or graziers: not in the interests of the local community: and not in the interests of the public. The only interests being served are the commercial interests of the owner, and this does not anywhere appear in the Act, or the 2015 advice for Inspectors, as a reason for approval. Furthermore there is no national emergency or statutory need to justify approval.

There are positive reasons why the development would be harmful to the Common:

1. It would erode the historical integrity of the Common (see above).
2. It would diminish the scenic effect of the entrance to the common from the south which offers, once the reclamation is complete, a natural undeveloped valley, a natural and peaceful scene uncluttered by caravans or chalets, or toilet blocks.
3. It would introduce cars, semi domestic accoutrements, the noise and activity, lighting, and the domestic animals associated with caravans and chalets. It would diminish the impact of the natural environment by distraction. The development as a whole cannot be concealed and its presence would have an effect on human and animal perceptions.
4. It would fracture the rewilding vision which is such an important constituent of the 2003 Landscape Master Plan.
5. It would erode the ecological opportunities that present themselves for public enjoyment in this new landscape, partly by the development itself, partly by the nature of the human activity attendant on this type of development as noise, lights, cars, vehicle movements, presence of domestic animals 24 hours a day. This type of activity can be incorporated into the countryside by acceptance of its side effects in the right

circumstances, but in this case the gains in not having it here is the opportunity instead to emphasize the ecological value of the site, its connectivity, and dedication to nature, its pastoral scene.

The ecological case for refusing the Planning Application and the alteration of the boundaries of the Common.

The first of these is that this newly reclaimed valley forms a north south corridor for all forms of wildlife down to the A170, and up to the top of the Tabular down slope, and on to the moors. It also forms part of the wildlife corridor east west centred on the area from the Hutton le Hole road across at least as far as the Wrelton to Cropton road, and indeed beyond. This is a most valuable landscape of natural connectivity, providing for many and diverse species to exist and develop.

Secondly the Authority's 2003 Landscape vision has provided the opportunity to enhance the value of this south Tabular landscape over time. The geological features and remnants alone provide ecological opportunities as well as human opportunities for recreational study and enjoyment.

The ecological development of Spaunton quarry was seriously disrupted by the reclamation works carried out in October 2017, representing a loss of ten years of recovery. There has been only two years since then: the weather conditions in those two years have not helped.

It is senseless to treat the ecology of the application site in isolation. It has to be considered in the context of the Spaunton gorge as a whole, and in terms of the evolving ecology as a whole. Any attempt to isolate the application site in ecological terms should be dismissed as absurd. Connectivity is everything.

For the quarry as a whole the evidence of the Ryedale Naturalists is helpful. An appendix gives the results of a trial study carried out in 2014 and kept up to date. What is most difficult to assess is the effect of the next ten years of natural regeneration, and the effect of the completion of the 2003 Landscape Master Plan. Also an assessment of the opportunities to encourage natural regeneration of the ecology is overdue. Needless to say, the rewilding of this valley presents excellent opportunities for ecological development, for research and study.

The proposed tourist development and the human activities associated with it would do nothing to enhance the ecological assets, existing and potential. The degree to which it would harm these assets in the short or long term is impossible to estimate.

Appendix

Factual survey by Ryedale Naturalists listing a selection of native species in the area (see http://www.ryenats.org.uk/spaunton_quarry/quarry_survey.htm). There is no comparable data on mammals, insects or birds, although 18 species of butterflies have been recorded. As regeneration gathers pace, much greater diversity is to be expected.

The geology

This is of particular interest to the public interest in the Common. An admirable leaflet put out by the North East Yorkshire Geology Trust NO25 called “The Appleton le Moors Trail” included Spaunton Quarry on its itinerary. This described the main rock as oolitic limestone, composed almost entirely of calcium carbonate, an upper Jurassic series of sediments within a warm tropical sea, circa 156 to 158 million years ago. However there can be alternate layers of limestone and calcareous gritstone due to the rise and fall of sea levels.

The geology, as well as the new landscape modelling, adds a great deal to the public interest of this new gorge through the Tabular landscape.

The interests of the wider public

Members of the CL162 Commons Protection Association have pointed out many different levels of public interest in the Appleton le Moors landscape, Appleton Common, and the redundant Spaunton Quarry. Many of these themes have been raised in these representations on the current appeals: the historical record and underlying connections with our national and regional history: the richness of the ecological inheritance and opportunities: the drama of the landscape: the geology: and the opportunities for informal recreation. The Association feels that these opportunities are there to be developed with the National Park, without any alterations of the Common Land boundary, and without being diminished by the introduction of catch penny caravan and chalet development on Common Land.

What the association would like to see come out of this hearing

- 1. The Association asks that the Inspector supports the North York Moors Authority in refusing these planning applications.**
- 2. If it falls to the Inspector to determine the application for chalet and caravan development on Common land that it be refused as contrary to the spirit and intention of the 2006 Commons Act. There is no national interest or emergency to justify national policy on Common Land being set aside for commercial development.**
- 3. If it falls to the Inspector to determine whether the old quarry buildings should be retained on Common land it be refused as above. In addition they are quite unsuitable in the new landscape, and poorly located.**
- 4. The Association hopes that if these applications are refused it will give the National park the confidence to make progress with their enforcement proceedings, in order to realize fully and properly the landscape scheme approved by all parties in 2003.**
- 5. The Association also hopes that consequent upon this ‘Hearing’, the National Park Authority will in the future take the need to consider development on Common Land seriously as a material consideration, and not in the dismissive manner that has characterised their approach in these applications.**
- 6. Furthermore it is hoped that the Authority will in future appreciate the Heritage significance of Appleton Common, Appleton village, and associated landscape, and protect the medieval boundaries of the Common.**
- 7. The Association hopes for recognition by the National Park of the landscape and ecological significance of the Tabular hills and valleys between Kirkbymoorside and Wrelton.**
- 8. The Association also hopes for a willingness by the National Park to assist the owner of the Spaunton Quarry gorge to make such adaptations as may be necessary to adapt the Common land for informal public access and enjoyment.**

Appendix. Pages 17 to 20

This information concerning the Spaunton Quarry site as a whole is provided courtesy of Ryenats, the Ryedale Naturalists Society.

Common name	Latin name
Adderstongue	<i>Ophioglossum vulgatum</i>
Agrimony	<i>Agrimonia eupatoria</i>
Alder	<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>
Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>
Avens water hybrid	<i>Geum rivale x urbanum</i>
Avens wood	<i>Geum urbanum</i>
Basil wild	<i>Clinopodium vulgare</i>
Bedstraw heath	<i>Galium saxatile</i>
Bedstraw hedge	<i>Galium mollugo</i>
Bedstraw lady's	<i>Galium verum</i>
Bird's foot trefoil	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>
Bittersweet	<i>Solanum dulcamara</i>
Black meddick	<i>Medicago lupulina</i>
Blackthorn	<i>Prunus spinosa</i>
Bluebell	<i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i>
Bracken	<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>
Bramble	<i>Rubus fruticosus agg.</i>
Buddleia	<i>Buddleia sp.</i>
Bugle	<i>Ajuga reptans</i>
Bulrush or Common reedmace	<i>Typha latifolia</i>
Burdock lesser	<i>Arctium minus</i>
Buttercup bulbous	<i>Ranunculus bulbosus</i>
Buttercup creeping	<i>Ranunculus repens</i>
Buttercup meadow	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>
Celandine lesser	<i>Ranunculus ficaria</i>
Centaury common	<i>Centaureum erythraea</i>
Centaury common white	<i>Centaureum erythraea</i>
Cinquefoil creeping	<i>Potentilla reptans</i>
Cleavers	<i>Galium aparine</i>
Cocksfoot	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>
Colt's foot	<i>Tussilago farfara</i>
Common rock rose	<i>Helianthemum nummularium</i>
Common twayblade	<i>Listera ovata</i>
Cowslip	<i>Primula veris</i>
Crane's-bill cut-leaved	<i>Geranium dissectum</i>
Crane's-bill dove's-foot	<i>Geranium molle</i>
Creeping bent	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>
Crested dogstail	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i>
Crosswort	<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>
Cudweed common	<i>Filago vulgaris</i>
Daisy	<i>Bellis perennis</i>
Dandelion	<i>Taraxacum agg.</i>
Deadly nightshade	<i>Atropa belladonna</i>

Dock curled	<i>Rumex crispus</i>
Dock wood	<i>Rumex sanguineus</i>
Dogs mercury	<i>Mercurialis perennis</i>
Elder	<i>Sambucus nigra</i>
Elm wych	<i>Ulmus glabra</i>
Enchanter's nightshade	<i>Circaea lutetiana</i>
Eyebright	<i>Euphrasia agg.</i>
Fairy flax	<i>Linum catharticum</i>
False oat	<i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i>
False oxlip	<i>Primula x polyantha</i>
Fern broad buckler	<i>Dryopteris dilatata</i>
Fern lady	<i>Athyrium filix-femina</i>
Fern male	<i>Dryopteris filix-mas</i>
Field madder	<i>Sherardia arvensis</i>
Figwort common	<i>Scrophularia nodosa</i>
Forget-me-not changing	<i>Myosotis discolor</i>
Forget-me-not field	<i>Myosotis arvensis</i>
Forget-me-not wood	<i>Myosotis sylvatica</i>
Foxglove	<i>Digitalis purpurea</i>
Gorse	<i>Ulex europaeus</i>
Grass brome false	<i>Brachypodium sylvaticum</i>
Grass cocksfoot	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>
Grass crested dogstail	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i>
Grass tufted hair	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>
Grass Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>
Great mullein	<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>
Ground ivy	<i>Glechoma hederacea</i>
Guelder rose	<i>Viburnum opulus</i>
	<i>Bromus ramosus (Bromopsis ramosa)</i>
Hairy brome	<i>Pilosella officinarum</i>
Hawkweed mouse-ear	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>
Hawthorn	<i>Stachys sylvatica</i>
Hedge woundwort	<i>Geranium robertianum</i>
Herb robert	<i>Heracleum sphondylium</i>
Hogweed	<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>
Holly	<i>Lonicera periclymenum</i>
Honeysuckle	<i>Cynoglossum officinale</i>
Houndstongue	<i>Centaurea nigra</i>
Knapweed common	<i>Alchemilla vestita</i>
Lady's mantle	<i>Cardamine pratensis</i>
Lady's smock	<i>Trifolium dubium</i>
Lesser trefoil	<i>Arum maculatum</i>
Lord and ladies	<i>Filipendula ulmaria</i>
Meadowsweet	<i>Polygala vulgaris</i>
Milkwort common	<i>Mentha arvensis</i>
Mint corn	<i>Adoxa moschatellina</i>
Moschatel	<i>Cerastium fontanum</i>
Mouse-ear common	<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>
Mullein great	<i>Urtica dioica</i>
Nettle stinging	

Orchid bee	<i>Ophrys apifera</i>
Orchid common spotted	<i>Dactylorhiza fuchsii</i>
Orchid common twayblade	<i>Listera ovata</i>
Orchid early purple	<i>Orchis mascula</i>
Orchid fly	<i>Ophrys insectifera</i>
Orchid fragrant	<i>Gymnadenia conopsea</i>
Orchid northern marsh	<i>Dactylorhiza purpurella</i>
Orchid pyramidal	<i>Anacamptis pyramidalis</i>
Oxeye daisy	<i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i>
Parsley piert	<i>Aphanes arvensis</i>
Pearlwort procumbent	<i>Sagina procumbens</i>
Pignut	<i>Conopodium majus</i>
Plantain ribwort	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>
Ploughman's spikenard	<i>Inula conyzae</i>
Poppy welsh	<i>Meconopsis cambrica</i>
Primrose	<i>Primula vulgaris</i>
Ragwort	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>
Ramsons	<i>Allium ursinum</i>
Raspberry	<i>Rubus idaeus</i>
Red bartsia	<i>Odontites vernus</i>
Red campion	<i>Silene dioica</i>
Red clover	<i>Trifolium pratense</i>
Rosebay willowherb	<i>Chamerion angustifolium</i>
Rough meadow grass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>
Rush hard	<i>Juncus inflexus</i>
Sandwort three-nerved	<i>Moehringia trinervia</i>
Sandwort thyme-leaved	<i>Arenaria serpyllifolia</i>
Scarlet pimpernel	<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>
Sedge carnation	<i>Carex, panicea</i>
Sedge glaucous	<i>Carex flacca</i>
Sedge pale	<i>Carex pallescens</i>
Sedge pill	<i>Carex pilulifera</i>
Sedge spring	<i>Carex caryophylla</i>
Sedge star	<i>Carex echinata</i>
Sedge wood	<i>Carex sylvatica</i>
Selfheal	<i>Prunella vulgaris</i>
Sheep's sorrel	<i>Rumex acetosella</i>
Silverweed	<i>Potentilla anserina</i>
Slender false brome	<i>Brachypodium sylvaticum</i>
Sow thislte corn	<i>Sonchus arvensis</i>
Sow thistle prickly	<i>Sonchus asper</i>
Speedwell germander	<i>Veronica chamaedrys</i>
Speedwell heath	<i>Veronica officinalis</i>
Speedwell thyme-leaved	<i>Veronica serpyllifolia</i>
Speedwell wall	<i>Veronica arvensis</i>
Speedwell wood	<i>Veronica montana</i>
St John's-wort hairy	<i>Hypericum hirsutum</i>
Stitchwort lesser	<i>Stellaria graminea</i>
Stork's-bill	<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>
Strawberry barren	<i>Potentilla sterilis</i>

Strawberry wild	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>
Sweet vernal grass	<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i>
Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>
Teasel	<i>Dipsacus fullonum</i>
Thistle creeping	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>
Thistle marsh	<i>Cirsium palustre</i>
Thistle musk	<i>Carduus nutans</i>
Thistle spear	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>
Thistle welted x1	<i>Carduus crispus</i>
Toadflax common	<i>Linaria vulgaris</i>
Tormentil	<i>Potentilla erecta</i>
Tufted hair grass	<i>Deschampsia caespitosa</i>
Vetch common	<i>Vicia sativa</i>
Vetch tufted	<i>Vicia cracca</i>
Vetchling meadow	<i>Lathyrus pratensis</i>
Violet common dog	<i>Viola riviniana</i>
Violet early dog	<i>Viola reichenbachiana</i>
Violet hairy	<i>Viola hirta</i>
Violet sweet	<i>Viola odorata</i>
Vipers Bugloss	<i>Echium vulgare</i>
Wavy hair grass	<i>Deschampsia flexuosa</i>
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>
Whitlowgrass common	<i>Erophila verna agg</i>
Wild thyme	<i>Thymus polytrichus</i>
Willowherb broadleaved	<i>Epilobium montanum</i>
Willowherb great	<i>Epilobium hirsutum</i>
Wood sorrel	<i>Oxalis acetosella</i>
Woodrush field	<i>Luzula campestris</i>
Yarrow	<i>Achillea millefolium</i>
Yellow cress	<i>Rorippa sylvestris</i>
Yellow oat	<i>Trisetum flavescens</i>
Yellow pimpernel	<i>Lysimachia nemorum</i>
Yorkshire fog	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>