

Biodiversity Metric Report

Trubs Farm, Rochdale
Reference: 81-734-R2-4
Date: April 25





E3P

Taylor Road
Trafford Park
Urmston
Manchester
M41 7JQ

+ 44 (0) 161 707 9612
<https://e3p.co.uk>

Registered in England
CRN: 08725262

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Report reference	81-734-R2
------------------	-----------

REV REF:	DESCRIPTION	AUTHOR	CHECKED	AUTHORISED	DATE
R2-1	First Issue	LS	HM	CK	13/09/24
R2-2	Revised	LS	HM	CK	17/09/24
R2-3	Updated Landscape Plans	LS	HM	CK	23/04/25
R2-4	Updated Landscape Plans	LS	HM	CK	30/04/25

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit, use, and information of the client. The liability of Environmental Engineering Partnership Limited T/A E3P with respect to the information contained in the report will not extend to any third party. This report has been prepared by the qualified persons as listed below.

WRITTEN BY	QUALIFICATIONS	POSITION
Luke Shaw	BSc (Hons)	Consultant Ecologist

REVIEWED BY	QUALIFICATIONS	POSITION
Huw Morgan	BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, CEnv, MCIEEM	Principal Ecologist

AUTHORISED BY	QUALIFICATIONS	POSITION
Celia Kenyon	BSc (Hons), MSc, MEnvSc, CEnv, MCIEEM	Associate Director



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site Address	Trubs Farm, Trub Road, Rochdale, OL11 2QH
Co-ordinates	E 388218, N 410069
Site Area	Approximately 4.7 ha
Current Site Use	The site comprised a modified grassland field that was being grazed by sheep, smaller areas of other neutral grassland, tall forbs, mixed scrub and a ditch are also present on site.
Proposed Development	Development proposals comprise the construction of residential housing, with associated roads and landscaping.
Results	The biodiversity metric shows that the proposed development achieves a gain in hedgerow units. However, a small gain in habitat units and watercourse units will also be achieved.
	Habitat Units +0.52 Hedgerow Units +1.24 Watercourse Units -0.26
	A 3.87% gain in habitat units, a 73.43% loss in watercourse units and a 100% gain in hedgerow units will be incurred on-site as a result of development. Based on current plans, a deficit of 0.82 habitat units and 0.29 watercourse units on a 10% gain will need to be compensated. The trading rules of the metric would be satisfied in relation to habitat units and hedgerow units as habitats lost would be ‘traded up’. The trading rules of the metric would not be satisfied in relation to watercourse units as these habitats being lost have not been ‘traded up’
Conclusions and Recommendations	A gain of 0.52 habitat units (3.87%) will be incurred as a result of the development. If the trading rules cannot be satisfied and a 10% net gain is not achieved, off-site compensation or conservation offset payment will be required for the development to proceed.
	A loss of 0.26 watercourse units (73.43%) will be incurred on-site as a result of the development, due to the destruction of the on-site ditch A 10% gain in watercourse units could be achieved by creating a 66 m Moderate condition ditch that is not encroached within 5 m on either of its banks. By implementing this an 11.02% (0.04) gain in watercourse will be achieved.
	Additional species enhancements could be provided on-site, which could include bat and bird boxes, hedgehog houses and hibernacula.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1.INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background	4
1.2. Previous Surveys	4
1.2.1. E3P (2024).....	4
1.3. Site Location	4
1.4. Objectives	5
2.METHODOLOGY	6
2.1. Biodiversity Metric	6
2.2. On-Site Habitat Baseline Data.....	6
2.3. River Condition Assessment.....	6
2.4. Post Development Habitat Creation.....	7
2.5. Limitations	7
3.RESULTS.....	7
3.1. On-Site Baseline Condition Assessment Results	7
3.2. Habitat Retention.....	8
3.3. On-Site Habitat Creation Condition Assessment	8
3.4. Baseline River Condition Assessment Results	12
3.5. Watercourse Retention.....	13
3.6. Strategic Significance	13
3.7. Biodiversity Unit Result	13
4.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
4.1. Habitat Units	14
4.2. Watercourse Units	14
5.PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION	15
6.REFERENCES.....	16
APPENDIX I UKHAB HABITAT PLAN	17
APPENDIX II POST DEVELOPMENT PLAN	22
APPENDIX III MORPH SURVEY AREA	23
APPENDIX IV BASELINE RIVER CONDITION ASSESSMENTS.....	24
APPENDIX IV THE LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL FULL SITE	29



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

E3P has been instructed by MCI Developments to undertake a Biodiversity Metric Calculation at Trubs Farm, Rochdale, hereafter referred to as “the site”.

This report has been produced by Luke Shaw BSc (Hons), Consultant Ecologist at E3P. Luke holds a qualifying membership with CIEEM and has experience undertaking Biodiversity Net Gain and Condition Assessments on a variety of projects across the UK.

This report should be read in conjunction with ‘The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool – Trubs Farm, Rochdale R3’.

1.2. PREVIOUS SURVEYS

1.2.1. E3P (2024)

E3P undertook a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site (Report reference: 81-734-R1). The site was found to comprise a grazed modified grassland field, with smaller areas of other neutral grassland, mixed scrub and tall forbs. A ditch was also present within the site boundary.

1.3. SITE LOCATION

The site is located in the south west of Rochdale. Rochdale Canal lies adjacent to the east of the site, the M62 borders the south of the site, Castleton Railway binds the west of the site, and a woodland area borders the north of the site. Residential housing extends to the north and west of the site, while agricultural land extends to the south and west of the site. St Martins Church and associated graveyard is located approximately 140 m east of the site. Castle Hawk Golf Club is located approximately 240 m west of the site. Please refer to Figure 1 for the approximate site location.



Figure 1 **Approximate Site Location**



1.4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Biodiversity Metric are as follows:

- ✦ Identify percentage change in on-site habitat.
- ✦ Identify the number of habitat units lost/gained on-site; and
- ✦ Determine the need for a conservation offset payment or off-site habitat creation.



2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. BIODIVERSITY METRIC

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' (DEFRA) Statutory Biodiversity Metric was used to undertake the metric calculation. The metric was undertaken following guidance as detailed within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Draft User Guide (Natural England, 2023).

This report has been produced by Luke Shaw. Luke has attended internal training courses focussing on Biodiversity Net Gain and using the Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool and has experience undertaking Biodiversity Net Gain and Condition Assessments on a variety of projects across the UK. Luke holds a Level 3 Field Identification Skills Certificate (FISC) and has undertaken the Modular River Survey training course hosted by Cartographer Studios, focussing on generating River Condition outputs for Natural England's Biodiversity Metric calculations, for which he is accredited.

This metric was reviewed by Associate Director Celia Kenyon, BSc (Hons) MSc MEnvSc CEnv MCIEEM. Celia has undertaken a number of online training courses with CIEEM including 'Calculating and Using Biodiversity Units with Metric 2.0' and 'Biodiversity Net Gain Through Development'. Celia has also completed Condition Assessments on a number of sites across the UK and holds a Level 3 Field Identification Skills Certificate (FISC).

2.2. ON-SITE HABITAT BASELINE DATA

The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Sheets (Natural England 2023) were used to undertake the condition assessment. The methodology follows the Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Draft User Guide (Natural England 2023).

The baseline data used to inform the condition assessment was collected on 19th March 2024 during the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal undertaken by E3P. Please see Appendix I for the UKHab Habitat Map.

On-site baseline habitats were measured off the UKHab Habitat Plan using QGIS. The area for scattered trees was calculated using the Tree Helper calculator within the metric.

2.3. RIVER CONDITION ASSESSMENT

MORPH SURVEY

A Modular River Physical (MoRPh) Survey was undertaken on the Rochdale Canal on 19th March 2024 by Ciara Bass, BSc (Hons) QCIEEM, Consultant Ecologist at E3P.

Ciara has attended internal training courses focussing on Biodiversity Net Gain and using the Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool and has experience undertaking Biodiversity Net Gain and Condition Assessments on a variety of projects across the UK. Ciara holds a Level 3 FISC and has undertaken the Modular River Survey training course hosted by Cartographer Studios, focussing on generating River Condition outputs for Natural England's Biodiversity Metric calculations, for which she is accredited.

This was undertaken following the methodology detailed within 'The MoRPh Survey – Technical Reference Manual' (Modular River Survey, 2022).



ROCHDALE CANAL

As Rochdale Canal is classed as a canal, five contiguous modules of 50 m in length were used during the MoRPh5 survey. A total length of 250 m was surveyed, comprising over 20% of the length of the Rochdale Canal flowing through or within 10 m of the site. As such, a single MoRPh5 survey was deemed appropriate to provide a condition for the canal. Please see Appendix III for the MoRPH5 Survey Area.

RIVER TYPE DESK STUDY

A desktop River Type Survey was undertaken, following guidance in 'A Guide to Assessing River Condition – Part of the Rivers and Streams Component of the Biodiversity Net Gain Metric' (Gurnell et al., 2020). This assessment assigns a watercourse one of 13 river types, based upon a homogenous 'reach' that contains the area of interest. Two alternative river types can be assigned to a river by the surveyor for those that are too large or deep for the riverbed to be adequately surveyed (Large River) or for too heavily modified to conform to one of the other river types (Navigable Rivers and Canals).

The start and end points of the reach are identified using satellite imagery and defined where one of the following is encountered:

- ✦ a major tributary (e.g., likely to contributing > 10% flow in the river/stream)
- ✦ a major artificial barrier (e.g., > 5m tall - likely to significantly change the flow or sediment movements)
- ✦ a distinct and persistent change in planform (e.g., meandering to straight / slightly sinuous)

The results of the MoRPh5 survey and River Type Survey were then combined using Cartographer which generated a Final Condition Score for input into the Biodiversity Metric.

2.4. POST DEVELOPMENT HABITAT CREATION

The Landscape Proposal Full Site was used to measure habitat creation on-site (Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd, 2025; Drawing Reference: 7450.05 Rev F). The areas of the proposed habitats were measured using QGIS. The area for scattered trees was calculated using the Tree Helper calculator within the metric.

Please see Appendix II for the Site Layout.

2.5. LIMITATIONS

Some areas on the site are double counted, including root protection zones and areas of habitat, where overlap is shown. This means areas of habitat pre- and post-development do not total to the same area.



3. RESULTS

3.1. ON-SITE BASELINE CONDITION ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Table 1 shows the details of the habitat condition assessment used for input into the metric calculation tool.

Table 1 Habitat Baseline Condition Assessment Results

HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	CONDITION ASSESSMENT	DESCRIPTION
Grassland – Modified Grassland	3.9978	Poor	Fails Criterion A which is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition: <i>There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m² present, including at least 2 forbs.</i>
Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland	0.4091	Moderate	Passes 3 of 5 condition assessment criteria: ✳ The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type. ✳ Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed. ✳ Cover of bracken (<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>) is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.
Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland (Tall Forbs)	0.1861	Poor	<i>Fails Criterion A which is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition: The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristics indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type.</i>
Urban – Developed Land: sealed surface	0.0494	N/A	N/A
Heathland and Scrub – Mixed Scrub	0.0280	Poor	Passes 2 of 5 condition assessment criteria: ✳ There are clearings, glades or rides present within the scrub, providing sheltered edges.



HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	CONDITION ASSESSMENT	DESCRIPTION
			 Seedlings, saplings, young shrubs and mature shrubs are all present.

3.2. HABITAT RETENTION

The habitats located within the Peat Area are due to be retained as the Peat Area will be fenced off to protect the peat. Please see Table 2 for the habitats to be retained.

Table 2 Habitats to be Retained

HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA/LENGTH (HA/KM)	CONDITION ASSESSMENT
Grassland – Modified Grassland	0.045	Poor
Grassland - Other Neutral Grassland	0.4091	Moderate

3.3. ON-SITE HABITAT CREATION CONDITION ASSESSMENT

Habitats have been proposed within the site based on the Landscape Proposal Full Site (Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd, 2025). Table 3 shows the details of the target condition assessment and total areas of habitat creation. It has been assumed that there will be no significant delay in the creation of the proposed habitat features, as such the delay in starting habitat creation has been set to zero.

Table 3 Habitat Creation Condition Assessment Results

HABITAT TYPE (PLANTING PLAN)	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	TARGET CONDITION	TIME TO TARGET CONDITION	DESCRIPTION
Hardstanding and Buildings	Urban – Developed Land, Sealed Surface	2.2400	N/A	N/A	N/A



HABITAT TYPE (PLANTING PLAN)	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	TARGET CONDITION	TIME TO TARGET CONDITION	DESCRIPTION
Gardens	Urban – Vegetated Gardens	0.7034	N/A	1 Year	N/A
Wildflower Seed Mix - EM2 General Meadow Mixture and Wildflower Suds Turf	Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland	0.5298	Moderate	5 Years	Passes 3 of 5 condition assessment criteria: - The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type. - Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed. - Cover of bracken (<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>) is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.
A22 Grass Seed and Close Mown Turf	Grassland – Modified Grassland	0.5651	Moderate	4 Years	Passes 5 of 7 condition assessment criteria: - There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m² present, including at least 2 forbs. This criterion is essential for achieving a Moderate condition. - Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. - Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of the total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities



HABITAT TYPE (PLANTING PLAN)	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	TARGET CONDITION	TIME TO TARGET CONDITION	DESCRIPTION
					- Cover of bracken is less than 20%. - There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species.
Native Tree and Shrub Planting	Heathland and Shrub – Mixed Scrub	0.0868	Moderate	5 Years	Passes 3 of 5 condition assessment criteria: - The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type. - There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species and species indicative of suboptimal conditions make up less than 5% of ground cover. - The scrub has a well-developed edge with scattered scrub and tall grassland and or forbs present between the scrub and adjacent habitat.
Ornamental Shrub Planting	Urban – Introduced Shrub	0.0160	N/A	1 Year	Automatically assigned by the metric.
Bulbs	Urban – Ground Level Planters	0.0101	N/A	1 Year	Automatically assigned by the metric.
Wildflower SUDS Turf From Wildflower Turf	Grassland – Other Neutral Grassland	0.0677	Moderate	5 Years	Passes 3 of 5 condition assessment criteria: - The parcel represents a good example of its habitat type, with a consistently high proportion of characteristic indicator species present relevant to the specific habitat type. - Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for insects, birds and small mammals to live and breed.



HABITAT TYPE (PLANTING PLAN)	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	TARGET CONDITION	TIME TO TARGET CONDITION	DESCRIPTION
					 Cover of bracken (<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>) is less than 20% and cover of scrub (including bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.) is less than 5%.
Proposed Heavy Standard Tree Planting	Individual Trees – Urban Tree (103 small trees)	0.4194	Moderate	27 Years	Passes 4 of 6 condition assessment criteria:  The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).  The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making <10% of the total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).  There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.  More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.
Native Hedgerow	Hedgerow – Species-rich Native Hedgerow	0.12	Moderate	5 Years	Passes 5 of 8 condition assessment criteria with no more than 4 failures in total and does not fail both attributes in more than one functional group.  Over 1.5 m average height along length.  Over 1.5 m average width along length.



HABITAT TYPE (PLANTING PLAN)	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	AREA (HA) / LENGTH (KM)	TARGET CONDITION	TIME TO TARGET CONDITION	DESCRIPTION
					- Gap between ground and base of canopy less than 0.5 m for over 90% of length. - Over 90% of hedgerow is free of invasive non-native plant species. - Over 90% of the hedgerow is free of damage caused by human activities.
Hedges	Non-Native and Ornamental Hedgerows	0.35	Poor	1 Year	Condition automatically assigned by the metric.

3.4. BASELINE RIVER CONDITION ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Two watercourses were present on site and within 10 m of the site boundary. Please see Table 4 for a summary of these watercourses and Appendix IV for the full River Condition Assessments.



Table 4 River Condition Assessment Results

WATERCOURSE REFERENCE	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	LENGTH (KM)	PRELIMINARY CONDITION SCORE	FINAL CONDITION CLASS	WATERCOURSE ENCROACHMENT	RIPARIAN ENCROACHMENT
Rochdale Canal	Priority Habitat	0.027	-1.372	Poor	Major Over 20% of the bank length is an engineered bank revetment associated with a bridge. There is no encroachment into the channel.	Major/Major A path, wall and houses were located within 10 m of the right bank top, whilst the left bank comprised a grazed modified grassland field (Delta-Simons Limited, 2023).
Ditch	Ditches	0.078	N/A	Poor	No Encroachment Less than 5% of the bank length is an engineered bank revetment and there is no encroachment into the channel.	Major/Major A grazed modified grassland field was located within 4 m of the right and left bank tops (Delta-Simons Limited, 2023).

3.5. WATERCOURSE RETENTION

Please see Table 5 for the retained lengths of the watercourse. The whole length of the Rochdale Canal that falls within 10 m of the site is being retained. However, the on-site ditch is being removed.

Table 5 Watercourse Retention

WATERCOURSE REFERENCE	HABITAT TYPE (UKHAB)	LENGTH (KM)	CONDITION
Rochdale Canal	Priority Habitat	0.027	Poor



3.6. STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE

The strategic significance was defined as 'Location ecologically desirable but not in the local strategy'. The site comprised other neutral grassland, modified grassland, tall forbs, a ditch and mixed scrub. Additionally, the site borders the Rochdale Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest, Special Area of Conservation and Site of Biological Importance. The site is not noted within Rochdale Council's Core Strategy (2016), however, the strategic significance for the Rochdale Canal has been established as 'formally identified in local strategy' as the watercourse is located within the Rochdale Council's Core Strategy (2016) as a key recreational and environmental asset.

3.7. BIODIVERSITY UNIT RESULT

The headline results of the metric show a total gain of 0.52 habitat units and 1.24 hedgerow units as a result of development. A loss of -0.26 watercourse units will also be incurred. Table 6 shows the headline results detailed within the Biodiversity Metric. Table 7 shows the units required to achieve a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.

Table 6 Headline Results

HEADLINE	CATEGORY	RESULT
Total Net Unit Change	Habitat Units	+0.52
	Hedgerow Units	+1.24
	Watercourse Units	-0.26
Total Net % Change	Habitat Units	+3.87%
	Hedgerow Units	+100%
	Watercourse Units	-73.43%

Table 7 Unit Deficit On A 10% Gain

HEADLINE	CATEGORY	RESULT
Unit Deficit on 10%	Habitat Units	0.82
	Hedgerow Units	N/A
	Watercourse Units	0.29

The trading rules of the metric would not be satisfied in relation to watercourse units as habitats lost have not been 'traded up'. Please see Table 8 for the trading summary detailed within the biodiversity metric.

Table 8 Headline Deficit Results

BROAD HABITAT	HABITAT TYPE	BROAD HABITAT UNIT LOSSES TO BE OFFSET
Medium Distinctiveness Watercourse Units	Ditches	0.26



4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. HABITAT UNITS

The proposed site plans show a total gain of 0.52 habitat units as a result of the development. Due to the lack of compensation for the loss of the modified grassland on site the trading rules within the metric, are not satisfied. Due to the large areas of grassland within the baseline and the lack of public open space to use as compensation within the site, this is considered to be unfeasible. As such, a 10% net gain is unlikely to be achieved on-site, and off-site compensation or an offset conservation payment will be required. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) will need to be consulted to determine if an offset payment is acceptable. Based on current plans, a deficit of 0.82 habitat units will need to be compensated for to achieve a 10% net gain. A 10% biodiversity net gain became mandatory on 12th February 2024.

The Biodiversity Metric does not take into account for additional species enhancements within the site, and to further increase the site's value for wildlife the following could be provided:

-  Creation of hibernacula (following guidance set out within Froglife, 2001) for common amphibians.
-  Hedgehog houses may be installed to enhance the site for hedgehogs.
-  Bat and bird boxes could be integrated on the buildings or trees.

4.2. WATERCOURSE UNITS

A loss of 0.26 watercourse units will be incurred on-site as a result of the development, due to the bridge over the Rochdale Canal and the removal of the on-site ditch.

A 10% gain in watercourse units could be achieved by creating a 66 m Moderate condition ditch that is not encroached within 5 m on either of its banks. By implementing this an 11.02% (0.04) gain in watercourse will be achieved.

If this is not feasible on-site, off-site compensation or conservation offset payment will be required for the development to proceed. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) will need to be consulted to determine if an offset payment is acceptable.



5. PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION

Please provide the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats on the date of calculation.

13.34

Please provide the date the onsite pre-development biodiversity value was calculated:

11/06/2024

If an earlier date, to the date of the planning application, has been used, please provide details of why this date has been used:

N/A

When was the version of the biodiversity metric used published?

12/02/2024

Has there been any loss (or degradation) of any onsite habitat(s), resulting from activities carried out before the date the onsite pre-development biodiversity value was calculated? Either:

-  - on or after 30 January 2020 which were not in accordance with a planning permission; or
-  - on or after 25 August 2023 which were in accordance with a planning permission?

No

Does the development site have irreplaceable habitats (corresponding to the descriptions in column 1 of [Schedule to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations (2023)]) which are:

- i. on land to which the application relates; and
- ii. exist on the date of the application for planning permission, (or an earlier agreed date)

No



6. REFERENCES

- ✿ A. Gurnell, J. England, S. Scott, and L. Shuker (2020) A Guide to Assessing River Condition – Part of the Rivers and Streams Component of the Biodiversity Net Gain Metric
- ✿ E3P (2024). Preliminary Ecological Appraisal– Trubs Farm, Rochdale. Report Reference: 81-734-R1
- ✿ Environment Agency (2009) River Basin Management Plan, North West River Basin District
- ✿ Modular River Survey (2022) The MoRPh Survey – Technical Reference Manual
- ✿ National Planning Policy Framework (2021). Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.
- ✿ Natural England Joint Publication JP039. (2023). The Statutory Biodiversity Metric: Draft User Guide
- ✿ Natural England. (2023). Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments
- ✿ Rochdale Council (2016). Rochdale’s Core Strategy Development Plan Document.
- ✿ Trevor Bridge Associates Ltd (2025). Landscape Proposal Full Site – Trubs Farm, Rochdale. Drawing Reference: 7450.05 Rev F.

END OF REPORT

APPENDIX I

UKHAB HABITAT PLAN





Key:

- Red Line Boundary
- Himalayan balsam pol
- Ditch

HABITATS

Habitats Baseline

- Developed land; sealed surface
- Mixed scrub
- Modified grassland
- Other neutral grassland
- Tall herb communities (H6430)

Notes

Issue: 1	Revision: 1	Date: 09/04/2024	Drawn: LS	Authorised: CK
Client: MCI Developments			Job No. 81-734	Date: 09/04/2024
			Drawing No. 81-734-001	Scale: 1:3200@A4
Job title: Trubs Farm, Rochdale			Drawing title: UKHab Habitat Plan	



Environmental Engineering Partnership Ltd
Manchester Office
Taylor Road, Urmston M41 7JQ
Tel: 0161 707 9612
Email: info@e3p.co.uk
Website: www.e3p.co.uk

The client must not amend any drawing, plan or other intellectual property produced by E3P Ltd without permission in writing from E3P Ltd. In the event that such permission is not obtained in advance of the amendment being made, E3P Ltd will not be liable for any damage and/or losses resulting as a result of the amended drawing, design or intellectual property.

APPENDIX II

POST DEVELOPMENT PLAN





Key:

- Red Line Boundary
- Proposed Individual Tree
- Non-native and ornamental hedgerow
- Species-rich native hedgerow
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Ground level planters
- Introduced shrub
- Mixed scrub
- Modified grassland
- Other neutral grassland
- Vegetated garden

Notes

Issue: 1	Revision: 3	Date: 28/04/2025	Drawn: LS2	Authorised: CK
Client: MCI Developments			Job No. 81-734	Date: 28/04/2025
			Drawing No. 81-734-011	Scale: 1:2100 @ A3
Job title: Trubs Farm, Rochdale			Drawing title: Post Development Plan	



Environmental Engineering Partnership Ltd
Manchester Office
Taylor Road, Urmston M41 7JQ
Tel: 0161 707 9612
Email: info@e3p.co.uk
Website: www.e3p.co.uk

The client must not amend any drawing, design or other intellectual property produced by E3P Ltd without permission in writing from E3P Ltd in advance of any amendments being made. In the event that such written permission is not obtained in advance of the amendments being made, E3P Ltd shall not be liable for any damage and/or losses, including as a result of the amended drawing, design or intellectual property.

APPENDIX III

MORPH SURVEY AREA



Key:

 Site boundary

 River reach

 MoRPh survey length

Rochdale Canal

Notes

Issue: 1	Revision: 1	Date: 17/04/2024	Drawn: CB2	Authorised: CK
Client: M.C.I Developments Ltd			Job No. 81-734	Date: 17/04/2024
			Drawing No. 81-734-003	Scale: 1:4000 @ A4
Job title: Trubs Farm, Rochdale			Drawing title: MoRPh Survey Plan	



Environmental Engineering Partnership Ltd
Punchester Office
Taylor Road, Urmston M41 7JQ
Tel: 0161 757 9612
Email: info@e3p.co.uk
Website: www.e3p.co.uk

The client must read and understand the drawing, design or other intellectual property produced by E3P Ltd without permission or
without E3P Ltd's consent of any amendments being made. In the event that such amendments are not
obtained in advance of the amendments being made, E3P Ltd shall not be liable for any damage and/or losses
arising as a result of the amendments being made.

APPENDIX IV BASELINE RIVER CONDITION ASSESSMENTS



Rochdale Canal

GRID REFERENCE OF MORPH5	SD 88295 10208	RIVER SECTION LENGTH:	250 m
---------------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	-------

RCA RIVER TYPE AND HABITAT DESCRIPTION

The Rochdale Canal is classed as a canal, due to this module lengths of 50 m were used during the MoRPh5 survey, and a total length of 250 m was surveyed. The left bank top was colonised by modified grassland, with the right bank experiencing significant encroachment by buildings, a wall and a path.

UPSTREAM GRID REFERENCE	SD 88296 10265	DOWNSTREAM GRID REFERENCE	SD 88291 10151
--------------------------------	----------------	----------------------------------	----------------

PHOTOGRAPHS



RESULTS

CONDITION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		RCA INDEX VALUES	NOTES/JUSTIFICATION
RCA INDEX ID	RCA INDEX NAME		
BANK TOP			
B1	Bank top vegetation structure	2	The left bank top was colonised by modified grassland, with some areas of mixed scrub.
B2	Bank top tree feature-richness	1	A small number of trees were identified on the bank top.
B3	Bank top water-related features	2	Wetland scrub and tress species were present along the surveyed area.

CONDITION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		RCA INDEX VALUES	NOTES/JUSTIFICATION
RCA INDEX ID	RCA INDEX NAME		
B4	Bank top Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS) cover	0	No invasive species were identified along the surveyed area.
B5	Bank top managed ground cover	-4	A path, houses and a wall encroached upon the canal's right bank top, whilst the left bank top comprised managed agricultural land.
BANK FACE			
C1	Bank face riparian vegetation structure	2	The bank faces were colonised by short grasses, scrub, and trees.
C2	Bank face tree feature-richness	0	Small numbers of trees were identified along the left bank of the canal
C3	Bank face natural bank profile extent	0	The banks were artificially built throughout.
C4	Bank face natural bank profile richness	0	
C5	Bank face natural bank material richness	0	The bank faces were artificially built.
C6	Bank face bare sediment extent	0	The bank faces were artificially built
C7	Bank face artificial bank profile extent	-4	The bank faces were artificially built throughout the whole Morph length
C8	Bank face reinforcement extent	-4	
C9	Bank face reinforcement material	-4	
C10	Bank face INNS cover	0	No INNS were identified on the bank faces during the survey.
CHANNEL MARGIN			
D1	Channel margin aquatic vegetation extent	1	A small amount of channel margin aquatic vegetation was identified during the survey.

CONDITION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		RCA INDEX VALUES	NOTES/JUSTIFICATION
RCA INDEX ID	RCA INDEX NAME		
D2	Channel margin aquatic morphotype richness	1	
D3	Channel margin physical feature extent	0	No channel margin physical features were identified during the survey.
D4	Channel margin physical feature-richness	0	
D5	Channel margin artificial features	0	No channel margin artificial features were identified during the survey.
CHANNEL BED			
E1	Channel aquatic morphotype richness	0	Submerged linear-leaved vegetation was not present throughout the channel.
E2	Channel bed tree features richness	0	Discrete accumulations of organic matter were not present throughout the channel.
E3	Channel bed hydraulic features richness	0	Water surface flow types included smooth, rippled, and unbroken standing waves.
E4	Channel bed natural features extent	0	No channel bed natural features were identified during the survey.
E5	Channel bed natural features richness	0	
E6	Channel bed material richness	0	Channel bed material was not identified during the survey
E7	Channel bed siltation	0	No channel bed siltation was identified during the survey.
E8	Channel bed reinforcement extent	-4	Channel bed reinforcement was identified during the survey.
E9	Channel bed reinforcement materials severity	-4	
E10	Channel bed artificial features severity	0	No channel bed artificial features were identified during the survey.

CONDITION ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		RCA INDEX VALUES	NOTES/JUSTIFICATION
RCA INDEX ID	RCA INDEX NAME		
E11	Channel bed INNS extent	0	No INNS were identified during the survey.
E12	Channel bed filamentous algae extent	0	No filamentous algae was identified during the survey.

OVERVIEW

Preliminary Condition Score	-1.372	River Type	Navigable/Canal
River Shape Index	10.000	Is The River Channel Overdeep?	No
Final Condition Class	Poor	Is The RCA Final Class Modified?	No

**APPENDIX IV
THE LANDSCAPE
PROPOSAL FULL SITE**





	DDB	JW			
--	-----	----	--	--	--