

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal



**Tyler
Grange**

Land off Greenvale, Rochdale

17th June 2026

TG Report No. 16099_R01d_LR

Project No:	Report No.	Date	Revision
16099	R01c	17th June 2026	D
Admin QA	Author	Checked	Approved
-	Leanne Russel BSc ACIEEM	David Paton MEnvSci	John Moorcroft BSc. MSc. MCIEEM. CEnv.

Disclosure:

This report, all plans, illustrations, and other associated material remains the property of Tyler Grange Group Ltd until paid for in full. Copyright and intellectual property rights remain with Tyler Grange Group Ltd.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. Tyler Grange shall not be liable for any use of this report other than for the purposes for which it was produced. Owing to the dynamic nature of ecological, landscape, and arboricultural resources, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before you rely on the contents of this report. Notwithstanding any provision of the Tyler Grange Group Ltd Terms & Conditions, Tyler Grange Group Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than 12 months after the date of this report.



Contents:

Summary

Section 1: Introduction	3
Section 2: Ecological Features and Potential Impacts, Mitigation, and Enhancement	5
Section 3: Biodiversity Net Gain	14
Section 4: Conclusions and Recommended Further Work	18

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Legislation and Planning Policy

Appendix 2: Methodology

Appendix 3: Site Landscape Proposals

Plans:

Plan 1: Habitat Features Plan 16099/P01

Plan 2: PBRA/GLTA Results Plan 16099/P02

Plan 3: Post-development Habitat Plan 16099/P03



Summary

- S.1. This report has been prepared by Tyler Grange Group Limited on behalf of Wain Homes North West. It sets out the findings of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at Greenvale Road, Rochdale, hereinafter referred to as 'the site' to inform the potential development of residential units.
- S.2. This report describes: the important ecological features that could be affected by the proposed development, identified through desk study and a site survey of the site in question; known potential ecological constraints which may need to be considered at the time of any planning application for the site: and identifies the opportunities for ecological enhancements, including considerations for biodiversity net gain (BNG).
- S.3. **Designated Sites:** In terms of protected sites, no internationally or nationally designated sites are to be impacted as a result of the proposed development. Twelve non-statutory designated sites are present within 2km of the site, it is expected that a CEMP will suitably prevent any impacts to these sites during the constructional phase whilst no impacts are expected during the operational phase.
- S.4. **Habitats:** The site is dominated by neutral grassland which is of local importance due to being detailed within the LBAP. Bramble scrub is of local importance due to the suitability for supporting priority and/or protected species. Lines of trees, scattered trees and woodland are of local importance due to being detailed within the Policy JP-G7 of the PfE Joint Development Plan which requires all lost trees to be replaced on a two for one basis. Hardstanding, buildings and ruderal vegetation is also present within the site, all of which are of negligible ecological importance. Habitats of local importance proposed to be lost should be replaced on a like for like or better basis to ensure the biodiversity value of the site is not impacted.
- S.5. **Badgers:** A pre-commencement badger survey will be required if more than 6 months elapse from the date of the initial survey to re-confirm the presence or absence of this species
- S.6. **Birds:** A common assemblage of birds is considered to be utilising the site, with species of importance (including lapwing and skylark) likely to favour surrounding habitats. Nevertheless, Habitat removal should occur outside of the core nesting bird season if possible and if not under supervision by a SQE. Additional tree and hedgerow planting is expected to maintain/enhance the quality of habitats for bird species on site.
- S.7. **Bats:** Three nocturnal surveys (or aerial inspections) will be required to be conducted on Tree T3, given that it is scheduled for removal, to determine a likely presence or absence of roosting bats. Trees T1 and T2 are to be soft felled if removal is required. Retention of existing boundary features (lines of trees, woodland) is expected to avoid impacts to commuting/foraging bat species, and any impacts to this suitable habitat are expected to be controlled through the implementation of a sensitive lighting strategy.
- S.8. **Hedgehogs:** The sensitive working methodologies outlined in **section 2** of this report should be adopted during the construction phase of the proposals.
- S.9. **BNG:** The proposals would result in a net loss of **4.40** habitat units (**-39.16%**) and a net gain of **0.39** hedgerow units (**+19.73%**). Given the net loss of habitat units arising from development, the development would need to make off-site contributions to a third-party unit provider, totalling **5.53** units, in order to obtain an overall gain of 10%. Off-site contributions should consist of the creation of grassland, woodland, and individual tree planting in order to satisfy the trading rules of the biodiversity metric. A LEMP to ensure the long-term management of the proposed habitat enhancements is expected to be secured via a suitable worded planning condition.



- S.10. No issues that could affect the principle or significantly affect the quantum of development the site could support have been identified. With the recommendations and further work set out in this report, there can be confidence that the site could be developed in accordance with relevant planning policy and legislation.



Section 1: Introduction

Introduction

- 1.1. This report has been prepared by Tyler Grange Group Ltd on behalf of Wain Homes North West. This report sets out the findings of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal at Greenvale, Rochdale, OL11 5QJ (OS Grid Reference SD 86045 13438), hereafter referred to as 'the site'. See **Figure 1.1** for the indicative red line boundary.



Figure 1.1. Indicative red line boundary (© Google Aerial Imagery)

Purpose

- 1.2. This report:
- Uses available background data and results of the field surveys to describe and evaluate the ecological features present within the likely "Zone of Influence"¹ (Zoi) of potential development of the site; and
 - With reference to relevant planning policy and legislation (**Appendix 1**), describes the actual or potential ecological issues and opportunities that might arise as a result of the site's development, or identifies issues that could affect the principle or quantum of development the site could support.

¹ Defined by the CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment as the area over which ecological features may be affected by biophysical changes as a result of the proposed project and associated activities. This is likely to extend beyond the project site, for example where there are ecological or hydrological links beyond the site boundaries



- 1.3. This assessment and the terminology used are consistent with the Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal².

Methodology

- 1.4. Full methods for the data search, phase 1/UK Habitat Classification (UK Habs) survey, PRA and BNG work can be found in **Appendix 2**.

Quality Control

- 1.5. All ecologists at Tyler Grange Group Limited are members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) or are working towards membership and act under the direction of members, and abide by the Institute's Code of Professional Conduct³.

² CIEEM (2017) Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

³ CIEEM (2022) Code of Professional Conduct, CIEEM, Winchester



Section 2: Ecological Features and Potential Impacts, Mitigation, and Enhancement

Designated Sites

- 2.1. The data search returned three Natura 2000 sites within 10 km of the site, and twelve statutory and non-statutory designated sites within 2 km of the site. These are detailed in **Table 2.1** over the page, along with potential impacts and mitigation measures which may be required.
- 2.2. The site also falls within the SSSI risk zone of the Rochdale Canal. However, the development does not fall into any of the criteria set out by Natural England requiring further assessment, such as air pollution. As such consultation with Natural England is not considered necessary, and this is **not discussed further within this report**.



Table 2.1. Designated Sites

Designated site	Distance and direction from site	Ecological Importance	Potential Impacts and Requirement for Mitigation	Relevant Legislation and Policy
Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	3.4 km south east	International	None due to distance and lack of aquatic linkage.	Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
South Pennine Moors SAC	8.7 km north east	International	None due to distance.	Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area (SPA)	8.7 km north east	International		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Rochdale Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	3.4 km south east	National	The site falls within the SSSI risk zone of the Rochdale Canal SSSI. However, the development type does not trigger the requirement to consult with the LPA.	Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Naden Brook Site of Biological Importance (SBI)	0.42 km west	County	Although these watercourses are within close proximity of the site, there are no connecting waterbodies, limiting the risk of impacts. However, it is recommended that best practice pollution prevention measures are incorporated into a CEMP to eliminate any residual risk. The development intends to change the use of the site to residential, the site is within an already heavily urbanised residential area; therefore, the operational phase of the development is not expected to impact any of the non-statuary sites within 2km of the site.	Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Old House & Mill Croft Brook SBI	0.82 km northwest	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Meadowcroft Woods SBI	1.04 km southeast	Local	Best practice pollution prevention measures, incorporated into a CEMP to prevent impacts during the construction phase. Although the development intends to change the use of the site to a residential area, the site is within a heavily urbanised residential area; therefore, the operational phase of the development is not expected to impact any of the non-statuary sites within 2km of the site. Meadowcroft Woods SBI, Old House & Mill Croft Brook SBI, and Ashworth Valley SBI are known to be publicly accessible via public rights of way (PRoW), and as such development could present a potential increase in recreational use. However, due to the size of development, the distance between the site and the SBIs, and the alternative greenspace provided within the proposed development, any overall increase in recreational use and impacts on these SBI sites is considered to be negligible.	Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Plumpton Wood SBI	1.19 km south	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Ashworth Valley SBI	1.21 km southwest	County		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Springfield Wood SBI	1.37 km southeast	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Doctor Dam & Holter Wood SBI	1.43 km northwest	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Meadow by Heywood Cemetery SBI	1.5 km southeast	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Tack Lee & Gristlehurst Woods SBI	1.55 km southwest	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Queen’s Park Lake SBI	1.61 km south	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
Fordoe & Naden Woods & Quarry SBI	1.89 km northwest	Local		Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8
				Rochdale Core Strategy SO4 & Places for Everyone Policy JP-G8



Habitats and Protected Species

- 2.3. The habitats and presence of, or potential for, protected species that could be affected by the proposed development are summarised below in **Tables 2.2** and **2.3** respectively. Species which are considered likely absent from the site based on professional judgement following consideration of the habitats within/surrounding the site, signs of species presence at the time of survey and data search records, are not discussed. The locations of habitats are shown on the Habitats Features Plan **16099/P01**.

Hardstanding and Buildings

- 2.4. Three buildings are present towards the north of the site. The land surrounding the buildings is hardstanding.

Grassland – Other neutral grassland

- 2.5. The site is dominated by neutral grassland. Common bent *Agrostis capillaris* dominates the species composition with tufted hair grass *Deschampsia cespitosa* being abundant. Cocksfoot *Dactylis glomerata* is frequent whilst field thistle *Cirsium discolor*, broad-leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, nettle *Urtica dioica*, meadow buttercup *Ranunculus acris* and common rush *Juncus effusus* are all occasionally present.

Woodland and forest – Other woodland; broadleaved

- 2.6. An area of broadleaved woodland is located in the northern section of the site, immediately south of the hardstanding area. The woodland is dominated by willow species *Salix spp.*, with abundant sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* and abundant goat willow *Salix caprea*.

Heathland and shrub – Bramble scrub

- 2.7. Three areas are present in the northern section of the site. The scrub is dominated by bramble *Rubus fruticosus* with abundant red dead-nettle *Lamium purpureum*, frequent spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* and occasional cleavers *Galium aparine*.

Sparsely vegetated land – Ruderal/Ephemeral

- 2.8. Ruderal/ephemeral is mainly present in the northern section of the site with one area present at the southeast corner. This habitat type is dominated by dock *Rumex spp.*, with abundant nettles *Urtica dioica* and spear thistle.

Line of trees

- 2.9. Lines of trees are present around the entire perimeter of the site. Species composition is dominated by sycamore, with abundant oak *Quercus spp.*. Holly *Ilex aquifolium*, hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*, field maple *Acer campestre* and Lawson's Cypress *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* are all frequently present with white poplar *Populus alba*, ash *Fraxinus excelsior* and lime *Tilia x europaea* occasionally present.

Scattered trees

- 2.10. Scattered trees are present around the site, mainly around the perimeter. Species present include sycamore, oak, field maple, bird cherry *Prunus padus* and lime.



Table 2.2. Habitats, their Importance, Potential Impacts and Mitigation/Enhancement Opportunities

Habitats	Ecological Importance/Suitability for Protected/Priority ⁴ species	Constraints	Potential Impacts and Mitigation/Enhancement Opportunities	Photograph
<u>Primary code(s):</u> Built-up areas and gardens u1 <u>Secondary code(s):</u> Developed land; sealed surface u1b Buildings u1b5 Ruderal or ephemeral 81	Negligible	NA	No mitigation required. These habitats could be enhanced by replacing non-native species with native tree, shrub, and grassland planting.	 
<u>Primary code(s):</u> Grassland g Heathland and shrub h Woodland and forest w <u>Secondary code(s):</u> Other neutral grassland g3c Mixed scrub h3h Other broadleaved woodland w1g Scattered trees 32 Line of trees 33	Local Other neutral grassland is a priority habitat. Woodland and trees detailed as important within PfE Policy JP-G7. Scrub, woodland and trees have foraging and nesting suitability for birds. Woodland and lines of trees provide suitable roosting, foraging and commuting habitat for bats as well as commuting badger and hedgehog. Grassland, ruderal and scrub habitats may provide suitable habitat for reptiles whilst the	Impacts to priority habitats and habitats of ecological importance should be avoided wherever possible. Where impacts cannot be avoided, these habitats should be replaced with similar habitats of greater ecological value.	If retained, these habitats should be protected during construction via a CEMP. If these habitats are to be lost, suitable mitigation will be required with trees being replaced on a two for one basis as required in PfE Policy JP-G7. Management prescriptions and supplementary native species planting may enhance retained habitats. The site may be enhanced for this habitat by planting additional lengths of tree lines/ native species hedgerow and managing grassland for biodiversity.	

⁴ Priority species and habitats are those listed at Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2005. Section 40 of the NERC Act puts a duty on local authorities to have regard for the conservation of these species, including when considering planning allocations and applications.



	scrub may also be suitable habitat for badgers and hedgehog.			  
--	---	--	--	--



2.11. Species which are considered likely absent from the site (including amphibians, reptiles, water voles, otter) are not discussed, because based on professional judgement following consideration of the habitats within/surrounding the site, signs of species presence at the time of survey and data search records, these species have been determined to likely be absent from the site.

Table 2.3 – Fauna (including Protected/Priority Species) their Importance, Potential Impacts and Mitigation/Enhancement Opportunities

Fauna (including Protected/Priority Species)	Ecological Importance/Suitability for Protected/Priority ⁵ species	Constraints	Potential Impacts and Mitigation/Enhancement Opportunities	Photograph
Birds	The data search returned records of 14 Section 41 bird species. Including both lapwing <i>Vanellus vanellus</i> and skylark <i>Alauda arvensis</i>. Of these, skylark is considered the most likely to utilise the site given the habitats present. However, the site is immediately adjacent to dense urban environment to the north and east and habitats to the south and west are more likely to be favoured by this species. Therefore it is considered that only a common assemblage of birds is likely to be utilising the site. Buildings and vegetation (notably bramble scrub and woodland) are suitable for nesting birds.	Removal of these habitats should be avoided during the nesting season (March to September inclusive, though this is not defined in law and birds may nest outside of this time) wherever possible.	Should any of these habitats be cleared during the nesting bird season, pre-removal checks for nesting birds must be carried out by a suitably experienced Ecological Clerk of Works (ECOW), no more than 48 hours prior to the works commencing.	
Badger	The data search returned 113 records of badger within 2km of the site. The woodland and scrub present on-site may be suitable for badgers with the lines of trees offering suitable commuting habitat.	Impacts to the scrub and woodland present on site should be avoided where possible. Should more than 6 months elapse since the initial site visit, a pre-commencement badger survey should be conducted to re-confirm the status of the species on site. Further surveys or licencing may be required should the presence of badgers be recorded.	If badgers are found to be utilising the site, suitable mitigation must be put in place. Commuting routes for badgers should be retained and enhanced where possible.	
Foraging/Commuting Bats	Records of the following species were returned within 2 km of the site within the last 10 years: common pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>, unidentified pipistrelle species, <i>Pipistrellus sp.</i>, unidentified bat species, brown long-eared bat <i>Plecotus auritus</i>, Daubenton's bat <i>Myotis daubentonii</i> unidentified myotis species <i>Myotis sp.</i>, noctule bat <i>Nyctalus noctule</i>, soprano pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i> and whiskered/Brandt's bat <i>Myotis mystacinus</i> / <i>Myotis brandtii</i>. Closest record of bats was 0.14km north of the site in 2007. The record was for an injured unidentified bat species.	Impacts to suitable linear habitats (tree lines, woodland edges etc.) are expected to be avoided with site proposals. Should proposals change to include impacts on these habitats, monthly or seasonal bat activity surveys may be required to inform mitigation.	Impacts to suitable habitat should be controlled via a CEMP and a bat sensitive lighting strategy. Native species planting in unlit areas, including linear features, are expected to enhance the site for commuting and foraging bats.	

⁵ Priority species and habitats are those listed at Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2005. Section 40 of the NERC Act puts a duty on local authorities to have regard for the conservation of these species, including when considering planning allocations and applications.



	The treelines, woodland edge, and scrub offer habitat of moderate suitability for commuting/foraging.			
Roosting Bats	Buildings B1 is a modern three-story brick-built building. No potential roosting features were observed, as such this building was determined to have negligible potential for roosting bats. B2 is a modern single storey outbuilding. The roof was pitched and made of slate. No potential roosting features were observed, as such this building was determined to have negligible potential for roosting bats. B3 is a single storey outbuilding. It is brick built with a slate pitched roof. No potential roosting features were observed, as such this building was determined to have negligible potential for roosting bats. Trees Three trees within the site were recorded as having potential bat roosting features. T1 is a sycamore with a knot hole 3 metres high with a northern elevation. T2 is a white poplar with a cracked limb 3 metres high with a southern elevation. T3 is a sycamore with the following PRFs: a tear-out 6 metres high within the central stem, a large wound 3 metres high with a western elevation, a knot hole 3 metres high with a southern elevation and lifted bark up the stem. T1 and T2 are considered to have PRF-I bat roosting potential whilst T3 is considered to have PRF-M bat roosting potential. Multiple mature trees within the southern line of trees were obscured by the canopy and therefore require a climbing assessment to determine their potential for roosting bats should these be subject to removal.	Impacts to Potential Roost Features (see 16099/P01) should be avoided in the first instance. If unavoidable, bat roost surveys of T3 will be required in the period May-August/September (inclusive) and where roosts are found suitable mitigation and European Protected Species (EPS) licensing If T1 and/or T2 are to be lost, they should be removed via soft-felling.	Impacts to any Potential Roost Features being retained should be controlled via a CEMP. If required for removal, soft-felling of T1 and T2 in the presence of an ECoW will be required. A sensitive lighting scheme should be implemented to mitigate impacts to commuting/foraging bats, particularly focusing along boundary features (i.e. tree lines). Inclusion of bat boxes in the scheme would enhance the site for roosting bats. Commuting routes and foraging habitat should be enhanced and/or created within the site to increase suitability of the site for bats.	 Building 1  Building 2  Building 3



				 Tree 1  Tree 2  Tree 3
Hedgehog	The data search returned 93 records of hedgehog within 2 km of the site. The woodland and scrub present on-site may be suitable for hedgehog with the lines of trees offering suitable commuting habitat.	Habitats on site provide some suitable foraging/nesting opportunities for hedgehogs. As such, sensitive working methodologies should be implemented to avoid impacts to this species group.	To ensure hedgehogs and other small mammals are not impacted on during the construction phase, sensitive working methodologies should be adopted, including but not limited to: • Storing site materials in skips or off the ground using pallets; • Ensuring any excavations are left ramped or with an exit should any hedgehogs or other small mammals become trapped; • Capping any pipework left overnight.	



			The above measures are expected to be documented and implemented via a CEMP report. The introduction of ‘hedgehog highways’ into the design will increase the connectivity for commuting and foraging hedgehog. This involves creating small holes (approximately 13cm²) at the base of fence panels to enable hedgehog to move freely.	
--	--	--	--	---



Section 3: Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.1. A development achieves biodiversity net gain when the total biodiversity units present post-development is higher than that of the biodiversity units present on site prior to development. Defra's Statutory Metric has been used to calculate the biodiversity value of the site before and after development in terms of "biodiversity units" to calculate an overall biodiversity net gain or loss.

Design Evolution

- 3.2. The design of the Development should be iterative, and in accordance with policy and best practice guidance, follow the 'mitigation hierarchy'. As such, the Development should be designed to avoid and retain the most important ecological features to ensure they can be managed in the long-term to enhance their importance for biodiversity. Where this is not possible, new habitats should be proposed to compensate for habitat losses with the aim of maximising the ecological value of the habitats proposed on the site. Our recommendations for the design strategy are as follows:
- Where possible, habitats of local importance (trees, hedgerows, neutral grassland) are retained and enhanced, and where not possible, shall be replaced by comparable habitats of equal or greater importance.
 - Grassland and scrub habitats are widespread across the site, and significant portions of this are expected to be lost with proposals. As such, proposals focus on greater value grassland and scrub planting (i.e. wildflower mix grassland, meadow mix grassland, native mixed scrub) in order to compensate for losses.

Existing Habitats

- 3.3. The following habitats are present within the red line boundary of the site and are shown on Habitat Features Plan **16099/P01**. No watercourses were present. The rationale for condition assessments is detailed within the metric **16099/BNG**.



Table 3.1 – Baseline Habitat Assessment and Suggested Action

Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Suggested action to address habitat losses
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	2.21	Medium	Poor	Same habitat required – bespoke compensation option
Heathland and shrub	Bramble scrub	0.05	Medium	Condition Assessment N/A	Same habitat required – bespoke compensation option
Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.14	Low	Moderate	Compensation Not Required
Woodland and forest	Other woodland; broadleaved	0.11	Medium	Poor	Same habitat required – bespoke compensation option
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.13	V.Low	N/A – Other	Compensation Not Required
Individual trees	Rural tree	0.15	Medium	Moderate	Same habitat required – bespoke compensation option

Table 3.2 – Baseline Hedgerow Assessment and Suggested Action

Hedge number	Hedgerow type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Suggested action to address habitat losses
H1	Line of Trees	0.43	Low	Moderate	Same distinctiveness band or better

Proposed Habitats

- 3.4. The proposals, as shown within **Appendix 3** and the Post-development Habitat Plan **16099/P03**, have been used to calculate the proposed habitat areas. The rationale for target condition assessments is detailed within the metric **16099/BNG**.

Table 3.3 – Created and Enhanced Habitats

Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Created/enhanced	Baseline condition	Distinctiveness	Target condition
Grassland	Modified grassland	0.09	Created	N/A	Low	Moderate
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.15	Created	N/A	Medium	Moderate



Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.10	Created	N/A	Medium	Moderate
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.21	Created	N/A	Medium	Moderate
Urban	Introduced shrub	0.02	Created	N/A	Low	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban	Vegetated garden	0.78	Created	N/A	Low	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban	Sustainable drainage system	0.11	Created	N/A	Low	Moderate
Urban	Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	0.10	Created	N/A	V. Low	Condition Assessment N/A
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	1.08	Created	N/A	V. Low	Condition Assessment N/A
Individual trees	Urban Tree	0.057	Created	N/A	Medium	Moderate
Individual trees	Urban Tree	0.2606	Created	N/A	Medium	Poor
A net loss of 4.40 habitat units, -39.16%						

Table 3.4 – Created and Enhanced Hedgerows

Habitat type	Length (km)	Created/enhanced	Distinctiveness	Target condition
Native Hedgerow	0.21	Created	Low	Moderate
Non-native and ornamental hedgerow	0.12	Created	V. Low	Poor
Line of Trees	0.11	Created	Low	Moderate
A net gain of 0.39 hedgerow units, +19.73%				



Results Summary

- 3.5. As described within The Statutory Biodiversity Metric **16099/BNG** and summarised below in **Figure 4.1**, based on the habitats present on site that will be lost and those to be created, the development would result in a loss of **4.40** habitat units, and a gain of **0.39** hedgerow units. This is a percentage loss of **39.16%** in habitat units and a gain of **19.73%** in hedgerow units.

FINAL RESULTS		
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	-4.40
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	0.39
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	0.00
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	<i>Habitat units</i>	-39.16%
	<i>Hedgerow units</i>	19.73%
	<i>Watercourse units</i>	0.00%
Trading rules satisfied?	No - Check Trading Summaries ▲	

Figure 3.1 – Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Results Summary, taken from The Statutory Biodiversity Metric.

- 3.6. Given the net loss of **4.40** habitat units arising from development, and the statutory requirement for developments to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity of 10%, the development would need to make off-site contributions to a third-party unit provider, totalling **5.53** units, in order to obtain an overall gain of 10%. Off-site contributions should consist of the creation of grassland, woodland, and individual tree planting in order to satisfy the trading rules of the biodiversity metric.

Management

- 3.7. The results of The Statutory Biodiversity Metric are based on the habitats within the site being maintained at a certain condition, as prescribed by the condition assessment sheets published by Defra.
- 3.8. Details of habitat establishment and long-term management will be provided through the production of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP). The LEMP would set out the prescriptions for the establishment and maintenance of the habitats on site for 30 years.



Section 4: Conclusions and Recommended Further Work

Key Issues

4.1. The key impacts of the development are as follows.

- **Designated Sites:** A CEMP is required to prevent impacts to non-statutory designated sites during the construction phase, and to detail precautionary working methods for protected and/or priority species.
- **Habitats:** Bramble scrub is of local importance due to their suitability to support protected and/or priority species. Neutral grassland is locally important due to being detailed within the LBAP whilst trees and woodland are of local importance due to Policy JP-G7 of the PFE Joint Development Plan. These habitats are retained where possible, and where lost, suitable compensation shall be put in place; The lines of trees on site offer suitable commuting habitat for species including bats, badger and hedgehog. This feature is expected to be retained with proposals.
- **Badgers:** An pre-commencement badger survey will be required if more than 6 months elapse from the date of the initial survey to re-confirm the presence or absence of this species.
- **Birds:** A common assemblage of birds is considered to be utilising the site, with species of importance (including lapwing and skylark) likely to favour surrounding habitats. Nevertheless, Habitat removal should occur outside of the core nesting bird season if possible and if not under supervision by a SQE. Additional tree and hedgerow planting is expected to maintain/enhance the quality of habitats for bird species on site.
- **Bats:** Three nocturnal surveys (or aerial inspections) will be required to be conducted on Tree T3, given that it is scheduled for removal, to determine a likely presence or absence of roosting bats. Trees T1 and T2 would need to be soft felled if removal is required. Retention of existing boundary features (lines of trees, woodland) is expected to avoid impacts to commuting/foraging bat species, and any impacts to this suitable habitat are expected to be controlled through the implementation of a sensitive lighting strategy.
- **Hedgehogs:** The sensitive working methodologies outlined in **section 2** of this report should be adopted during the construction phase of the proposals.
- **BNG:** The proposals would result in a net loss of **4.40** habitat units (**-39.16%**) and a net gain of **0.39** hedgerow units (**+19.73%**). Given the net loss of habitat units arising from development, the development would need to make off-site contributions to a third-party unit provider, totalling **5.53** units, in order to obtain an overall gain of 10%. Off-site contributions should consist of the creation of grassland, woodland, and individual tree planting in order to satisfy the trading rules of the biodiversity metric. A LEMP to ensure the long-term management of the proposed habitat enhancements is expected to be secured via a suitable worded planning condition.

Potential Further Work

4.2. Depending on the proposals, further surveys which may be required to inform a planning application are set out in **Table 4.1** below.



Table 4.1 – Further Surveys and Timing of Surveys.

Survey	Visits and timings
Bat emergence surveys (or aerial inspections) of T3	Three visits a minimum of 3 weeks apart in May-August/September (inclusive).
Badger survey	Pre-commencement badger survey of the site and 30m buffer around the site.

Potential Control Mechanisms

- 4.3. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is expected to be conditioned to ensure long-term management (30 years) of habitats post-development which is a requirement of the Environment Act 2021.
- 4.4. A CEMP will be produced (to be controlled through a planning condition) to control the construction phase mitigation measures. The CEMP will include precautionary working methods for protected or priority species.

Conclusion

- 4.5. No issues that could affect the principle or significantly affect the quantum of development the site could support have been identified. With the recommendations and further work set out in this report, there can be confidence that the site could be developed in accordance with relevant planning policy and legislation (SO4 and Policy G7 of the Rochdale Core Strategy and JP-S1, JP-G7 and JP-G8 of the PFE Joint Development Plan).



Appendix 1: Legislation and Planning Policy

Legislation

- A1.1. Specific habitats and species receive legal protection in the UK under various pieces of legislation, including:
- The Environment Act 2021;
 - The Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended);
 - The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended);
 - The Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000;
 - The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006;
 - The Hedgerows Regulations 1997; and
 - The Protection of Badgers Act 1992.
- A1.2. The European Council Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna, 1992, often referred to as the 'Habitats Directive', provides for the protection of key habitats and species considered of European importance. Annexes II and IV of the Directive list all species considered of community interest. The legal framework to protect the species covered by the Habitats Directive has been enacted under UK law through The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).
- A1.3. In Britain, the WCA 1981 (as amended) is the primary legislation protecting habitats and species. SSSIs, representing the best examples of our natural heritage, are notified under the WCA 1981 (as amended) by reason of their flora, fauna, geology or other features. All breeding birds, their nests, eggs and young are protected under the Act, which makes it illegal to knowingly destroy or disturb the nest site during nesting season. Schedules 1, 5 and 8 afford protection to individual birds, other animals and plants.
- A1.4. The CROW Act 2000 strengthens the species enforcement provisions of the WCA 1981 (as amended) and makes it an offence to 'recklessly' disturb a protected animal whilst it is using a place of rest or shelter or breeding/nest site.

Environment Act 2021: Town and Country Planning Act

- A1.5. The Environment Act gained Royal Assent in November 2022. Whilst the premise of BNG has been around prior to this, the Assent of the Act set the Framework for future legislation to be changed. The Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA), specifically Schedule 14, was amended in February 2024 making Biodiversity Net Gain a condition of planning (not a planning condition). The target 'gain' is currently set at 10% but the Secretary of State has the ability to change this.



Natural Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System

- A1.6. ODPM Circular 06/05 was prepared to accompany PPS9, however continues to be valid, and material in the consideration of planning applications since PPS9's replacement by the NPPF.
- A1.7. ODPM Circular 06/05 provides guidance on applying legislation in relation to nature conservation and planning in England. Part I considers the legal protection and conservation of internationally designated sites (namely candidate Special Areas of Conservation (cSACs), SACs, potential Special Protection Areas (pSPAs), SPAs and Ramsar sites) and Part II considers the legal protection and conservation of nationally designated sites, namely Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs).
- A1.8. Part III considers the protection of habitats and species outside of designated areas (particularly UK Biodiversity Action Plan species and habitats, which it states are capable of being a material consideration in the preparation of local development documents and the making of planning decisions.
- A1.9. Part IV considers species protected by law and states that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration in the consideration of a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat and that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted.

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), December 2023

- A1.10. The updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in December 2023 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It replaces the first National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012.
- A1.11. Paragraph 11 states that:
- "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development."*
- Section 11 of the NPPF, paragraph 120, sub-section b states that planning policies and decisions should:
- b) *"encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside;*
- c) *recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production"*
- A1.12. Section 15 of the NPPF (paragraphs 174 to 188) considers the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.
- A1.13. Paragraph 180 states that planning and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:



- a) *“protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);*
- b) *recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;*
- c) *maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; and*
- d) *minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”*

A1.14. Paragraph 181 states that plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.

Paragraph 185 states that in order to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

- a) *“Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity⁶; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation⁷; and*
- b) *promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.”*

A1.15. When determining planning applications, Paragraph 186 states that local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- a) *“if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;*
- b) *development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;*
- c) *development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons⁸ and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and*

⁶ Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

⁷ Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them.

⁸ For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.



- d) *development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.”*

A1.16. As stated in paragraph 187 the following should be given the same protection as habitats sites⁹:

- a) *“potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;*
b) *listed or proposed Ramsar sites¹⁰; and*
c) *sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.”*

A1.17. Paragraph 182 states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.

Places for Everyone (PfE) Joint Development Plan 2024¹¹

A1.18. The PfE Joint Development Plan is relevant for all local authorities within the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, in which Rochdale is included, and includes the following relevant policies:

- JP-S1: Sustainable Development: ‘development should aim to maximise its economic, social and environmental benefits simultaneously, minimise its adverse impacts, utilise sustainable construction techniques and actively seek opportunities to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.’
- JP-G7: Trees and Wood: ‘work to deliver the aims and objectives of the Greater Manchester Tree and Woodland Strategy, aiming to significantly increase tree cover, protect and enhance woodland, and connect people to the trees and woodland around them.’
- JP-G8: A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity: ‘Through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought.’

Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy October 2016¹²

A1.19. The Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy includes the following policies relevant to the development.

A1.20. SO4 – To promote a greener environment:

‘To do this we will focus on:

⁹ The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 181) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 68); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

¹⁰ Potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and proposed Ramsar sites are sites on which Government has initiated public consultation on the scientific case for designation as a Special Protection Area, candidate Special Area of Conservation or Ramsar site.

¹¹ Greater Manchester Combined Authority (2024). [Places for everyone joint development plan document](#).

¹² Rochdale Borough Council (2016). [Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy](#).



1. Minimising Rochdale's contribution to climate change and mitigating and adapting to its adverse effects;
2. Ensuring in particular that development is energy efficient and contributes to carbon reduction;
3. Reducing the likelihood of flooding through appropriate flood risk management, especially in Rochdale town centre and parts of Littleborough and Heywood;
4. Improving our urban open spaces and making them more accessible;
5. Maximising the value of our green open areas and countryside to provide opportunities for recreation, amenity, biodiversity and flood management;
6. Minimising and managing waste and managing minerals resources sustainably; and
7. Ensuring no detriment to the conservation interests of European and other protected natural sites.'

A1.21. Policy G7 – Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity:

'We will ensure that sites and features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection. Opportunities for enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity, creating new sites and features of interest and improving opportunities for public enjoyment will be supported. No development should result in a net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity interest in the borough and overall development in the borough should result in a net gain.'

Local Biodiversity Action Plan

- A1.22. The only habitat present on site that is detailed within the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (GM BAP) is the 'other neutral grassland' which is detailed within the 'Grasslands' action plan.



Appendix 2: Methodology

Data Search

- A2.1. A desk-based study was conducted whereby records of designated sites and records of protected and priority species were purchased and interrogated for the site and the surrounding landscape. The aim of the data search is to collate existing ecological records for the site and adjacent areas. Obtaining existing records is an important part of the assessment process as it provides information on issues that may not be apparent during a single survey, which by its nature provides only a 'snapshot' of the ecology of a given site.
- A2.2. The following resources were consulted/contacted:
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the countryside (MAGIC) website¹³;
 - Greater Manchester Local Record Centre (GMLRC)¹⁴; (Data ordered and received November 2024);
 - Rochdale Borough Council Website¹⁵;
 - Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website¹⁶,
 - Natural England (NE) designated sites website¹⁷,
 - Ordnance Survey mapping; and
 - Google Maps, including aerial photography.
- A2.3. The following areas of search around the boundary of the site boundary were applied:
- 2 km for protected and priority species, national statutory designated and non-statutory sites; and
 - 10 km for European statutory sites.

'Extended' Phase I Survey and UK Habs

- A2.4. An 'extended' Phase 1 survey was carried out on the 30th October 2024 by David Paton MEnvSci, a suitably experienced ecologist and qualifying member of CIEEM. The methods used during the walkover survey broadly followed methods used in an 'extended' Phase I habitat survey¹⁸ and entailed recording the main plant species and classifying and mapping habitat types with reference to the Habitat Definitions provided by the UK Habitat Classification Working Group¹⁹.

¹³ <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/> [Accessed 08/11/2024]

¹⁴ <https://gmlrc.org/> [Accessed: 08/11/2024]

¹⁵ <https://www.rochdale.gov.uk/> [Accessed 08/11/2024]

¹⁶ <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/ProtectedSites/> [Accessed 08/11/2024]

¹⁷ <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/> [Accessed 08/11/2024]

¹⁸ Joint Nature Conservation Committee (2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey - a technique for environmental audit. JNCC, Peterborough.

¹⁹ UKHab Ltd. (2023). UK Habitat Classification Version 2.0 (at <https://www.ukhab.org>)



- A2.5. Additionally, the habitats identified were evaluated for their potential to support legally protected and notable fauna species. Where access allowed, adjacent habitats were also considered in order to assess the site within the wider landscape and to provide information with which to assess possible impacts within the context of the site boundary.
- A2.6. All habitats were assessed utilising the relevant condition criteria for the relevant habitat type under The Statutory Metric, which included confirming 'pass' / 'fail' criteria taken from the UK Habitat/Phase 1 methodology where necessary.

Preliminary Bat Surveys

- A2.7. The surveys followed standard methodologies set out in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines²⁰, the Bat Workers Manual²¹ and Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists- Good Practice Guidelines 4th Edition²² and comprised:
- Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) – External and internal building inspection survey to assess potential of buildings on site to support roosting bats;
 - Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) – Ground level inspection of trees to assess potential of trees on site to support roosting bats; and
 - Day-time Bat Walkover (DBW) – Walkover of the sites to assess potential bat activity including foraging areas and potential commuting routes.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA)

- A2.8. A PBRA was undertaken on all buildings within the Site boundary. The assessment was undertaken on 30th October 2024 by David Paton. All surveys were daytime inspections and the conditions for all surveys was considered optimal. The location of the buildings and trees at the Site are shown on plan **16099/P01**. All buildings were inspected from the ground using binoculars, high powered torch, digital camera and endoscope for accessible features. In relation to buildings, such signs may include bat droppings, urine splashes, staining and features suitable for allowing bats access to roost (e.g. gaps behind soffits / hanging tiles / ridge tiles, lifted slates / flashing). The internal inspection of the buildings comprised a thorough search for evidence of roosting bats in accessible loft spaces (i.e. droppings, urine stains) and an assessment of the presence of potential roosting features internally.
- A2.9. The potential of the buildings and trees to support roosting bats was assessed using the criteria shown in **Table A2.1** below.

Table A2.1: Building / Structure Assessment Criteria - adapted from Collins, 2023.

Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/underground levels).

²⁰ Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

²¹ Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. (eds). (2004) 3rd Edition Bat Workers' Manual., JNCC, Peterborough, ISBN 1 86107 558 8

²² Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London. ISBN-978-1-7395126-0-6



Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitats
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions ^b and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site, but could be used by individual hibernating bats ^c).
Moderate	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation – the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed)
High	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^b and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g. maternity or classic cool/stable hibernation site.

^a Negligible is defined as ‘so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant’. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute).

^b For example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.

^c Evidence from the Netherlands shows mass swarming events of common pipistrelle bats in the autumn followed by mass hibernation in a diverse range of building types in urban environments. Common pipistrelle swarming has been observed in the UK and winter hibernation of numbers of this species has been detected at Seaton Delaval Hall in Northumberland. This phenomenon requires some research in the UK, but ecologists should be aware of the potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in prominent buildings in the landscape, urban or otherwise.



Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA)

- A2.10. A GLTA was undertaken on all trees within the Site boundary. The assessment was undertaken on 30th October 2024 by David Paton. All surveys were daytime inspections and the conditions for all surveys was considered optimal. The location of the trees at the Site are shown on plan **16099/P01**. All trees were inspected from the ground using binoculars, high powered torch, digital camera and endoscope for accessible features. Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) of interest include at detailed in **Table A2.2** below.

Table A2.2: PRF Types that can be Exploited by Bats and How they Form - adapted from Collins, 2023.

PRFs formed by disease and decay	PRFs formed by damage	PRFs formed by association
woodpecker holes squirrel holes knot holes pruning cuts tear outs wounds cankers compression forks butt rots	lightning strikes hazard beams subsidence cracks shearing cracks transverse snaps welds lifting bark desiccation fissures frost cracks	fluting ivy

- A2.11. The potential of trees to support roosting bats was assessed using the criteria shown in **Table A2.3** below.

Table A2.3: Assessment of Tree Suitability Criteria - adapted from Collins, 2023.

Roost Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitat
NONE	Either no PRFs in the tree or highly unlikely to be any
FAR	Further assessment required to establish if PRFs are present in the tree
PRF-I	A tree with at least one PRF present
PRF-M	A tree that is suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony.

Day-time Bat Walkover (DBW)

- A2.12. A DBW was undertaken on all habitats within the Site boundary. The assessment was undertaken on 30th October by David Paton. All surveys were daytime inspections and the conditions for all surveys were considered optimal. The DBW assessed habitats on-site for the likelihood to be used by foraging and commuting bats as detailed in Table A2.3 below. This combined with desk study records of local bats and bat roosts, and potential for roosting bats on-site is used to determine suitability of the site for bat activity.

Table A2.3: Flight Path and Foraging Habits Assessment Criteria - adapted from Collins, 2023.



Suitability	Description of Roosting Habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight-lines, or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flight-paths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.
Low	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight-paths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flight-paths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flight-paths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

Biodiversity Net Gain

A2.13. The Statutory Biodiversity Metric operates by calculating the number of biodiversity units associated with a particular habitat type (both pre-and post-development) – the ‘unit’ value associated with each habitat type is calculated based on the following parameters:

- Size (in hectares)/Length (in km);
- Distinctiveness (i.e. how rare/valuable a given habitat is);
- Condition (i.e. how well the recorded habitat fits [or will fit] the standardised description of that habitat); and



- Strategic significance (i.e. if the existing or proposed habitat is within an area formally adopted in the local plan for green infrastructure or biodiversity improvements).

A2.14. When considering the creation of new habitats in the post-development site, other factors are also considered when calculating the 'unit' value of a given habitat and these are:

- Time to reach the target condition of each habitat; and
- Difficulty category for the creation of a given habitat.

A2.15. A calculation has been undertaken using the baseline habitats identified during habitat condition assessment survey, which was carried out on the 30th October 2024, alongside the 'extended' Phase 1 survey above. All surveys were carried out by David Paton MEnvSci, a suitably experienced ecologist and qualifying member of CIEEM.

A2.16. The UK Habitat Classification was used to identify habitat types. Note that the calculation is completed separately for non-linear and linear habitats. Habitat areas entered into The Statutory Biodiversity Metric in hectares were rounded to two decimal places.

Evaluation

A2.17. The evaluation of habitats and species is defined in accordance with published guidance²³. The scale of importance of each ecological feature is assigned within a defined geographical context, namely international and European, national, regional, county, and local. Below these are features considered to be of negligible importance.

A2.18. Consideration will also be given to legally protected or controlled species which are 'important features' in the context of this assessment, for which mitigation measures are required to ensure legal compliance, regardless of their geographic scale of importance. Thus, it is possible for a feature of negligible ecological importance to be legally protected and hence require mitigation.

A2.19. Evaluation is based on various characteristics that can be used to identify ecological features likely to be important in terms of biodiversity. These include site designations (such as Sites of Species Scientific Interest (SSSIs), or for undesignated features, the size, conservation status (locally, nationally or internationally), and the quality of the ecological feature. In terms of the latter, quality can refer to habitats (for instance if they are particularly diverse, or a good example of a specific habitat type), other features (such as wildlife corridors or mosaics of habitats) or species populations or assemblages.




Appendix 3: Site Landscape Proposals







KEY & NOTES




Existing Trees & Vegetation to be Retained
Refer to drawings and report by Iain Tavendale for further information




Proposed Avenue Trees
Pyrus calleryana 'Chanticleer' or similar appropriate street tree
16-18cm Extra Heavy Standard




Proposed Street and Front Garden Trees
Mix of appropriate 12-14cm Heavy Standard native and ornamental tree species to include:
Acer campestre 'Elegant'
Betula albosinensis 'Fascination'
Crataegus prunifolia 'Splendens'
Gleditsia triacanthos 'Sunburst'
Robinia pseudoacacia 'Bessoniana'
Sorbus aria 'Lutescens'
Sorbus aucuparia
Sorbus 'Joseph Rock'




Proposed Back Garden Trees
Mix of appropriate 12-14cm Heavy Standard native and ornamental species to include:
Amelanchier lamarkii
Crataegus prunifolia 'Splendens'
Magnolia stellata
Prunus 'Tai Haku'
Prunus 'Charles Sargentii'
Sorbus vilmosinii




Proposed Native Species Trees
Mix of appropriate 12-14cm Heavy Standard (Pines to be 2-2.5m high) native species trees to include:
Betula pendula
Fagus sylvatica
Malus sylvestris
Quercus robur
Sorbus aucuparia




Proposed Native Understorey/Scrub Mix
To be a mix of appropriate 60-80cm bareroot native scrub species to include:
Crataegus monogyna
Corylus avellana
Ilex aquifolium
Rosa canina
Rubus fruticosus
Viburnum opulus



Proposed Ornamental Hedge
Ornamental hedgerows to properties to be 90-120cm bareroot Fagus sylvatica (Beech) or similar




Proposed Native Species Hedge
Mix of appropriate 60-80cm bareroot native species to include:
Crataegus monogyna
Corylus avellana
Prunus spinosa
Ilex aquifolium
Viburnum opulus



Proposed Ornamental Shrub Planting
Plants to be selected from a palette of appropriate ornamental/amenity species using a mix of 3lt, 5lt and 10lt cg plants




Proposed Amenity Grass
To be seeded with species rich wildflower meadow such as Emorsgate EL1 Flowering Lawn Mixture



Proposed Wildflower Meadow
To be seeded with species rich wildflower meadow such as Emorsgate EMS Meadow Mixture for Loamy Soils



Proposed SuDS Pond with Wet Meadow
To be seeded with species rich meadow such as Emorsgate EM8 Meadow Mixture for Wetlands or similar



Proposed Houses




Proposed Roads




Proposed Shared Access Surfacing




Proposed Driveways



Proposed Paths and Patios




Proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Tracks
3m wide to enable maintenance vehicles (occasional) access to the ponds - Paths to be surfaced with compacted gravel.




Proposed Fences
Garden Boundary Fence
Post and Wire Fence (new section to meet the existing fence/wall along the southern boundary)



Easement to Existing Power Lines



Proposed Galvanised Steel Estate Railing
Powder coated in black - 1m in height



Proposed Knee Rail

NOTE: Proportion of trees within native species hedgerow to the southern boundary to be planted at 25-30cm girth (semi mature). See native species hedgerow precedent images to top right of drawing.


Plans:

Plan 1: Habitat Features Plan **16099/P01**

Plan 2: PBRA/GLTA Results Plan **16099/P02**

Plan 3: Post-development Habitat Plan **16099/P03**





Legend

Boundaries

Redline Boundary

Baseline Habitats

Target Note - Himalayan Balsam

Scattered Broad-leaved Tree

Baseline - Line Habitats

Line of Trees

Baseline - Polygon Habitats

Buildings


Hardstanding

Other tall herb and fern - ruderal

Poor semi-improved grassland

Scrub - dense/continuous

Broadleaved woodland - semi-natural



Project	Land off Greenvale, Rochdale
Drawing Title	Habitat Features Plan
Scale	As Shown (Approximate)
Drawing No.	16099/P01
Date	March 2025
Checked	DP/JM



3 Jordan Street, Deansgate, Manchester, M15 4PY
T: 0161 236 8367 E: info@tylergrange.co.uk W: www.tylergrange.co.uk



Legend

Boundaries

Redline Boundary

Bat Survey Results Plan

PBRA Results


Building - Negligible Roost Potential

GLTA Results

Tree - Negligible Potential

Tree - PRF-I Potential

Tree - PRF-M Potential



Project	Land off Greenvale, Rochdale
Drawing Title	PBRA/GLTA Results Plan
Scale	As Shown (Approximate)
Drawing No.	16099/P02
Date	March 2025
Checked	DP/JM



3 Jordan Street, Deansgate, Manchester, M15 4PY
T: 0161 236 8367 E: info@tylergrange.co.uk W: www.tylergrange.co.uk



Legend

- Boundaries**

Redline Boundary
- Post-development Plan**

Retained Habitats

Retained Trees

Retained Line of Trees

Created Habitats

Native Trees

Ornamental Trees

Native Hedgerow
- Ornamental Hedgerow

Modified Grassland

Wet Meadow Mix Grassland

Wildflower Mix Grassland


SUDS Feature

Mixed Scrub

Pathway

Gardens

Built Form



Project	Land off Greenvale, Rochdale
Drawing Title	Post-development Habitats Plan
Scale	As Shown (Approximate)
Drawing No.	16099/P03a
Date	June 2026
Checked	DP/JM



3 Jordan Street, Deansgate, Manchester, M15 4PY
T: 0161 236 8367 E: info@tylergrange.co.uk W: www.tylergrange.co.uk

An abstract collage of various geometric shapes and icons in shades of blue, purple, and yellow. The shapes include triangles, squares, and polygons. Icons include a hand with a small burst of lines above it, a large purple arrow pointing downwards, a purple asterisk-like shape, a black silhouette of a plant with leaves, a black silhouette of a hand with fingers spread, and a black silhouette of a fan or wheel. A yellow hexagon is the central focus, containing the main text.

Step into our world

www.tylergrange.co.uk



**Tyler
Grange**

Landscape | Ecology | Arboriculture