



Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Scout Moor II
Further Environmental Information

June 2026



Technical Report

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Calculations and Report

Scout Moor II Wind Farm

Cubico Wind Development (Wind 1) Ltd



your project our expertise

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Terms of Reference	1
1.2 Objectives	1
2. Legislative and Policy Requirements	2
2.1 Legislation	2
2.2 Planning Policy	2
3. Methodology	4
3.1 Reasoning for Approach	4
3.2 Site Survey and Habitat Condition Assessment	5
3.3 Proposed Development Layout	5
3.4 Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations	5
4. Results	6
4.1 Habitat Baseline	6
4.2 Biodiversity Calculations	7
5. Conclusions	14
6. References	15
7. Figures	16
Appendices	17
Appendix A. Condition Assessment Habitats within the Site	18
Appendix B. Biodiversity Net Gain Metric Results	23
Tables	
Table 9.5 1-Area-based Habitats in Baseline	6
Table 9.5 2- Watercourse Habitats in Baseline	7
Table 9.5 3-Summary of BNG for Area Habitats	9
Table 9.5 4-Summary of BNG for Watercourse Habitats	11
Table 9.5 5-Condition Assessment Habitats within the Projects Assessment	18
Table 9.5 6-Condition Assessment for watercourses within Site	21

Document Prepared For
Cubico Sustainable Investments

Document Prepared By
Katie Howe
Senior Ecologist
katie.howe@atmosconsulting.com

Document Approved By
Mikael Forup
Technical Director (Biodiversity and BNG)
mikael.forup@atmosconsulting.com

Version	Date	Reason
8706 Rev1	April 2025	Draft issues for client review
8706 Rev2	May 2025	Changes after client comments
8706 Rev3	May 2026	Changes following design change and submission of FEI
8706 Rev4	May 2026	Changes following client comments
8706 Rev5	June 2026	Changes following layout amendments



URS is a member of Registrar of Standards (Holdings) Ltd.

Copyright © 2026 Atmos Consulting Ltd

The copyright in this work is vested in Atmos Consulting Ltd, and the information contained herein is confidential. This work, either in whole or in part, may not be reproduced or disclosed to others or used for any purposes, other than for internal Cubico Wind Development (Wind 1) Ltd, without Atmos Consulting's prior written approval.

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of Reference

This Biodiversity Net Gain Report has been prepared by Atmos Consulting on behalf of Cubico UK Development (Wind 1) Limited ('the Applicant' or 'Cubico'). It is submitted as part of Further Environmental Information in respect of the cross-boundary applications for full planning permission ('the Applications') relating to the construction and operation of a new onshore wind farm (to be known as 'Scout Moor II'), alongside a comprehensive moorland restoration scheme (the 'Proposed Development'), on land at Rooley Moor ('the Site').

The Site crosses the administrative boundaries of Rossendale Borough Council ('RBC') and Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council ('RMBC') (collectively referred to as 'the Councils'). The Councils are the Local Planning Authorities ('LPA's') responsible for the determination of the Applications, which were originally submitted on 23 July 2025 and were validated by the Councils on 07 August 2025 (RBC ref. 2025/0267 and RMBC ref. 25/00680/FUL).

Following the completion of an extended period of statutory consultation on the Applications, the Applicant has evolved the Proposed Development to respond to comments received from statutory and non-statutory consultees, the public and other interested stakeholders and is hereby formally amending the Applications through the submission of Further Environmental Information ('FEI'). The FEI supersedes the information submitted in July 2025 ('the 2025 Submission') and will be subject to further statutory consultation by the Councils. A summary of the amendments to the Applications is set out in detail the Planning, Design and Access Statement (prepared by Turley), but in summary includes the reduction in turbine numbers from 'up to 17 turbines' to 'up to 12 turbines', alongside the relocation/repositioning of turbine positioning, access track layout and the layout and design of other associated infrastructure.

As per BNG guidance, the metric only deals with direct loss of habitats. Indirect impacts are covered within the main EIA, Chapter 9, Ecology.

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of this report are to:

- Summarise the legislative requirements for biodiversity net gain;
- Summarise the habitat baseline and condition of the Site;
- Demonstrate the process followed in line with the biodiversity gain hierarchy;
- Quantify the baseline biodiversity value of the Site and the measures required to achieve a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain; and to
- Indicate the potential need for longer term monitoring over 40-years based on the habitats to be enhanced or created.

2. Legislative and Policy Requirements

2.1 Legislation

BNG is a legal requirement in England. The relevant primary legislation for the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain is principally set out under **Schedule 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990**. This legislation was inserted into the 1990 Act by Schedule 14 of the **Environment Act 2021** and was amended by the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. The Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Consequential Amendments) Regulations 2024 made consequential amendments to other parts of the 1990 Act.

From 12th February 2024, all qualifying developments are required to demonstrate a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the Site habitat, evidenced via completion of the **statutory biodiversity metric**. This increase must demonstrate it has followed the **biodiversity gain hierarchy** first through on-Site biodiversity gains, second registered off-Site biodiversity gains or third statutory biodiversity credits.

For 'small sites' defined as residential developments on land less than 0.5ha in size or between 1 and 9 dwellings, or commercial developments on land less than 1ha in size or less than 1,000sqm, these are required to also demonstrate 10% gain and can utilise the 'small sites metric'.

Where achievement of 10% BNG relies on 'significant on-site enhancements' or where off-Site habitat measures are required in order to deliver 10% BNG, a **Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP)** will be required as a condition of consent. A **Biodiversity Gain Plan** will also be required as a condition of consent.

Further detail on the criteria are available in the secondary guidance at www.gov.uk.

2.2 Planning Policy

National Planning Policy

The **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** states that planning policy should identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable gains for biodiversity.

Paragraph 193 in Chapter 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment includes the following requirements for planning applications to demonstrate:

- 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 reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and*

development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be

Local Policy and Guidance

Rossendale Local Plan 2019-2036 and Rochdale Cores Strategy follow statutory guidance for use of the BNG metric.

To determine the 'strategic significance' habitats referenced within the within Great Manchester Local Nature Recovery Strategy and the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy as 'Formally identified in local strategy', habitats that have not specifically listed within the local habitat initiatives but have been deemed as important habitats within the local area have been classified as 'Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy' and all other habitats have been classified as 'Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy'.

3. Methodology

3.1 Reasoning for Approach

3.1.1 Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy

The process must demonstrate how the Proposed Development has sought to protect or minimise losses of the most valuable habitats within the Site. This is done by implementing the 'Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy', as follows:

- **Avoid Adverse Effects:** The first priority is to minimise negative impacts on existing habitats within the development site. This is particularly important for areas with medium, high, or very high distinctiveness (scoring 4 or more on the [Statutory Biodiversity Metric](#)).
- **Mitigate Unavoidable Effects:** If adverse impacts cannot be entirely avoided, the next step involves minimising and mitigating these impacts as much as possible.
- **Enhance On-Site Habitats:** Once impacts have been minimised, the focus shifts to enhancing the quality of existing habitats within the development site.
- **Create New On-Site Habitats:** If further improvements are needed to achieve the 10% net gain requirement, developers should explore creating new habitats within the development area.
- **Secure Off-Site Biodiversity Units:** If achieving the required net gain on-site proves insufficient, developers can secure **off-site biodiversity units**. ILM excels in facilitating this step for developers, with a diverse portfolio of high-quality Biodiversity Gain Sites that generate these units. These units represent habitat creation or restoration elsewhere, contributing to the overall 10% biodiversity net gain requirement.
- **Purchase Biodiversity Credits:** As a last resort, if all previous options have been exhausted, developers can purchase statutory biodiversity credits. However, this option should only be considered after exploring all other possibilities within the hierarchy.

3.1.2 Irreplaceable Habitats

Irreplaceable habitats are those which are very difficult (or take a very long time) to restore, create or replace once they have been destroyed. This may be due to their age, uniqueness, species diversity and rarity. They include some of England's most ecologically valuable terrestrial and intertidal habitats.

The definition and list of irreplaceable habitats for BNG are set out in the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024. The list includes:

- ancient woodland
- ancient and veteran trees
- blanket bog
- limestone pavements
- coastal sand dunes
- spartina saltmarsh swards
- mediterranean saltmarsh scrub
- lowland fens

The presence of irreplaceable habitats on Site must be recorded in the statutory biodiversity metric. However, the 10% BNG requirement does not apply when irreplaceable habitats are proposed to be

lost. Instead, bespoke compensation would be required, and planning permission for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitat will only be granted in wholly exceptional circumstances and where a suitable compensation strategy exists. It is therefore best to avoid any adverse impacts on irreplaceable habitat present within a proposed development site.

3.2 Site Survey and Habitat Condition Assessment

A UK Habitat (UKHAB) Classification survey of the Site was undertaken on 15th-16th July, 22nd-26th July, 5th-9th August and on 26th September 2024 and updated grid connection 28th 29th April 2026 to include the grid connection. The Modular River Physical (MoRPh) surveys were undertaken on 2nd-4th and 8th-11th April 2025 (Figure 1). The condition of the habitats present was assessed using the information available from these surveys to inform the biodiversity calculator.

3.3 Proposed Development Layout

Cubico Sustainable Investments provided the layout of the Proposed Development (Scout Moor II Layout 9 Hybrid FEI Option) with further enhancements outlined in the present report.

3.4 Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations

In order to calculate the baseline Biodiversity Unit (BU) value of the Site, the effects of the Proposed Development and to quantify the proposed mitigation, enhancement and habitat creation measures, a biodiversity metric was populated. This utilised the DEFRA Statutory Biodiversity Metric to calculate the overall net gain achieved by the Proposed Development. It followed three steps.

1. Firstly, the existing baseline habitat data, in UKHAB format, was entered into the metric by selecting the correct habitat type from the drop-down menu, as well as its extent, condition and strategic significance. Where present, this was done separately for the three habitat modules in the metric, i.e. area-based habitats (such as fields and ponds), hedgerows & lines of trees, and watercourses. This determined the baseline BU value of the Site;
2. Secondly, the amount of each baseline habitat to be retained or enhanced was entered. This therefore also calculated any habitat losses;
3. Thirdly, the proposed habitat enhancements were entered into the metric along with their target condition and strategic significance; and
4. Finally, the proposed habitat creation measures were entered into the metric, along with their proposed extent and target condition, as well as their strategic significance.

The habitat enhancement and creation measures, when compared to the baseline minus the habitat loss, indicate the overall biodiversity net gain (or loss). Further details are provided in Section 3 and Appendix A and Appendix B including the assumptions and metric results.

4. Results

4.1 Habitat Baseline

The habitats present within the Site and their condition are summarised in the tables below. The calculations can be found in the accompanying Statutory Biodiversity Metric file (Scout Moor 2 The_Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_Calculation_Tool Rev5).

4.1.1 Condition Assessment Survey

The habitats within the Site were assigned a condition score (where appropriate) with the habitats as illustrated on Figure 9-2 results for and summarised in Appendix A and full condition assessment within Scout Moor II The Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool 17.06.2026.

4.1.2 Area-based Habitats

The area-based habitats present within the Site are summarised in the Table below.

Table 9.5 1-Area-based Habitats in Baseline

Habitat Type	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic Significance	Baseline BU
Artificial unvegetated unsealed surface	0.30	V. Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	0.00
Blanket bog	30.31	V. High	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	0.00
Blanket bog	63.58	V. High	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	0.00
Blanket bog	362.64	V. High	Poor	Formally identified in local strategy	1073.64
Bracken	19.67	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	39.35
Developed land; sealed surface	13.87	V. Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	0.00
Fens (upland and lowland)	4.99	V. High	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	79.81
Fens (upland and lowland)	0.69	V. High	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	5.52
Modified grassland	4.45	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	17.78
Modified grassland	141.44	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	282.87
Other coniferous woodland	4.61	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	9.23
Other inland rock and scree	0.07	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	0.30
Other woodland; broadleaved	3.26	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	29.98

Habitat Type	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic Significance	Baseline BU
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	0.28	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	2.61
Ponds (priority habitat)	0.05	Medium	Poor	Formally identified in local strategy	0.33
Upland acid grassland	33.02	Medium	Good	Formally identified in local strategy	455.69
Upland acid grassland	215.61	Medium	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	1983.65
Upland acid grassland	96.26	Medium	Poor	Formally identified in local strategy	442.79
Upland heathland	6.90	High	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	41.39
Total	1002.01				4464.92

Irreplaceable habitats indicated in bold

The calculations above included both default assumptions (that are inbuilt into the Biodiversity Metric) and criteria which were selected from a series of drop-down menus. The condition criteria passed for each habitat in Appendix A.

4.1.3 Watercourse-based Habitats

The area-based habitats present within the Site are summarised in the Table below.

Table 9.5 2- Watercourse Habitats in Baseline

Habitat Type	Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic Significance	Baseline BU
Other rivers and streams	5.19	High	Moderate	Formally identified in local strategy	47.75
Other rivers and streams	0.57	High	Fairly Good	Formally identified in local strategy	9.83
Total	5.78				57.58

4.1.4 Irreplaceable Habitats and Habitat Distinctiveness

Blanket bog is the only habitat type located within the Site that is classified as an irreplaceable habitat. There is 456.53ha of blanket bog located within the Site and of this 16.84ha is proposed to be lost. A bespoke compensation scheme is therefore required and this is detailed fully within the Moorland Restoration and Management Plan (MRMP). One other 'very high' distinctiveness habitat, namely 'Fens (upland and lowland)', is present, with 5.68ha within the Site.

4.2 Biodiversity Calculations

The proposed habitat retention, creation and enhancement measures set out above were also input into the Metric (see Scout Moor 2 The_Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_Calculation_Tool Rev5). The results are included in Appendix B.

4.2.1 Area-based Habitats

The total baseline BU value of area habitats within the Site is 4464.92 BU, with the predicted post-development value being 4947.57 BU. This results in an overall net gain of 482.65 BU for area habitats, which represents an increase of 10.81%.

The calculations therefore indicate that the proposal to:

- enhance 116.7ha of poor-condition blanket bog to moderate condition (only areas out with the proposed loss),
- creation of 0.67ha of mixed woodland, and
- the enhancement of 49.49ha poor-condition modified grassland to good-condition other upland acid grassland.

Will satisfy the statutory requirement of a minimum of 10%.

4.2.2 Watercourse-based Habitats

The total baseline BU value of watercourse habitats within the Site is 57.58 BU, with the predicted post-development value being 63.69 BU. This results in an overall net gain of 6.11 BU for watercourse habitats, which represents an increase of 10.62%.

The calculations therefore indicate that the proposal to enhance 2.84km of moderate condition other rivers and streams to fairly good through riparian planting of shrubs, scrubs and trees along the bank tops and bank faces, will satisfy the statutory requirement of a minimum of 10%.

The location of the proposed enhancement is yet to be determined and will depend on location of water crossings. This detail would be confirmed post consent via a detailed HMMP (pursuant to a S106 obligation).

Table 9.5 3-Summary of BNG for Area Habitats

Habitat Type	Distinctive-ness	Strategic Significance	Baseline Condition	Lost	Retained		Enhanced		Created		Target Condition	Notes
				Ha	Ha	BU	Ha	BU	Ha	BU		
Artificial unvegetated unsealed surface	V. Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	N/A - Other	0.00	0.30	0.00						
Blanket bog	V. High	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Good	2.28	28.03	0.00						
Blanket bog	V. High	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Moderate	1.58	62.00	0.00						
Blanket bog	V. High	Location ecologically desirable but not in local strategy	Poor	12.98	233.57	0.00	116.70	1247.39			Moderate	Enhanced from poor condition as detailed within the Moorland Restoration & Management Plan
Bracken	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Condition Assessment N/A	0.00	19.67	39.35						
Developed land; sealed surface	V. Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	N/A - Other	0.13	13.65	0.00			24.52	0.00		Turbines and all associated infrastructure
Fens (upland and lowland)	V. High	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Moderate	0.00	4.99	79.81						
Fens (upland and lowland)	V. High	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Poor	0.00	0.69	5.52						

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Calculations and Report

Habitat Type	Distinctive-ness	Strategic Significance	Baseline Condition	Lost	Retained		Enhanced		Created		Target Condition	Notes
				Ha	Ha	BU	Ha	BU	Ha	BU		
Modified grassland	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Moderate	0.00	4.45	17.78						
Modified grassland	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Poor	3.24	88.29		See Upland acid grassland, below					
Other coniferous woodland	Low	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Poor	0.00	4.61	9.23						
Other inland rock and scree	Medium	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Poor	0.00	0.07	0.30						
Other woodland; broadleaved	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Moderate	0.00	3.26	29.98						
Other woodland; mixed	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Poor						0.67	2.58		Screening for substation
Ponds (priority habitat)	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Moderate	0.00	0.33	2.61						
Ponds (non-priority habitat)	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Poor	0.00	0.05	0.22						
Upland acid grassland	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Good	0.00	33.02	455.69	49.9	451.06			Good	Enhancement is from modified grassland in poor condition as detailed within the Moorland Restoration & Management Plan

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Calculations and Report

Habitat Type	Distinctive-ness	Strategic Significance	Baseline Condition	Lost	Retained		Enhanced		Created		Target Condition	Notes
				Ha	Ha	BU	Ha	BU	Ha	BU		
Upland acid grassland	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Moderate	5.13	212.14	1951.73						
Upland acid grassland	Medium	Formally identified in local strategy	Poor	1.18	94.84	436.27						
Upland heathland	High	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Poor	0.00	6.90	41.39						
Sub-totals				25.19	810.22	3246.55	166.60	1698.44	30.48	2.58		
Total BU												4947.57
Total BNG %												10.81%

Irreplaceable habitats indicated in bold

Table 9.5 4-Summary of BNG for Watercourse Habitats

Habitat Type	Distinctive-ness	Strategic Significance	Baseline Condition	Lost	Retained		Enhanced		Created		Target Condition	Notes
				Ha	Ha	BU	Ha	BU	Ha	BU		
Other rivers and streams	High	'Formally identified in local strategy	Moderate	0	0.62	8.56	2.84	45.31	0	0		
Other rivers and streams	High	'Formally identified in local strategy	Fairly Good	0	0.57	9.83	0	0	0	0		
Sub-totals				0	1.19	18.39	2.84	45.31	0	0		
Total BU												63.69
Total BNG %												10.62%

4.2.3 Trading Rules

The proposed on-Site changes to the habitats result in the trading rules being passed.

Very High Distinctiveness Habitats

- Blanket bog has an overall positive Site wide change of 173.75 BU. This overall positive change is only for areas outside of the development footprint and does not account for any enhancement designed to account for the loss of blanket bog as per guidance for loss of irreplaceable habitats.
- Fens (upland and lowland) have no overall change within the Site.

High Distinctiveness Habitats

- Upland heath has no overall change within the Site.
- Other lowland mixed deciduous woodland has no overall change within the Site.
- Other rivers and streams has an overall positive Site wide change of 6.11 BU.

Medium Distinctiveness Habitats

- Other inland rock and scree have no overall change within the Site.
- Other upland acid grassland has an overall positive Site wide change of 412.61 BU.
- Other woodland; mixed has an overall positive Site wide change of 2.58 BU.
- Ponds (non-priority habitat) have no overall change within the Site.

Low Distinctiveness Habitats

- Bracken has no overall change within the Site.
- Modified grassland has an overall negative Site wide change of -106.28 BU. However, this loss is offset through the enhancement of other upland acid grassland from this habitat, as per requests from the Environment Agency and Natural England during the initial submission.

Very Low Distinctiveness Habitats

- Artificial unvegetated unsealed surface have no overall change within the Site.
- Developed land; sealed surface has no overall change within the Site.

4.2.4 Assumptions and criteria

The calculations above are based on both default assumptions that are built into the Metric and criteria/assumptions selected from a series of drop-down menus. They include the following for transparency:

Habitat Creation

- Condition Assessments are not required for urban habitats (including artificial unvegetated unsealed surface).
- Other woodland mixed will be created in poor condition with no minimum score required for this condition type.

Habitat Enhancement

- Blanket bog enhanced within the Site is proposed to be enhanced to be in 'Moderate' condition and must either pass a minimum of four condition criteria or, if the habitat fails criteria A or H, must pass a minimum of six condition criteria.
- Other upland acid grassland within the Site is proposed to be enhanced (from modified grassland in poor condition) to be in 'Good' condition which would require it to pass all five condition criteria.
- Other rivers and streams within the Site is proposed to be enhanced, on a minimum combined length of 2.84km, from moderate condition to 'Fairly good' condition by increasing the positive score for condition indicators B1, B2, C1 and C2. Fairly good has been selected as a precautionary approach instead of good condition as the measures required to achieve good condition, such as removal of bank reinforcement and improving the channel margin physical features, are unlikely to be possible.

5. Conclusions

The 1002.01ha baseline is dominated by blanket bog, other upland acid grassland and modified grassland. The Proposed Development results in a small loss of 25.19ha, which includes a loss of 16.84ha of blanket bog, which is classified as an irreplaceable habitat. In line with guidance, bespoke compensation has been developed within the Moorland Restoration & Management Plan to account for this loss of habitat.

The Proposed Development will increase the biodiversity units of the area through the enhancement of 116.7ha of poor-condition blanket bog to moderate-condition blanket bog, the enhancement of 49.49ha poor-condition modified grassland to good-condition other upland acid grassland and the creation of 0.67ha of creation of other mixed woodland.. The method of enhancement of these areas are outlined further within the Moorland Restoration and Management Plan (MRMP) and outline Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP), also submitted with the planning application.

The Proposed Development will increase the biodiversity units of the watercourse habitats through the enhancement of 2.84km of moderate-condition other rivers and streams to fairly-good condition habitat through riparian planting of shrubs, scrubs and trees along the bank tops and bank faces.

It has been demonstrated that the Proposed Development will achieve the minimum statutory requirement for biodiversity net gain, resulting in an overall biodiversity net gain for area habitats of **10.81%** and for watercourse habitats of **10.62%**

6. References

DEFRA (2025). Statutory biodiversity metric tools and guidance. Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs. Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>

Rochdale Core Strategy <https://www.rochdale.gov.uk/downloads/file/405/core-strategy>

Rossendale Local Plan 2019-2036

[https://www.rossendale.gov.uk/downloads/file/17076/rossendale local plan 2019 to 2036 - written statement](https://www.rossendale.gov.uk/downloads/file/17076/rossendale-local-plan-2019-to-2036-written-statement)

7. Figures

Figure 9-2 UKHab Baseline Figure

Figure 9-7 Proposed BNG Habitats

Appendices



Appendix A. Condition Assessment Habitats within the Site

Table 9.5 5-Condition Assessment Habitats within the Projects Assessment

Map Label	UKHab Code	UKHab Habitat Types	Condition Assessment	Justification
G1	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G10	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G11	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G12	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G13	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G14	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G16	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G17	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G19	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G20	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G23	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G24	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Pass a & c
G25	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Pass c, d & e
G26	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G27	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G28	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G8	g4	Modified grassland	Poor	Fails a, pass c, f & g
G100	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G15	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Good	Pass a, b, c, d & e
G18	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G2	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G21	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G22	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G29	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G3	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G30	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G300	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass b, c, d & e

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Calculations and Report

Map Label	UKHab Code	UKHab Habitat Types	Condition Assessment	Justification
G31	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G32	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, d & e
G33	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, d & e
G34	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass b, d & e
G35	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass d & e
G36	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass d & e
G37	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass d & e
G39	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Good	Pass all
G4	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G40	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, d & e
G41	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G42	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass d & e
G43	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass a, b & c
G44	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Good	Pass all
G45	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Good	Pass a, b, c, d & e
G46	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass c, d & e
G47	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass c, d & e
G49	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Pass d & e
G5	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass b, d & e
G50	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Poor	Passes b, d & e
G6	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass b, d & e
G7	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
G8	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, d & e
G9	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, d & e
Garn	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, c, d & e
Gat1	g1b6	Other upland acid grassland	Moderate	Pass a, b, d & e
He1	h1b5	Dry heaths uplands	Poor	Pass d, e, h & k
He2	h1b5	Dry heaths uplands	Poor	Pass b, d, g, h, i & j
He3	h1b5	Dry heaths uplands	Poor	Pass d, e, h, i, j & k
He4	h1b5	Dry heaths uplands	Poor	Pass d, e, f, h, i & j
He700	h1b5	Dry heaths uplands	Poor	Pass d, e, f, h, i & j

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Calculations and Report

Map Label	UKHab Code	UKHab Habitat Types	Condition Assessment	Justification
U1	s1d	Other inland rock and scree	Poor	Pass b & c
G48	g1b6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
B1	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
B10	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Poor	Pass c, d & e
B11	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Good	Pass a, c, d, e, f & h
B12	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Good	Pass a, c, d, e & f
B13	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e, f & h
B2	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Poor	Pass c, d & e
B3	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
B4	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Poor	Pass c, d & e
B5	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
B7	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
B8	f1a6	Degraded blanket bog	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
F1	f2f	Other wetlands	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
F2	f2f	Other wetlands	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
F3	f2f	Other wetlands	Good	Pass a, c, d, e & f
F4	f2f	Other wetlands	Moderate	Pass c, d, e & f
F5	f2f	Other wetlands	Poor	Pass c, d & e
F6	f2f	Other wetlands	Poor	Pass c, d & e
F7	f2f	Other wetlands	Poor	Pass c, d & e
F8	f2f	Other wetlands	Poor	Pass c, d & e
W1	w2c	Other coniferous woodland	Poor	Score: 17
W2	w2c	Other coniferous woodland	Poor	Score: 22
W3	w1f7	Other woodland mixed deciduous woodland	Moderate	Score: 28
W4	w2c	Other coniferous woodland	Poor	Score: 19

Table 9.5 6-Condition Assessment for watercourses within Site

Sub reach	Average of positive indicators	Average of negative indicators	River Type	Preliminary Condition Score	Final condition
River 1 Rochdale east	1.263	0.000	F - Straight/sinuuous, coarsest CO, average GP	1.263	Moderate
Lee Quarry Rochdale 1	1.053	0.000	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.053	Moderate
Lee Quarry Rochdale 2	1.211	-0.154	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.057	Moderate
Lee Quarry Rochdale 3	1.316	-0.154	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.62	Moderate
Cowpn Brook 1	1.158	-0.615	D - Straight/sinuuous to plane bed, coarsest BO/BE, average GP	0.543	Moderate
Cowpn Brook 2	1.474	-1.000	D - Straight/sinuuous to plane bed, coarsest BO/BE, average GP	0.474	Moderate
Cowpn Brook 3	1.263	0.000	D - Straight/sinuuous to plane bed, coarsest BO/BE, average GP	1.263	Moderate
Cowpn Brook 4	1.158	-0.154	D - Straight/sinuuous to plane bed, coarsest BO/BE, average GP	1.004	Moderate
Cowpn Brook 5	1.105	0.000	D - Straight/sinuuous to plane bed, coarsest BO/BE, average GP	1.105	Moderate
Prickshaw Brook 1	1.368	-0.692	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	0.676	Moderate
Prickshaw Brook 2	1.000	-0.615	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	0.385	Moderate
Prickshaw Brook 3	0.842	-0.308	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	0.534	Moderate
Prickshaw Brook 4	0.789	-0.533	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	0.251	Moderate
Fern Isle 1	1.211	-0.231	F - Straight/sinuuous, coarsest CO, average GP	0.980	Moderate
Fern Isle 2	0.789	0.000	F - Straight/sinuuous, coarsest CO, average GP	0.789	Moderate
Green Booth 1	1.263	-0.154	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.085	Moderate
Green Booth 2	1.526	0.000	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.526	Fairly good
Green Booth 3	1.316	-0.231	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.109	Moderate
Ding Clough 1	1.526	0.000	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.526	Fairly Good
Ding Clough 2	1.526	0.000	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.526	Fairly Good
Ding Clough 3	1.316	0.000	C - Straight/sinuuous to step-pool, coarsest BO/BE, average CO	1.316	Moderate

Scout Moor II

Headline Results

Scroll down for final results ⚠

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	Habitat units	4464.92	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	57.58	
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	4947.57	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	63.69	
On-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	482.65	10.81%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	6.11	10.62%
Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change (units & percentage)	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%
Combined net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	482.65	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	6.11	
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	

FINAL RESULTS				
Total net unit change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	482.65		
	Hedgerow units	0.00		
	Watercourse units	6.11		
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)	Habitat units	10.81%		
	Hedgerow units	0.00%		
	Watercourse units	10.62%		
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓			
Unacceptable loss of irreplaceable habitat recorded – no bespoke compensation for losses has been agreed ▲				
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	4464.92	4911.42	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	57.58	63.34	0.00
				No additional area habitat units required to meet target ✓
				No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
				No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓
Input errors/rule breaks present in metric ▲				

