

Manchester Road, Rochdale

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report

2026



Client EG On The Move Ltd

Project Title Manchester Road, Rochdale

Project Reference RHE.3706

Project Leader Simon Holden

Contact Details simon@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Isabella Ercole	Junior Ecologist	11/06/2026
Checker	Simon Holden	Regional Manager	31/07/2026
Reviewer			
Revision			



RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY

Manchester

0161 465 8971

The Stables, Paradise Wharf, Ducie
Street, Manchester. M1 2JN

manchester@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

West Devon

01822 752 054

PO Box 255, Tavistock, Devon.
PL19 1FU

devon@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

East Midlands

0115 678 1830

eastmidlands@rachelhackingecology.co.uk



RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY

Report Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methods	6
3. Results	8
4. Assessment	13
5. Recommendations	15
Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation	17
Appendix 2: Site Photographs	21
Appendix 3: BNG Headline Results	24
Appendix 4: Baseline and Post-development Habitat Plans	25

Executive Summary

Development Details

The client is proposing commercial development at Manchester Road, Rochdale hereafter referred to as the 'site'.

This report describes the ecological features of the site and its surroundings and assesses the potential impacts of the development on the ecological interest. Recommendations are provided so that the development is compliant with biodiversity policy and legislation.

Ecological Interest

The site has a moderate level of ecological interest. Ecological features of interest include other broadleaved woodland habitat (local level importance).

Outcomes

No further survey is required. The proposed development will result in the loss of broadleaved woodland and a predicted loss of -1.74 units (-62.74%). Landscaping could reduce the level of loss slightly but offsetting will be required to achieve 10% net gain.

Enhancement opportunities are identified.



1. Introduction

1.1 Project Brief

- 1.1.1 Rachel Hacking Ecology Limited (RHE) was commissioned in 2026 by EG On The Move Ltd (the Client) to carry out an Ecological Appraisal and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment of land at Manchester Road, Rochdale (the 'site'). The site is located at O.S. grid reference: SD 88767 11960 (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. Site location

- 1.1.2 The proposed development site comprises the development of a car park with EV bays for an existing service station.
- 1.1.3 The site is bordered by the A58 Manchester Road to the north, with broadleaved woodland to the west. The wider landscape is urban.

Description of Development

- 1.1.4 The development will involve a parcel of soft landscaping surrounding a roadside coffee shop to increase the size of the service station and add additional amenities. These amenities are additional parking, EV charging bays and a petrol station. Post development plans are contained in Appendix 4.

1.2 Scope of Work

- 1.2.1 The Client commissioned RHE to carry out the following works:
- Desk-based study to obtain details of designated sites, protected and notable species within a specified search area.
 - Record the extent, type, and condition of habitats within and next to the site.

- Calculate the baseline and post-development biodiversity units.
- Search for signs of protected species and assessment of the potential of habitats and features to support protected and notable species.

1.3 Site Visit Information

Surveyor Details

- 1.3.1 The site was visited by Jasmin West (Ecologist) on 2nd June 2026. Jasmin has two years' experience conducting habitat assessments

Weather

- 1.3.2 The weather at the time of the survey was clouded and mild, 17°C and overcast.



2. Methods

2.1 Desk Study

- 2.1.1 The Magic website (Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside) was interrogated for the presence of Statutory Designated Sites (and European Protected Species licences) within a 1km radius of the site.
- 2.1.2 The site was checked to determine if it is located within an Impact Risk Zones for any Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and if so, whether the Local Planning Authority will need to consult Natural England.
- 2.1.3 Greater Manchester Local Environmental Record Centre (GMLERC) was contacted to provide details of non-statutory designated sites and records of protected and notable species within a 1km radius of the site.

2.2 Field Survey

Habitat Survey

- 2.2.1 The site was walked over and the habitats and features of ecological interest were mapped and described according to the UK. Habitat Classification system¹. Habitats and features of particular interest were target noted.

2.3 Biodiversity Net Gain

- 2.3.1 During the site walkover the ecological condition of each habitat was assessed in accordance with the Defra (2024) guidelines².
- 2.3.2 Habitat data including type, area (or length), condition and strategic location were uploaded to the Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculator spreadsheet to determine the baseline value of the site. The extent of any habitats to be retained or enhanced was also entered into baseline worksheets.
- 2.3.3 The post-development masterplan was interrogated to determine areas of hard standing, buildings, and associated infrastructure. New, retained and enhanced habitats were classified and allocated a target condition, based on habitat type, location and management input. This information was uploaded to the metric spreadsheet to obtain a post-development value.

¹ UKHab-v2.01-July-2023-Final-2.pdf. at <http://UKhab.org>

² The_Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_-_User_Guide_.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)

- 2.3.4 The pre- and post-development values were compared to determine whether the yield of biodiversity units achieved a deficit or gain.

2.4 Mitigation Hierarchy

- 2.4.1 Mitigation measures should be embedded within the masterplan design and planning application process. Measures during the construction phases should be included in a Construction Environmental Management Plan: Biodiversity (CEMP). This process from proposal to implementation needs to consider the 'mitigation hierarchy' of avoid, reduce, compensate, and enhance:

- Aim to avoid negative effects through the design process.
- Mitigate if negative effects cannot be avoided.
- Use compensation measures to offset residual impacts.
- Identify and implement opportunities to enhance biodiversity.

3. Results

3.1 Survey Constraints

3.1.1 The site was fully accessible and there were no constraints to the survey.

3.2 Designated Sites

3.2.1 The desk study provided information on the statutory and non-statutory designated sites and these are listed below in Table 1.

3.2.2

Table 1. Designated Sites			
Name	Status	Location/distance	Interest
Rochdale Canal	SAC SSSI SBI	550m south	Rochdale Canal is known for its large population of floating water-plantain <i>Luronium natans</i> and its biodiverse water plant community.
Marland Wood	SBI	1.09km west	Marland Woodland is home to a diverse range of wildlife and butterflies.
Meadowcroft Wood	SBI	1.3km northwest	Ancient woodland
Springfield Wood	SBI	1.3km northwest	Ancient woodland
Meadow by Heywood Cemetery	SBI	1.8km	Grassland

3.2.3 The site is located within the Impact Risk Zones of Rochdale Canal SSSI. The proposed development will not require the Local Planning Authority to consult with Natural England.

3.3 Habitats

3.3.1 Survey photographs are contained in Appendix 2 and the habitats survey plan is contained in Appendix 4. Species abundance, if included, follows the DAFOR system (Dominant, Abundant,

Frequent, Occasional, Rare, Locally Dominant, Locally Abundant and Locally Frequent) and is provided in brackets after each species.

- 3.3.2 There are no irreplaceable habitats on site.

Developed Land; Sealed Surface

- 3.3.3 The majority of the site consists of developed land; sealed surface to the west (see Photograph 1), which contains three commercial buildings (visible in Photographs 2-4).

Developed Land; Unsealed Surface

- 3.3.4 A small, strip of developed land; unsealed surface buffers the broadleaved woodland and developed land sealed surface to the south and tall ruderal; ephemeral to the north.

Other Broadleaved Woodland

- 3.3.5 The second largest habitat, to the west of the site is a square parcel of plantation broadleaved woodland, with a footpath. The trees within the woodland are approximately 30-40 years old and species recorded include Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*, Poplar *Populus* sp., Beech *Fagus sylvatica* and Elder *Sambucus nigra*. Shrub layer is limited to Holly *Ilex aquifolium*. Ground layer comprises Common Ivy *Hedera helix*, Bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg., Bracken *Pteridium aquilinum* and Common Nettle *Urtica dioica*. The invasive species Japanese Knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* and Himalayan Balsam *Impatiens glandulifera* are present. Fly tipping is present throughout the habitat as seen in Photograph 5. The woodland is in moderate condition (scoring 27 out of a possible 39 points).

Modified Grassland

- 3.3.6 A U-shaped parcel of modified grassland borders the site in the north and the west. Species recorded include Perennial Rye-grass *Lolium perenne*, Broadleaved Dock *Rumex obtusifolius*, Broadleaved Plantain *Plantago major* and Dandelion *Taraxacum* agg.

Tall Ruderal; Ephemeral

- 3.3.7 A small parcel of ruderal; ephemeral vegetation lies in the north of the site, buffering the modified grassland and broadleaved woodland habitats. Species include Creeping Buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, Cleavers *Galium aparine*, Herb Robert *Geranium robertianum*, Yorkshire Fog *Holcus lanatus* and Rosebay Willowherb *Chamaenerion angustifolium*.

Individual Trees

- 3.3.8 Three individual Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* trees were recorded during the survey. T1 is located in the parcel of tall ruderal; ephemeral. T2 and T3 are located in the eastern section of modified grassland.

Introduced Shrub

- 3.3.9 A section of introduced shrub lies within the eastern section of modified grassland, bounding T2.



3.4 Species

Invertebrates

- 3.4.1 The desk study returned 5 records of Insect species between 2019 and 2024 with the closest record being 0.18km away from the site
- 3.4.2 The woodland on site offers potential nesting habitat for common, urban invertebrate species. This group is not considered further.

Amphibians

- 3.4.3 There are no ponds within 250m of the site, therefore the site is unlikely to support amphibians, including Great Crested Newt *Triturus cristatus*. Amphibians are not considered further.

Birds

- 3.4.4 The desk study returned 100 records of Bird species Between 2016 and 2023, including Song thrush *Turdus philomelos*, Dunnock *Prunella modularis*, Starling *Sturnus vulgaris*, House Sparrow *Passer domesticus*, Herring Gull *Larus argentatus* and Bullfinch *Pyrrhula pyrrhula* with the closest record being 0.22km away from the site.
- 3.4.5 The woodland on site offers potential nesting habitat for common, urban bird species.

Badger

- 3.4.6 The desk study returned 4 records of Badger *Meles meles* between 2018 and 2020 with the closest record being 0.36km away from the site.
- 3.4.7 No evidence of Badger was recorded. The site is not considered to be suitable habitat for Badgers, despite the presence of broadleaved woodland, due to the urban surroundings and high levels of disturbance.

Bats

- 3.4.8 The desk study returned 10 records of Common Pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* between 2017 and 2025, with the closest record being 0.29km away from the site.
- 3.4.9 Two retail buildings and a metal canopy are located on the site; a Spar retail unit to the north of the site and a forecourt canopy.
- 3.4.10 The property has a metal canopy supported by steel frames above the fuel dispensing pumps. This is in good condition and appears to be well sealed. It is constructed from materials of poor thermal capacity which are unlikely to provide suitable shelter for bats (see Photograph 2).
- 3.4.11 The retail unit and coffee shop are constructed from brick which is in good condition which no damaged bricks or missing mortar for bats to utilize (see Photographs 3 and 4). The windows and doors, including the frames, are all intact, with no missing panes.
- 3.4.12 The roofs of the buildings are flat with metal capping. This is flush and appears to be well-sealed.

- 3.4.13 No suitable roosting habitat was found in any of the external structures. The structures on site offer negligible suitability for roosting bats.
- 3.4.14 No Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) were identified on the trees on site. The woodland on site offers bat foraging habitat but given its location it is likely to only be used by Common Pipistrelle and is unlikely to be important in maintaining the favourable conservation status of any local bat populations.

Hedgehog

- 3.4.15 The desk study returned 8 records of Hedgehog *Erinaceus europaeus* between 2018 and 2022 with the closest record being 0.54km away from the site.
- 3.4.16 The woodland offers suitable habitat for Hedgehog.

Plants

- 3.4.17 The desk study returned one record of Marsh Stitchwort *Stellaria palustris* in 2023, 0.47km away from the site.
- 3.4.18 No rare plants were recorded on site.

3.5 Invasive Species

- 3.5.1 The desk study returned no records of invasive species within the search area.
- 3.5.2 Japanese Knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* and Himalayan Balsam *Impatiens glandulifera* were recorded behind the retail unit.
- 3.5.3 During a previous habitat assessment in 2023, Japanese Rose *Rosa rugosa* was also recorded on site.

3.6 Biodiversity Net Gain

- 3.6.1 Table 2. provides a summary of the baseline habitat units. The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) headline results can be seen in Appendix 3. Please refer to the metric for further details of the baseline habitats and BNG scores (*RHE.3706. The BNG Statutory Metric – Manchester Road Rochdale 2026*).

<i>Table 2 Baseline Habitat Units</i>			
Habitat	Area (ha)	Condition	Units
Broadleaved Woodland	0.274	Moderate	2.19
Developed Land; Sealed Surface	0.245	N/A - Other	0.00
Modified Grassland	0.039	Moderate	0.16
Tall Ruderal; Ephemeral	0.014	Poor	0.03
Developed Land; Unsealed Surface	0.006	N/A - Other	0.00
Individual Trees	0.0489	Moderate	0.39
Total	0.63		2.77

3.6.2 The baseline habitat value within the red line development area is 2.77 area units and no hedgerow or watercourse units.

4. Assessment

4.1 Development Context

4.1.1 The following is based on the provided layout plan (see Appendix 4).

4.2 Impacts on Designated Sites

4.2.2 No impacts on designated sites are anticipated given the distances involved and the lack of impact pathways.

4.3 Impacts on Habitats

4.3.1 The proposals will result in the loss of 0.2ha of 'other broadleaved woodland'. This would be a permanent adverse impact significant at the local level.

4.3.2 One Sycamore tree would be lost – this would be adverse and significant at the site level only. Impacts to other habitats would be of negligible significance.

4.3.3 Retained woodland could be negatively impacted by the use of heavy machinery during development without mitigation.

4.4 Biodiversity Net Gain (post-development)

4.4.1 The plans propose the addition of soft landscaping features on site to offset the removal of broadleaved woodland, tall ruderal; ephemeral and modified grassland, however woodland loss cannot be compensated on site.

4.4.2 The post-development value of the site is summarised in Table 3 and Table 4 below:

<i>Table 3 Post-development Habitat Units</i>			
Habitat	Area(ha)	Condition	Units
Broadleaved Woodland	0.077	Moderate	0.62
Developed Land; Sealed Surface	0.469	N/A - Other	0.00
Modified Grassland	0.0373	Moderate	0.15
Tall Ruderal; Ephemeral	0.004	Poor	0.02
Developed Land; Unsealed Surface	0	N/A - Other	0.00

Individual Trees	0.0326	Moderate	0.26
------------------	--------	----------	------

Table 4 showing a summary of the Biodiversity Changes on site.

Metric section	Units Achieved					Results	
	Baseline	Post-development				Change in Units	Percentage Change
		Retained	Enhanced	Created	Total		
Habitat Units	2.77	0.38	0	0.02	0.4	-1.74	-62.74%

Summary of Net Change

- 4.4.3 The baseline value of the site is 2.77 habitat units. The post-development value of the site is 1.03 habitat units. The resulting net change is -1.74 habitat units, equivalent to -62.74% Biodiversity Net Gain. Trading Rules have not been met due to the loss of woodland (medium distinctiveness).

4.5 Impacts on Species

Birds

- 4.5.1 Removal of woodland and trees could result in impacts to nesting birds, should these be present.

Bats

- 4.5.2 Loss of woodland and increased lighting are likely to reduce the availability of foraging habitat. This would be significant at the site level only. The surroundings are already lit due to main roads and Common Pipistrelle is tolerant of artificial lighting.

Hedgehog

- 4.5.3 Hedgehogs could be harmed during site clearance and construction, should they be present.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Further Surveys

- 5.1.1 No further surveys are required.

5.2 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

- 5.2.1 Protection of ecological features (habitats and species) during the construction phase will be described in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Mitigation measures to protect, maintain and enhance ecological features during the operational phase of development will be described in a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP). Management Plans will contain Operational Aims and Objectives, Rationale for management, Prescriptions and schedules detailing the timing and responsibility for delivering the prescriptions. It is anticipated that the CEMP and HMMP will be provided as a planning condition in advance of the commencement of the proposed development.

Habitats

- 5.2.2 Retained woodland should be protected during construction by a Tree Protection Plan.
- 5.2.3 Landscaping should include trees and a range of shrubs to provide pollen, nectar and fruits.

Nesting Birds

- 5.2.4 Impacts on nesting birds should be avoided by carrying out site clearance and similar operations outside of the bird breeding season (March- August). If vegetation has to be cleared during the bird breeding season checks immediately before clearance by a suitably qualified ecologist will be required. If nesting activity is detected work in that area will need to stop until the ecologist considers that nesting activity is finished.
- 5.2.5 Bird boxes should be installed on nearby trees and buildings to ensure nesting habitat is retained.

Bats

- 5.2.6 Broadleaved woodland habitat that is removed on site should be supervised by a suitably qualified ecologist. The individual tree removed on site (T1), should be assessed for potential roosting features, and if they are present mitigation will be required.
- 5.2.7 Bat boxes should be installed in retained woodland to enhance roosting opportunities.

Hedgehogs and other mammals

- 5.2.8 To ensure that Hedgehogs and other small mammals are not trapped or harmed during the construction work, smaller excavations should be covered if left overnight. Larger excavations, if left overnight or for longer periods, should be ramped to enable animals to escape.

5.3 Invasive Species

- 5.3.1 Measures to avoid the spread of Japanese Knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Rose during construction should be provided in the CEMP. It is recommended that a specialist contractor is employed to provide this service.

5.4 Biodiversity Net Gain

- 5.4.1 The assessment shows there will be a net loss of biodiversity units. To meet mandatory requirements a further 2.01 habitat units will be required. At least 1.71 units of broadleaved woodland (or other habitat of medium distinctiveness or higher) will be required to meet trading rules. Landscaping refinements could reduce the shortfall but it will not be possible to achieve 10% on site and therefore offsetting will be required by purchasing units from a habitat bank.

Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) describes the Government's planning policy for England and how it should be applied. Within this framework, the requirements in relation to biodiversity are included within several policies. The two most relevant to individual planning decisions are Paragraphs 187, 192 and 193, shown below:

- 187. Planning policies 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;
 - 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 and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs;
 - e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and
 - f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.
- 192. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:
 - 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.
- 193. When determining planning applications, 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 reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- 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.

Legislation

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CROW Act 2000) includes the notification and confirmation of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). SSSIs can be notified for their floral, faunal, geological, or physiographical features. Protection against damaging operations and management of SSSIs is also included within the Act. Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) are zones around an SSSI account for the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and identify development proposal which could have adverse impacts.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CROW Act 2000) protects native animals, plants and habitats. Under the Act it is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild animal listed on Schedule 5 and it is an offence to interfere with places used for shelter or protection, or intentionally disturb animals occupying such places. The Act prohibits picking, uprooting or destroy any wild plant (or any attached seed or spore) listed in Schedule 8.

European Protected Species (EPS) such as bats, Hazel Dormouse, Otter, Natterjack Toad, Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Great Crested Newt are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CROW Act 2000) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The Acts make it an offence to:

- a) Deliberately capture, injure or kill an EPS;

- b) Deliberately impair an EPS's ability to survive, breed, reproduce, rear or nurture young; to hibernate or migrate; or significantly affect the local distribution or abundance of the EPS.
- c) Possess or control live or dead EPS or any part of, or anything derived from a EPS;
- d) Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of an EPS;
- e) Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any place that is used for shelter or protection by an EPS;
- f) Intentionally or recklessly disturb a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection that is occupied by an EPS.

All common herptiles are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRoW Act 2000). Grass Snake, Slow Worm, Common Lizard, Adder are protected against intentional killing or injury. Common Frog, Common Toad, Smooth Newt and Palmate Newt is protected against sale. In addition, all British reptiles, Common toad and Great Crested Newt are listed as Species of Principal Importance.

All nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). It is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or take, damage, or destroy its nest whilst in use or being built, or take or destroy its eggs. It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb a species listed on Schedule 1 of the Act while they are nest building or at or near a nest with eggs or young, or to disturb the dependent young.

The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 makes it an offence to wilfully, or to attempt to kill, injure, take, possess or cruelly ill-treat a Badger, or intentionally or recklessly interfere with a sett. Interference of a sett includes disturbing Badgers during occupation of a sett, or damaging or destroying a sett, or obstructing access to the sett.

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 places a duty on every public authority to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Section 41 of the same Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitats that are of 'Principal Importance' for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The Secretary of State must take steps, as appear reasonably practicable, to further the conservation of those living organisms and habitats in any list published under this section. The list of species and habitats of principal importance currently includes 943 species and 56 habitats. These are the species and habitats found in England which are regarded as conservation priorities under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework

The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 protect 'important' hedgerows from destruction or damage. A hedgerow is 'important' if it (a) has existed for 30 years or more; and (b) satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of



Schedule 1 of the Regulations. Under the Regulations, it is against the law to remove or destroy 'important' hedgerows unless permitted by the local planning authority.

The Environment Act 2021 makes it mandatory for housing and development, subject to some narrow exemptions, to achieve at least a 10% net gain in value for biodiversity – a requirement that habitats for wildlife must be left in a measurably better state than before the development. Developers must submit a 'biodiversity gain plan' alongside usual planning application documents. The local authority must assess whether the 10% net gain requirement is met in order to approve the biodiversity gain plan.

The Environment Act 2021 strengthens the duty on public authorities (NERC Act, 2006) to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity.

The Environment Act 2021 amends the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to introduce an additional purpose for granting a protected species licence in relation to development, 'for reasons of overriding public interest', and two additional tests for the granting of such licences: that there is 'no other satisfactory solution' and that granting the licence is 'not detrimental to the survival of any the population of the species concerned'. These changes will reduce the scope for unlicensed activities to provide clear safeguards before licences can be granted, providing legal certainty and clarity to developers about their environmental obligations.

Appendix 2: Site Photographs

Table 1 Survey Photographs		
Image Number	Notes	Image
1	Developed land; sealed surface	
2	Building 1	
3	Building 2	

4	Building 3	
5	Plantation Broadleaved Woodland	
6	Modified Grassland	

7	Tall Ruderal Ephemeral	
---	---------------------------	--

Appendix 3: BNG Headline Results

On-site baseline					
	Habitat units	2.77			
	Hedgerow units	0.00			
	Watercourse units	0.00			
On-site post-intervention (Including habitat retention, creation & enhancement)					
	Habitat units	1.03			
	Hedgerow units	0.00			
	Watercourse units	0.00			
On-site net change (units & percentage)					
	Habitat units	-1.74	-62.74%	On-site net gain is less than target set ▲	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%		
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%		
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	-1.74			
	Hedgerow units	0.00			
	Watercourse units	0.00			
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	-1.74			
	Hedgerow units	0.00			
	Watercourse units	0.00			
Total net % change (Including all on-site & off-site habitat retention, creation & enhancement)					
	Habitat units	-62.74%	Total net gain achieved is less than target set ▲		
	Hedgerow units	0.00%			
	Watercourse units	0.00%			
Trading rules satisfied?					No - Check Trading Summaries ▲
Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit	
Habitat units	10.00%	2.77	3.04	2.01	
Hedgerow units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional hedgerow units required to meet target ✓
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	No additional watercourse units required to meet target ✓

Appendix 4: Baseline and Post-development Habitat Plans







