Playing Fields Holt Lane SWT Comments

Date: 21st May 2026
Application Reference: SMD/2025/0305
Location: Playing Fields Holt LaneProposed Development: Erection of 9no. bungalows: 4no. for the over 55s and 5no. Standard market

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust has been asked to review the above application as part of a service level agreement with Staffordshire Moorlands District Council to provide ecology advice regarding planning and development management functions.

We received further documents and the previous comments have been updated in light of these. The updated comments were updated in blue in December 2025. Further documents were submitted in January 2026 and subsequent comments are in green. Further documents were submitted in 2026 and subsequent emails also provided further detail - comments relating to these are in purple. New documents submitted July comments in red.

Documents Viewed:

- Application form
- Existing site layout, Hammonds Construction Ltd, April 2024
- Proposed Site Layout Plan, Hammonds Construction Ltd, June 2025
- Proposed Site Location Plan, Hammonds Construction Ltd, June 2025
- Planning Statement, Byall Oliver Limited, 21st June 2025
- Biodiversity Net Gain Statement, UES, 25th July 2025
- Biodiversity Net Gain Completed Metric
- Biodiversity Net Gain Condition Assessment
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, UES, 23rd September 2024
- 20251128 BNG Biodiversity Metric - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- 20251128 Condition Assessments - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- 20251128 UES BNG Biodiversity Statement - Development North of Holt lane, Kingsley
- 20251128 UES HMMP - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- 20251128 UES PEA - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- HMMP checklist UES 07/01/2026
- UES HMMP - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley UES04545/06 V2 8th January 2026
- 20260105 BNG Biodiversity Metric - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- 20260105 Condition Assessments - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley
- 20260105 UES BNG Biodiversity Statement - Development North of Holt lane, Kingsley
- 20260105 UES BNG Biodiversity Statement - Development North of Holt lane, Kingsley V5 10th March 2026

- BNG Biodiversity Metric - Development North of Holt Lane, Kingsley 04.03.26, Matthew Inthone Chao
- Site Layout Plan – Proposed – Scheme 8 Bungalow Development, June 2025, 6060-020
- Email correspondence compliance with biodiversity gain hierarchy 11th May 2026
- Draft Application Form (not yet appearing on planning portal)

Summary: We have no objections, subject to the conditions at the end of this document. Please note BNG is a pre-commencement condition and, although this is being provided offsite, a gain plan will need to be submitted to discharge this condition.

- The published date of the metric used is listed as 30/08/2024, this is not a date that the metric was published. Minimum validation requirement not met. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is resolved
- The pre-development biodiversity value is dated for 30/08/2024, this is before the date that the application was submitted. This date should have been agreed between the person writing the biodiversity gain plan and the LPA with reasoning given for an earlier date on the application form please provide evidence of this agreement. Alternatively, the date that the application was submitted should be given. Minimum validation requirement not met. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is resolved
- Biodiversity value incorrect on the application form. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is not resolved. This is resolved

For completeness previous requests that are now resolved are included below:

- Please provide details of how off-site BNG is to be delivered. Unsure where to find this, it is not in the BNG statement – please tell us where it is or provide these details. This is not resolved. This is resolved.
- Please either change the plans so that a priority pond can be delivered or change the type of pond in the metric to one which is achievable. This is not resolved. This is resolved.
- Please provide a draft HMMP which includes remedial measures for if the enhanced grassland does not reach condition and also maintenance to ensure the priority pond meets all of the criteria in the habitat condition assessment. Please provide evidence that the pond will met the criteria required and have semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter. The HMMP does not use the standard Natural England template. Please complete the Natural England checklist to show what is included. The checklist has been provided and this and the HMMP need to be reviewed in more detail after clarification has been made regarding the proposed habitats and our queries answered. Due to the requirement for a response ASAP, we will need to look at the HMMP at a later date and it makes sense that this is after on-site habitats have been confirmed.

- We do not believe it is possible to create a priority pond as er UKHab definition and we would strongly advise that SMDC do not enter a legal agreement unless the metric and plans are changed to deliver a much more achievable non-priority pond. This will result in a minimal change to the on-site BNG achieved.
- The BNG metric states that the pond '*A newly created pond will be created within the northern section of the site. It is expected to pass all condition criteria'*. This is not possible and needs to be amended as criteria B cannot be achieved.
- Please see comments relating to the trees in the grassland meeting the UKHab definition for woodland in their current placement and the difficulty in creating good quality ONG under a tree canopy. The plans should be updated to create either grassland or woodland.
  This is resolved.
- It appears information regarding badgers has been removed from the PEA, please provide an unredacted version. This is resolved

Further detail

We have been supplied with further information and been informed that the 10% biodiversity net gain will be secured through the purchase of off-site units.

Application Form

Predevelopment biodiversity value is 1 and the date this was calculated is 30/08/2024. This is prior to the date that the application form was submitted, which is dated 22/06/2025. Please supply evidence that this earlier date has been agreed between the person who will be writing the biodiversity gain plan and the LPA with reasoning given for an earlier date on the application form. Alternatively, the date that the application was submitted should be given. Please correct, this is a minimum validation requirement as per the BNG PPG. This application should not have been validated. In addition, the BNG report stated the biodiversity value is 4.09 habitat units and 0.91 hedgerow units, therefore the value on the application form is incorrect.

The date that the version of the metric was published is also given as 30/08/2024. This is not any date that the statutory biodiversity net gain metric was published. Please correct, this is a minimum validation requirement as per the BNG PPG. This application should not have been validated.

This is outstanding and needs to be resolved. This is resolved

BNG

Some of the grassland is being enhanced from poor condition modified grassland to good condition other neutral grassland. Modified grassland usually occurs on enriched soils but this is a former playing field and there is other neutral grassland already adjacent to the modified grassland. Having spoken to the Ecologist, they feel that this is achievable on this site. In the HMMP, we would like to see remedial measures put in

place to ensure that the target condition is reached within the 15 years allowed in the metric.

We would like to see details of the planned pond to check that it is capable of becoming a priority pond in good condition. It would need to pass all 9 of the criteria. This includes:

- Good water quality with no signs of pollution
- There is semi-natural habitat completely surrounding the pond for at least 10m from the ponds edge
- Less than 10% of surface covered by duckweed or filamentous algae
- No dams, pumps or pipework
- Absence of non-native plants and animals
- Not artificially stocked with fish
- Emergent, submerged or floating plants cover at least 50% of the pond area
- Pond surface no more than 50% shaded but adjacent trees and scrub.

Currently the plans do not allow the second criteria to be met. Plans should be changed to allow at least 10 m of seminatural habitat around the whole of the pond, or the pond type changed on the metric and report. Plans should also show no pipework going to the pond and there should be evidence that polluted water will not runoff into the pond to maintain good water quality and discourage duckweed and filamentous algae. We have not received evidence that this is resolved. This is resolved.

Ponds

We are concerned that:
a) the pond cannot meet all of the habitat condition criteria (as stated in the metric) due t the site layout and'
b) the pond will not become a priority pond as defined un UKHabs.

The BNG metric stated that this is a priority pond expected to reach moderate condition, the notes in the metric state '*A newly created pond will be created within the northern section of the site. It is expected to pass all condition criteria*.'. This is not possible with the plans as they are as they will fail to meet the criteria B that states 'there is semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above) completely surrounding the pond, for at least 10m from the pond edge for its entire perimeter.'. The habitat creation plan in the BNG Biodiversity statement shows modified grassland immediately adjacent to the pond and built up areas and gardens within 10 m – neither of these are semi-natural habitat (moderate distinctiveness or above), so the pond, as it stands cannot meet this criteria.

It is also unclear why a priority pond is being created when changing this to a non-priority pond – which is more achievable will result an a 0.01% reduction in change in habitat units from 0.046% to 0.045% but will be much less scrutinised. Th be a priority pond, it must meet the definition in the UKHabs handbook V2. This is:

'Permanent and seasonal standing water bodies that are <2ha in extent and meet one or more of the following criteria:

(1) Habitats of international importance: Ponds that meet criteria under Annex 1 of the Habitats Directive.
(2) Support species of high conservation importance: Red data book species; UK BAP species; species fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act – Schedules 5 and 8; Habitats Directive Annex 2 species; a nationally Scarce wetland plant species; or three Nationally Scarce aquatic Invertebrate Species.
(3) Exceptional assemblages if key biotic groups: Ponds supporting exceptional populations or numbers of key species. Based on (i) criteria specified in guidelines for the selection of biological SSSIs (currently amphibians and dragonflies only), and (iii) exceptionally rich sites for plants or invertebrates (i.e. supporting >30 wetland plant species or >50 aquatic macroinvertebrate species)
(4) Ponds of high ecological quality: Ponds classified in the top PSYM category ("high") for ecological quality (i.e. having a PSYM score ≥75%). [PSYM (the Predictive SYstem for Multimetrics) is a method for assessing the biological quality of still waters in England and Wales; plant species and / or invertebrate families are surveyed using a standard method; the PSYM model makes predictions for the site based on environmental data and using a minimally impaired pond dataset; comparison of the prediction and observed data gives a % score for ponds quality].
(5) *Other important ponds: Individual ponds or groups of ponds with a limited geographic distribution recognised as important because of their age, rarity of type or landscape context (e.g. pingos, duneslack ponds, machair ponds).'*

It is highly unlikely that a pond can be created meeting UKHabs propriety ponds definition and specialist Ecologists with appropriate licences would be required to carry out surveys - if protected species are present. Given the extra habitat complexity when compared to a non-priority pond, extra survey effort and expertise required and low chance of success, we would recommend that the applicant aims for a non-priority pond which would result in a difference in the %ang habitat change of 0.01%; we would also recommend that SMDC do not enter into a legal agreement to deliver a priority pond as government guidance on legal agreements for BNG recommends '*LPAs and responsible bodies should not enter into an agreement if they do not think the landowner will meet their obligations*'.

The UKHab definition for non-priority ponds is '*standing water bodies that are <2ha in extent and that do not meet the criteria for Priority Habitats ponds (see 40).'*. We believe this is achievable.

Other Neutral Grassland

The other neutral grassland and modified grassland will be enhanced to other neutral grassland in good condition. The Ecologists have verbally communicated that they think

that the soil where there is currently modified grassland is of sufficient quality to create other neutral grassland of good condition. Usually we would require a soil test to prove this but, given the close proximity to existing other neutral grassland and use as a sports pitch (therefore it is not expected that herbicides have been applied), and assurances from the Ecologists, we have not asked for soil testing. There should, however be remedial measures in place for soil testing, and potentially replacing the soil if the habitat that the Ecologists believe is achievable is not achieved e.g. x grassland species do not grow or percentage cover of course grasses or plants such as nettles or docs that indicate enrichment. We recommend that, in the absence of soil testing, the S106 accounts for this and ensures that funds are available for such remedial measures. In addition to the lack of soil testing, we are concerned with the plans to plant trees amongst the other neutral grassland as the shading and further enrichment from annual leaf fall will impact the quality of the grassland. Looking at the placing of the trees, number of trees, size of trees currently surrounding the site, it is suspected that, in time, some of the areas of other neutral grassland will be completely shaded – as an example (and without having access to exact plans) the triangle of other neutral grassland in the north eastern area of the site is approximately 389m^2, it is to have 4 small trees planted within it, these are 163m^2 when they are small, if these trees grow to the size of a medium tree, the area would be 651m^2 so the grassland would be completely shaded. In addition to this, the UKHab definition for broadleaved and mixed woodland is >25% cover and the definition for grassland is *'>75% herbaceous (grasses, sedges, rushes, ferns and forbs) rather than woody'*, so, even small trees this would meet the criteria for woodland. We would therefore recommend that either the grassland type and / or condition are amended or fewer trees are planted in this area. Woodland would mean that the trading rules for the metric are not met for a moderate distinctiveness habitat. We suspect that the trees planted down the eastern side of the site on other neutral grassland would have similar measurements /outcomes on habitats to be created.

We would recommend that soil testing is done to ensure soils are suitable for creating other neutral grassland in good condition, largely because the cost of these is far less than remedial measures if it is not delivered.

In addition, although trees are required to mitigate for the loss of 4 trees; these should not be planted in the other neutral grassland to the extent that the habitat will not meet the basic UKHab grassland definition and meet the woodland definition. Removing the urban trees to be planted from the metric would result in an overall change of - 3.80% - a net loss in biodiversity.

Both habitats removed from plans - this is resolved.

The applicant has removed several proposed habitats from the plans. We have received reasoning for this via email correspondence dated 11th May. This explains considerations that have gone into providing the habitats and why, ultimately, they are

dropped and the applicant is to buy off-site BNG units. This demonstrated compliance with the net gain hierarchy.

Off-Site BNG

As not all of the BNG will be delivered on-site, some will need to be supplied elsewhere. Please provide details of how this is to be achieved. This is important as, if a S106 is required on blue line boundary land, this will need to be put in place before a planning decision can be reached. This is not resolved. This is resolved – we have been told that the applicant is buying off-site BNG units.

We have insufficient information to consider whether the Biodiversity Gain Condition is capable of being discharged. Significant on-site BNG needs to be managed and monitored for 30 years, to enable a S106 to be set up to enable the LPA to monitor this, details of the monitoring and management are required. To enable us to do this for this application, we require the following information:

- Draft HMMP to allow S106 to be set. This should use the Natural England template and detailing management to create desired habitat, timings of when you would expect to see certain conditions and remedial measures for if things do not go to plan (especially for the poor condition Modified Grassland being enhanced to good condition Other Neutral Grassland). It should also include measures recommended in the PEA regarding pruning.
- Detail in the LEMP of the creation of suitable ground conditions for the habitats that are being created
- You may wish to submit a draft Biodiversity Gain Plan to provide evidence that the trading rules / net gain hierarchy etc have been met, however we are not insisting on this at this stage – this will be required as a pre-commencement condition

HMMP

A draft HMMP has been provided. It does not follow the Natural England HMMP template which would be preferable. There are sections such as the risk register and remedial measures which are set out in an easy to read way in the Natural England template. As the standard template has not been used, please complete the Natural England HMMP checklist to ensure that everything required is included in the HMMP provided. Targets set should be specific to the monitoring year and habitat type – e.g. at the moment it is unclear which of the grassland criteria would be expected to be met after year 1 etc. and, as an example, for grassland should set out target species expected to be present after years 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 etc., sword height (for the time of year). If the soil type is not known (the assumption is based on map data not on-site sampling), we would expect soil samples to be taken to determine the best seed mix for the soil type on site. Any delay in setting seed due to allowing for soil sampling should be reflected in the metric.

We do not believe a priority pond (UKHab definition) is capable of being delivered and strongly suggest this is replaced with a much more achievable non-priority pond. We have not looked at the HMMP in detail as our comments regarding the pond / grassland need to be resolved and this may result in changes to the HMMP.

The draft HMMP will now not be applicable to the new plans. As per net gain guidance, all significant habitats on-site will need to be secured with a planning condition or S106 and will need a HMMP. This would include all medium distinctiveness habitats; this could include scrub, some hedgerows and trees depending upon the finalised agreed plans. We are happy that these could either be included in a HMMP or LEMP as they are relatively low maintenance. We would expect these to include details listed in Natural England's checklist for a HMMP which ensures management and monitoring for 30 years. This should include details of ground preparation / habitat creation (planting / spacing etc.) specific targets for each of the years on the monitoring schedule and details of remedial measures if these targets are not being met and have a post development habitat plan. This is resolved – offsite BNG

Monitoring Reports

Further detail to be provided on what should be included in the monitoring report and whether it would be based on the Natural England templates e.g. photos showing the habitats. See comments above, photographs should be included. This is resolved – offsite BNG

Off-site delivery of BNG

- If the BNG is being delivered off-site then some detail on how this may be achieved, especially if this is on blue line boundary land a S106 would need to be set up to secure the BNG.

A condition or S106 will be needed to secure the monitoring of 30 years of management and monitoring after the development has finished. This needs to be agreed with the LPA prior to determination. This condition or S106 agreement should either include the approval of the HMMP or this could be approved in a separate condition. Ideally this should include measures of success and remedial measures if things are not going to plan. We would need to see details of this to determine whether enough measures are in place to ensure that at least 10% BNG is delivered 30 years after development has finished.

We would recommend that you should consider whether the Biodiversity Gain Condition is capable of being discharged when creating the HMMP, as, if the Biodiversity Gain Condition cannot be discharged and changes need to be made to any plans, the HMMP may need to be adjusted to accommodate this.

The applicant has confirmed that BNG will be delivered off-site by purchasing biodiversity units. Clarification has been given as to why on-site units are no longer being provided. This is resolved

PEA

RAMs for badgers are mentioned, however they are not in the version of the PEA that we have. These should be provided along with any other omitted details regarding badgers. This is resolved – RAMs to be implemented and conditioned.

Conditions

Please see comments above regarding HMMP / LEMP – conditions should try to reduce repetition of detail.

Pre-commencement

Bats and Nocturnal Wildlife

A sensitive nocturnal lighting scheme should be secured through a pre-commencement planning condition. Any external nocturnal lighting both during and after construction should be designed in line with guidance from the BCT on Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night. Lighting should include cowls / hoods or shields, operational timers and use a lighting spectrum ideally below 2700K. This should avoid overspill onto the vegetation, with particular reference to the line of trees along the eastern site boundary and hedgerows. The strategy shall:

a) identify features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats and other nocturnal species and that are likely to cause disturbance to them in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for instance for foraging,
b) Cater for other species such as badger and otters that are sensitive to light pollution; and
c) show how and where external lighting will be installed (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. Under no circumstances should any other external lighting be installed without prior consent from the local planning authority.

Reason: *to comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Biodiversity Duty*

(NERC Act Section 40), NPPF, local plan policy NE1. Many species protected by wildlife legislation are active at night (e.g. bats, badgers and otters are sensitive to light pollution. The introduction of artificial light might mean such species are disturbed / discouraged from using their breeding or resting places.

Bat and Bird Boxes / Ecological Measures

A pre-commencement condition detailing the number, type and citing of bird boxes and bricks, bat boxes and hedgehog boxes along with installation instructions to be submitted to and agreed by the LPA Ecologist. All bat and bird boxes should be made of woodcrete or a similar material to ensure longevity. Plans should also provide provisions for hedgehog highways allowing hedgehogs to move freely between the gardens.

Reason: *to comply with wildlife legislation including the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Biodiversity Duty (NERC Act Section 40), NPPF, local plan policy NE1, the National Design Guide and Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide 18 SPD*

HMMP

The development shall not commence until a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (the HMMP) for all on-site significant habitats is produced, prepared in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan using the Natural England template / checklist and including:

- a non-technical summary;
- the roles and responsibilities of the people or organisation(s) delivering the [HMMP];
- the planned habitat creation and enhancement works to create or improve habitat to achieve the biodiversity net gain in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan;
- the management measures to maintain habitat in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Gain Plan for a period of 30 years from the completion of development; and
- the monitoring methodology and frequency in respect of the created or enhanced habitat to be submitted to the local planning authority,

Reason: *To ensure mandatory biodiversity net gain is delivered as part of the development, in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 7a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), local plan policy NE1, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the national design guide.*

CEMP

No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management plan (CEMP) has been submitted to the local planning authority (LPA) this must include:

- Risk assessments of potentially damaging construction activities.
- Identification of biodiversity protection zones including RPAs.

- Practical measures during construction to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided by method statements).
- The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity.
- The times during construction works when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works.
- Responsible persons and lines of communication
- The role and responsibilities of an ecological clerk of works or similar competent person.
- Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.
- Pollution protection measures for woodland – reducing dust / runoff

The CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the LPA. There are further details below with RAMs which should be included in the CEMP.

RAMs and Protected Species Measures (to be included in the CEMP)

A reasonable avoidance statement should be provided for amphibians, badgers and hedgehogs detailing Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) including those in the PEA for these during any further ground clearance works and construction and be included in the CEMP and be signed off as read by construction personnel. Measures for breeding birds should be included. This should include instructions detailing what should be done if a protected species is encountered and measures to avoid entrapment of mammals during construction works. This should be secured through a planning condition and a provision made for construction personnel sign to say that they have read, understood and will adhere to this.

Reason: To prevent harm to habitats and species, including those offered legal protection from legislation including *the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended),* the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Also adhering the requirements of the Biodiversity Duty (Section 40 of the NERC Act), to Local Plan Policy NE1

Breeding Birds

No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and / or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority. If breeding birds or a nest is found, exclusion zones will be put in place as directed by a competent ecologist until after the young have fledged.

Reason: *All British birds, their nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act.*

LEMP

A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement or of the development. This should cover aspects that are not included in the HMMP and, if necessary, ground preparation in advance of the HMMP being followed as well as:

- Description of creating appropriate ground conditions for the planned habitats
- Description and evaluation of features to be managed.
- Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.
- Aims and objectives of management.
- Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.
- Prescriptions for management actions.
- Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled
- forward over a five-year period).
- Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

In addition, the following measure set out in the PEA should be incorporated into the LEMP (or HMMP if applicable):

- Implementing good horticultural practice in any landscaping scheme, including the use of peat-free composts, mulches and soil conditioners.
- The use of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, fungicides and slug pellets) should be discouraged to prevent fatal effects on the food chain. Any pesticides used should be non-residual.
- Excessive removal or pruning of trees and hedgerows should be avoided to maximise the growth and plant matter available to wildlife. Pruning should be left until late winter to leave seeds and berries for wintering wildlife and to ensure no impact on breeding and nesting birds.

As per the PEA, principles and landscaping ideas beneficial to wildlife and relevant to this site to be included in the LEMP include:

- Planting and management of hedgerows
- Planting of berry and nut bearing shrub species to encourage winter birds
- Planting and management of shrubs which develop a mosaic of structures to support breeding birds
- Use of nectar bearing flowers to encourage invertebrates (such as bees, flies, beetles and butterflies)
- Species are to be native of local provenance or to have a proven benefit to biodiversity.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

accordance with the approved details.

Reason: *to be in line with the NPPF, the National Design Guide, local plan policy NE1, Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide 18 SPD also to comply with the biodiversity duty (section 40 of the NERC Act).*

Conditions

Restriction on occupation of development until nocturnal lighting plan implemented

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the sensitive lighting plan for occupation / post construction has been installed / constructed in accordance with details shown in the approved Lighting Design Strategy for Light-Sensitive Biodiversity.

Reason: *to comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Biodiversity Duty (NERC Act Section 40), NPPF, local plan policy NE1. Many species protected by wildlife legislation are active at night (e.g. bats, badgers and otters are sensitive to light pollution. The introduction of artificial light might mean such species are disturbed / discouraged from using their breeding or resting places.*

Restriction on occupation of development until specific biodiversity outcomes achieved

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until bird boxes, bat boxes and hedgehog highways have been installed / constructed in accordance with details shown in the bat and bird box plan / LEMP.

Reason: *to comply with wildlife legislation including the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), Biodiversity Duty (NERC Act Section 40), NPPF, local plan policy NE1, the National Design Guide and Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide 18 SPD*

As per the PEA, if the development proposals change, a condition should secure that a ground level tree assessment (GLTA) should be undertaken of all trees that have the potential to be adversely impacted by the development, including felling, arboricultural works or significant levels of disturbance, to assess their potential to support roosting bats. This survey can be undertaken at any time of the year. If any trees due to be adversely impacted are found to have the potential to support roosting bats, aerial tree

inspections should be conducted. If any potential roosting features are still found to be suitable following the inspections, further bat presence / absence surveys or further aerial inspections may be required, which would need to be undertaken during the peak bat survey season (May to August inclusive). The condition should also allow for any recommendations as a result of these surveys to be adhered to.

As per the PEA, hedgerow, trees and woodland are to be retained where possible, or replaced as part of a detailed landscaping scheme with only native species preferably of local provenance. If the development proposals change to impact the woodland onsite, any woodland lost will need to be replaced two-fold in terms of area in an appropriate location and three trees planted for every one lost.

A condition relating to root protection areas (RPAs) should be set including an appropriate area for fencing to be installed to protect roots and no storage of materials under trees – this should be clarified with the tree officer.