

SMDC Planning Reference –	DOC/2025/0061		
Site Name –	Advanced Protein		
Summary of proposals -	Landscape Conditions Discharge Application		
Consultation Note Subject –	Landscape and Visual Matters		
Planning Case Officer –	Jane Curley		
Landscape Comments Prepared By –	Stuart Ryder of Ryder Landscape Consultants		
Date of site visit —	2022	Date of first response	24/6/26
		Date of second response	N/A
		Date of this response	N/A
Summary of comments –	The Landscape Conditions discharge application is considered acceptable, subject to a series of minor amendments to the proposal drawings and the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan.		

Advanced Protein – Application to Discharge Landscape Conditions 12, 14 & 15

Purpose of Landscape Review Note

Ryder Landscape Consultants (RLC) have been appointed by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council (SMDC) to review the detailed landscape design proposals and management plan associated with the Advanced Protein extension site at Cheddleton. The comments have been requested to confirm that the soft landscape proposals are considered appropriate to the development, will be delivered through good horticultural practice and have adequate landscape management and maintenance planning. Based on this review the adequacy of the material to discharge the three associated Conditions will be decided by the SMDC Case Officer.

Three landscape planning conditions

The three landscape planning conditions under review are:

- Condition 12 – Landscape / Visual Impact
- Condition 14 – Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan
- Condition 15 – Materials Management Plan

Each planning condition is set in italicised text below, a list of documents considered given and then discussions as to the documents' effectiveness to discharge the condition they address. Where necessary back reference is made to my consultation response on the original planning application SMD/2022/0088.

Condition 12 – Landscape / Visual Matters

Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development including site clearance and levelling shall commence until such time that a detailed hard and soft Landscape Mitigation Scheme (LMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LMS shall be informed by the updated BNG assessment to be submitted under Condition 22. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved LMS.

The soft landscape proposals approved shall subsequently be implemented in the first growing season after construction has commenced and replacement of dead, diseased or dying stock should be undertaken in accordance with the Landscape Maintenance and Management to be approved under Condition 14.

Reason:- *To protect the character and appearance of the area*

Documents Reviewed

The following three documents have been submitted to SMDC to discharge landscaping planning conditions associated with the proposals:

- 478_PP_01_Rev A – Planting Plan (no firm name set on it);
- 478_PP_02_Rev A – Off Site Woodland Planting Plan (no firm name set on it); and
- 478_HL_01 – Proposed Hard Landscape.

478_PP_01_Rev A – Planting Plan

A copy of this drawing has been marked up with 14 numbered yellow dots to locate the following comments.

1. The use of *Crataegus monogyna* as a car park tree is questioned given their relatively small size and thorny nature, a larger substitute species is encouraged?
2. The black lettering in a dark green tree symbol makes the labelling unreadable when printed. The species type and location of the proposed trees is however acceptable.
3. Grass type labelling confusion – this would not likely need a pond margin mix, please see my comment 12 that identifies a suspected mix up in the key.
4. Grass type G5 not indicated in the key where the other four types are, it is however listed in the planting schedule as a Woodland Mix Flowers sown under the woodland planting area. The plan uses 1.5g/m², but Naturescape's current published sowing rate for N10F is 2g/m². I would therefore amend the LMMP/ plan specification to use 2g/m².
5. Again, grass mix labelling confusion.
6. Repeat of a previous comment about the attenuation basin and trying to give it a more naturalistic appearance. I have sketched on a curvilinear north edge that

would increase south facing basin margins which are more useful for invertebrates and provide a better BNG / GI effect. There are no landscape or visual implications from publicly accessible locations to the indicated rectangular form as the basin is not evident.

7. How is the back of the attenuation basin accessed for maintenance purposes, the indicative pond marginal species can be difficult to walk through or drive over when established.
8. The Common Name description of Hybrid Black Poplar is unhelpful and would be better described as Native Black Poplar and somewhere in the notes a description of *Populus nigra* subsp. *betulifolia* — Native Black Poplar, UK provenance, preferably local/regional provenance where available is sourced from a reputable nursery.
9. The woodland mix species, supply sizes and types and general density is acceptable. There are some spelling errors in the description at the start of the list.
10. The native hedge planting species are acceptable as is their proposed supply size and planting spaces.
11. The grass mix schedules is considered appropriate for the different areas assuming that Point 12 is easy to resolve.
12. I think the G2 and G3 descriptors have been swapped over but it may be worth checking grass annotations across the drawing to confirm.
13. Presumably the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan is the Sightline Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan 478 AP Cheddleton_LMMP Rev D – if it is then please put the applicable title here.
14. This list of specimen tree planting is a repeat of the Plant Schedule – perhaps it could be removed to free up some drawing space for a revision box.

Overall, the planting proposals around the extension building itself appear practicable, deliverable and with some minor modifications straightforward to manage which is the key to it taking place. The end planting should provide a structure for the new building to be set in and subject to successful ongoing aftercare form a vegetated foil to the building that has habitat and amenity value.

478_PP_02_Rev A – Off Site Woodland Planting Plan

A copy this drawing has been marked up with six numbered yellow dots to locate the following comments:

1. Please can the hedgerow standards be spaced less evenly so a degree of randomness is shown.
2. The tree species suggested for the hedgerow standards are acceptable, but they will need to have tree guards fitted to prevent stock and deer grazing. Simple

timber post and sheep mesh ones may be appropriate given this is not estate style planting.

3. I think hazel should be added to this list as a minimum.
4. Similar naming inconsistency with the Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan (LMMP) as the drawing notes above.
5. Please include reference to the ground preparation as proposed by Naturescape which I understand to require seed preparation to receive the broadcasted seed.
6. A bit of place holding text requires removal.

478_HL_01 – Proposed Hard Landscape

Just a single comment has been made on the hard surfacing drawing. The yellow number 1 dot is to mark the suggestion that drop kerbs are also supplied at maintenance access points into the soft landscape areas.

The materials otherwise are simplistic and designed for the industrial use of the development. I have no other comments to make on this drawing.

Review – Overall Comment

In principle the proposals are fit for purpose and will ultimately form structural landscape planting to set the new building within. The modifications I suggest in my numbered notes should be undertaken in an update to the landscape proposal plans and I anticipate none to cause any undue concern to the Applicant. The single exception to this is the suggested change in shape to the attenuation basin (Plan 01 Rev A – Point 6) in an attempt to give it a more naturalistic shape, increased BNG value whilst still retaining its storage capacity. If the Applicant chooses not to modify the shape of the basin it will have no substantive effect on the acceptability of the proposals, just an easy opportunity for landscape betterment would be missed. On updating the drawings, I consider there would be an acceptable set of enforceable drawings and Condition 12 can be discharged.

Condition 14 – Landscape Management & Maintenance Plan

No development shall take place until such time that a Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan (LMMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority including measures for its operation for the life of the development. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved LMMP.

Reason – *To reflect the importance of the soft landscape mitigation proposals for the local landscape character.*

Document Reviewed

The document I reviewed was the 478_AP Cheddleton_LMMP Rev C July 2025 version of the written plan.

Review – Overall Comment

The LMMP broadly addresses the main requirements of Condition 14, but I would not describe it as fully robust or clearly compliant without amendment. It is capable of satisfying Condition 14 in principle, because it contains management prescriptions, timing, monitoring, replacement planting, and responsibility arrangements for the operational phase. However, there are several drafting and coordination weaknesses that should be corrected before the LPA confirms it as the definitive approved LMMP.

Review – Areas of Strength

The LMMP is reasonably comprehensive suite of landscape and ecological management prescriptions. It identifies objectives to retain and protect habitats, enhance biodiversity, minimise landscape character effects, minimise visual amenity effects, and maintain wildlife connectivity. It also directly addresses the reason for Condition 14 by managing the different types of planting that together perform a large part of the scheme mitigation function, included are the following:

- woodland planting along the south-western boundary;
- native hedgerows;
- selected standard trees;
- off-site woodland / habitat creation;
- meadow grassland;
- attenuation pond marginal planting;
- replacement planting and weed control;
- inspection and remedial action.

Review - Areas of Weakness

The following are matters of concern that should be addressed in an updated LMMP to make it more robust and give SMDC reassurance about its ongoing delivery.

1. Please state expressly that the LMMP applies for the life of the development / operational life of the facility, not just 25 years.
2. Include a definitive schedule of approved drawings and documents, including the latest hard landscape plan, planting plan, off-site landscape plan, soil handling plan, SuDS maintenance plan and any separate BNG/HMMP documents where relevant as submitted.
3. Clarify the relationship between and purpose of on-site planting, off-site woodland planting, off-site meadow enhancement, BNG delivery and any Peak Ecology Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. Put simply what are the different areas providing functionally? This allows future landscape managers to know what each area is meant to be doing, and a simple bulleted list is sufficient.

4. Remove erroneous wording, especially the “solar farm” reference, and correct strategy numbering and appendix references.
5. Add a simple reporting requirement such as an annual landscape maintenance report issued to the SMDC for the first 5 years, then 5-yearly thereafter, confirming what activities have been undertaken and a summary of failures, replacements, weed control, watering, hedge/woodland establishment, and any remedial measures.
6. Confirm that replacement planting will be of the same species, size and specification unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.
7. Confirm who is responsible if the landholding or facility operator changes with the management and maintenance passed on to subsequent title owners or tenants.

Condition 15 – Materials Management Plan

No development shall commence including site stripping and clearance until such time that a Materials Management Plan (MMP) that defines the excavation and bund formation processes and provides detailed drawings of the proposed raised earthworks has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- *In the interests of the character and appearance of the area*

Document Reviewed

The document I reviewed was the GRM Letter Report dated May 7th, 2026.

Review Overview

The report directly states that it is intended to satisfy Condition 15 and it addresses excavation volumes, reuse, export, ground conditions, groundwater control, proposed levels and cross-sections. It also explains that no berms or bunds are proposed, which is important because Condition 15 asks for excavation and bund formation processes and drawings of proposed raised earthworks. Berms that were initially suggested at the Site appear not to have been pursued in these final proposals.

However, it is relatively brief and does not provide a detailed construction methodology for material handling, temporary stockpiling, haul routes, erosion control, sequencing, compaction, validation or landscape/appearance protection during earthworks. I would therefore advise that it is not defective in principle but should ideally be supported by a short addendum before formal discharge.

Condition 15 test

Condition 15 requires a MMP to define the excavation and bund formation processes and provides detailed drawings of the proposed raised earthworks.

The reason is:

"In the interests of the character and appearance of the area."

The GRM report directly quotes this requirement and states that the report is intended to satisfy the condition.

Strengths of the GRM MMP

The following matters are considered as addressed appropriately.

Matter	Assessment
Ground conditions	It summarises confirmed strata: topsoil generally around 0.3m, weathered Morridge Formation, Morridge Formation and Kniveden Sandstones.
Excavation process	It states that excavation should be achievable using conventional hydraulic excavation techniques, with breaker or similar plant potentially required where shallow rock is encountered.
Water control	It states that conventional sump pumping should be adequate to control shallow excavation water ingress.
Volumetric balance	It provides topsoil generation, topsoil reuse, cut and fill volumes.
Bund issue addressed	It states clearly that no berms or bunds are proposed.
Drawing support	It includes existing/proposed levels and site sections A-C and D-H, which show the relationship between existing and proposed ground levels.
Waste / reuse route	It explains that clean natural soils reused on site are not waste until there is an intention to discard, and surplus soils will be removed to licensed facilities or transferred under a separate MMP / DoWCoP route.

Weaknesses / clarification points

1. The report is limited on method

The report gives the broad excavation approach, but it does not provide a detailed earthworks method statement. For Condition 15, I would expect more detail on:

- sequencing of topsoil strip, cut, fill and export;
- temporary stockpile locations and maximum stockpile heights;
- haul routes within the site;
- wheel washing / road cleanliness;
- dust and sediment control;
- protection of retained trees, hedges and landscape margins;
- measures to prevent visual scarring, erosion and slope instability;
- inspection and hold points;
- who signs off the final levels and restored surfaces.

This is particularly relevant because the reason for the condition is character and appearance, not just waste classification. Some of these matters may already be addressed in the Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) or similar.

2. The export route is not fixed

The MMP says surplus material will either be removed to licensed facilities or moved to another site under a separate MMP / direct transfer route. That is acceptable at a strategic level, but before works start it would be better to define at Site level:

- destination facility or receiving site;
- waste carrier details;
- waste classification / testing where needed;
- transfer notes;
- approximate number of vehicle movements – please see later calculations; and
- routing arrangements.

3. The conclusion contains a wrong application reference

A relatively minor point but the report conclusion states that the MMP has been prepared to discharge of Condition 15 of Planning Permission SMD/2022/0548 which I recognise as the Rownall Road BESS scheme near Wetley Rocks. That should be corrected before discharge to save confusion.

4. The phrase "levels are to be revised" is ambiguous

GRM states that "some material export / disposal is indicated to be required, and levels are to be revised". If the levels are still to be revised, the LPA should not discharge the condition until the final levels and sections are confirmed. If this is just loose wording, it should be deleted or clarified.

Remaining on the same topic of levels the pdf plan at Appendix D have overlaid levels over each other making it difficult to read the proposed levels set in blue font.

Quantity calculations

GRM gives the following figures in its letter report.

Item	GRM stated quantity
Development area to be stripped	16,179 m ²
Assumed topsoil depth	0.3 m
Topsoil generated	4,854 m ³
Soft landscape area	8,535 m ²
Topsoil reused at 0.5 m depth	4,268 m ³
Excess topsoil to be exported	586 m³
Overall cut / excavation	27,785 m ³
Intended fill	4,151 m ³
Excess non-topsoil excavated material	23,634 m³
Total export amount (Topsoil & Non-Topsoil)	24,220 m³

Estimated earth-moving lorry movements

The number of lorries depends on whether the volumes are treated as in-situ volumes or loose excavated volumes. Excavated clay / mixed natural material commonly bulks when dug. I have therefore shown calculations for no-bulking and 20% bulking scenario.

Assumption A - 8-wheel tipper, approx. 11 m³ per load

Material	Volume, no bulking	Loads at 11 m³/load	Volume with 20% bulking	Loads at 11 m³/load
Excess topsoil	586 m ³	54 loads	703 m ³	64 loads
Excess other excavated material	23,634 m ³	2,149 loads	28,361 m ³	2,579 loads
Total export	24,220 m ³	2,203 loads	29,064 m ³	2,643 loads

This equates to approximately 2,203 to 2,643 loaded lorry trips, or 4,406 to 5,286 two-way vehicle movements if each lorry arrival and departure is counted separately.

Assumption B - articulated bulk tipper, approx. 16 m³ per load

Material	Volume, no bulking	Loads at 16 m³/load	Volume with 20% bulking	Loads at 16 m³/load
Excess topsoil	586 m ³	37 loads	703 m ³	44 loads
Excess other excavated material	23,634 m ³	1,478 loads	28,361 m ³	1,773 loads
Total export	24,220 m ³	1,515 loads	29,064 m ³	1,817 loads

This equates to approximately 1,515 to 1,817 loaded lorry trips, or 3,030 to 3,634 two-way vehicle movements.

Planning significance of the export quantity

The export quantity is substantial. Even on the more efficient articulated lorry assumption, it could involve around 1,500 to 1,800 loaded exports. On a more typical 8-wheel tipper assumption, it could involve around 2,200 to 2,600 loaded exports.

That has implications for:

- construction traffic;
- mud on the highway;
- dust;
- noise;
- timing of earthworks;
- local residential amenity;
- landscape disturbance during stripping and excavation;
- sediment and runoff control;
- the appearance of temporary stockpiles and exposed cut faces.

These matters are not reasons to reject the MMP, but they are reasons to require a more operationally detailed addendum or inclusion in a CEMP or Traffic Impact Assessment.

If they have already been reviewed and accepted by Staffordshire Highways Authority, then please disregard these concerns.

Recommended matters for any addendum or revision

I would advise the LPA to request the following before discharge:

1. Correct the application reference in the conclusion from SMD/2022/0548 to SMD/2022/0088.
2. Confirm that the earthworks are limited to cut/fill platforms, gradients, roads, yards, pond and building formation.
3. Confirm whether the submitted existing/proposed levels and sections are final. If levels are "to be revised", submit the final drawings before discharge or an acceptable tolerance such as + or – 300mm as you sometimes see on residential applications.
4. Provide a short earthworks method statement covering sequence of topsoil strip, cut, fill and export; stockpile locations and dimensions; haul routes; vehicle cleaning; dust, mud and sediment control; erosion protection to exposed slopes; protection of retained trees and soft landscape margins; inspection and sign-off of final levels.
5. Confirm anticipated export lorry numbers and whether exports will be by 8-wheel tippers, articulated bulkers or a mix.
6. Confirm disposal / receiving site arrangements, including whether surplus material will go to licensed facility or direct transfer under a declared MMP.

I trust these comments are helpful to you as you look to work with the Applicant to discharge these three conditions and should you wish to discuss any with me, please do not hesitate to call or e-mail.

Stuart Ryder

Ryder Landscape Consultants

24th June 2026