

Planning Applications Manager
High Peak Borough Council
Planning Department
Municipal Buildings
Glossop
Derbyshire
SK13 8AF

For the attention of Rachael Simpkin

Your Ref: DOC/2026/0036

Our ref: DWTHPK576-3

30th July 2026

Dear Rachael,

Proposal: Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 42 & 43 relating to HPK/2023/0025

Location: Land South of , Hollin Cross Lane , Glossop , Derbyshire , SK13 8JH

Application Ref No: DOC/2026/0036

With reference to the above application, I am responding as the Biodiversity Planning Officer responsible for work relating to the Service Level Agreement, which the High Peak Borough Council and the Trust have signed. The following comments are aimed at providing accurate and up to date information on the nature conservation issues associated with the proposed development.

Response

Condition 20. Landscaping Scheme

We have reviewed the Landscaping Proposals Drawings No.: 6004.05 and 6004.06 Rev. A. We are satisfied with the details provided, pending the clarification requested regarding woodland types and condition below.

Sandy Hill, Main Street, Middleton, Matlock, DE4 4LR

01773 881188 • enquiries@derbyshirewt.co.uk

Condition 22. Landscape, Biodiversity and Ecological Management Plan (LBEMP) and Woodland Management Plan

We have reviewed the LBEMP (Biodiverse Consulting, April 2026). We welcome the update survey visit to ensure condition assessment could be undertaken of all onsite habitats. A net loss of -3.08 habitat units (-17.12%) will result from the scheme. As such, to achieve at least no net loss or a small gain, the purchase of offsite units from a Habitat Bank will be required. A total of 4.32 habitat units is advised in the report to achieve no net loss and satisfy the trading rules. A small gain in hedgerow units will be delivered on site and no net loss of watercourse units will result from proposals.

We request a copy of the metric for review. We also request clarity on the woodland enhancement, as the maps indicate that the entirety of the onsite woodland will be enhanced from other broadleaved woodland to lowland mixed deciduous woodland but the text indicates that only a small amount of woodland will be enhanced from moderate to good condition.

Condition 23. Swift Nest Box Plan

We have reviewed the 'Briefing Note: Plan of Integral Swift Nesting Boxes' and have the following comments:

- The condition requires compliance with BS 42021:2022, which states a ratio of boxes to dwellings of 1:1. Therefore, 24 boxes should be provided for the 24 dwellings and additional boxes should be provided for the converted property based on guidance in the British Standard (four to 10 on a small block of flats; 10 to 40 or more on a large site, such as a school, hospital, warehouse, or a major apartment development). If bricks cannot be retrofitted for the converted building, external boxes will be accepted.

- Integral swift boxes do not typically require cleaning out, as swifts do not build typical nests from nesting material and adult birds remove dropping from the brick themselves. Furthermore, integral bricks are generally sealed units which cannot be easily cleaned out once fitted. Reference to cleaning should be removed.
- The type of brick proposed is acceptable. Another suitable model is the AfS S brick <https://www.actionforswifts.com/> . If external models are proposed of the converted building, woodstone or woodcrete models provide the best longevity.

Condition 24. CEMP: Biodiversity

We have reviewed the CEMP (Biodiverse Consulting, February 2026) and have the following comments:

- Section 3 – the text states that the table includes protection measures, which it doesn't. This should be deleted. Currently, this table is quite generic. It would be more useful if it contained a summary of specific receptors at this site and what activities could affect them. For example, the bat section should identify the roosts in Buildings 1 and 2, the badger section should state whether badgers have been recorded on site or not and identify the highest risk areas i.e. the woodland and scrub, the highest risks to hedgehogs and herptiles will be during initial clearance of grassland and scrub, and so on. The table should be used as a quick summary, with the protection measures then provided in the following sections. It seems that the highest risk is posed during demolition and vegetation clearance, so it should be made clear when ECoW support is required to avoid widespread unsupervised clearance or clearance at the wrong time of year.
- Section 4.4.2 should specifically refer to works to buildings as well as vegetation removal. It should state that where clearance is unavoidable

between March and August, a nesting bird check will be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist within 48 hours of proposed works.

- Section 4.5.2 should explain where amphibians and reptiles are likely to be found (if at all) i.e. beneath rocks, logs, other debris or dense vegetation. It should also state that generally, where a common herptile is encountered, it should be carefully moved with gloved hands and a clean container to a pre-determined area of shelter. It is unrealistic to expect contractors to call the ECoW every time a common toad is encountered, for example.
- Section 4.6.3 should state whether badgers have been recorded on site previously.
- We would recommend that the Demolition Method Statement (Condition 29) should also identify the bat roosts on site and clearly state that all works must be undertaken under licence, to avoid causing an offence under wildlife legislation.

Condition 15. Japanese Knotweed Survey and Report

The CEMP: Biodiversity refers to an Invasive Species Management Plan but I cannot see this on the portal. Please forward when available.

Condition 26. Lighting Scheme

I can't see a Lighting Scheme document on the portal. Please forward when available

It is hoped that the information provided is helpful to the Council. If you require any further information or wish to discuss any of the comments made, please do not hesitate to contact me.



Derbyshire
Wildlife Trust

Yours sincerely,

Libby Duggan-Jones

Libby Duggan-Jones MBiolSci MCIEEM

Biodiversity Planning Lead (North)

planning@derbyshirewt.co.uk

Sandy Hill, Main Street, Middleton, Matlock, DE4 4LR

01773 881188 • enquiries@derbyshirewt.co.uk

Derbyshire Wildlife Trust Limited is a company registered in England and Wales with company number 715675. Registered charity number 222212. VAT registration number 509 4825 32

Wilder by nature