

Cheshire Wildlife Trust's response to Peak Cluster EIA Scoping Report

Summary

This document sets out the initial concerns and recommendations of the Cheshire Wildlife Trust regarding the proposed Peak Cluster pipeline route and associated Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping process. Our comments relate specifically to the terrestrial Cheshire¹ region and not the marine environment.

We have identified several key issues of concern with the potential to cause significant and extensive impacts to biodiversity in the Cheshire region.

We have grave concerns that the scoping process has not adequately considered important ecological assets from the outset. This has led to the unfortunate situation where 42 Local Wildlife Sites could be directly impacted, a scenario which could have been avoided or lessened if existing ecological data or the Local Nature Recovery Strategy had been used to inform the plans.

We are especially concerned about the potential impacts to 14 ancient woodlands, 19 main rivers, numerous peatlands, Priority Habitats, and wildlife corridors, including hundreds of kilometres of native hedgerows across the entire route. Many of these habitats are highly sensitive or irreplaceable and essential to enable recovery of nature in the region.

We are particularly concerned about the timing of construction works. Where wintering birds could be impacted, such as on the Wirral with its SPA Functionally Linked Land, impacts in the winter months must be avoided. Construction during the spring and summer months must be avoided where breeding bird populations could be affected. Sensitive areas include most Local Wildlife Sites and all woodlands and scrub, but also breeding and foraging areas for ground nesting birds including skylark, curlew and other waders, particularly in the Peak District and Pennine Foothills.

We call for a stronger commitment to the mitigation hierarchy, with avoidance of impacts prioritised above mitigation and compensation. Where impacts are unavoidable bespoke mitigation/compensation must be secured for 'very high distinctiveness' habitats, ancient woodland, river crossings and Local Wildlife Sites. All compensation secured by Biodiversity Net Gain should be compliant with the British Standard and the BNG Good Practice Principles.

We strongly advise that the current route(s) should be reconsidered in the light of new evidence, especially in very sensitive locations such as the Wirral, the Peak District National Park/Pennine Fringe, the ancient woodlands and where the scheme intersects with the rivers Dane and Gowy.

¹ Including Wirral and the Peak District National Park

Concerns about sites

The scheme in Cheshire could permanently impact 4 SSSIs (including an SPA), Functionally Linked land for the SPA, 14 ancient woodlands, 19 main rivers, 42 Local Wildlife Sites/potential Local wildlife Sites, hundreds of kilometres of hedgerows and numerous areas of undesignated Priority Habitats.

Particularly sensitive locations where direct impacts could occur include:

- Mersey Narrows and North Wirral Foreshore SPA and SSSI (0.16km north)
- Thurstaston Common (SSSI and LNR) (intersects with scheme)
- Meols Meadows SSSI - Lowland meadow (intersects with scheme)
- Sandbach Flashes SSSI (immediately adjacent)
- Peak District habitats and moorlands close to Sponds Hill.
- SPA Functionally Linked Land in Wirral - Gilroy Ponds and Hoylake Fields and Frankby Fields (on coastal and floodplain grazing marsh Priority Habitat and adjacent to Hoylake Carrs Natural Flood Management scheme)
- Elmerhurst Wood LWS - ancient woodland (near Lyme Park)
- Read's Wood – ancient woodland (Prestbury) (undesignated)
- The Roughs ancient woodland (Higher Poynton) (undesignated)
- Rookery Farm ancient woodland (North Rode) (undesignated)
- Cheshire Brook Wood LWS – ancient woodland
- Cromwell Wood – ancient woodland (within River Dane LWS)
- Timbersbrook LWS (possibly ancient woodland)
- 7 additional (non-LWS) ancient woodlands in Cheshire
- 19 main river crossings but particularly three that cross the River Dane.
- Styperson Park LWS/Macclesfield Canal LWS (containing Barton's Clough ancient woodland)
- Lyme Park Grassland and Woodland LWS (Lowland fen and grassland Priority Habitats)
- Lowland raised bog at Lower Gorsley Green Farm Marton (undesignated)
- Lower Hall Black Poplar site LWS (on River Gowy)
- Longside Bog LWS (Peak District NP). Acid grassland and upland heath Priority Habitats and rare species
- Greenhays pasture and woodland LWS (Middlewich). Species-rich grassland and wet woodland Priority Habitat

- Capenhurst Lane Fields LWS (Capenhurst). Rare species and waxcaps

SPA/SSSIs

The nationally and internationally designated sites listed above should be out of the scope of the scheme. Impacts to these sites are unacceptable.

Local Wildlife Sites (LWS)

The scheme could impact approximately **42 Local Wildlife Sites² and potential LWSs** in Cheshire

We are extremely disappointed that the EIA scoping exercise did not take Local Wildlife Sites into account. LWSs cover the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats in the region and are a material consideration in the planning system, protected by local and national policies. Impacts to LWS should be avoided in the first instance according to the mitigation hierarchy. It is therefore highly disappointing that they weren't considered from the outset when the potential routes for Peak Cluster were identified. Direct impacts to any Local Wildlife Sites are likely to be significant at the county level or above.

Because they weren't considered from the outset 42 Cheshire LWSs and their habitats and species are at significant risk from loss or fragmentation of habitat as a result of permanent or temporary land take, surface water or groundwater pollution, dust emissions, disturbance and killing/injury of protected and notable species.

Local Wildlife Sites are the core ecological network sites in the new Cheshire region Local Nature Recovery Strategy and crucial for nature's recovery. The LNRS should inform the planning process (including for NSIPs) and local planning authorities must have regard to them in complying with the strengthened biodiversity duty.

Although we have not yet looked at all LWS on the route we understand several in the path of Peak Cluster are ancient woodland and others are river corridors. A number of them host very high distinctive habitats such as fen or acid grassland and several are also notable for the rare species they support including:

- Lower Hall Black Poplar site LWS (on river Gowy) The native Black Poplar is Britain's rarest tree and this site has approximately 13 which sit in the path of Peak Cluster pipeline. It is imperative that these trees are not impacted by the scheme.

We hope that the final route chosen for Peak Cluster will avoid impacts to Local Wildlife Sites and potential Local Wildlife Sites. We expect that where LWS may be impacted they are fully surveyed. Any impacts should result in a bespoke restoration plan (onsite compensation/enhancement) so LWS can be returned to their original distinctiveness and condition rather than being de-designated. For very high distinctiveness habitat (as set out in BNG metric) or impacts to ancient woodland we advise that soil translocation should be

² In appendix

implemented. We ask that Peak Cluster does this in consultation with CWT as we hold detailed survey data for most Local Wildlife Sites.

Ancient Woodland

Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and highly protected in planning policies. We were dismayed to see the proposed route intersects with 14 ancient woodlands in Cheshire³. Many of these span the whole route so impacts will be unavoidable. There are several others that lie immediately adjacent such as Bowshot Wood near Kirmincham.

Any impact, including indirect impacts, should be considered nationally significant. It is essential that avoidance is prioritised. Where the route lies close to an ancient woodland there should be a minimum 15 m buffer to cover the root protection zone.

Should impacts to ancient woodland arise then the scheme will not be able to claim BNG has been achieved. The PEIR must set out an ancient woodland strategy detailing how impacts will be avoided or mitigated/compensated for as a last resort. We expect that all impacted ancient woodland soils are translocated as part of this process.

Rivers & Watercourses

The risks to the region's river system and associated riparian habitats and species are substantial. The scheme crosses multiple catchments and could impact 19 main rivers and tens (if not hundreds) of additional brooks, streams, ditches and canals.

The PEIR should set out the strategy for watercourses with avoidance being prioritised over direct impacts. The risks are significant and include:

- habitat destruction,
- sediment pollution,
- disruption of fish migration,
- impacts on aquatic invertebrates,
- impacts on riparian mammals,
- erosion and flood risk,
- ecological fragmentation.

We strongly advise that culverting is avoided and horizontal directional drilling is used unless the surrounding riparian habitats or species are sensitive. We are particularly concerned about the location where the scheme crosses the River Dane at North Rode. The Dane is an actively meandering near-natural river with ancient woodland on its banks at this location.

³ Listed in appendix

We also advise that a minimum 10m buffer is used to protect any adjacent watercourses during the construction process. River Condition Assessments and fish/invertebrate surveys should be undertaken as part of the process to determine the significance of the impacts.

Impacts to other habitats

Peak Cluster has identified that across the whole route there are **5791⁴** parcels of Priority Habitat (including those on LWS). This is likely to be a significant underestimate as not all PH is listed on inventories.

Many areas of Priority Habitat in Cheshire that lie in the path of Peak Cluster pipeline are not protected by non-statutory and statutory designations, including hundreds of pockets of **Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland**. Some of these are extensive such as near Styperson Bollington. There are also areas of unprotected **Lowland fen** at Harehill Prestbury and unprotected **Lowland dry acid grassland** adjacent to Higher Lane, Disley (both very high distinctiveness habitats). Numerous **ponds** lie within the footprint of the scheme which could support rare or protected species.

We are particularly concerned that the scheme could impact areas of **waxcap grasslands**. Waxcap grasslands are poorly recorded and many are not protected by designations. Waxcap grasslands are of international importance and cannot be replaced once destroyed. The Cheshire Peak District and Peak fringe is one of the best places in the UK for this habitat; Lyme Park and its surroundings are especially important, although waxcaps have also been recorded on Capenhurst Lane Fields LWS. We would like to see autumn surveys on areas which have the potential to host waxcap grassland and a mitigation strategy identified.

There are likely to be hundreds of kilometres of mature **native hedgerow** within the footprint of the scheme including particularly strong networks at Birtles and at Whitely Green/Bollington. Where hedgerows are removed it will impact the breeding success of local bat and bird populations unless additional habitat is created in the local vicinity to compensate for the losses.

There are 5 Cheshire Wildlife Trust habitat creation schemes that are within the Peak Cluster footprint (Oak bank stables, Cranage 2x parcels, The Nab, Saltersford – CWT BNG scheme protected by legal agreement).

At risk too are the wildlife corridors that have been identified through the Neighbourhood planning system and represent sites that are particularly valued by the local communities along the route (including Guilden Sutton, Christleton, Tiverton, Minshull Verdon, Moston, Cranage, Congleton, Bollington and High Lane).

Peak Cluster must avoid impacts to these sites where possible and mitigate and compensate where impacts are unavoidable.

⁴ Figures in Appendix

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

We are particularly concerned because the EIA scoping report has very few details on the strategy to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain.

We expect Peak Cluster to publish a methodology that is fully compliant with the British Standard for BNG BS 8683⁵ and the BNG Good Practice Principles⁶ as set out in the Statutory BNG metric User guide (page 9)⁷. Additionally the methodology should detail:

- How BNG surveys will be undertaken across the route.
- Which parcels will receive on the ground BNG distinctiveness and condition surveys and which will not.
- Details on how parcels or habitats that have not been visited will be assessed (such as aerial photography).
- Details and justification of the assumptions regarding habitat distinctiveness and condition will applied pre- and post-development
- Confirmation of the land within and outside the scope of BNG with justification for any excluded parcels.
- Details and justification for any impacts deemed temporary.
- Details of an ancient woodland strategy (impacts sit outside scope of BNG).
- Details of which of the multiple watercourses will be subject to a Morph survey and a list of the assumptions made for those that are not surveyed.
- Details of which hedgerows will be subject to a BNG survey and a list of the assumptions made for those that are not surveyed.
- Details of how onsite and offsite creation and enhancement will be undertaken (we would expect prioritisation of onsite restoration).
- Details on how offsite compensation will align with Local Nature Recovery Strategies.

LNRS, connectivity and species

Details should be provided on how the scheme will align with the LNRS both in terms of the measures for improvement and compensation but particularly in terms of how ecological connectivity could be impacted (e.g. culverting of watercourses, loss of habitats in areas of core connectivity recognised in the LNRS. Impacts to core sites including LWS).

We have serious concerns that ecological connectivity will be severely impeded by the scheme due to extensive habitat loss. Increasing the fragmentation of wildlife habitats will affect many Priority species but particularly⁸:

⁵ <https://knowledge.bsigroup.com/products/process-for-designing-and-implementing-biodiversity-net-gain-specification>

⁶ <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Biodiversity-Net-Gain-Principles.pdf>

⁷ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/689c5ee17b2e384441636196/The_Statutory_Biodiversity_Metric_-_User_Guide_-_July_2025.pdf

⁸ This is an initial list based upon the habitats impacted as we have not looked in detail at which species are most at risk.

- wetland birds,
- farmland birds,
- woodland birds,
- bats,
- water vole (present on the Birkett Wirral in 2025),
- willow tit,
- kingfisher,
- aquatic invertebrates,
- natterjack toads,
- amphibians,
- fish - notably the critically endangered European eel and European protected River Lamprey.

If water vole habitats are impacted, it is essential that an equivalent area of additional compensatory riparian habitat (close to the site of impact) is established in advance of the losses. Following habitat establishment water voles should be displaced or translocated into the new habitat so that the population is supported during the construction process. Water voles are the fastest declining mammal in the UK and the Cheshire population has suffered an unprecedented rapid decline in recent years with local extinctions occurring across the region. Supporting recovery of the water vole population is one of the region's highest nature priorities at the current time.

Peat & Carbon Storage

CWT is particularly concerned that the EIA process with its route options have failed to avoid impacts to peat. There are extensive areas of deep and shallow peat within the footprint of the scheme⁹. This is predominantly in the Peak District close to Sponds Hill, Lyme Park and Disley/Longside Bog with numerous smaller pockets of deep peat in Cheshire East, notably close to Marton, Henbury and Gawsworth. There are also several extensive pockets of deep peaty soils at the site of Macclesfield AGI.

Our key concerns:

- peat excavation could release stored carbon,
- greenhouse gas implications are under-assessed,
- peatlands have ecological and archaeological importance.

We strongly recommend:

- dedicated peat surveys,
- avoidance of areas of deep peat,

⁹ A list of peat bodies within the footprint of the scheme is provided in the appendix

- where impacts are unavoidable peat management plans should be created.

Bird Survey Concerns

- **Wintering bird surveys**
 - **Wirral** -Peak Cluster has stated that surveys of passage and wintering birds commenced in October 2025 from public rights of way. Monthly wetland surveys were performed along the foreshore in Hoylake in winter 25/26 to record waterbirds (divers, grebes, cormorants, herons, swans, geese, ducks, rails, cranes, waders, gulls, terns and kingfishers) and raptors.
 - **Functionally Linked Land** surveys were undertaken within the footprint of the scheme (plus 500m buffer) during winter 2025/26
 - **Sandbach Flashes SSSI** WeBS counts - Monthly survey visits were undertaken during winter 2025/26 within the Scoping Boundary and a 500 m buffer.
 - **River Gowry Valley** winter walkover surveys - Monthly survey visits were undertaken between during winter 2025/26 near Hargrave,
- **Breeding bird surveys** – no specific locations have been identified in the EIA scoping report for breeding bird surveys other than stating they will be undertaken in locations which support habitats which can be important for breeding birds.

We do not believe that a single season is enough to adequately assess populations of wintering or breeding birds and surveys must be undertaken over at least two seasons. Peak Cluster must also take into consideration the most recent population data which is available from the BTO to value populations correctly. Where the scheme is likely to impact >1% of the district or county population there will be significant impacts at the district or county level which will require specific mitigation or compensatory measures.

There needs to be a process identified in the PEIR on how the impacts to wintering and breeding birds will be assessed in terms of noise, disturbance, habitat loss and timings. To mitigate for impacts to wintering birds the disturbance must be restricted to the summer months and for breeding birds the disturbance must be in the winter months.

We have grave concerns that the habitat loss for the coastal AGI (Wirral) will result in impacts to wintering birds of the SPA such as black tailed godwit and curlew. Peak cluster must set out the process whereby alternative habitat is provided if the impacts are found to be significant at a district or county level and not restricted to mitigating significant impacts to the SPA.

Natural England and RSPB have identified that the area potentially impacted by Peak Cluster in the Peak District is important for ground nesting birds such as curlew, lapwing, skylark and snipe. Curlew¹⁰ require a minimum of 9ha for feeding and consequently could be impacted by disturbance, even if they nest some distance from the site of impact. It is imperative that disturbance caused by construction work avoids the summer months in this sensitive area.

We also have grave concerns regarding impacts to breeding birds across the region in the hundreds of hedgerows, woodlands and riverbanks impacted by the scheme. Peak Cluster need

¹⁰ Curlew are BoCC red listed and globally 'near threatened'

to identify the exact criteria they will use to determine whether a breeding bird survey is required. This should be related to whether there could be significant impacts at the district level or above (see above). If data is missing or landowner refuses permission to survey the precautionary principle must be used. Details of the criteria should be set out in the PEIR alongside how Peak Cluster will mitigate any significant impacts (at district level or above) for example through timings and habitat creation local to the site of impact.

Peak District National Park Concerns

CWT is concerned about potential extensive impacts to the Peak District National Park. National Park designation provides legal protection for areas of exceptional landscape, wildlife and cultural heritage. Plans for Peak Cluster undermine the very principles that have protected the national park for over 70 years and put at risk the special qualities that are valued by the thousands of visitors and residents.

The Park is strictly protected in planning policies through the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. Additionally the National Planning Policy Framework highlights that 'weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks ... which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.'

Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 recognises the importance of national parks by declaring:

'Relevant authority should take appropriate, reasonable, and proportionate steps to explore measures which further the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes' - including national parks- 'as far as is reasonably practical, relevant authorities should seek to avoid harm and contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, special qualities, and key characteristics of Protected Landscapes.'

Allowing this type of damage to the habitats and landscapes of the National Park could set a dangerous precedent and make it more likely that other large scale developments are approved in the future, undermining the very reason for the Park's existence.

Avoidance, Mitigation and Compensation Strategies

The scoping report sets out a high-level overview of how the EIA will identify significant impacts (amongst other things). We would like to see a commitment that all significant moderate adverse impacts (as identified through the EIA process) will be addressed through mitigation and compensation.

The report contains very few details of how impacts will be assessed, mitigated or compensated for. This needs to be agreed in advance. For example:

- How significance will be determined using reference data. We suggest referring to Appendix 1 of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for the latest statistics for the Cheshire region. <https://cheshirelnp.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Appendix-1-Cheshire-and-Warrington-Local-Nature-Recovery-Strategy-Area-Description.pdf>

- Details of the particular circumstances where avoidance will be used.
- The use of alternative construction (e.g., Horizontal Directional Drilling, habitat translocation) and the particular circumstances or thresholds where these will be used.
- The use of habitat translocation, a process that is critically important for ancient woodland soils, 'very high distinctiveness' habitats, waxcap grasslands and many of the direct impacts to SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites.
- How cumulative (in combination) impacts should be assessed.
- How onsite compensation will be prioritised for sensitive locations such as ancient woodland and Local Wildlife Sites and 'very high distinctiveness' habitats.
- How compensation and BNG will link to the priorities of the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
- How the scheme will take account of habitat connectivity by utilising ecological network data¹¹ to inform the design (as set out in local plan policies).
- How continued engagement with local communities, environmental NGOs, and statutory conservation bodies throughout the entirety of the project will help inform its design (in terms of avoidance, mitigation and compensation).

Conclusion

Cheshire Wildlife Trust is deeply concerned about the potential ecological impacts of the proposed Peak Cluster pipeline and associated infrastructure across Cheshire. The scheme, as scoped, poses a significant risk to irreplaceable ancient woodland, Local Wildlife Sites, peatlands, river systems, wildlife corridors and Priority Habitats. All are fundamental for nature's recovery in the region and currently support a wide range of protected and Priority species.

In particular, we consider it unacceptable that Local Wildlife Sites data was not considered during route selection at the earliest stage of the process. This omission has resulted in potentially avoidable conflicts with at least 42 Local Wildlife Sites or potential Local Wildlife Sites covering grasslands, woodlands, heathlands and river corridors. Many of these habitats are highly sensitive, irreplaceable, or support notable species, and their loss or fragmentation could have long-term consequences for biodiversity, climate resilience and ecological connectivity.

We therefore strongly urge Peak Cluster to revisit the route selection process and demonstrate a far greater commitment to the mitigation hierarchy, with avoidance of impacts as the overriding priority. Sensitive areas including SPA functionally linked land in the Wirral, the Rivers Dane and Gowy corridors, ancient woodlands, peatlands, and the Peak District National Park should be treated as constraints where impacts should be avoided wherever possible.

We would especially like to see a commitment to avoid impacts to wintering and breeding birds by carefully timing of the construction process at sensitive locations including Functionally Linked Land, Local Wildlife Sites, all woodlands and open habitats in the Peak District/Peak Fringe.

¹¹ The LNRS has identified the key ecological networks for the region.

Unavoidable impacts must be fully justified, transparently assessed and accompanied by robust mitigation and compensation measures. Onsite compensation/enhancement should be prioritised for sensitive locations such as ‘very high distinctiveness’ habitats, ancient woodlands, river crossings and Local Wildlife Sites. All compensation should be informed by the Cheshire and Warrington Local Nature Recovery Strategy and supporting ecological network evidence.

The forthcoming PEIR must provide substantially more detail regarding the scope and methodologies for habitat and species surveys, principles for implementation/delivery and long-term commitments. The document should demonstrate how these will comply with current industry standards including the British Standard for designing and implementing BNG (BS 8683) and the BNG Good Practice Principles.

Finally, we expect ongoing and meaningful engagement with the Cheshire Wildlife Trust, other NGOs, local communities and statutory consultees throughout the design and assessment process. The decisions made through this project will have lasting implications for biodiversity recovery across the Cheshire region, and it is essential that the highest environmental standards are applied at every stage.

Notice

Written by Dr Rachel Giles

All information correct as of the 19th of May 2026

No part of this document may be copied, reproduced, distributed, published, adapted, translated, paraphrased, or otherwise used in any form or by any means without the prior written consent of Cheshire Wildlife Trust.

Appendices

Priority habitats impacted across entire route according to Peak Cluster

Ponds	50	Within
Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh	135	Within
Upland heathland	15	Within
Traditional orchard	76	Within
Good quality semi-improved grassland	1,185	Within
Grass moorland	11	Within
Lowland calcareous grassland	45	Within
Lowland dry acid grassland	37	Within
Deciduous woodland	1,645	Within
Lowland raised bog	38	Within
Purple moor grass and rush pastures	12	Within
No main habitat but additional habitats present	2,493	Within
Lowland fens	49	Within

Ancient woodlands – Cheshire

Pocket near Arrowe brook

Lower Heath wood Thingwall LWS (unavoidable overlap)

The Dungeon (immediately adjacent - CWAC)

Hermitage Thornes LWS (big overlap)

Cheshire Brook Wood LWS (very high quality with rare species- unavoidable)

Pocket near River Dane North Rode (newly identified near Wood Cottage West of A34)

Pockets within River Dane LWS (Cromwell wood newly identified near North Rode)

Harehill (small overlap)

Read's wood (large overlap near Greendale Prestbury)

Barton's Clough Adlington (unavoidable - in Macclesfield Canal LWS)

Hazelhurst wood (in centre of site for AGI Cranage)

Pocket NE of Birchencliffe Farm Pott Shrigley

The Roughts Higher Poynton (big overlap)

Elmerhurst wood LWS (very big overlap unavoidable if north option used)

Main rivers in Cheshire directly impacted

- River Gowy,
- River Dane, Three points with ancient woodland and LWS
- River Bollin
- River Weaver
- River Wheelock
- Small brook (Middlewich)
- Sanderson's brook
- River Croco
- Tributary of chapel brook at Marton Heath
- Snape Brook
- Pott Brook
- River Dean
- Whitely Green Brook
- Poynton Brook
- Red brook (Adlington)
- Bollinhurst Brook
- Pott Shrigley Brook
- Timbersbrook
- Cheshire Brook
- Tens of smaller watercourses, brooks and streams

Local Wildlife Sites and potential Local Wildlife Sites directly impacted in Cheshire

Leasowe common (Large overlap unavoidable)

Manor Farm Frankby (Large overlap unavoidable)

Royden Park Frankby (Large overlap)

Arrove Park mainly accessible greenspace (Large overlap)

Stanley Wood Storeton (some overlap)

Benty Heath Ponds (unavoidable)

Street Hey Lane (unavoidable on north route)

Roften wood (unavoidable on one route)

Wirral Way (unavoidable on north route)

White House ponds (large overlap on south route)

The Duckery (large overlap with both routes)

Badgers Rake covert (overlap with both routes)

Capenhurst Lane fields (unavoidable)

Big wood Capenhurst (large overlap)

Acres wood (irreplaceable veteran trees - big overlap)

Shropshire Union canal Main Line (unavoidable)

Picton Green Lane (unavoidable)

Lower Hall Black Poplar site on River Gowy (unavoidable)

Shropshire Union Canal Middlewich branch (unavoidable)

River Wheelock North Banks (unavoidable if route goes south of Middlewich)

Greenhays farm pasture and woodland (unavoidable if route goes north of Middlewich)

River Dane Bostock (unavoidable if route goes north of Middlewich)

River Dane Congleton to Peak Park (unavoidable)

Timbersbrook - possible ancient woodland (unavoidable)

Macclesfield Canal (unavoidable)

Styperson Park (unavoidable)

Grassland at Styperson Park (big overlap on south route)

Red brook Adlington (unavoidable)

Blakehey wood (unavoidable)

Lockgate Farm (big overlap)

Throstles nest Farm fields (big overlap on one option)

Ryles woodland Middlecale wood (some overlap)

Lymepark grassland and woodland -very high distinctiveness fen present (big overlap)

Bollin的角度 brook plantation (big overlap)

Glebe field Disley – significant overlap (part is shallow peat)

Longside bog – major impacts (both routes)

Sweet Lodge Grassland Disley East of Higher Lane (overlap on shallow peat – south route)

Bakestonedale Moor upland heath (big overlap south route)

Pollinating Cheshire/CWT reserves impacted

Oak bank stables

Cranage 2x parcels

The Nab

Saltersford

Neighbourhood Plan Wildlife corridors impacted

Guilden Sutton

Christleton

Tiverton

Minshull Verdon

Moston

Cranage

Congleton

Bollington

High Lane

Impacted Peat Parcels in Cheshire

North of Davenport Lane/North west of Marton Village (deep peaty soils/Lowland raised bog, - big overlap)

Marton (many pockets of deep peaty soils probably unavoidable)

Site of Macclesfield AGI (several extensive pockets of deep peaty soils probably unavoidable)

Gawsworth SE of Gawsworth Hall (deep peaty soil, probably unavoidable)

Henbury/Whirley (deep peaty pockets, big overlap)

Disley (extensive areas of shallow peat)

Sponds Hill south of Lyme Park and surrounds (extensive areas of deep and shallow peat, unavoidable)