

From: Goodenough, Anne Anne.Goodenough@naturalengland.org.uk   
Subject: Midhope PA2  
Date: 4 June 2021 at 19:40  
To: Dan dan@wakefieldestate.co.uk



Good afternoon Dan,

I've received the outstanding PA2 advice, confirming that various elements of work can be accommodated through either of the following approaches:

- *Multiple PA2s are possible at the same time, providing the second PA2 can be demonstrated to be covering different things from the first, and the reasoning and justification for the second PA2 is clearly recorded. So using multiple PA2s would still allow the pieces of work to run con-currently by different contractors.*
- *It is also possible to have 1 PA2 to cover a whole project even though the different elements mean you need to get more than one set of 3 quotes - proceeding with a single PA2 but getting a set of 3 quotes for each part that needs different skills/contractors.*

I lean towards running the fire risk management elements as a separate follow-up PA2. What are your thoughts? Although it could be included now, I think the brief would ideally be informed by the habitat survey/capital works outputs and Anthony B-L's strategic planning work to make sure it doesn't miss anything.

Attached is the latest version:  
Thanks,

Anne

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.



Brief for  
Feasibi...1.docx

# Brief for Feasibility Study for Midhope Moor

## 1. Purpose

*The purpose of this brief is to advise the applicant of what must be delivered through a Payment for Advice applied for under the PA2 Feasibility Study option of the Countryside Stewardship Scheme. Further information can be found on .GOV: <https://www.gov.uk/countryside-stewardship-grants/feasibility-study-pa2>*

The aim of this Feasibility Study is to [update moorland habitat data held for Midhope moor](#), and to allow development of a detailed programme of habitat restoration capital works for areas of deeper peat. It is anticipated that these capital works will include activities such as gully blocking, re-profiling and re-vegetation measures. The Feasibility Study as described in this brief will [map deep peat](#), [describe moorland habitats \(with particular reference to blanket bog\)](#) and quantify the capital works required to provide a detailed specification against which quotes can be sought and a true cost confirmed.

Deleted: across Midhope

Deleted: and

**NB Those submitting tenders must have sufficient experience and skill in undertaking this type of work. The applicant and Natural England will need sufficient evidence to be able to determine whether individual tenderers are suitable.**

**We ask that each tenderer supplies details of their relevant accreditations, other qualifications and references and at least 3 examples of previous, similar work. This information should also be provided for any subcontractors.**

**This information should relate to the named members of staff most likely to run the project and not to the senior member of the organisation where the involvement of this senior staff member is not anticipated in day-to-day management of the project.**

## 2. Location

Midhope lies on the eastern edge of the Peak District. Maps showing the location and RLR boundaries are provided in Appendix 1 to clarify the boundaries of the survey areas. The approximate central grid reference for the survey area is SK 209 988.

The site comprises Units 88, 89, 90, 91 and 92 of the Dark Peak SSSI. The wider SSSI is a component of the much larger South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC.

## 3. Background

The land is currently under an HLS agreement, which expires on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2023. An initial programme of peatland restoration works was carried out in the first 5 years of the agreement, (see map in Appendix 2).

This feasibility study seeks to [update habitat information](#), gather information about the extent of deep peat on Midhope and to identify peatland restoration works that might form part of any future scheme agreement.

#### 4. Contact details

Contact details for the site are as follows:

#### 5. Access arrangements

[Some example text from another plan – can be amended as appropriate to suit circumstances at Midhope-

*Access to the land will be by agreement with the [Wakefield Estates Ltd](#). It is essential, and a requirement of the contract, that arrangements for access are also made with the Head Gamekeeper, so that they understand who will be on the moor and what they will be doing each day that access is required. The necessary contact details will be provided to the successful tenderer.*

[Access to survey during the breeding bird season may require SSSI consent and will need to be agreed with Natural England.](#)

*The site is managed as a grouse moor and from mid-August onwards it will be imperative to work around shoot days when requesting access permission, and arrangements may become more complex. The shooting season ends on 10th December, although shooting on this land may end sooner, but any winter fieldwork will be dependent upon suitable weather conditions and may be difficult, especially on the higher ground.*

*Those invited to tender are encouraged to view the site by prior arrangement with the agent, and head keeper before confirming a price for the work and to appraise themselves of maps and further site-specific information which the Estate or Natural England may hold.*

#### 6. Aims and rationale for the contract

The Feasibility Study has the following aims:

- Survey of the depth of peat to provide a plan showing the extent of deep peat (>40cm) across the site.
- NVC survey of vegetation types across the site, to update and refine existing habitat maps.
- Mapping and classification of 'Blanket bog states' across areas of deep peat.
- A review of the restoration works done under the current HLS scheme, including gully blocking, bank reprofiling and bare peat restoration (see Appendix 2).
- Recommendations for bracken control
- To develop a restoration plan, establishing where further works can be done, including:
  - **Gully blocking** - Establish and map the gullies to be blocked and including a categorisation of each gully and specifications of the method of blocking.
  - **Bank reprofiling** - Establish and map the banks to be reprofiled.
  - **Bare Peat** - Map areas and provide recommended methods.
  - **Sphagnum inoculation** – areas that would benefit from Sphagnum inoculation should be identified and appropriate methods identified to improve the functionality of the blanket bog.

Deleted: [insert details here]

Deleted: Head Gamekeeper, as well as with the contact above. I...

Deleted: made directly

Deleted: and

Deleted: s

Deleted:

Deleted: A full s

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: A full survey of the land to

Deleted: to include

## 7. Detailed requirements of the Feasibility Study

### Part A – Site Survey and Evaluation

#### i. Peat Depth Survey

- Verify as far as possible the extent of deep peat soils across the study area (deep peat is defined as peat >40 cm depth, regardless of the surface vegetation), using both ground and remote sources
  - As a general principle, sampling points should be every 100m but may be more frequent where significant changes occur (eg areas of transition between blanket bog and dry heath, including, but not limited to, those indicated at Appendix 3) and potentially less frequent where there are large areas of relatively uniform habitat / peat depths.
- The collated data will need to be clearly displayed as a peat and soil map of the survey area for each RLR parcel; indicating the different classifications, including distinguishing between mineral soils; peat soils less than 15cm and peat soils between 15 – 39 cm in depth; where peat is 40cm+ the peat depths should be ranged as 40 - 99; 100 – 149; 150 – 199 etc. This information should be displayed on a map and provided as a GIS shapefile.
  - Areas where peat depth is very variable and classification boundaries between deep / shallow cannot reliably be mapped should be identified. Such areas might be mapped as transition zones or intermediate areas but the successful contractor should discuss and confirm their approach to classification with Natural England.
- Record presence or absence of Sphagnum at each sample point described above, to provide an overview of its distribution across the site.

#### ii. Vegetation Survey

- Map the extent of the broad NVC communities on each RLR parcel.
  - Representative quadrats in each NVC community should be recorded to describe vegetation across the site.
  - The approach to mosaics or transition/intermediate areas eg blanket bog vegetation occurring over shallow peats should be discussed and agreed with Natural England by the successful contractor.
  - Existing Phase 1 habitat maps held by Natural England can be supplied to inform this work. These should be used to guide field surveys and verified to inform the approach to NVC classification.
- Map, classify and describe areas of blanket bog according to the Upland Management Group's 'Blanket bog state' system ([Blanket Bog Land Management Guidance Factsheet.pdf](#) ([moorsforthefuture.org.uk](http://moorsforthefuture.org.uk)))

#### iii. Mapping of active grips, gullies and eroding peat

- Using existing data, remote sources and ground survey, accurately map areas of gullyng, bare peat and grips. Features should be categorised according to severity and level of active erosion. Maps produced should be provided as both a paper

Deleted: <#>Mapping of bracken beds with recommendations for control.¶

<#>¶

<#>¶

<#>¶

<#>¶

Page Break

<#>¶

Deleted: PART A

Deleted: -

Deleted: Site

Deleted: Survey and Evaluation

Deleted: Extent of deep peat

Commented [JW2]: The Estate would suggest a comprehensive approach is taken to the mapping of the deep peat. We see this as a very good chance to have this work completed, with this information being critical to moorland activities going forwards. Having this mapped, agreed and accurately available to all will undoubtedly assist in the future management of the Moor.

Deleted: Using both ground and remote sources, and with particular reference to areas of uncertainty highlighted on the habitat maps provided (see Appendix 3) v...

Deleted: .

Deleted: particularly i

Deleted: n

Deleted: <#>Areas may be identified where blanket bog vegetation occurs over shallow peat, or where peat depth is very variable and boundaries cannot reliably be mapped. Such areas may be mapped as transitional zones but their classification should be confirmed with Natural England. ¶

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: ¶

Commented [JW3]: There is the opportunity to add survey work to verify a blanket bog state/broad habitat map here. I suspect we may find it difficult to get a contractor who can do both the ecology & the works spec in sufficient detail though. Can discuss.

Commented [JW4]: The Estate is in agreement that the vegetation survey should be as all-encompassing as possible, with full vegetation assessments ideally being taken at all peat truthing locations. We are aware of the time that this will involve, but see the long term benefits of collecting this information now for the future management and restoration of the Moor.

Moved up [1]: Record presence or absence of Sphagnum at each sample point described above. [Blanket Bog Land Management Guidance Factsheet.pdf](#) ([moorsforthefuture.org.uk](http://moorsforthefuture.org.uk))¶

¶ **Mapping of active grips, gullies and eroding peat**¶ Using existing data, remote sources and ground survey, accurately map areas of gullyng, bare peat and grips. Features should be categorised according to severity and level of active erosion. Maps produced

report and in digital format, with area/length measurements provided of features in different categories for inform potential interventions in Part B.

- Previous work was carried out up to 2018 and comprised a mixture of peat dams and re-profiling on gully features high on the catchment, with re-vegetation treatments on areas of bare peat (see Appendix 2). GIS files are available to inform this element, which include work completed and a wider programme of works suggested in outline at the time.

#### iv. Review effectiveness of past moorland restoration activity

- Survey and evaluate the effectiveness of past moorland restoration activity on the site.
- The aim here is not to inspect every dam along the length of previously blocked gullies, but to assess the broad-scale effectiveness of the previous blocking programme. A walkover should seek to identify any areas where there are serious problems or where remedial work is essential to restore the hydrology of the site. If any such areas are identified, then any interventions to address these problems should be quantified in Part B.

#### v. Bracken management recommendations

- Informed by habitat mappings from Part A (ii), make recommendations for bracken control. These recommendations should take into account the conservation objectives for the site and protect features of interest for the SSSI (eg remnant clough woodland).

## Part B – Blanket Bog Capital Works Specification

A plan should be developed which sets out detailed recommendations for capital works considered appropriate to restore vegetation on deep peat to a good ecological condition, e.g. by restoring natural hydrology. It is expected that such a plan would include:

- **Remedial works on grip/gully features which have already been blocked** – using the findings from PART A (iv), where the effectiveness of past restoration activity on the Moor is reviewed; map and quantify any remedial works proposed, including provision of an appropriate specification for any works required in order to enable potential contractors to provide an accurate quote for the work. Such measures could include re-profiling of grip sides, modification of existing dams or overflow channels, or additional intermediate dams if current spacing is too wide, as well as any recommendations for treatment to speed up recolonisation of grip voids or excessively deep pools.
- **Blocking of additional active grips/gullies on deep peat** – identify and map the lengths of additional grips or gullies where peat dams are the recommended solution. Provide an appropriate specification and GIS based maps of those grips recommended for blocking with peat dams, including categorisation of the current size and condition of the grip/gully, and whether or not there is a need for re-profiling of grip/gully sides, in order to enable potential contractors to quote accurately for the work required. If localised areas are excluded from blocking proposals or a different treatment is recommended, a justification should be provided.
- **Blocking of additional eroded grips, gullies and re-vegetation of areas of bare peat** – blocking or erosion control measures such as stone dams, trickle dams, brash or heather bales; reprofiling of hags and re-vegetation measures for bare peat areas should all be a consideration. Appropriate measures should be recommended based on best practice and any direct experience of successful novel approaches which have been used elsewhere (full details and specification to be provided), and an indication of relative priority and practicality if a number of different areas are identified for such treatments. Consider the need for management of the grazing through livestock exclusion, temporary fencing or shepherding as part of such proposals.
- Sphagnum inoculation – identify and quantify areas that would benefit from Sphagnum inoculation, recommending appropriate methods including any preparatory work.
- Sward diversification – identify and quantify any areas that would benefit from sward diversification interventions, including re-seeding and plug planting.

Deleted: B -

Deleted: Development of a Capital Works Specification...

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11.5 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11.5 pt, Bold, Font color: Black

Deleted: A capital works specification should be developed which details a comprehensive programme of peatland restoration works for the site.

Deleted: ill consider:

Deleted: A

Deleted: grip

Deleted: blocking

Deleted: will have been

Deleted: The starting assumption is that all grips will need to be dammed to restore the natural hydrology of the site. ...

Deleted: grip

Deleted: must

Deleted: A

The plan must clearly and accurately identify areas to be targeted for capital works (using maps and GPS data sets), accurately quantify the works required and provide methodologies for the different elements.

The specification should also:

- Provide a detailed project timescale for individual operations. For complex projects it may be appropriate for this to be presented as a Gantt chart.
- Assess where watercourse or other consents e.g. SSSI, Scheduled Monument, County Council, Utilities etc. will be required before works may be completed.
- Consider and make recommendations for appropriate access routes – are there any suitable roads/tracks/wheelings/stable ground to access the deep peat areas
- Consider site location in relation to any potential storage areas or compound (for machinery, lift sites, building materials, power/fuel) that may be required to facilitate the works.
- Take into consideration historic and archaeological features present as identified in past Historic Environment Record (HER) information or any more recent sources, for those areas where capital works are proposed.
- Consider other sensitive interest features that might constrain the programme of works, e.g. GCR site of geological interest (see Appendix 4)

Data for Parts A and B need to be collated as specified above and will need to be provided in the following formats:

- Report(s), including summary / site location and description / methods / results
- PDF Maps – presented as individual RLR parcel, part parcel or as a whole moor depending on scale for clarity.
- ArcGIS data – polygon, line and point data sets supported by a detailed tabular dataset populated with the required attributes indicating the RLR parcel, grid reference (northings and eastings).
- Tabular format in Excel detailing the attributes per RLR parcel to enable the collated data to be analysed.
- Photos supplied as jpegs with explanatory filenames.

Deleted: <#>Sphagnum inoculation – areas that would benefit from Sphagnum inoculation should be identified and appropriate methods identified to improve the functionality of the blanket bog. ¶  
<#>Recommendations for management of bracken¶  
<#>All the above

Commented [JW5]: 1.The Estate would also like to explore the possibility of completing some heather restoration and regeneration works to those areas of the Moor that have been historically receded and been “eaten out”. The aim of this would be to improve the quality of the moorland habitat by restoring heather in areas which would have originally supported heather but have become dominated by Molinia grass. Restoring the heather will lead to a more diverse vegetation structure that will benefit moorland birds and other wildlife.  
2. At present there is no specific mention of wildfire mitigation, nor the possibility of including this directly within the feasibility study, rather than as an afterthought of gully blocking, sphagnum inoculation(etc.).The Estate would like to see this addressed specifically, given the very real danger this poses. It would be very useful to discuss this, such as the feasibility of installing ponds/scrapes, placing IBC’s at strategic points, creating access routes and fire RV points, etc?

Deleted: <#> detailed

Deleted: A

Deleted: should be provided

Deleted: M

Deleted: S

Deleted: – consider distance

Deleted: if required)

Deleted: H

Deleted: must be taken into consideration

Deleted: All data n

Deleted: Summary report – capital works specification, recommendations for management, constraints etc.

Deleted: field

Deleted: Maps should include: peat depth; sphagnum presence; extent of blanket bog overlaid onto peat depth; peatland restoration features (such as grips, gullies, bare peat, hags, micro-erosion).

## 8. Other information to be provided by those wishing to submit a tender

Potential contractors must consider these elements in agreeing a final specification for the work, and provide further information on how they can meet these requirements.

### Health and Safety policy

#### Risk assessments

**Professional Indemnity (PI) Insurance:** covers the contractor against making a mistake in their work which would impact on themselves or their clients. It starts at £100,000 and can go up to £5 million or higher. The 'appropriate level' of PI needed for each project should reflect the level of 'risk' that is faced by the owner or NE if the contractor gets it wrong.

**Public Liability (PL) Insurance** covers the public against an accident or mistake made by the contractor. It is particularly relevant for site-based work but it is generally considered a requirement for any work as this includes cover for all eventualities outside of the office. PL tends to start at £1 million and it is quite normal practice for PL to be at least £2 million, sometimes more. Again, the level is dependent on the type of work and if you are going to be coming into contact with people, sites, etc. or if you are desk bound.

**Employers Liability Insurance** is a legal requirement for any business with employees.

#### 8. Ownership

When an organisation asks or commissions another person or organisation to create a copyright work, the first legal owner of copyright is the person or organisation that created the work and not the commissioner, unless you otherwise agree it in writing. Any contract that requires electronic or hard copy outputs should therefore make clear what permissions the author of the report assigns to the commissioner in terms of copying and using the material. The following standard requirements apply to this brief, which contractors will need to agree to be bound by:

"You agree to:

- a. grant to Natural England and [Wakefield Estates Ltd](#) an irrevocable, perpetual and royalty-free licence to use, copy, keep and disseminate the Outputs as they see fit and to grant sub-licences of the same kind;
- b. obtain and maintain in force all authorisations of any kind required for you to use, copy, keep and disseminate the Outputs and to grant such licence to us;
- c. contract to the effect that any creation by you or on your behalf of material which forms Outputs is undertaken on terms that either the copyright in the material is assigned to you or that the copyright owner may not commercially exploit it;
- d. grant licences in respect of the Outputs under the Creative Commons model licence 'Attribution Non-Commercial' but not on other terms without our prior written consent;
- e. not otherwise exploit the Outputs commercially without our prior written consent from Natural England and [Wakefield Estates Ltd](#).



## 9. Dates for completion of work

**Deadline for submission of quotes: [30<sup>th</sup> June 2021](#),**

Deadlines for the Feasibility Study findings to be submitted will be discussed and agreed with the appointed contractor, but a draft report will be required by [30<sup>th</sup> September](#). A subsequent meeting to be arranged between the contractor, the applicant and Natural England and a final report to follow by an agreed deadline, normally within a month of the meeting.

Commented [GA6]: Does these dates sound reasonable?

Deleted: XXXX

Deleted: XXXX.

Formatted: Superscript

## 10. Contact details

Queries about this brief should be directed in the first instance to [Wakefield Estates via the contact details provided in Section 4](#). The following contacts may also be able to help clarify technical aspects of the work required:

### [Natural England](#)

[Anne Goodenough, Lead Adviser, East Midlands – Uplands team](#)

[Anne.goodenough@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:Anne.goodenough@naturalengland.org.uk)

Deleted: [tbc]

Formatted: Font: Bold

Field Code Changed

[Appendix 1. Site Location and Survey Boundary](#)

[Appendix 2. Overview of Blanket Bog Restoration Work already delivered](#)

[Appendix 3. Existing Habitat Maps to inform vegetation survey](#)

[Appendix 4. Geological Conservation Review site](#)

**Appendix 5: Pricing Schedule for a Feasibility Study (Payment for Advice 2) for Midhope**

**Costs supplied by:** [To be completed by contractor].....

**Date of Quotation:** [To be completed by contractor].....

**Valid Until:** [To be completed by contractor].....

The contractor should itemise and cost individually all work identified as needed to fulfil the specification.

<u>For the completion of:</u>	<u>Sub-tasks</u>	<u>Cost ex. VAT</u>	<u>Cost incl. VAT (if applicable)</u>
Part A – Site Survey & Evaluation	Peat depth survey		
	Vegetation survey		
	Mapping of grips/gullies/eroding peat		
	Review of past restoration work		
Part B – Blanket Bog Restoration	Capital Works Specification		
Travel & Subsistence expenses, using mileage at the standard rate.			
	Sub-total:		
10% contingency (based on sub-total)			
	Overall TOTAL:		

Formatted Table

Signed: .....

On Behalf of : .....

Position: .....

Company Address: .....

Company Telephone: .....

VAT number: .....

Company registration number (where a limited company): .....