|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 – Shadow HRA Template**  **Regulation 63 – Habitats Regulations Assessment** | | | | **East Devon District Council** |
| **Stage 1: Screening for Likely Significant Effect on the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC** | | | | |
| **Part A: The proposal** | | | | |
| **1**. Type of permission/activity: |  | | | |
| **2**. Application reference no: |  | | | |
| **3**. Site address:  Grid reference: |  | | | |
| **4**. Brief description of proposal: | * **Type of development** * **Distance to the European site** * **Is the proposal site within a consultation zone (landscape connectivity, core sustenance, pinch point, hibernation sustenance zone)** * **Size** * **Current land use (habitat type and immediately adjacent habitat types)** * **Timescale** * **Working methods** | | | |
| **5**. European site name | Beer Quarry and Caves SAC (BQ&CSAC) – SAC EU Code UK0012585 | | | |
| **6**. Qualifying Features and Conservation Objectives:  Ecological characteristics associated with the features (including those associated with the site, and information on general trends, issues or sensitivities associated with the features if available). | **Annex II species that are a primary reason for selection of this site**   * 1323 – Bechsteins bat (*Myotis bechsteinii*). This complex of abandoned mines in south-west England is regularly used as a hibernation site by small numbers of Bechstein’s bat Myotis bechsteinii as well as an important assemblage of other bat species.)   **Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection**   * 1303 – Lesser horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*) * 1304 – Greater horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus Ferrumequinum*)   **Conservation Objectives** (Natural England 27/11/2018)**:**  *“With regard to the SAC and the natural habitats and/or species for which the site has been designated (the ‘Qualifying Features’ listed below), and subject to natural change;*  *Ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained or restored as appropriate, and ensure that the site contributes to achieving the Favourable Conservation Status of its Qualifying Features, by maintaining or restoring;*   * *The extent and distribution of qualifying natural habitats and habitats of qualifying species* * *The structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats* * *The structure and function of the habitats of qualifying species* * *The supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats and the habitats of qualifying species rely* * *The populations of qualifying species, and,* * *The distribution of qualifying species within the site.*   *These Conservation Objectives should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Supplementary Advice document (where available), which provides more detailed advice and information to enable the application and achievement of the Objectives set out above.*”  The designated area of the SAC is relatively small and comprises the quarry and caves and the immediately surrounding areas. However, the qualifying features (the bat populations) are dependent upon a much wider area outside the SAC boundary which provides foraging habitat and commuting routes and supports other critical roosts. Protection of key areas of habitat in the area is therefore essential in order to maintain and enhance the favourable conservation status of the qualifying features. | | | |
| **7**. Ecological survey  Summary of effort and findings | ***Name of documents containing ecological survey information:***  ***Summary of survey effort (no. transects, static detector deployments and bat emergence surveys, if applicable):***  ***Summary of relevant findings and Bat Activity Index (number of bat passes from greater and lesser horseshoe bats – note that Bechstein passes are unlikely due to low amplitude, flight patterns and cryptic call parameters):***  ***Relevant figure excerpts from document (maps, tables, if relevant/concise):*** | | | |
| **Part B: Screening assessment for Likely Significant Effect – In absence of proposed mitigation** | | | | |
| **8**. Is this application necessary to the management of the site for nature conservation? |  | | | |
| **9**. What BQ&CSAC consultation zones is the proposal within (insert “**X**”)?  *Refer to the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC Habitats Regulations Assessment Guidance document and online mapping* | 10 km GHB Landscape connectivity zone | |  | |
| 4 km GHB Sustenance zone | |  | |
| 2 km GHB Hibernation sustenance zone | |  | |
| 11.2 km LHB Landscape connectivity zone | |  | |
| 2.5 km LHB Sustenance zone | |  | |
| 1.2 km LHB Hibernation sustenance zone | |  | |
| 10.25 km Bechstein’s Landscape connectivity zone | |  | |
| 2.5 km Bechstein’s sustenance zone | |  | |
| Pinch point | |  | |
| **10**. Summary assessment of potential impacts to Qualifying Features of the European site, in the *absence* of mitigation measures.  Consider scale, extent, timing, duration, reversibility and likelihood of the potential effects.  *Impacts of these types are considered to result in result in a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) on the SAC. Refer to the flow chart on page 19 of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC Habitats Regulations Assessment Guidance document*  **If the proposal is located in a Landscape Connectivity Zone (LCZ) ONLY**, then the only impact to result in an LSE is “*A – Landscape scale connectivity impacts*”.  *Consider construction phase and operational phase. For some proposals, it may also be necessary to consider de-commissioning and after-use.* | *A – Landscape (large) scale connectivity impacts* |  | | |
| *B - Direct impacts on the SAC roost or other key roost(s)* |  | | |
| *C - Change in habitat quality and composition (loss or change in quality of foraging habitat)* |  | | |
| *D - Severance or disturbance of linear features used for navigating or commuting* |  | | |
| *E - Disturbance from new illumination causing bats to change their use of an area/habitat* |  | | |
| *F - Disturbance to or loss of land or features secured as mitigation for BQ&CSAC bats from previous planning applications or projects* |  | | |
| *G – Loss, damage, restriction or disturbance of a pinch point* |  | | |
| *E - Other impacts – e.g. physical injury by wind turbines or vehicles* |  | | |
| **11**. Potential for in-combination effects (*other permissions granted and proposals in the area that could result in impacts when assessed in combination – review planning permissions in the vicinity with similar impacts*) |  | | | |
| **12**. Natural England consultation comments (if available) |  | | | |
| **Part C: Conclusion of Screening** | | | | |
| **13**. Is the proposal likely to have a significant effect ‘alone’ or ‘in combination’ on a European site?  *Refer to the flow chart in the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC Habitats Regulations Assessment Guidance document* | We conclude that, in the absence of mitigation measures, a Significant Effect on the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC **is likely**, either ‘alone’ or ‘in-combination’ with other plans and projects.  An **Appropriate Assessment** of the proposal **will therefore be necessary**. | | | |
| Name  Date |  | | | |

*Complete Section 2 if it is considered that a full Appropriate Assessment is required*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017**  **Regulation 63 – Habitats Regulations Assessment** | | | |
| **Stage 2: Full Appropriate Assessment of effects on the qualifying features of the Beer Quarry and Caves SAC** | | | |
| **Part D: Assessment of Impacts with Mitigation Measures**  **NB:** In undertaking the Appropriate Assessment, the LPA must ascertain whether the project would adversely affect the integrity of the European site. The Precautionary Principle applies, so to be certain, the Authority should be convinced that no reasonable scientific doubt remains as to the absence of such effects. | | | |
| **14. Assessment of impacts taking account of mitigation measures included in the proposal and possible additional restrictions** | | | |
| **Applicant’s proposed mitigation – Provide document reference numbers and titles below:** | | | |
| **Potential LSE (as identified in section 10. A-H)** | **Avoidance/Mitigation/Compensation measures proposed**  *Consider both Construction and Operational Phases, and monitoring requirements.* | **Conclusion regarding effectiveness of mitigation and residual LSE**  *Consider how measures would be implemented, how certain you are that measures will remove LSE, how long it will take for measures to take effect, monitoring requirements and changes that would be made if monitoring shows failure of measures.* | **Secured by** |
| **14. A** - *Landscape (large) scale connectivity impacts* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.B** - *Direct impacts on the SAC roost or other key roost(s)* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.C** - *Change in habitat quality and composition (loss or change in quality of foraging habitat)* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.D** - *Severance or disturbance of linear features used for navigating or commuting* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.E** – *Disturbance from new illumination causing bats to change their use of an area/habitat* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.F** - *Disturbance to or loss of land or features secured as mitigation for BQ&CSAC bats from previous planning applications or projects* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.G** *– Loss, damage, restriction or disturbance of a pinch point* | N/A |  |  |
| **14.H** - *Other impacts – e.g. physical injury by wind turbines or vehicles* | N/A |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part E. In-combination impacts** | |
| **15**. List of plans or projects with potential cumulative in-combination impacts |  |
| **16**. How impacts of current proposal combine with other plans or projects individually or in combination |  |
| **Part F: Further Information** | |
| **17**. Compliance with current East Devon Local Plan  *List relevant environmental policies/ strategies and how this proposal achieves or opposes these policies/ strategies* |  |
| **18**. Does the proposal take into account measures agreed at outline or pre-app stages (if applicable) |  |
| **19**. Does the proposal take into account Natural England consultation responses, and include suitable measures as identified in the Natural England consultation? (if applicable) |  |
| **Part G. Conclusion of Appropriate Assessment - The Integrity Test** | |
| **20**. List of avoidance/ mitigation/ compensation measures and safeguards to be covered by condition or planning obligations (Unilateral Undertaking or S106) | List of avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures, as per section 14: |
| **21**. Applicants conclusion of integrity test. |  |
| **22**. Completed by:  Date: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Appendix 1: Mitigation proposals** |