

CURRAGHINALT GOLD PROJECT, COUNTY TYRONE, NORTHERN IRELAND

**Further Environmental Information – Addendum to
Ecological Impact Assessment and Ecological
Mitigation and Management Plan**
Prepared for: Dalradian Gold Limited

DALRADIAN
GOLD

SLR Ref: SLR Ref: 501.00241.00006
Version No: 1 FINAL
July 2019



BASIS OF REPORT

This document has been prepared by SLR Consulting Limited with reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the manpower, timescales and resources devoted to it by agreement with Dalradian Gold Limited (the Client) as part or all of the services it has been appointed by the Client to carry out. It is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

SLR shall not be liable for the use of or reliance on any information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document for any purpose by any person other than the Client. Reliance may be granted to a third party only in the event that SLR and the third party have executed a reliance agreement or collateral warranty.

Information reported herein may be based on the interpretation of public domain data collected by SLR, and/or information supplied by the Client and/or its other advisors and associates. These data have been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid.

The copyright and intellectual property in all drawings, reports, specifications, bills of quantities, calculations and other information set out in this report remain vested in SLR unless the terms of appointment state otherwise.

This document may contain information of a specialised and/or highly technical nature and the Client is advised to seek clarification on any elements which may be unclear to it.

Information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document should only be relied upon in the context of the whole document and any documents referenced explicitly herein and should then only be used within the context of the appointment.

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose of the Report.....	1
2.0 UPDATED BIODIVERSITY IMPACT STATEMENT	1
3.0 CONCLUSIONS	3

DOCUMENT REFERENCES

APPENDIX

Appendix 01 – Biodiversity Impact Calculation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In November 2017, Dalradian Gold Limited (DGL) submitted a planning application to the Department for Infrastructure (Dfi), specifically the Strategic Planning Division, to construct an underground gold mine and associated surface infrastructure at a site located between the Towns of Gortin and Greencastle, in County Tyrone.

In line with the requirements of Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015, the application included an Environmental Statement (ES) to report the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken for the proposed development.

In a letter dated 8 January 2019, the Dfi stated that Further Environmental Information (FEI) is required to be submitted under Regulation 23 of the Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015.

This document provides an addendum to the FEI being submitted by DGL.

1.2 Purpose of the Report

In the process of addressing comments raised by consultees the Proposed Site Infrastructure Site Peat Management Plan has been updated and this is being submitted as part of a package of information provided with the FEI request.

This addendum provides an update to the Biodiversity Impact Statement that was presented in the Ecological Impact assessment (September 2017) and the Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (EMMP) (September 2017). This update takes into account the new proposed layout for peat storage and areas of habitat restoration.

2.0 Updated Biodiversity Impact Statement

To address consultee comments regarding peat stability DGL has taken positive steps to revise its peat management plan. The resultant plan changes where peat shall be placed removing areas 2 and 3 and utilising a larger single storage cell on the dry stack facility. Excavated peat will also be used as much as possible for habitat restoration directly after excavation rather than all going straight to storage. The removal of areas 2 and 3 (referred to as MU5 and MU4, respectively, in the EMMP) will result in a minor change in the balance of habitats lost/restored at the site. There would be no changes to the habitat enhancement area 1 (referred to as MU2 in the EMMP).

The original Ecological Impact Assessment (September 2017) included an assessment of the biodiversity impact based upon calculations using a Biodiversity Impact Assessment metric, derived from the pilot scheme developed by the Department of Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). This calculation has been run again taking into account the changes to the peat management strategy that reduces the footprint of peat cell areas and as result the loss of habitats associated with these and the reduction in areas of restored peat cell.

The updated calculation indicates that the proposed infrastructure site has an existing biodiversity value of 1504.36 (habitat areas + linear habitats). The gold mine development is anticipated to have net loss in biodiversity value of 98.61 at the proposed infrastructure site and proposed ventilation raises (Table 1). This figure takes into account habitat creation and enhancement measures proposed at the proposed infrastructure site. Please note that none of the infrastructure features, for example the surface water attenuation ponds and diversion berms have been included as part of assessing the Biodiversity Impact Scores as their primary function is to provide services to the mine and not biodiversity.

Table 1: Biodiversity Impact Statement without Compensation

Habitats	Area (ha)	Habitat Biodiversity Value
Total existing area onsite	140.44	1402.88
Habitats negatively impacted by development Habitat Impact Score	68.73	626.86
On site habitat mitigation Habitat Mitigation Score	70.37	534.60
Biodiversity loss still requiring compensation Habitat Biodiversity Impact Score		-92.26
Percentage of biodiversity impact		14.72
Linear Habitats	Length (km)	Habitat Biodiversity Value
Total existing length onsite	22.71	101.48
Linear features negatively impacted by development Linear Impact Score	8.14	40.78
On site linear mitigation Linear Mitigation Score	2.26	34.43
Linear biodiversity loss still requiring compensation Linear Biodiversity Impact Score		-6.35
Percentage of linear biodiversity impact		15.57

By updating the Peat Management Plan and utilising land on the DSF for storage it has been possible to reduce the overall land take and impact, through habitat loss, of the scheme. The calculation shows that the reduction in habitats lost has reduced the Biodiversity Impact associated with this.

Table 1 still demonstrates that compensation is required outside the proposed infrastructure site to be able to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and in particular to offset the loss of peatland habitats.

DGL have managed to secure 52.73 ha of land comprising predominantly of blanket bog but with some wet heath / acid grassland mosaic and marsh / marshy grassland on peat. The ratio of peatland habitat compensation to the area of peatland habitat loss to the gold mine development is approximately 2:1.

This demonstrates that through the provision of the compensation areas that the mine development will have an overall net gain for biodiversity of 128.27 (Table 2).

The spreadsheets used for the calculating the Biodiversity Impact Assessment are included within Appendix 1 of this report.

Table 2: Biodiversity Impact Statement with Compensation

Habitats	Area (ha)	Habitat Biodiversity Value
Total existing area onsite	140.44	1402.88
Habitats negatively impacted by development Habitat Impact Score	68.73	626.86
On site habitat mitigation and compensation Habitat Mitigation Score	123.10	755.13
Biodiversity gain Habitat Biodiversity Impact Score		128.27
Percentage of biodiversity impact		
Linear Habitats	Length (km)	Habitat Biodiversity Value
Total existing length onsite	22.71	101.48
Linear features negatively impacted by development Linear Impact Score	8.14	40.78
On site linear mitigation Linear Mitigation Score	2.26	34.43
Linear biodiversity loss Linear Biodiversity Impact Score		-6.35
Percentage of linear biodiversity impact		15.57

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

This document provides an addendum to the FEI being submitted by DGL with respect to a planning application to the DfI to construct an underground gold mine and associated surface infrastructure at Curraghinalt.

To address consultee comments regarding peat stability DGL has taken positive steps to revise its peat management plan.

By updating the Peat Management Plan and utilising land on the DSF for storage it has been possible to reduce the overall land take and impact, through habitat loss, of the scheme. The calculation shows that the reduction in habitats lost has reduced the Biodiversity Impact associated with this.

DGL have managed to secure 52.73 ha of land near to the site comprising predominantly of blanket bog but with some wet heath / acid grassland mosaic and marsh / marshy grassland on peat and this shall be enhanced and managed as part of a compensation package.

With compensation in place it is demonstrated that the mine development will have an overall net gain for biodiversity.

APPENDIX 01

Biodiversity Impact Calculation

Infrastructure Development	Footprint Area (ha)	Existing habitats on site		Habitat distinctiveness		Habitat condition		Habitat Biodiversity Value						Notes	
		Code	Phase 1 Habitat	Habitat Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Habitats to be retained with no change within development		Habitats to be retained and enhanced within development		Habitats to be lost within development		
									Area (ha)	Existing value	Area (ha)	Existing value	Area (ha)		Existing value
Direct Impacts and Retained Habitats															
					A		B	C	D (A x B x C)	E	F (A x B x E)	G	H (A x B x G)		
Proposed Infrastructure Site	138.23		Woodland: Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland	0.8	High	6	Moderate	2	0.80	9.6	0	0			
			Woodland: Broad-leaved plantation	0.23	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.03	0.12	0	0	0.20	0.80	
			Woodland: Coniferous plantation	4.83	Low	2	Good	3	0.91	5.46	0	0	3.92	23.52	
			Woodland: Mixed plantation	0.08	Medium	4	Poor	2	0.00	0	0	0	0.08	0.64	
			Woodland: Dense continuous scrub	0.78	Medium	4	Moderate	2	0.66	5.28	0	0	0.12	0.96	
			Grassland: Semi-improved acidic grassland	4.86	High	6	Moderate	2	0.40	4.8	0	0	4.46	53.52	
			Grassland: Semi-improved neutral grassland	0.10	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.02	0.08	0	0	0.08	0.32	
			Grassland: Improved grassland	28.63	Low	2	Moderate	2	3.42	13.68	3.50	14	21.71	86.84	
			Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	36.06	High	6	Moderate	2	9.42	113.04	17.27	207.24	8.13	97.56	
			Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	13.41	High	6	Moderate	2	5.19	62.28	3.37	40.44	4.85	58.20	
			Heathland: Wet heath / Acid grassland mosaic	2.86	High	6	Moderate	2	0.24	2.88	0	0	2.62	31.44	
			Wetland: Sphagnum bog	33.49	High	6	Moderate	2	0.90	10.8	23.54	282.48	9.05	108.60	
			Wetland: Acid/neutral flush	0.26	High	6	Moderate	2	0.23	2.76	0	0	0.03	0.36	
			Wetland: Fen and mire	7.94	High	6	Good	3	0.00	0	0	0	7.94	142.92	
			Wetland: Standing water	0.15	High	6	Good	3	0.00	0	0	0	0.15	2.70	
			Built Environment: Buildings/hardstanding	3.75	None	0	Moderate	2	0.00	0	0	0	3.75	0.00	
Ventilation Raises	0.40		Heathland: Wet heath / Acid grassland mosaic	0.20	High	6	Poor	1	0.00	0	0	0	0.20	1.20	
			Wetland: Sphagnum bog	0.20	High	6	Moderate	2	0.00	0	0	0	0.20	2.40	
Existing infrastructure site	1.81		Grassland: Improved grassland	0.20	Low	2	Poor	1	0.20	0.4		0			
			Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	0.02	High	6	Poor	1	0.02	0.12		0			
			Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	0.14	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.14	0.56		0			
			Wetland: Standing water	0.04	None	0	Poor	1	0.04	0		0			
			Other: Spoil	0.42	None	0	Poor	1	0.42	0		0			
			Other: Bare ground	0.45	None	0	Poor	1	0.45	0		0			
			Built Environment: Buildings/hardstanding	0.54	None	0	Poor	1	0.54	0		0			
Total	140.44		Total	140.44			Total		24.03	231.86	47.68	544.16	67.49	611.98	
$\sum D + \sum F + \sum H = 1388.00$															
Site Habitat Biodiversity Value (J)															
Indirect Impacts Including Off Site Habitats															
Value of Loss from Indirect Impacts															
Li, Lii															
Li - Lii															
Before															
After															
Before															
After															
Before															
After															
Before															
After															
Before															
After															
Total									M	0				HIS = J + M	
Habitat Impact Score (HIS)															
611.98															

Proposed Habitats on Site			Target habitat distinctiveness		Target habitat condition		Time till target condition		Difficulty of creation / restoration		Habitat Biodiversity Value	Notes	
Code	Phase 1 Habitat	Habitat Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Time (years)	Score	Difficulty	Score	(N x O x P) / Q / R		
Habitat Creation		N	O	P	Existing Value S(=F)		Q	R	((N x O x P)-S) / Q / R				
Landscaping	Woodland: Broad-leaved plantation	3.98	Medium	4	Moderate	2	20	2	Medium	1.5	10.61	Landscape broadleaved woodland	
Landscaping	Woodland: Broad-leaved plantation	0.46	Medium	4	Moderate	2	25	2.4	Medium	1.5	1.02	Landscape broadleaved woodland (Ash Woodland)	
Landscaping	Grassland: Semi-improved acidic grassland	6.70	High	6	Good	3	5	1.2	Medium	1.5	67.00	Landscape Seed Mix 2 acid grassland	
Landscaping	Heathland: Wet heath / Acid grassland mosaic	4.30	High	6	Good	3	10	1.4	Medium	1.5	36.86	Landscape Seed Mix 1 heath scrub with anticipated some natural acid grassland regeneration	
MU2	Wetland: Sphagnum bog	1.43	High	6	Good	3	5	1.2	High	3	7.15	Habitat creation not designed to create blanket bog but rather a peatland habitat that is active.	
Smooth Newt	Wetland: Standing water	0.09	High	6	Good	3	5	1.2	Medium	1.5	0.90	New ponds created for smooth newts	
Total		16.96											
Habitat Enhancement													
MU1	Wetland: Sphagnum bog	18.34	High	6	Good	3	2	10	1.4	High	3	78.12	
MU2	Wetland: Sphagnum bog	0.68	High	6	Good	3	2	10	1.4	High	3	2.44	
MU3	Heathland: Wet heath / Acid grassland mosaic	3.96	High	6	Good	3	1	10	1.4	Medium	1	50.20	Restoration of acid grassland to wet heath / acid grassland mosaic
MU3	Wetland: Sphagnum bog	4.52	High	6	Good	3	1	15	1.7	High	3	15.76	
MU6	Wetland: Fen and mire	1.40	High	6	Good	3	1	10	1.4	Medium	1.5	11.52	Includes restoration of 0.53 ha of marsh / marshy grassland to Sphagnum bog
MU7	Wetland: Fen and mire	0.37	High	6	Good	3	3	5	1.4	Medium	1.5	1.74	Includes restoration of 0.25 ha of marsh / marshy grassland to Sphagnum bog
HE1	Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	0.42	Medium	4	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Low	1	3.37	Enhancement of existing grassland for badger
HE2	Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	5.61	High	6	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Medium	1.5	55.54	Enhancement of existing grassland to improved habitat for foodsource for bats
HE3	Grassland: Improved grassland	3.50	Low	2	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Low	1	16.67	Enhancement of existing grassland to improved habitat for foodsource for bats
HE4	Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	1.72	Medium	4	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Low	1	16.37	Enhancement of existing grassland to improved habitat for foodsource for bats
HE5	Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	1.23	Medium	4	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Low	1	11.47	Enhancement of existing grassland for smooth newts
HE6	Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	5.13	High	6	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Medium	1.5	50.74	Enhancement of existing grassland for smooth newts
HE7	Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	6.53	High	6	Good	3	1	5	1.2	Low	1	97.12	Enhancement of existing grassland for common lizard
Total		53.41											

Trading Down Correction Value	0.00
Habitat Mitigation Score (HMS)	534.60
Habitat Biodiversity Impact Score (HMS - HIS)	-77.38
Percentage of Biodiversity Impact Loss	12.64

Infrastructure Development	Footprint Area (ha)	Existing Linear Features on Site		Linear distinctiveness		Linear condition		Habitat Biodiversity Value						
		Code	Phase 1 Habitat	Feature Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Linear Features to be retained with no change within development		Linear Features to be retained and enhanced within development		Linear Features to be lost within development	
									Area (ha)	Existing value	Area (ha)	Existing value	Length (km)	Existing value
		Direct Impacts and Retained Habitats		A	B	C	D (A x B x C)	E	F (A x B x E)	G	H (A x B x G)			
Proposed Infrastructure Site	144.70		Wetland: Running water	3.33	High	6	Poor	1	1.62	9.72	0	0	1.71	10.26
			Hedges: Native species-rich intact hedge	0.11	Very high	8	Poor	1	0.11	0.88	0	0		
			Hedges: Intact hedge	2.34	High	6	Moderate	2	1.46	17.52	0	0	0.88	10.56
			Hedges: Defunct hedge	1.29	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.44	1.76	0.42	1.68	0.43	1.72
			Hedges: Hedge with trees	0.52	Very high	8	Moderate	2	0.11	1.76	0	0	0.41	6.56
			Ditches: Dry ditch	10.71	Low	2	Poor	1	7.13	14.26	0	0	3.58	7.16
			Other: Earth bank	4.32	Low	2	Moderate	2	3.28	13.12	0	0	1.04	4.16
			Boundaries: Wall	0.09	Medium	4	Poor	1	0.00	0	0	0	0.09	0.36
Total	144.70		Total	22.71			Total		14.15	59.02	0.42	1.68	8.14	40.78
												$\sum D + \sum F + \sum H$	101.48	
												Site Linear Biodiversity Value (J)		
Indirect Impacts Including Off Site Habitats				K					Value of Loss from Indirect Impacts					
									Li, Lii	Li - Lii				
Before														
After														
Before														
After														
Before														
After														
Before														
After														
Before														
After														
Total										M	0		Linear Impact Score (HIS)	HIS = J + M 40.78

Code	Proposed Habitats on Site		Target habitat distinctiveness		Target habitat condition		Existing Value S(=F)	Time till target condition	Difficulty of creation / restoration		Linear Biodiversity Value		
	Phase 1 Habitat	Feature Length (km)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score			Time (years)	Score		Difficulty	Score
Habitat Creation													
Landscape	Hedges: Native species-rich intact hedge	1.84	Very High	8	Good	3	10	1.4	Low	1	31.54		
	Total	1.84											
Habitat Enhancement													
Landscape	Hedges: Defunct hedge	0.42	Medium	4	Good	3	1	1.4	Low	1	2.89		
	Total	0.42											
											Trading Down Correction Value	0.00	
											Linear Mitigation Score (HMS)	34.43	
											Linear Biodiversity Impact Score (HMS - HIS)	-6.35	
											Percentage of Linear Impact Loss	15.57	

Biodiversity Impact Assessment Summary (With Offsite Compensation)

Site name:	Curraghinalt Project
Planning reference number:	

Habitats	Area (ha)	Habitat Biodiversity Value
Total existing area onsite	140.44	1402.88
Habitats negatively impacted by development Habitat Impact Score	68.73	626.86
On site habitat mitigation and compensation Habitat Mitigation Score	123.10	755.13
Biodiversity gain Habitat Biodiversity Impact Score		128.27
Percentage of biodiversity impact		
Linear features		
	Length (km)	Linear Biodiversity Value
Total existing length onsite	22.71	101.48
Linear features negatively impacted by development Linear Impact Score	8.14	40.78
On site linear mitigation Linear Mitigation Score	2.26	34.43
Linear biodiversity loss Linear Biodiversity Impact Score		-6.35
Percentage of linear biodiversity impact		15.57

Phase 1 Habitat Description	Phase 1 Habitat Code	Distinctiveness	Difficulty of Creation	Difficulty of Restoration			
Built Environment: Buildings/hardstanding	n/a	None	0	Low	1	Low	1
Built Environment: Gardens (lawn and planting)	n/a	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Woodland: Broad-leaved semi-natural woodland	A111	High	6	n/a	-	Low	1
Woodland: Broad-leaved plantation	A112	Medium	4	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Woodland: Coniferous semi-natural woodland	A121	Medium	4	n/a	-	Low	1
Woodland: Coniferous plantation	A122	Low	2	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Woodland: Mixed semi-natural woodland	A131	Medium	4	n/a	-	Low	1
Woodland: Mixed plantation	A132	Low	2	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Woodland: Wet woodland	n/a	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Woodland: Dense continuous scrub	A21	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Woodland: Scattered scrub	A22	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Woodland: Broad-leaved parkland / Scattered trees	A31	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Woodland: Coniferous parkland / Scattered trees	A32	Medium	4	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Woodland: Recently felled woodland	A4	Low	2	n/a	-	n/a	-
Woodland: Orchard	A5	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Grassland: Unimproved acidic grassland	B11	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Semi-improved acidic grassland	B12	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Unimproved neutral grassland	B21	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Semi-improved neutral grassland	B22	Medium	4	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Unimproved calcareous grassland	B31	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Semi-improved calcareous grassland	B32	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Poor semi-improved grassland	B6	Medium	4	Medium	1.5	Low	1
Grassland: Improved grassland	B4	Low	2	n/a	-	Low	1
Grassland: Marsh / Marshy grassland	B5	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Grassland: Set-aside / Arable field margins	J113	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Grassland: Amenity grassland	J12	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Heathland: Dry dwarf shrub heath	D1	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	-0.5
Heathland: Wet dwarf shrub heath	D2	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	0.5
Heathland: Dry heath / Acid grassland mosaic	D5	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Heathland: Wet heath / Acid grassland mosaic	D6	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Standing water	G1	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Running water	G2	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Reedbed	n/a	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Wetland: Sphagnum bog	E1	High	6	Very High	10	High	3
Wetland: Acid/neutral flush	E2	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Fen and mire	E3	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Swamp	F1	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Wetland: Inundation	F22	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Arable	J11	Low	2	n/a	-	Low	1
Other: Continuous bracken	C11	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Tall ruderal	C31	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Non-ruderal	C32	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Ephemeral/short perennial	J13	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Quarry (active)	I21	None	0	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Quarry (disused)	I21	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Spoil	I22	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Refuse tip	I24	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Introduced shrub	J14	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Bare ground	J4	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Linear Features							
Hedges: Intact hedge	J21	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Native species-rich intact hedge	J211	Very High	8	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Hedge with trees	J23	Very High	8	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Native species-rich intact hedge with trees	J231	Very High	8	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Defunct hedge	J22	Medium	4	n/a	-	Low	1
Hedges: Linear scrub	J21	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Linear trees	A3	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Hedges: Introduced scrub	J14	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Wetland: Running water	G2	High	6	Medium	2	Low	1
Ditches: Standing water	G1	High	6	Medium	2	Low	1
Ditches: Running water	G2	High	6	Medium	2	Low	1
Ditches: Dry ditch	J26	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Boundaries: Wall	J25	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
Boundaries: Dry stone wall	J25	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Inland cliff	I1	Medium	4	Low	1	Low	1
Other: Earth bank	J28	Low	2	Low	1	Low	1
EU Annex I Habitats							
Blanket Bogs (priority where active*)	7130*	High	6	Very High	10	High	3
Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix	4010	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	0.5
Molinia meadows on calcareous, peaty or clayey-silt-laden soils	6410	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
NI Priority Habitats							
Blanket bog	BB	High	6	Very High	10	High	3
Lowland heathland	LH	High	6	Medium	1.5	Medium	1.5
Purple moor-grass and rush pastures	PR	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Upland Flushes, Fens and Swamps	UF	High	6	High	3	Medium	1.5
Ponds	P	High	6	Low	1	Low	1
Mixed Ashwoods	MA	High	6	Medium	1.5	Low	1

Distinctiveness	
Very high	8
High	6
Medium	4
Low	2
None	0

Condition	
Good	3
Moderate	2
Poor	1

Time	
5 years	1.2
10 years	1.4
15 years	1.7
20 years	2
25 years	2.4
30 years	2.8
32+ years	3

Difficulty	
Very high	10
High	3
Medium	1.5
Low	1
None	0

EUROPEAN OFFICES

United Kingdom

AYLESBURY

T: +44 (0)1844 337380

BELFAST

T: +44 (0)28 9073 2493

BRADFORD-ON-AVON

T: +44 (0)1225 309400

BRISTOL

T: +44 (0)117 906 4280

CAMBRIDGE

T: + 44 (0)1223 813805

CARDIFF

T: +44 (0)29 2049 1010

CHELMSFORD

T: +44 (0)1245 392170

EDINBURGH

T: +44 (0)131 335 6830

EXETER

T: + 44 (0)1392 490152

GLASGOW

T: +44 (0)141 353 5037

GUILDFORD

T: +44 (0)1483 889800

LEEDS

T: +44 (0)113 258 0650

LONDON

T: +44 (0)203 805 6418

MAIDSTONE

T: +44 (0)1622 609242

MANCHESTER

T: +44 (0)161 872 7564

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

T: +44 (0)191 261 1966

NOTTINGHAM

T: +44 (0)115 964 7280

SHEFFIELD

T: +44 (0)114 245 5153

SHREWSBURY

T: +44 (0)1743 23 9250

STAFFORD

T: +44 (0)1785 241755

STIRLING

T: +44 (0)1786 239900

WORCESTER

T: +44 (0)1905 751310

Ireland

DUBLIN

T: + 353 (0)1 296 4667

France

GRENOBLE

T: +33 (0)6 23 37 14 14