



Haile Moor Mine

Haile, Egremont

# **EclA Report**

#### **Prepared For: Electricity North West Limited**

Document Reference: 10969.01.003

April 2025

Version 1.0

TEP 401 Faraday Street Birchwood Park Warrington WA3 6GA Tel: 01925 844004 Email: tep@tep.uk.com Offices in Warrington, Market Harborough, Gateshead, London and Cornwall



Project Name	Haile Moor Mine
Location	Haile, Egremont
Document Title	EcIA Report
Client	Electricity North West Limited
Year of Surveys	2025
Prepared By	The Environment Partnership Ltd
Version	1.0
Office	Warrington
Document Ref	10969.01.003

Amendmer	nt History				
Version	Date	Modified by	Check/ Approved by	Reason	Status
1.0	April 2025	HG	HG	First issue	Complete

The Environment Partnership Ltd is a private limited company registered in England. Registered number 7745159. Registered office: 401 Faraday Street, Birchwood Park, Warrington, WA3 6GA.

© Copyright 2025 The Environment Partnership Ltd. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by The Environment Partnership Ltd ("TEP") for sole use of our Client in accordance with the provisions of the contract between TEP and the Client. No third party may use or rely upon this document or its content. TEP accepts no liability or responsibility for any such use or reliance thereon by any third party.



TEP is a Registered Practice of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. The content of this document has been prepared in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct and is compliant with



British Standard BS42020:2013 Biodiversity Code of Practice for Planning and Development.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this document are based upon information gathered by TEP and provided by third parties. Information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been independently verified by TEP, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document.

Nothing in this report constitutes legal opinion. If legal opinion is required, the advice of a qualified legal professional should be secured.



## Contents

Execu	tive Summary	.4
1.0	Introduction	. 5
2.0	Methods	. 8
3.0	Results	14
4.0	Assessment of Potential Impacts	18
5.0	Mitigation and Enhancement	21
6.0	Conclusions	24

## Figures

Figure 1:	Site location and	ocal context6	3
-----------	-------------------	---------------	---

## Drawings

Drawing 1: UK Habitat Classification Survey (Ref G10969.01.008)

## Annexes

Annex A: Development Proposals

Annex B: Target Notes and Photographs



## **Executive Summary**

Site Details	The site is located near Haile, Egremont, Cumbria CA22 2PE (grid ref: NY 04182 08702)
Proposals	The site application boundary measures 0.09ha. The proposals are for the installation of a lattice tower, generator and equipment cabin at Haile Moor Mine.
Designated Wildlife Sites	There are three internationally statutory designated sites within 10km of the site River Ehen Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Lake District High Fells SAC and Drigg Coast SAC. There are seven nationally statutory designated sites within 5km of the site boundary, Haile Great Wood, Black Moss, Florence Mine, River Calder Section, Low Church Moss, Silver Tarn, Hollas and Harnsey Mosses and Clints Quarry Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)'s. There are two locally non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site, Carletonmoor Wood County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Brighome Wood CWS.
Important Ecological Features Present Within or Adjacent to the Site	No notable habitats have been recorded within or directly adjacent to the site.
Recommendations	A pre-works check should be undertaken for badger, brown hare, hedgehog and herptiles. A sensitive lighting scheme during and post-construction and RPZ should be employed around trees adjacent to the site boundary.
Conclusions	The following recommendations are made to ensure that delivery of the project remains compliant with relevant legislation and policy:

This Executive Summary is not a substitute for the full report. Refer to the full text of this report for further detail.



## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Environment Partnership (TEP) was commissioned by Electricity North West Limited to undertake an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) for a site called Haile Moor Mine (hereafter referred to as 'the site') in Haile, Egremont, Cumbria, CA22 2PE.
- 1.2 An Ecological Desk Study has been produced to support this EcIA, reported under separate cover (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001). This EcIA report should read in conjunction with the Desk Study.
- 1.3 This EcIA report includes details of the methods employed and any limitations of the surveys undertaken. Results are provided with supporting maps, together with an evaluation of the ecological features within the site, an assessment of the potential impacts associated with the development proposals and requirements for mitigation. The assessment has been undertaken with due consideration for current best practice guidelines (CIEEM 2017a<sup>1</sup>, 2018<sup>2</sup>).

## Site Location

1.4 The site (central grid reference NY 04182 08702) is located approximately 0.8km east of Haile village and is depicted by the red line shown in Figure 1. The surrounding landscape is predominantly agricultural with pockets of woodland located northwest of the site boundary. A series of becks namely Kirk Beck, Hannah Beck, Comb Beck and Black Beck are also present in the wider area.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CIEEM (2017a) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing, 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine version 1.2. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester



Figure 1: Site location and local context

#### **Proposals**

- 1.5 The proposals are for the installation of a lattice tower, generator and equipment cabin at Haile Moor Mine.
- 1.6 Further details for site proposals are presented in Annex A.

## **Planning Context**

- 1.7 Relevant information regarding local planning policy is provided in the Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001).
- 1.8 The site is not allocated under any policies listed in the Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039 (adopted 2024).
- 1.9 Under the National Planning Policy Framework 2023<sup>3</sup> (NPPF), opportunities to achieve a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain within developments should be pursued.

#### Scope

- 1.10 This ecological assessment considers potential ecological effects upon any notable habitats or species which may be present or adjacent to the site.
- 1.11 This report provides baseline information on the habitats and protected species present within the site, gathered during a desktop study and UKHab habitat survey undertaken in March 2025.
- 1.12 This report presents the findings of the EcIA, the objectives of which are to:
  - Detail the methods and results of the aforementioned surveys;
  - Identify features of ecological value within the site, such as legally protected species or habitats of importance to biodiversity;
  - Identify any non-native invasive species within the site and provide advice regarding removal or management;
  - Advise on avoidance or mitigation requirements that may be needed prior to development commencing; and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)



 Provide outline recommendations for biodiversity enhancement within site proposals in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).



## 2.0 Methods

## **Desk Study**

- 2.1 In line with current best practice (CIEEM, 2016<sup>4</sup>, 2017b<sup>5</sup>), information regarding designated sites, notable habitats and existing protected and notable species records of the past decade, within a 2km minimum radius of the site was collated and reviewed to inform this ecological assessment. Further detail regarding ecological zones of influence (EZOI) applied for different ecological features and the sources of information included are presented in the Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001).
- 2.2 In brief, key data sources included Natural England (open source data), Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039 (adopted 2024), Cumbria Biodiversity Data Centre (CBDC) and Cumbria Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and a review of relevant (within the past ten years) species records.
- 2.3 Statutory designated wildlife sites were searched for as follows (EZOI applied for each is indicated in brackets):
  - Ramsar sites (including proposed sites) (10km);
  - National Sites Network (10km), includes Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Areas (SPA) (including potential sites) (10km);
  - Marine Conservation Zones (10km)
  - Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (5km);
  - National Nature Reserve (NNR) (5km);
  - Marine Nature Reserve (MNR) (5km);
  - National Parks (5km);
  - Local Nature Reserves (LNR) (2km);
  - Country Parks (2km); and
  - Strategic Nature Areas (2km).
- 2.4 Non-statutory designated wildlife sites were searched for within 2km of the site and these may include:
  - County Wildlife Sites (CWS);
  - Potential County Wildlife Sites (pCWS);

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> CIEEM (2016) Guidelines for Accessing and Using Biodiversity Data. Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> CIEEM (2017b) Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management



- Local Wildlife Site (LWS);
- Unconfirmed Wildlife Sites (UWS); and
- Other Sites of Wildlife Interest (OSWI).
- 2.5 Notable habitats were searched for within 0.25km of the site. Notable habitats may include those listed under any of the following:
  - Ancient woodland;
  - Main rivers;
  - Habitats of principal importance (HPI) as listed by the requirements of Section 41 (S41) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006<sup>6</sup>; and
  - Local Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats (LBAP).
- 2.6 Pre-existing records for notable species were reviewed from the combined data sources, where found from within approximately 2km of the site. Notable species include those listed under any of the following:
  - Protected animal species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (EPS);
  - Protected bird species under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (WCA1);
  - Protected animal species under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (WCA5);
  - Protected plant species under Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (WCA8);
  - Invasive non-native plant species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (WCA9);
  - Invasive non-native species under the Invasive Alien Species (Enforcement and Permitting) Order 2019 (IAS);
  - Species of principal importance (SPI) as listed by the requirements of S41 of NERC;
  - Protection of Badgers Act 1992 (PBA);
  - Red and Amber listed Birds of Conservation Concern (BRd/BAm); and
  - Cumbria Biodiversity Action Plan Species (CBAP).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England.



#### Limitations

2.7 Species records can provide a useful indication of the species present within the search area, although the absence of a given species from the dataset cannot be taken to represent actual absence.

### **Habitats and Flora**

#### Habitat Survey

- 2.8 An extended UK Habitat (UKHab) survey and condition assessment was completed by a suitably qualified TEP ecologist, certified to Level 4 under the Field Identification Skills Certification (FISC). The survey was completed on 21 March 2025. Weather conditions were dry.
- 2.9 The survey was carried out in accordance with the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) assessment method and Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (CIEEM, 2017b). The method records the habitats present within the survey route, based on the UKHab descriptions. Plant species were identified in accordance with the New Flora of the British Isles (Stace, 2019<sup>7</sup>) and recorded as target notes using the DAFOR<sup>8</sup> scale, where relevant.
- 2.10 The survey was expanded to include off-site habitats adjacent to the site in order to provide context. Adjacent habitats were viewed from accessible locations within the site boundary. Habitats are displayed with the site boundary on Drawing 1 (G10969.01.008).

#### Limitations

- 2.11 Any ecological survey represents a snapshot of ecological conditions at the time of survey; ecological conditions may change over time. Efforts to identify dominant plant species for the purposes of characterising broad habitat types do not constitute a detailed botanical survey.
- 2.12 The survey was conducted in March which is outside the optimum survey period of April to mid-October. However, given the nature and size of the site this is not considered to be an overriding constraint. There were no constraints regarding access and no limitations on the data obtained.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Insert reference here, use "Footnote Text" style.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Insert reference here, use "Footnote Text" style.



### Fauna

- 2.13 Ordnance Survey maps and aerials were reviewed to identify potentially suitable habitats offsite within influence (e.g. dispersal distances for mobile species) of the site. The Ecological Desk Study identified any pre-existing records for protected and notable species within at least 2km of the site.
- 2.14 The habitat survey included an extended assessment of the habitats present for their potential to support notable or protected wildlife species. Any signs indicating the presence of these species were recorded.
- 2.15 In combination, this data informed the ecological evaluation of the site and impact assessment for the proposed development.

#### Ground-level tree assessment (GLTA) for roosting bats

- 2.16 A Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) of trees within and immediately adjacent to the site was carried out on 21st March 2025 by a qualified TEP ecologist.
- 2.17 Following the GLTA, trees were categorised with reference to their bat roost habitat suitability (PRF-M, PRF-I or None) as determined by their characteristics and potential roost features (PRFs).

#### Limitations

- 2.18 The GLTA was undertaken in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, 2023)<sup>9</sup> during suitable weather conditions and therefore there was no significant constraint to the survey. Poor light conditions can cause PRFs to be missed, wind can blow away external signs e.g., droppings and rain can wash away droppings and make staining around roost entrances difficult to distinguish.
- 2.19 Optimal conditions for identifying tree PRFs are when trees are not in leaf. The recommended survey window for GLTA is between December and March (inclusive) such that the survey was undertaken in the optimal season.

#### **Badger Survey**

2.20 A badger survey was undertaken by experienced TEP ecologists on the 21st March 2025. The survey included land within the Scheme boundaries and land within 30m where access was permitted. All suitable habitats including woodland/scrub and hedgerow bases were checked for badger signs.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London. ISBN-978-1-7395126-0-6



- 2.21 The badger surveys were carried out in accordance with the following guidance:
  - Badgers and Development, 2007<sup>10</sup>
  - Surveying Badgers, 1989<sup>11</sup>
  - National Badger Survey, 1990<sup>12</sup>

#### Limitations

2.22 No limitations to the badger survey were encountered during the survey.

## **Ecological Assessment Process**

- 2.23 This EcIA follows the published guidelines (CIEEM, 2018) and accepted best practice approach (BS42020:2013<sup>13</sup>) of the mitigation hierarchy whereby impacts are first avoided or, where this is not possible, reduced or mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated.
- 2.24 In summary, the following procedure was undertaken during this EcIA:
  - Describe the baseline and identify important ecological features;
  - Describe important ecological features and identify those which may potentially be affected by the site;
  - Identify potential impacts upon important ecological features and characterise the effect of such impacts (in respect of biophysical changes and taking account of relevant aspects of ecosystem structure or function);
  - Incorporate measures to avoid or reduce these effects;
  - Determine whether residual ecological effects are considered significant after avoidance or mitigation;
  - Identify appropriate compensation measures to offset significant residual effects; and
  - Identify opportunities for ecological enhancement.
- 2.25 Important ecological features are identified and valued, ecological impacts are characterised and assessed, and recommendations for appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement are made, in accordance with CIEEM guidance.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> NATURAL ENGLAND (2007) Badgers and Development. Natural England, Peterborough
<sup>11</sup> Harris, S., Cresswell, P, & Jefferies, D. (1989) Surveying Badgers. Mammal Society Occasional Publication No.9. Mammal Society, London.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> CRESSWELL P., HARRIS S., & JEFFERIES D.J. (1990). The History, Distribution, Status and Habitat Requirements of the Badger in Britain. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> British Standards Institution (2013) BS 42020:2013: Biodiversity — Code of practice for planning and development. BSI Standards Limited, London



#### THE ENVIRONMENT PARTNERSHIP

- 2.26 BS42020:2013 defines a significant effect as one "which is important, notable, or of consequence, having regard to its context". CIEEM describes significance as "a concept related to the weight that should be attached to effects when decisions are made". CIEEM defines an ecological effect as significant if it is "sufficiently important to require assessment and reporting so that the decision maker is adequately informed of the environmental consequences of permitting a project".
- 2.27 BS42020:2013 sets out a practical approach to determining the significance of an ecological effect, applicable at all levels of decision making in legal and policy terms, as follows:
  - Will the effect on biodiversity influence the balance of planning considerations and therefore the decision as to whether planning permission is likely to be refused or granted; and
  - If planning permission is granted, is the effect important enough to warrant the use of planning conditions and/or obligations to guarantee proposed measures or to impose restrictions, or to seek further requirements (e.g. for mitigation, compensation, enhancement, monitoring or management).
- 2.28 Significance is therefore assessed on a case-specific basis according to the importance of the ecological feature (wildlife site, habitat or species) within the conservation hierarchy, and the effect upon it.

## Assumptions

2.29 Information provided by third parties, including publicly available information, is assumed to be correct at the time of publication.



## 3.0 Results

## **Planning Context**

- 3.1 The NPPF at Chapter 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment requires that development delivers net gains in biodiversity in addition to minimising the impacts on biodiversity. The chapter highlights the need to protect and enhance valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils, as well as recognising the wider benefits of ecosystems.
- 3.2 The Copeland Local Plan 2021-2039 was adopted by Cumberland Council on 05 November 2024. Relevant extracts of local planning policy are provided in the Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001). The following policies relate to biodiversity and nature conservation:
  - Strategic Policy N1 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity
  - Strategic Policy N2 Local Nature Recovery Networks
  - Strategic Policy N3 Biodiversity Net Gain
  - Strategic Policy N5: Protection of Water Resources
  - Strategic Policy N9 Green Infrastructure
  - Policy N14 Woodlands, Trees and Hedgerows

#### Wildlife Sites

#### National Sites Network

- 3.3 Full details regarding designated sites are provided within the Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001).
- 3.4 There are three sites within the National Sites Network located within 10km of the site. These are:
  - River Ehen SAC 5.05km north-west;
  - Lake District High Fells SAC 8.75km north-east; and
  - Drigg Coast SAC 8.39km south.

#### **Other Statutory Wildlife Sites**

- 3.5 There are seven SSSIs within the National Sites Network located within 5km. These are:
  - Haile Great Wood SSSI 0.89km north-west



- Black Moss SSSI 2.0km north-west
- Florence Mine SSSI 2.35km north-west
- River Calder Section SSSI 3.88km north-east
- Low Church Moss SSSI 3.90km south-west
- Silver Tarn, Hollas and Harnsey Mosses SSSI 4.46km south-west; and
- Clints Quarry SSSI 4.69km north-west
- 3.6 SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) highlight the potential for effects on a SSSI if certain types of development are planned within a specified radius of it. The site falls within a single IRZ. The proposals do not meet any of the risk parameters identified for this IRZ.

#### Local Wildlife Sites

- 3.7 There are two non-statutory local wildlife sites identified within 2km of the site. These are:
  - Carletonmoor Wood CWS 1.38km north-west
  - Brigholme Wood CWS 2.0km south-east

## Habitats and Flora

#### **Pre-existing Data**

- 3.8 The Desk Study identified the following notable habitats mapped within 0.25km of the site:
  - Good quality semi-improved grassland (non-priority); and
  - Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land
- 3.9 Habitats of ecological value present in and around the site are described below and illustrated in Drawing 1: G10969.01.008. Target notes (TN) and photographs illustrative of the habitat/feature described are provided in Annex B.

#### Modified grasslands (g4.10.14.102)

- 3.10 The site is a single parcel of modified grassland (TN1) in good condition with scattered scrub and scattered rushes. The grassland is grazed by sheep, characterised by a short, even sward which supports an average of seven species per square metre.
- 3.11 The grassland consists predominantly of perennial ryegrass *Lolium perenne* and white clover *Trifolium repens*. Other species include daisy *Bellis perennis*, common



mouse-ear *Cerastium fontanum*, creeping thistle *Cirsium arvense*, cock's-foot *Dactylis glomerata*, Yorkshire-fog *Holcus lanatus*, soft rush *Juncus effusus*, creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* and common nettle *Urtica dioica*.

3.12 The site is accessed via an off-site band of sheep grazed modified grassland which lies outside of the red line boundary (TN2).

### Fauna

#### Badger

- 3.13 The Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001) did not return any records of badger within 2km of the site.
- 3.14 No evidence of badger including setts or snuffle holes were identified within the site or adjacent land during the habitat survey. A single mammal path was recorded along the sites southern boundary which was attributed to sheep due to the large gap in the fence and hoof tracks.

#### Bats

- 3.15 The Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001) did not return any records of bat species within 2km of the site although it is considered likely bats are present in the local vicinity.
- 3.16 No potential roosting features for bats were observed within the adjacent trees and shrubs during the habitat survey.
- 3.17 Two derelict brick buildings to the west have potential for crevice-dwelling bats due to cracks/gaps in the brickwork, though appeared less suitable for void roosting species as the roof voids are open and daylight permeates the interior due to the large empty doorways/windows and the numerous holes present within the corrugated asbestos roofs. An internal inspection was not undertaken. These buildings lie outside of the site boundary and are not due to be effected by the proposals.

#### **Other Relevant Species**

- 3.18 The Ecological Desk Study (TEP Ref: 10969.01.001) returned two records for brown hare Lepus europaeus and three records for hedgehog Erinaceus europaeus. No evidence of such species was recorded during the site visit.
- 3.19 The habitat survey identified an on-site pile of roofing materials, an off-site rubble pile and gaps between the stones in an adjacent earth bank which may provide



refuge for small mammals and herptiles. Evidence of use of the site by moles *Talpa europaea* and rabbits *Oryctolagus cuniculus* was recorded during the site visit.



## 4.0 Assessment of Potential Impacts

- 4.1 This section assesses the potential impacts on ecological features associated with the site described in Section 1.0 and detailed in Annex A.
- 4.2 Consideration is given to the 'mitigation hierarchy', i.e. that impacts are first avoided or where this is not practicable, mitigated and as a final resort, compensated (offset).

## Wildlife Sites

#### **National Sites Network**

- 4.3 There are three internationally designated sites within 10km of the proposed development site, the closest being River Ehen SAC located 5.05km north-west of the site boundary. Given the nature of the proposals it is not anticipated that there will be any direct or indirect impacts on the nearby internationally designated sites as a result of the proposed development.
- 4.4 There are seven nationally designated sites within 5km of the proposed development site, the closest being Haile Great Wood SSSI located 0.75km northwest of the site boundary. Given the nature of the proposals it is not anticipated that there will be any direct or indirect impacts on these nationally designated sites as a result of the proposed development.

#### Other Statutory Wildlife Sites

4.5 There are no statutory locally designated sites within 2km of the proposed development site.

#### Local Wildlife Sites

4.6 There are two non-statutory locally designated sites within 2km of the site, the closest being Carletonmoor Wood CWS located 1.38km north-west of the site boundary. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated as a result of development.

### Habitats and Flora

#### **Notable Habitats**

- 4.7 Two notable habitats are mapped within 250m of the site.
- 4.8 Habitat identified as 'open mosaic habitats on previously developed land' has been mapped approximately 15m from the site boundary. However, it is noted that this is described as 'probably the priority habitat but some uncertainty of interpretation' and



that it has been mapped through aerial photography only. It is not considered that this is sufficiently accurate in isolation to confirm the presence of open mosaic habitat on previously developed land. Furthermore, this off-site habitat will not be impacted by the proposals.

4.9 Good quality semi-improved grassland (non-priority) is also mapped approximately 250m from the site boundary, this habitat will not be affected by the proposals.

#### **Other Habitats**

#### <u>Grasslands</u>

4.10 The modified grassland within the site is considered to be of limited ecological value. Small losses and temporary impacts to these grasslands are not considered to be a limiting factor for the proposed development.

#### **Notable Flora**

4.11 No protected (WCA8) plant species were identified during the habitat survey. There are no implications to the proposed development with regard to protected plant species.

#### **Invasive Flora**

4.12 No invasive (WCA9) plant species were identified during the habitat survey. There are no implications to the proposed development with regard to invasive plant species.

#### Fauna

#### Badger

- 4.13 No evidence of badger was identified within the site or adjacent land during the habitat survey. There are no current implications to the proposed development with regard to badger.
- 4.14 Badgers are highly mobile species and whilst no evidence was found during surveys in March 2025, this may not be the case in twelve months' time. As a result, there would be potential implications to badger if an active sett was identified within the site or within a 30m buffer of the works area in the future. This may be direct impacts on a sett, or indirect impacts as a result of noise and vibrations from the proposed works.



#### Bats

4.15 No potential roosting features for bats were observed within the adjacent trees and shrubs during the habitat survey. Two buildings adjacent to the site boundary may have some minimal potential for roosting bats but are outside of the red line and not considered likely to be impacted by the proposals.

#### Other

- 4.16 The grassland within the site may provide limited suitable foraging and commuting opportunities for brown hare and hedgehog that have been recorded locally. However, no evidence of such species was recorded during the survey work undertaken and given the small size of the site and nature of the proposals, post-development it is considered that similar opportunities for such species will still be present locally.
- 4.17 The on-site pile of roofing materials, off-site rubble pile and gaps between the stones in an adjacent earth bank may provide refuge for small mammals and herptiles. No records of herptiles have been recorded locally, however should site clearance and groundworks impact such features it could result in the possible death/injury of individuals should they be present.



## 5.0 Mitigation and Enhancement

5.1 This section describes appropriate and proportionate measures for impact avoidance, mitigation and enhancement required or recommended to address the potential ecological effects described in Section 4.0.

### **Habitats and Flora**

#### Avoidance and Mitigation Required

5.2 A Root Protection Zone (RPZ) should be implemented around retained off-site trees that lie in close proximity to the site boundary in accordance with BS5837:2012 if development is likely to affect the trees, their roots and overhanging canopies. Replacement planting of trees unavoidably lost to development should be provided on site or, where this is not possible, in the local vicinity.

#### Additional Measures or Enhancement Recommended

5.3 There is potential for pollution from the construction activities to enter nearby habitats during the construction of the proposed development. This risk can be avoided through the production and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which would be secured by planning condition. The CEMP must include standard, best-practice methods on how site run-off will be controlled, how site waste will be managed, how fuel and other spillages will be prevented and must include emergency procedures for any pollution accidents.

#### Fauna

#### Badger

5.4 Badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 from killing, injury and certain acts of cruelty. Their setts are also protected from damage, obstruction or destruction.

#### Avoidance and Mitigation Required

5.5 If works have not commenced within twelve months of the original assessment (by March 2026) a pre-commencement badger survey is recommended to ensure no badger setts have been built within influencing distance of the proposed development.



#### Bats

5.6 All British bats are European protected species, afforded full protection under the Habitats Regulations and the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Bats are protected from killing or injury, and from disturbance at the place of rest. Bat roosts are also protected from obstruction, damage or destruction (whether or not a bat is in occupation at the time).

#### Avoidance and Mitigation Required

- 5.7 A Sensitive Lighting Strategy should be employed during and post construction. Lighting Design should be implemented to avoid indirect impacts of lighting on nocturnal and crepuscular species. There are four key lighting design principles:
  - Use of unnecessary lighting will be avoided.
  - Spatial spread of lighting the horizontal and vertical spread of artificial light will be minimised and consider both primary and reflected light sources.
    Directional lighting can be achieved by angle and orientation of beam, use of a cowl, louvre or other light shield, or a combination of these.
  - Timing and duration of lighting timers and bespoke dimming regimes may be used to ensure that luminaires are reduced at times of predicted low use. These can be set to change with the seasons and therefore reflect the shifting time of dusk and dawn throughout the year. Motion sensors provide further control to ensure that areas are illuminated only when required.
  - Intensity and colour of lighting light intensity will be as low as possible whilst meeting the objectives of the intended function. The colour of lighting will need to take into account the sensitivity of the ecological receptors on site. Light sources selected should emit zero ultra-violet light wherever possible. Interim guidance from the Bat Conservation Trust (2014) recommends that white and blue spectrum light should be avoided or, where white lights are required, these should be of warm/neutral colour and have a peak wavelength above 550 nanometers. Narrow spectrum light sources should be used (to lower the range of species affected by lighting).

#### Other

- 5.8 Brown hare and hedgehog are S41 species of principal importance and have been recorded locally.
- 5.9 The on-site pile of roofing materials, off-site rubble pile and gaps between the stones in an adjacent earth bank may provide refuge for small mammals and herptiles should they be present. Site clearance and groundworks could result in the



possible death/injury of individuals, therefore there will be implications for the proposed development with regards to these species.

#### Avoidance and Mitigation Required

- 5.10 Precautionary working measures should be adopted to minimise the risk of harm or injury to brown hare, hedgehog and herptiles. A pre-works check should be undertaken of the site and potential refuge features to ensure such species are not present ahead of works.
- 5.11 If vegetation clearance works are taking place during the hibernation period (October to March, inclusive) and a hibernating hedgehog is found, the hedgehog should be moved to a hibernation box placed in a safe place and lined with straw.



## 6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 The site is considered to be of low ecological value with limited features present to support protected species.
- 6.2 Impacts to the site are considered to be permanent but limited in scope considering the extent of the development proposals and existing habitat value.
- 6.3 Precautionary pre-works/pre-clearance checks are recommended with regard to badger, brown hare, hedgehog and herptiles.



# Drawings

Drawing 1: UK Habitat Classification Survey (Ref G10969.01.008)





Site boundary

• Target note

g4 Modified grassland

 $\underline{\mbox{Note:}}$  The locations of habitats and habitat features are indicative. sion of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO. ed by pe (N) Contains OS data © Crown Copyright and database right 2025. All rights Contains data from OS Zoomstack. Licence number 0100057890. HUISELLUSE WUUU Site Map Igeonnouse Wood Bleas booW wo l Wood Haile 0 S Rd Rev Description Drawn Approved Date THE ENVIRONMENT PARTNERSHIP TEP 401 Faraday Street, Birchwood Park, Warrington, WA3 6GA Tel 01925 844004 e-mail tep@tep.uk.com www.tep.uk.com

#### ENW Haile Moor Mine

Proi

## Title UK Habitat Classification Survey

### Drawing Number G10969.01.008

Drawn	Checked	Approved	Scale	Date
MC	IJ	HG	1:500 @ A3	04/04/2025



# Annex A: Development Proposals



	ORI	GINAL DRAWIN	G SIZE A3		P2407_	002
	Not	es:				
	1.	This drawing to b series	e read in conjunctior	n with	full drawir	ng
	2. /	All dimensions a	re in mm unless othe	rwise	noted.	
~						
~						
	A	GENERAL ARRANG	EMENT ISSUE		22.11.24	СК
	REV.	Ľ	DESCRIPTION		DATE	BY
	CON	-A-R	·S	EL	ıro-Te əsign	əl
	Clien	ele		C	itu	┛
	Drav	ving Title	ARGE SITE PLAI	N		
	Site	Location H	AILE MOOR MIN EGREMONT CUMBRIA CA22 2PE	ΝE		
	Drav	wn by	Checked by	Appro	ved by	
	Date	e Drawn	Date Checked	Date A	Approved	
	Drav	wing Number	22.11.24	22.11.	24	
	P2	2407_002-GA	-007-A			



# Annex B: Target Notes and Photographs



## **Target Notes**

The habitat survey was undertaken in March which is a sub-optimal period. Many species, including protected, notable or non-native invasive species may not have been in evidence at the time of the survey. Consequently, species lists recorded represent only those species recorded at the time of survey.

#### Modified grassland [g4]

KEY	to	DAFOR	Scale	of Abunda	nce
	~~		ooulo	or / to dridd	1100

Value	Cover	Notes
D = Dominant	>75%	Rarely used in practice
A = Abundant	51-75%	Very common in many parts of the target note area
F = Frequent	26%-50%	Several plants in several locations across target note area
O = Occasional	11-25%	Several plants in a few locations, or vice versa
R = Rare	1-10%	Small number of individuals, scattered or clustered within target note area/ site

#### Target Note 1

Modified grassland [g4] with scattered scrub (.10) and scattered rushes (.14), which is sheep grazed (.102). Characterised by a short, even sward which is supports 7 species per square meter. A small earth slope runs through the grassland from north to south, on which grows a gorse *Ulex europaeus* shrub. The grassland is used for grazing, and for storing farm machinery and storage materials. The red line boundary does not appear to include the boundaries of the grassland, which are enclosed by a post and wire fence on the southern and western sides, and an earth bank along the eastern and southern sides. Bracken *Pteridium aquilinum*, tall forbs, and scattered scrub (elder *Sambucus nigra*, hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*, dog-rose *Rosa canina*) are also present at the fringes but mostly sit outside of the red line boundary.

	,	
Binomial	Common	DAFOR
Lolium perenne	Perennial Ryegrass	А
Trifolium repens	White Clover	А
Bellis perennis	Daisy	0
Cerastium fontanum	Common Mouse-ear	0

Species recorded within the TN area at the time of survey included:



Binomial	Common	DAFOR
Cirsium arvense	Creeping Thistle	0
Dactylis glomerata	Cock's-foot	0
Holcus lanatus	Yorkshire-fog	0
Juncus effusus	Soft Rush	0
Ranunculus repens	Creeping Buttercup	0
Urtica dioica	Nettle	0
Agrostis capillaris	Common Bent	R
Agrostis stolonifera	Creeping Bent	R
Cynosurus cristatus	Crested Dog's-tail	R
Plantago lanceolata	Ribwort Plantain	R
Rubus fruticosus agg.	Bramble	R
Rumex sp.	Dock species	R
Ulex europaeus	Gorse	R



#### **Target Note 2**

A narrow band of off-site modified grassland [g4] which is sheep grazed (.102) and used as a track (.839) to gain access to the site. This habitat is characterised by a short, even sward intersected by frequent bare, stony ground due to its use as an access track. A line of willow trees *Salix sp.* partially overhangs a section of the track to the west. A large rubble pile may provide refuge for small mammals and herptiles to the east.

Species recorded within the TN area at the time of survey included:



Binomial	Common	DAFOR
Lolium perenne	Perennial Ryegrass	А
Trifolium repens	White Clover	F
Agrostis stolonifera	Creeping Bent	0
Dactylis glomerata	Cock's-foot	0
Cerastium fontanum	Common Mouse-ear	R
Urtica dioica	Nettle	R



### Target Note 3

Pile of roofing materials may provide refuge for small mammals and herptiles.



**Target Note 4** Large off-site pile of rubble may provide refuge for small mammals and herptiles.