



Protected Places and Species Assessment

Case ID: 201602317
Earl's Palace, Kirkwall

08 August 2016

Pt A Protected Places	
1 Site of special scientific interest	
Are the works located within the boundary of a SSSI?	No
Note: If 'Yes', SNH must be consulted prior to issuing consent.	
2 Natural Sites	
Are the proposed works directly connected with or necessary for site management for nature conservation?	No If No, go to next Q
Is the proposal likely to have a significant effect on an SPA or SAC? Give details of your reasoning below, identifying any SPA or SACs:	No
If an 'Appropriate Assessment' is required, please enter details below (after consultation with SNH)	
Will the proposal adversely affect the integrity of the site? Note: If 'yes' or 'not sure' the application should be refused	No

Pt B Protected Species	
1 Plants	
Is there any evidence to suggest the following EPS plants may be present on site?	
Fern, Killarney	No
Naiad, Slender	No
Plantain, Floating-leaved water	No
Saxifrage, Yellow Marsh	No
Is there any evidence to suggest that the following EPS animals may be present on site, or nearby?	
Bats (all varieties) (For bats only, please give details of your assessment of the likely presence of bats on the monument)	Yes
The GIS dataset suggests that bats may be present in the vicinity. They could be present on the monument or roosting in nearby trees. However, the proposed works will not affect them.	
Scottish Wildcat	No
Sand Lizard (only known colony is on Coll)	No
Great Crested Newt (Distribution mainly South Scotland, Central belt and Inverness Area)	No
Common Otter	Yes
Natterjack Toad (Distribution mainly south coast of Dumfriesshire)	No

If 'Yes', what implications do the proposed works have on the species in question?	
The GIS dataset suggests that otters may be present in the vicinity. However, the proposed works will not affect them.	
Can the negative impacts be prevented through alteration of plans or attachment of conditions? (Please give details below)	NA
If 'No', are the works likely to meet the first two tests prescribed in regulation 44: 1. public health and safety or public interest 2. no satisfactory alternative Please give details below	NA
Note: If 'No' then the application should be refused on the grounds of the impact on EPS.	
If 'Yes', do SNH consider that the proposed works will be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the EPS concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range?	NA
Note: If 'Yes' then the application should be refused on the grounds of the impact on EPS.	

Nicola Hall

Useful Links:
[Guidance](#)
[ARCGIS Project](#)