



## Protected Places and Species Assessment

Case ID: 201602265  
25 August 2016  
Invercauld Bridge

<b>Pt A Protected Places</b>	
<b>1 Site of special scientific interest</b>	
Are the works located within the boundary of a SSSI?	No
<b>Note: If 'Yes', SNH must be consulted prior to issuing consent.</b>	
<b>2 Natural Sites</b>	
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 affect on an SPA or SAC? Give details of your reasoning below, identifying any SPA or SACs:	No
<p>Close to Creag Clunie and the Lion's Face SSSI</p> <p>The application site lies within the <b>River Dee SAC</b> – see <a href="http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=8357">http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=8357</a> for details. This SAC is designated for its freshwater pearl mussel stocks. The applicant has commissioned a report on the presence or absence of this species within the application site, and the outcome of the report is that the freshwater pearl mussels are not present at this site and that this section of river bed is wholly unsuitable for their habitat. There is unlikely therefore to be an impact on the SAC.</p> <p>The application site lies within the <b>Cairngorms Massif SPA</b> – see <a href="http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=10234">http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=10234</a> for details. This SPA is designated for its breeding population of golden eagles. The nature of the works is such that they are unlikely to have an impact on golden eagle habitat, and therefore there is unlikely to be an impact on the SPA.</p> <p>The application site lies within the <b>Ballochbuie SPA</b> - see <a href="http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=8467">http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/siteinfo.jsp?pa_code=8467</a> for details. This SPA is designated for its populations of capercaillie and Scottish crossbills. The nature of the works is such that they are unlikely to have an impact on capercaillie or Scottish crossbill habitat, and therefore there is unlikely to be an impact on the SPA.</p>	
If an 'Appropriate Assessment' is required, please enter details below (after consultation with SNH)	
Will the proposal adversely affect the integrity of the site?	No
<b>Note: If 'yes' or 'not sure' the application should be</b>	

refused	
---------	--

<b>Pt B Protected Species</b>	
<b>1 Plants</b>	
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
Bats – within 2km on GIS. Works to the monument are at the waterline, and whilst voids are due to be consolidated they are unlikely to be suitable bat habitat, so no impact is likely.	
Scottish Wildcat	Yes
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?	
Otter – within 100m on GIS. The applicant has commissioned an otter survey which has confirmed that otter are not present at the application site. Wildcat – within 10km on GIS. The nature of the works is such that a permanent impact on wildcat habitat is considered unlikely.	
Can the negative impacts be prevented through alteration of plans or attachment of conditions? (Please give details below)	N/A
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	N/A
<b>Note: If 'No' then the application should be refused on the grounds of the impact on EPS.</b>	
If 'Yes', do SNH consider that the proposed works will be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the EPS	N/A

concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range?	
<b>Note: If 'Yes' then the application should be refused on the grounds of the impact on EPS.</b>	

**Oliver Lewis**

-----  
Useful Links:

[Guidance](#)

[ARCGIS Project](#)