



Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) Checklist



ASSOCIATION OF
Local Government Ecologists

EclA Criteria (to ensure decisions are based on adequate information in accordance with Clauses 6.2 and 8.1 of BS42020:2013)		Yes No n/a	Paragraph reference number(s)
Pre-app/ scope	1. Where pre-application advice has been received from the Local Planning Authority and/or an NGO and/or statutory body (e.g. NE DAS, NRW DAS) ⁱ , it has been fully accounted for in the EclA	N/A	
	2. The scope, structure and content of the EclA is in accordance with published good practice ^{ii, iii and iv}	Yes	1.1
Surveys, Sites, Species and Habitats	3. Adequate ^v and up-to-date ^{vi} : a. Desk study has been undertaken ^{vii} b. Phase 1 habitat survey (or equivalent) has been undertaken ^{vii} c. Phase 2 ecology surveys have been undertaken (where necessary) ^{viii}	Yes	2.0
	4. All statutory and non-statutory sites likely to be significantly affected are clearly and correctly identified	Yes	3.0
	5. All protected or priority species and priority habitats ^{ix} likely to be significantly affected are clearly and correctly identified, and adequate surveys have been undertaken to inform the baseline	Yes	3.2 -3.4
	6. Any invasive non-native plant species present are clearly and correctly identified	Yes	3.3
	7. Where a separate PEA Report states that Phase 2 ecology surveys are required, these have been undertaken in full and results submitted with the application (or lack of such surveys is justified)	Yes	3.3 & 3.4
Impacts and Effects	8. The assessment is based on clearly defined development proposals along with relevant drawings/plans (and any plans used are the same version number as those submitted with the application) or	Yes	App. 3
	9. The residual ecological effects are considered to be not significant at any geographical scale irrespective of the detailed development proposals, and the assessment is based on a worst-case-scenario		
	10. The report describes and assesses all likely significant ecological effects (including cumulative effects) clearly stating the geographical scale of significance (where relevant)	Yes	4.0
Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement	11. The mitigation hierarchy has been clearly followed ^x	Yes	
	12. The report: a. Clearly identifies the proposed mitigation and compensation measures, and explains how these will adequately address all likely significant adverse effects b. Includes, where necessary, proposals for post-construction monitoring c. Recommends how proposed measures may be secured through planning conditions/obligations and/or necessary licences	Yes	4.0
	13. A summary table of proposed mitigation and compensation measures has been provided	yes	4.5
	14. The need for any mitigation licences required in relation to protected species is clearly identified	N/A	
	15. Proposals to deliver ecological enhancement/Biodiversity Net Gain have been provided	Yes	4.4
Competence/Good Practice	16. Limitations ^{xi} of the ecological work have been correctly identified and the implications explained	Yes	2.6
	17. All relevant key timing issues (e.g. site vegetation clearance or roof removal) that may constrain or adversely affect the proposed timing of development have been identified	Yes	4.4
	18. All ecological work and surveys accord with published good practice methods and guidelines OR deviation from such guidelines is made clear and fully justified, and the implications for subsequent conclusions and recommendations made explicit in the report ^{xiii}	Yes	2.0
	19. All ecologists and surveyors hold appropriate species licences (where relevant) and/or have all necessary competencies to carry out the work undertaken		2.5
Conclusions	20. The report clearly identifies where the proposed development complies with relevant legislation and policy, highlighting any possible non-compliance issues, and highlighting circumstances where a conclusion cannot be drawn as it requires an assessment of non-ecological issues (such as socio-economic ones)	Yes	4 & App 1
	21. The report provides a clear summary of losses and gains for biodiversity, and a justified conclusion of an overall net gain for biodiversity	yes	4.5
	22. Justifiable conclusions ^{xiii} based on sound professional judgement ^{xiv} have been drawn as to the significance of effects on any designated site, protected or priority habitat/species or other ecological feature, and a justified scale of significance has been stated	yes	4

I confirm the accuracy of the summary information provided in the checklist and I accept that misrepresentation of the report content will result in a professional conduct complaint to CIEEM.

Name..... **Katie Jones**

Signature:

Company and position . **Moor to Sea Ecology, Principal Ecologist** date: **18/10/2023**

Footnotes:

- i. Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service, Natural Resources Wales' Discretionary Advice Service
- ii. CIEEM (2017) Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing.
- iii. CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment.
- iv. BS42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of Conduct for Planning and Development.
- v. Adequate ecological information is defined as being Appropriate (i.e. the right type of surveys for the site and the receptors likely to be found) and Sufficient (i.e. there is sufficient effort in view of the time, size, complexity etc of the site to ensure all likely receptors are adequately accounted for – such as abundance and distribution) (refer to BS42020:2013 Clause 6.2).
- vi. CIEEM (2019) Advice note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys.
- vii. Based on the approach described in Section 2 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- viii. See Section 3, Box 4 and Appendix 5 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- ix. See Section 1 Box 1 of CIEEM's Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2018).
- x. In accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework (England, 2018).
- xi. An explicit understanding of any limitations for the ecological work should be provided in accordance with Clause 6.7 of BS42020:2013 (including limitations associated with: survey methods, adequacy of equipment, reference to relevant desk top data, interpretation and analysis of results, competency of all ecological surveyors and personnel undertaking the impact assessment and design of mitigation).
- xii. Deviation from standard methods and guidance must be reported in accordance with BS42020:2013 (Clauses 4.4, 6.3.6 to 6.3.9 and 6.7). CIEEM has published and signposted to relevant guidance in its online Resource Hub (cieem.net/resource-hub).
- xiii. In accordance with CIEEM's Guidelines on Ecological Impact Assessment (2018).
- xiv. Further information on how to provide robust justification for any deviation in methods used from those published in good practice guidance is provided in CIEEM (2016) Pragmatism, Proportionality and Professional Judgement. In Practice. Issue 91; page 57.



Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management

www.cieem.net

© November 2019