****

**Feature Assessment Form – Woodland**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of SSSI | Rook Clift SSSI | | Date of assessment | |  | |
| SSSI reportable feature(s) being assessed | Lowland Mixed Deciduous W8 W12 & Nationally scarce plant - Tilia platyphyllos, Large-leaved Lime | | Assessed by | |  | |
| Unit Number |  | | Suggested feature condition | |  | |
| **Woodland – wet and dry** | | | | | | |
| **Variable** | **Measurement** | **Target** | | **Summary value** | | **Pass/Fail** |
| Coppice regrowth | Y/N | Signs of seedlings growing through to saplings to young trees at sufficient density to maintain canopy density over a 10 yr period (or equivalent regrowth from coppice stumps). | |  | |  |
| Cover of ground flora | % | 80% of ground flora cover referable to relevant NVC community | |  | |  |
| Cover of native trees and scrub species | % | At least 95% of cover in any one layer of site-native or acceptable naturalised species | |  | |  |
| Cover of non-native trees & scrub species | % | At least 95% of cover in any one layer of site-native or acceptable naturalised species | |  | |  |
| Cover of open space | % | A proportion of gaps at any one time may develop into permanent open space; equally some current permanent open space/glades may in time regenerate to closed canopy. | |  | |  |
| Cover of specific species (individual) | % | Minimum levels of particular native tree/shrub species (where important and appropriate) | |  | |  |
| Evidence of regeneration | Comment | At least three age classes spread across the average life expectancy of the commonest trees. If helpful, as well as recording age classes present, record which species are regenerating. | |  | |  |
| Extent of ancient woodland | % | For wood pasture/parkland: no loss of semi-natural wood-pasture mosaic area; no reduction in the number of veteran trees. | |  | |  |
| Extent of feature (AREAHEC) | Ha | No loss of ancient woodland; no loss of ancient semi-natural stands. | |  | |  |
| Extent of semi-natural woodland | % | At least current area of recent semi-natural stands maintained, although their location may alter. | |  | |  |
| Presence of ancient trees | Y/N | Some areas of relatively undisturbed mature/old growth stands or a scatter of large trees allowed to grow to overmaturity/death on site (e.g. a minimum of 10% of the woodland or 5-10 trees per ha). | |  | |  |
| Presence of dead wood | Y/N | A minimum of 3 fallen lying trees >20 cm diameter per ha and 4 trees per ha allowed to die standing. | |  | |  |
| Presence of indicator of local distinctiveness – use table of page 4 | Y/N | Target(s) to be set to maintain distinctive elements at current extent/levels and/or in current locations, | |  | |  |
| Presence of minimum intervention areas | Y/N | Some areas of relatively undisturbed large trees allowed to grow to overmaturity/ death on site | |  | |  |
| Presence of saplings & young trees | Y/N | Signs of seedlings growing through to saplings to young trees at sufficient density to maintain canopy density over a 10 yr period (or equivalent regrowth from coppice stumps). | |  | |  |
| Presence of tree planting | Y/N | No more than 20% of areas regenerated by planting. All planting material of locally native stock. No planting in sites where it has not occurred in the last 15 years. | |  | |  |
| Presence/evidence of plant disease or dieback | Y/N | Death, destruction or replacement of native woodland species through effects of introduced fauna or other external unnatural factors not more than 10% by number or area in a five year period. | |  | |  |
| Signs of recent browsing (LOWMEDHI) | Low  Medium  High | Are there recent signs of browsing? | |  | |  |
| Tree canopy cover | % | Canopy cover present over 30-90 % of stand area (except in parkland stands). | |  | |  |
| Understorey cover | % | Understorey (2-5m) present over at least 20% of total stand area (except in parkland). | |  | |  |
| Deer impact | Low  Medium  High  (*Refer to guidance below: https://www.thedeerinitiative.co.uk/uploads/guides/183.pdf)* | Evidence of deer seen (record species); dung, racks (deer paths) slots & scrapes; browse line, bark stripping or fraying, browsing impact on vegetation incl. epicormic growth at base of yew trunks and where limbs layering. NB. This is not a full Deer Impact Assessment but requires general observations. (*Refer to guidance below: https://www.thedeerinitiative.co.uk/uploads/guides/183.pdf)* | |  | |  |
| Nationally scarce plant - Tilia platyphyllos, Large-leaved Lime  Population Size | Mapping; Count of functional individuals | Presence of species in a defined number of subpopulations or site sectors (spatial target); At least a minimum viable population size present; No loss in population extent > 10%; No decline in the population size category | |  | |  |
| Nationally scarce plant - Tilia platyphyllos, Large-leaved Lime  Presence | Presence/absence | Species should be present Identification of the species | |  | |  |
| Nationally scarce plant - Tilia platyphyllos, Large-leaved Lime  Regeneration | Y/N | Signs of seedlings growing through to saplings to young trees at sufficient density to maintain canopy density over a 10 yr period (or equivalent regrowth from coppice stumps). | |  | |  |

**Point recording**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables from page 1** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **Grid Reference** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Tree canopy cover %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Understorey cover %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Coppice regrowth Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Ground flora of NVC*  *%* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Native plants %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Non-native plants %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Open space %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Cover of specific species %* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Regeneration Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Ancient trees Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Dead Wood Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Indicators of local distinctiveness Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Minimum intervention areas Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Saplings and young trees Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Tree plants Y/N* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Plant disease of dieback* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Browsing – Low, medium, high* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large-leaved Lime  Population Size |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large-leaved Lime  Presence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Large-leaved Lime  Regeneration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Narrative written***  *(tick when completed)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Photo taken*** *(tick when completed)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Threats recorded if relevant*** *(tick when completed)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Species** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Survey Stop Narratives:** Please record summary for each stop addressing different variable and identifying any condition threats. | |
| Stop 1 |  |
| Stop 2 |  |
| Stop 3 |  |
| Stop 4 |  |
| Stop 5 |  |
| Stop 6 |  |
| Stop 7 |  |
| Stop 8 |  |
| Stop 9 |  |
| Stop 10 |  |

**Threats**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Condition Threat** | **Context** | **Please provide comments if applicable** |
| **Biological resource use** | To cover situations where the formal or informal 'exploitation' of plants and animals may lead to a deterioration of condition: hunting, collecting (plants & animals), pest control, persecution, forestry operations in non-plantations, fishing and harvesting of aquatic species. This does not cover situations where resources are 'farmed', eg plantations, fish farms. |  |
| **Change in land management** | Relates to potential changes in active land management regimes, usually intensification, and inactive land management, ie where management is withdrawn. It also covers negotiation of renewal agreements where there is uncertainty that the agreement holder will renew leading to a possible change to inappropriate management. Some habitats are more robust to neglect than others and a few may not require active management for a period of time (eg high forest woodland). This also covers intensification of management for game species. |  |
| **Changes in species distributions** | Reasons for variations in population distributions are often unknown and complex but may include the population moving due to climate change, weather or because features are mobile. |  |
| **Coastal squeeze** | Recognises that coastal squeeze is an ongoing influence on notified SSSIs which needs regular review of changes, particularly to extent of features, and an adaptive approach to respond to these changes. Delivering management responses, for example managed realignments, is complex and resource intensive. |  |
| **Deer** | Deer populations in England continue to expand leading to high concentrations on increasing numbers of SSSI. Implementation of deer management is a complex and sensitive subject. However, impacts from intensive deer browsing are detectable via CSM monitoring and, therefore, need to be addressed to maintain condition. The most appropriate location of deer management (eg shooting) may not be on the SSSI itself, but the impacts on the local herd are such that numbers on the SSSI are managed at appropriate levels. |  |
| **Direct impact from 3rd party** | Features can be compromised through the activities of third parties – for example from fly tipping or increasing pressure from off-road activity. Recreational disturbance generally (see below). |  |
| **Direct land take from development** | This category gives an opportunity to provide a link between land use case work (eg. development plans and development control). This includes development associated with housing, commercial & industrial, and tourism/recreation. |  |
| **Disease** | This threat recognises that implementation of appropriate management (including bio-security measures) may be possible that minimises impact on notified features – allowing FCT attributes to be met. |  |
| **Energy production** | This is included to recognise potential threat from oil & gas drilling, and renewable energy sites. This relates to on and off shore facilities, and site infrastructure supporting these facilities e.g. cabling. New technologies such as fracking are included. |  |
| **Hydrological changes** | Provides the ability to record potential changes resulting from changes in local hydrological regimes and/or possible impacts from more regular and prolonged periods of drought |  |
| **Invasive species** | This threat recognises that implementation of appropriate management (including bio-security measure) may be possible to minimise impacts on notified features – allowing FCT attributes to be met. |  |
| **Marine & freshwater fishery** | This covers managed fisheries, fo r example, proposals for shrimp or fin fish aquaculture, fish ponds on farms, fish stocking, fishery management & fishing practices on rivers & standing waters, hatcheries, seeded shellfish beds that may impact condition. Relates to both freshwater and marine situations. |  |
| **Physical modification** | Relates to engineering works that prevent natural (geomorphological) processes, for example, that may change water flow patterns (eg dams, weirs) or that that restrict coastal processes on a site notified for its geomorphological processes |  |
| **Recreational disturbance** | Provides ability to record potential impact of changes in type, pattern, or intensity of recreational activity. This could, for example, be from potential housing developments or from disturbance of roosting birds by bait-digging or wildfowling. |  |
| **Transportation and service corridors** | This includes threats to condition that may result from proposals relating to: roads and railways; utility and service lines; shipping lanes (including dredging); flight paths. |  |
| **Water pollution** | Use this when a decline in water quality due to diffuse or direct pollution sources will over time effect an adverse change in condition if not addressed. |  |

**Management**

Please provide descriptions and relevant pictures of what Management activities are in place, if they are working and if not what management will be put in place.

**Photographs/Map**

Please include photographs with a relevant description and location e.g. Japanese knotweed located in Unit 1 Grid Reference SE 3044 0403 or TN1 on map.

Please include a map showing the route walked/stop numbers and photo locations.