

Site 5 – The Mullet Peninsula

The Mullet Peninsula is a large site situated on the south-western tip of the Mullet Peninsula, approximately 12 km south-west of Belmullet, Co. Mayo. It comprises two sand dune systems separated by a small headland in the west of the site and a local road. The larger sand dune system runs along the west coast of the Mullet Peninsula from Tiraun Point to Letterbeg, while the smaller sand dune system is found at the southern tip of the peninsula at Portmore. The site forms part of the Mullet/Blacksod Bay Complex (SAC 000470). All the sub-sites are within the SAC boundary. The core areas are the sub-sites where the field surveys took place (see general introduction to Volume 2).

Based on the currently available mapping, twelve coastal Annex I habitats occur within Mullet/Blacksod Bay Complex SAC, five of which are listed as Qualifying Interests (Table 1).

Table 1. Annex I habitats present at Mullet/Blacksod Bay Complex SAC, the area they occupy (based on the most recent mapped available) and status as a Qualifying Interest of the SAC. An asterisk denotes a priority Annex I habitat and habitats that were not the target of this survey are excluded.

Habitat Code	Area (ha)	Qualifying Interest?
1210 Drift line vegetation	0.031	No
1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks	0.624	No
1310 <i>Salicornia</i> flats	0.024	Yes
1330 Atlantic salt meadows	17.976	No
1410 Mediterranean saltmarsh	21.629	No
2110 Embryonic shifting dunes	3.393	No
2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)	10.416	Yes
*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)	881.698	Yes
*2150 Decalcified dune heath	10.571	Yes
2170 Dunes with creeping willow	35.554	No
2190 Humid dune slacks	31.048	No
*21A0 Machairs	494.979	Yes

The main land-use for the site is for agricultural purposes, particularly in the western section of the site, and to a lesser extent, it is used for recreation.

Habitat losses were recorded due to building of farming structures AND housing (Table 2). Quarrying was an impact observed during CMP, confirmed during SDM even if the activity was already ended. In 2023 quarrying activities were not recorded during the survey.

Table 2. Habitat loss recorded during the desk and field surveys in hectares.

Habitat	Within SAC?	Loss (ha)	Impact code	New habitat
*2130	No	0.010	PA07	Buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3)
*2130	Yes	0.093	PA07	Buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3)
*21A0	Yes	0.561	PC01	Spoil and bare ground (ED2)
*21A0	No	0.531	PF01	Buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3)
*2130	No	0.397	PF01	Buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3)
*2130	Yes	0.477	PF01	Buildings and artificial surfaces (BL3)

Conservation assessments were carried out within one sub-site occupying a total area of 546 ha (Table 3). Only three habitats (**1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks**, **2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** and ***2150 Decalcified dune heath**) were in Favourable condition and the remainders were in Unfavourable - Inadequate condition, mainly due to overgrazing, deposition of agricultural waste and offroad driving.

Table 3. Summary of Conservation Status for all habitats assessed at The Mullet Peninsula.

Subsite	Habitat	Area	Structure and functions	Future Prospects	Overall assessment
5.01 Aghleam	1220	Favourable (Stable)	Favourable (NA)	Favourable	Favourable (NA)
5.01 Aghleam	2110	Favourable (Stable)	Favourable (Stable)	Favourable	Favourable (Stable)
5.01 Aghleam	2120	Favourable (Stable)	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Decreasing)	Favourable	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Deteriorating)
5.01 Aghleam	*2130	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Decreasing)	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)	Unfavourable - Bad	Unfavourable - Bad (Deteriorating)
5.01 Aghleam	*2150	Favourable (Stable)	Favourable (NA)	Favourable	Favourable (NA)
5.01 Aghleam	2170	Favourable (Stable)	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)	Unfavourable - Inadequate	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)
5.01 Aghleam	2190	Favourable (Stable)	Favourable (Increasing)	Unfavourable - Inadequate	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)
5.01 Aghleam	*21A0	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Decreasing)	Unfavourable - Inadequate (Stable)	Unfavourable - Bad	Unfavourable - Bad (Deteriorating)

Sub-site 1. Aghleam

Summary Information

Survey Date: 05-09 July 2023

Water Framework Directive Waterbody: not applicable

Previous survey identifiers: CMP124

Current survey details:

Table 4: Current survey details for Annex I habitats at Aghleam

Habitat	Area	Monitoring stops
1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks	0.201	2
2110 Embryonic shifting dunes	1.818	5
2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)	2.875	8
*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)	294.117	16
*2150 Decalcified dune heath	4.370	8
2170 Dunes with creeping willow	35.554	12
2190 Humid dune slacks	28.466	8
*21A0 Machairs	150.700	16

1210 Drift line vegetation

1210 Drift line vegetation was not recorded during the baseline survey. Three small areas of this habitat were mapped during SDM along the west coast, however at the time of the survey the total area was thought to be below the minimum monitoring area and the habitat's conservation status was not assessed. During CHNW21 the habitat was not recorded.

1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks

Area

1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks was not recorded during the baseline survey. A small area of this habitat was mapped in the north of the site during SDM but it was below the minimum monitoring area and its conservation status was therefore not assessed. The habitat has now increased over the most recent reporting cycle due to natural processes. There was no indication that the area of the habitat had been affected by human activities. Area was assessed as Favourable and, due to this, the trend is stable.

Structure and Functions

1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks present at Aghleam is composed by *Honckenya peploides* or *Potentilla anserina* dominated communities. No notable species were recorded. No criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, so the Structure and Functions were Favourable. Because **1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks** was not assessed during SDM, the trend is not applicable.

Future Prospects

No pressures have been recorded in the 2023 survey. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable, because no impacts were recorded for this habitat during the SDM.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (NA)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Because all of the three parameters were assessed as Favourable, the overall conservation assessment for **1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks** at 5.01 Aghleam is Favourable. **1220 Perennial vegetation of stony banks** was not assessed during SDM, therefore the trend is not applicable.

Overall Conservation Status: Favourable (NA)

Condition of the habitat by area

100% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

2110 Embryonic shifting dunes

Area

The habitat has increased from 0.92 ha to 1.82 ha since SDM. This increase was due to natural processes of deposition. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable. Because of these fluctuations between increasing and decreasing, due to erosion events, the trend of the area is stable.

Structure and Functions

No criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, so the Structure and Functions were Favourable. Because **2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** was assessed as Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore stable.

Future Prospects

No negative impact was recorded. Natural erosion processes and walking over dunes were considered as low intensity neutral impacts. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (stable)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Because all of the three parameters were assessed as Favourable, the overall conservation assessment for **2110 Embryonic shifting dunes** at 5.01 Aghleam was Favourable and trend is stable.

Overall Conservation Status: Favourable (stable)

Condition of the habitat by area

100% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)

Area

The area of **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** reduced from 3.85 ha to 2.88 ha since SDM. This was mainly due to natural succession and there was no sign of anthropogenic loss. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable. Because of these fluctuations between increasing and decreasing, due to erosion events, the trend of the area is stable.

Structure and Functions

One criterion failed in the Structure and Functions assessment: flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species (% frequency) was observed at only 12.5% of stops, while the threshold is 40%. The Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** was assessed as Favourable during SDM, the trend is therefore decreasing.

Future Prospects

No negative impact was recorded. Walking over dunes was considered as medium intensity neutral impact. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as stable, because the previous assessment was Favourable too.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (stable)

Because one of the three parameters was assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, the overall conservation assessment for **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** at 5.01 Aghleam was Unfavourable - Inadequate and the trend is deteriorating.

Overall Conservation Status: Unfavourable - Inadequate (deteriorating)

Condition of the habitat by area

No flowering/fruitleting of the target species recorded in a few polygons of the habitat led to consider about 20% of the habitat's area to be in poor condition. The remaining 80% was considered to be in good condition.

*2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)

Area

The area of ***2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** decreased a little bit from 294.42 ha to 294.12 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This decrease was mainly due to anthropogenic causes (building of farming structures, housing), but it corresponded to only 0.04% of the habitat's area. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Unfavourable - Inadequate. The previous assessment was Favourable, therefore the trend of the area is decreasing.

Structure and Functions

Only one criterion failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, regarding the height of the vegetation. In fact, an average height between 2 and 10 cm was recorded in only 25% of stops, while the threshold is 30-70%, the remainder was longer than 10 cm, reflecting some kind of undergrazing. As this criterion failed, the Structure and Functions were Unfavourable - Inadequate. The Structure and Functions was assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate in 2016. The trend is therefore stable.

Future Prospects

The most significant impact recorded at the habitat was overgrazing, which had a medium-intensity negative impact on 80% of the habitat. Sand trapping using brash had a medium-intensity positive effect on 1% of the **2120 Marram dunes (white dunes)** during SDM. This was considered positive as it complemented natural processes and was used where there was evidence of some anthropogenic disturbance, but now it has a low intensity negative impact over the ***2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** because it has probably worn off and the tyres, used for sand trapping, were out in the open.

Other negative impacts were recorded. Vehicle tracks, structures for livestock, agricultural waste and silage bale storage all had either a medium intensity effect on up to 10% of the habitat, and a sports pitch and off-road driving both had a low-intensity negative impact on 2% of the habitat.

Finally, the spreading of problematic native species (*Urtica dioica*, *Senecio jacobaea*, *Daucus carota*, *Cirsium* spp.) was considered as a medium-intensity negative impact on 2% of the habitat.

Due to the above-mentioned negative impacts, particularly overgrazing and consequent native problematic species spreading, Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Bad, and the trend was assessed as decreasing.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Bad (decreasing)

Because one of the three parameters was assessed as Unfavourable - Bad, the overall conservation assessment for ***2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** at 5.01 Aghleam is Unfavourable - Bad. Since the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable) in the previous assessment, the trend is therefore deteriorating.

Overall Conservation Status: Unfavourable-Bad (deteriorating)

Condition of the habitat by area

Because about 51 hectares of ***2130 Fixed dunes (grey dunes)** were affected by several impacts (mainly overgrazing, spreading of problematic native species and vehicle trampling), this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 80% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

*2150 Decalcified dune heath

Area

The area of ***2150 Decalcified dune heath** increased a little bit from 4.09 ha to 4.37 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This increase was the result of a different mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable (stable).

Structure and Functions

No criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, even if one failed criterion was passed by expert judgement. This is about the recorded growth phases of *Calluna* and *Calluna* cover in the mature phase: the threshold was $\geq 10\%$ of *Calluna* cover in the mature phase, while the recorded cover was 10% throughout 25% of the monitoring stops. Therefore, the Structure and Functions were assessed as Favourable. The Structure and Functions were not assessed in 2016. The trend is therefore not applicable.

Future Prospects

No impacts were recorded, Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Favourable, and the trend was assessed as not applicable.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (NA)
- Future Prospects: Favourable (NA)

Because all of the three parameters were assessed as Favourable, the overall conservation assessment for ***2150 Decalcified dune heath** at 5.01 Aghleam is Favourable and the trend is not applicable.

Overall Conservation Status: Favourable (NA)

Condition of the habitat by area

Due to the low cover of *Calluna* in the mature phase, about 10% of the habitat's area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 90% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

2170 Dunes with creeping willow

Area

The area of **2170 Dunes with creeping willow** decreased from 39.43 ha to 35.55 ha between SDM and CHNW21. There had been no indication of change due to human activities. This decrease was likely to be the result of a different and better mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable (stable). It would be advisable to conduct hydrological investigations to definitively assess whether changes in groundwater level could be the cause of changes in habitat distribution (2170 and 2190).

Structure and Functions

One criterion failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, regarding *Salix repens* height, that should be 5 to 30 cm throughout all the stops. At monitoring stop 1 and 2, *Salix repens* was tall and bushy due to undergrazing. As this criterion failed, the Structure and Functions were Unfavourable - Inadequate. The Structure and Functions was assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate during SDM. The trend is therefore stable.

Future Prospects

Overgrazing and undergrazing represented medium intensity negative impacts affecting about 50% of the habitat's area. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, and the trend was assessed as stable.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Although Area was assessed as Favourable, Structure and Functions and Future Prospects were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, so the overall conservation assessment for **2170 Dunes with creeping willow** at 5.01 Aghleam is Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate in the previous assessment, the trend is therefore stable.

Overall Conservation Status: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Condition of the habitat by area

Due to under/overgrazing, about 20% of the habitat's area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 80% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

2190 Humid dune slacks

Area

The area of **2190 Humid dune slacks** increased from 24.85 ha to 28.46 ha between SDM and CHNW21. This increase was the result of a different and more detailed mapping technique. This is consistent with an Area assessment of Favourable. Due to this, the trend is stable. It would be advisable to conduct hydrological investigations to definitively assess whether changes in groundwater level could be the cause of changes in habitat distribution.

Structure and Functions

No criteria failed in the Structure and Functions assessment, so the Structure and Functions were Favourable. Since **2190 Humid dune slacks** was assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate during SDM, the trend is therefore increasing.

Future Prospects

Artificial ponds and dumping of silage bales had a medium and high-intensity negative effect on the **2190 Humid dune slacks** over 10% of the habitat's area. Artificial ponds used as watering holes for cattle can

result in trampling of the habitat and sources of pollution for the groundwater in the slacks, depending on how intensely they are used. Dumping silage bales may introduce agricultural species into the habitat. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, and the trend was assessed as stable.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Favourable (stable)
- Structure and Functions: Favourable (increasing)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Although Area and Structure and Functions were assessed as Favourable, Future Prospects were assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate, so the overall conservation assessment for **2190 Humid dune slacks** at 5.01 Aghleam is Unfavourable - Inadequate. Since the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate in the previous assessment, the trend is therefore stable.

Overall Conservation Status: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)

Condition of the habitat by area

Due to artificial ponds and dumping of silage bales, about 10% of the habitat's area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 90% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

**21A0 Machairs*

Area

The area of ***21A0 Machairs** decreased from 151.98 ha during the SMD to 150.70 ha. This was due to anthropogenic causes, particularly housing (0.53 ha) and quarrying (0.56 ha). Quarrying was noted as an ongoing impact for ***21A0 Machairs** at Aghleam during CMP. It appears from OSI aerial photographs that the extent of the quarries has increased since the baseline survey, but no work was ongoing on the survey day in 2012. In 2023 quarrying activities were not recorded during CHNW21. Since the loss is estimated to be less than 1% per year since the SDM, Area was therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing).

Structure and Functions

Only one criterion failed during the Structure and Functions assessment: the lowest cover of bryophytes recorded was 0% while the relevant threshold is at least 1% in every stop. The Structure and Functions were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Inadequate and the trend is stable.

Future Prospects

High-intensity negative impacts associated with agricultural improvement at Aghleam included presence of farming structures and silage bales. Dumping and rubbish burning were also noted in the ***21A0 Machairs**. Grazing by sheep had a positive impact and affected 20% of the habitat, while overgrazing resulting in trampling, fencing, farming structures (corral) and supplementary feeding were recorded over 80% of the habitat's area. Other high intensity negative impacts recorded were the presence of a trellis, a road and Yucca hedges. Vehicle tracks and offroad driving were recorded as medium-intensity negative impacts affecting about 1.50 ha. Future Prospects were therefore assessed as Unfavourable - Bad, and the trend was assessed as decreasing.

Conservation assessment

The conservation status assessments of the three parameters are as follows:

- Area: Unfavourable - Inadequate (decreasing)
- Structure and Functions: Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable)
- Future Prospects: Unfavourable - Bad (decreasing)

Because one of the three parameters was assessed as Unfavourable - Bad, the overall conservation assessment for ***21A0 Machairs** at 5.01 Aghleam is Unfavourable - Bad. Given that the overall assessment was Unfavourable - Inadequate (stable) in the previous assessment, trend is therefore deteriorating.

Overall Conservation Status: Unfavourable - Bad (Deteriorating)

[Condition of the habitat by area](#)

Overgrazing, causing the complete absence of bryophytes in the moss layer, was affecting about 20% of ***21A0 Machairs**, so this area was considered to be in poor condition. The remaining 80% of the habitat was considered to be in good condition.

Site 5 Subsite 1 Aghleam Appendices

Appendix 1 Area

Total habitat area recorded during reporting cycles to date.

Habitat	2007	2013	2019	2025
1210	0.000	0.060	NS	0.000
1220	0.000	0.030	NS	0.201
2110	1.480	0.920	NS	1.818
2120	5.130	3.850	NS	2.875
2130	292.780	294.420	NS	294.117
2150	1.910	4.090	3.287	4.370
2170	39.430	39.430	NS	35.554
2190	24.940	24.850	NS	28.466
21A0	152.170	151.980	NS	150.700

Favourable Reference Area and cumulative changes in area due to human activities (restoration and loss) recorded during reporting cycles to date. Natural fluctuations are not taken into account.

Habitat	Favourable Reference area (ha)	2007 change (ha)	2013 change (ha)	2019 change (ha)	2025 change (ha)
1210	0.060	NR	0	NS	NR
1220	0.030	NR	0	NS	0
2110	1.480	0	0	NS	0
2120	5.130	0	0	NS	0
*2130	292.780	0	0	NS	0.04
*2150	1.910	0	0	0	0
2170	39.430	0	0	NS	0
2190	24.940	0	0	NS	0
*21A0	152.170	0	1.05	NS	1.49

Appendix 2. Structure and functions

Negative indicator species and non-native invasive species

Habitat	Species name	Cover (%)
2110	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	10.0
2120	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	0.5
2120	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>	5.0
*2130	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	2.0
*2130	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	1.5
*2130	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>	0.9
2170	<i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i>	3.0
2170	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	2.0
2170	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>	2.0
2170	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	0.5
2170	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>	1.5
2190	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	0.5
2190	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	1.0
*21A0	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	2.6
*21A0	<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>	1.8
*21A0	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	1.0

Positive indicator species and notable species

Habitat	Species name	Cover (%) (if recorded)
1220	<i>Beta vulgaris s. maritima</i>	2.0
1220	<i>Honckenya peploides</i>	17.0
1220	<i>Potentilla anserina</i>	45.0
2110	<i>Elytrigia juncea</i>	
2110	<i>Elytrigia juncea</i>	
2120	<i>Ammophila arenaria</i>	
2120	<i>Elytrigia juncea</i>	
*2130	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i>	
*2130	<i>Anthyllis vulneraria</i>	
*2130	<i>Carex arenaria</i>	
*2130	<i>Carex flacca</i>	
*2130	<i>Crepis capillaris</i>	
*2130	<i>Daucus carota</i>	
*2130	<i>Euphrasia officinalis ag.</i>	
*2130	<i>Festuca rubra</i>	
*2130	<i>Galium verum</i>	
*2130	<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>	
*2130	<i>Linum catharticum</i>	
*2130	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	
*2130	<i>Luzula campestris</i>	
*2130	<i>Pilosella officinarum</i>	
*2130	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	
*2130	<i>Poa pratensis</i>	
*2130	<i>Polygala serpyllifolia</i>	
*2130	<i>Potentilla erecta</i>	
*2130	<i>Rhinanthus minor</i>	
*2130	<i>Rhytidadelphus squarrosus</i>	

*2130	<i>Rhytidiadelphus triquetrus</i>	
*2130	<i>Scleropodium purum</i>	
*2130	<i>Thymus polytrichus</i>	
*2130	<i>Trifolium repens</i>	
*2150	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i>	2.7
*2150	<i>Calluna vulgaris</i>	83.8
*2150	<i>Carex arenaria</i>	4.3
*2150	<i>Cladonia species</i>	1.0
*2150	<i>Erica cinerea</i>	4.0
*2150	<i>Erica tetralix</i>	2.0
*2150	<i>Festuca rubra</i>	4.3
2170	<i>Carex arenaria</i>	
2170	<i>Carex flacca</i>	
2170	<i>Euphrasia officinalis ag.</i>	
2170	<i>Festuca rubra</i>	
2170	<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	
2170	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	
2170	<i>Rhytidiadelphus squarrosus</i>	
2170	<i>Salix repens v. argentea</i>	
2170	<i>Scleropodium purum</i>	
2190	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>	
2190	<i>Bryum pseudotriquetrum</i>	
2190	<i>Calliergon cuspidatum</i>	
2190	<i>Carex arenaria</i>	
2190	<i>Carex flacca</i>	
2190	<i>Carex nigra</i>	
2190	<i>Dactylorhiza species</i>	
2190	<i>Festuca rubra</i>	
2190	<i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i>	
2190	<i>Juncus articulatus</i>	
2190	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	
2190	<i>Mentha aquatica</i>	
2190	<i>Potentilla anserina</i>	
2190	<i>Prunella vulgaris</i>	
2190	<i>Ranunculus flammula</i>	
2190	<i>Sagina nodosa</i>	
2190	<i>Salix repens v. argentea</i>	
*21A0	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>	
*21A0	<i>Bellis perennis</i>	
*21A0	<i>Carex arenaria</i>	
*21A0	<i>Carex flacca</i>	
*21A0	<i>Cerastium fontanum</i>	
*21A0	<i>Crepis capillaris</i>	
*21A0	<i>Euphrasia officinalis ag.</i>	
*21A0	<i>Festuca rubra</i>	
*21A0	<i>Galium verum</i>	
*21A0	<i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i>	
*21A0	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	
*21A0	<i>Orchis species</i>	
*21A0	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	
*21A0	<i>Thymus polytrichus</i>	
*21A0	<i>Trifolium repens</i>	

Structure and Functions Assessment Criteria

Habitat	Indicator	Pass/Fail
1220	Shingle habitat	Pass
1220	Native species	Pass
1220	Notable/rare species	Pass
1220	Negative indicator species	Pass
1220	Non-native species	Pass
1220	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
1220	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
2110	Positive indicator species	Pass
2110	Negative indicator species	Pass
2110	Non-native species	Pass
2110	Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species	Pass
2110	Notable/rare species	Pass
2110	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
2110	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
2120	Positive indicator species	Pass
2120	Negative indicator species	Pass
2120	Non-native species	Pass
2120	Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species	Fail
2120	Notable/rare species	Pass
2120	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
2120	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
*2130	Positive indicator species	Pass
*2130	Negative indicator species	Pass
*2130	Non-native species	Pass
*2130	Cover of trees and scrub other than <i>Juniperus communis</i>	Pass
*2130	Trees or saplings from adjacent plantations	Pass
*2130	Height of vegetation	Fail
*2130	Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species	Pass
*2130	Bare sand	Pass
*2130	Notable/rare species	Pass
*2130	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
*2130	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
*2150	Typical species	Pass
*2150	Browsing	Pass
*2150	<i>Calluna vulgaris</i> growth phases	Pass
*2150	Negative indicator species	Pass
*2150	Non-native species	Pass
*2150	Cover of trees and scrub	Pass
*2150	Cover of dwarf shrubs	Pass
*2150	Bare sand	Pass
*2150	Disturbance	Pass
*2150	Pre-designation Coastal defences currently affecting the habitat	Pass
*2150	Post-designation anthropogenic impacts on substrate/mobility of the system	Pass
2170	Positive indicator species	Pass
2170	Negative indicator species	Pass
2170	Non-native species	Pass
2170	Rank grasses	Pass
2170	Cover of trees and scrub other than <i>S. repens</i>	Pass

2170	Height of Salix repens	Fail
2170	Bare sand	Pass
2170	Notable/rare species	Pass
2170	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
2170	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
2190	Positive indicator species	Pass
2190	Bryophytes	Pass
2190	Cover of Salix repens	Pass
2190	Negative indicator species	Pass
2190	Non-native species	Pass
2190	Cover of scrub	Pass
2190	Forb:grass ratio (mean)	Pass
2190	Bare ground	Pass
2190	Notable/rare species	Pass
2190	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
2190	Damage due to disturbance	Pass
*21A0	Positive indicator species	Pass
*21A0	Bryophytes	Fail
*21A0	Negative indicator species	Pass
*21A0	Non-native species	Pass
*21A0	Flowering or fruiting of positive indicator species	Pass
*21A0	Sward height	Pass
*21A0	Bare ground	Pass
*21A0	Notable/rare species	Pass
*21A0	Interference with the sediment dynamics	Pass
*21A0	Damage due to disturbance	Pass

Appendix 3. Impacts and Activities

Impacts recorded

Habitat code	Impact code	Impact description	Relative importance	Influence	Source	Timing	Trend	Area
1220	PX04							
2110	PF05	Walking	Low	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	50.0
2110	PM07	Natural erosion	Low	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0
2120	PF05	Walking and tracks	Medium	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	5.0
*2130	PA07	Overgrazing and trampling (cattle and horse). Farming structures and silage bales	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	80.0
*2130	PA19	Deposition of waste and silage bales	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	2.0
*2130	PA25	Vehicle track	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0
*2130	PE01	Road	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	0.5
*2130	PF03	Sports pitch	Low	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	1.0
*2130	PH08	Deposition of tyres	Low	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	1.0
*2130	PI03	Arctium spp	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0
*2130	PM07	Natural erosion and sand blowouts	Medium	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	10.0
*2150	PX04							
2170	PA05	Undergrazing	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	10.0
2170	PA07	Overgrazing, trampling, farming structure and fencing	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	40.0
2190	PA07	Artificial pond and fencing	Low	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	10.0
2190	PA19	Agricultural waste	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Increasing	0.5
2190	PM07	Natural succession to HCH FS2 (Iris pseudacorus)	Medium	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	0.1
*21A0	PA07	Overgrazing, trampling (sheep), fencing, farming structures (corral) and supplementary feeding	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	80.0
*21A0	PA08	Grazing (sheep)	Medium	Positive	Inside	Ongoing	Increasing	20.0
*21A0	PA19	Agricultural waste	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	1.0
*21A0	PA22	Drainage for agriculture	Low	Neutral	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	1.0
*21A0	PA25	Vehicle tracks, offroad driving (agriculture) and farming structures	Medium	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0
*21A0	PD06	Trellis/Repeater	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	0.5
*21A0	PE01	Road	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Stable	0.1
*21A0	PF06	Deposition and burning of waste	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0
*21A0	PI02	Yucca spp hedges	High	Negative	Inside	Ongoing	Decreasing	1.0

Conservation Measures required

Habitat code	Measure code	Measure description	Area (ha)	Status (in place/partial/ Absent/unidentified)	Response timeframe	Purpose	Location (inside and or Outside SAC)
2120	CF03	Measure required to regulate recreational activities	0.1438	Absent	Medium-term results	Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical	Inside

						species	
*2130	CA05	Measure required to regulate grazing	235.2935	Absent	Medium-term results	Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species	Inside
2170	CA05	Measure required to regulate grazing	17.7770	Absent	Medium-term results	Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species	Inside
*21A0	CA05	Measure required to regulate grazing	150.6999	Absent	Medium-term results	Restore the structure & functions, including the status of typical species	Inside

Appendix 4. Condition of the habitat by area

Summary of habitat condition

Habitat code	% remaining habitat in poor condition	% remaining habitat in good condition
1220	0	100
2110	0	100
2120	20	80
*2130	20	80
*2150	10	90
2170	20	80
2190	10	90
*21A0	20	80