

**Leo Smith
Ornithological
Surveys & Consultancy**



APP/L3245/W/23/3332543

Erection of an up to 30 MW Solar PV Array, comprising ground mounted solar PV panels, vehicular access, internal access tracks, landscaping and associated infrastructure, including security fencing, CCTV, client storage containers and grid connection infrastructure, including substation buildings and off-site cabling

Proposed Solar Farm To The West Of Berrington Shrewsbury Shropshire

Proof of Evidence from Leo Smith, Ornithologist

1. Personal

1. I have been a semi-professional Ornithologist since 2003, since retiring from a principal management post in Local Government.
2. I have surveyed breeding Skylark for National Trust and Natural England over many years.
3. I am one of the foremost ornithologists in Shropshire, and was editor and compiler of *The Birds of Shropshire*, a 532-page hard-backed book, the most comprehensive record of the county's bird life ever published, by Liverpool University Press in 2019. It includes an analysis of the population, population trends, distribution and habitat of all species that breed in the County, including Skylark.

2. Proof of Evidence

1. The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal reference APP/L3245/W/23/3332543 in this proof of evidence, is true and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.
2. I submitted a third-party representation to the Appeal, which appears on the council website, indicating that I have read the appropriate documents related to the original Planning Application, and the Appeal.
3. This Proof of Evidence relates mainly to the sections of the Appellants Statement of Case (CD4.2), concerning the ecological issues, in particular the loss of Skylark Territories. It also reviews the *Skylark Mitigation and Management Plan (ADAS May 2023, CD14 and CD15)*. It also identifies considerations that should have been included by both the Council and the Appellant in their own documents, but which have not. This reflects my area of expertise.
4. My evidence highlights
 - i. The very high density of breeding Skylarks on the proposed development site, by national and County standards, and the need to protect it
 - ii. The status of Skylark as a Section 41 species under Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006, and the legal protection provided for it under NPPF, which has not been taken into account by either the Council or the Appellant

- iii. The failure of the Appellant to survey the Mitigation land, and the Appellant's confirmation that Skylarks are present on the Mitigation land in the breeding season.
 - iv. The failure of the Appellant to provide adequate Mitigation for the lost Skylark territories.
 - v. The need for Natural England to comment on the proposals for the Mitigation site, which will impact on the neighbouring Berrington Pool SSSI (a Midland Mere & Mosses – Phase 1 (SSSI / RAMSAR) site).
 - vi. The lack of understanding of the habitat and breeding requirements of Skylark shown by both the Council and the Appellant, showing that they would not be able to negotiate a satisfactory S106 agreement to last for the lifespan of the proposed development (40 years).
5. In the following text, all direct quotes from source documents are placed in quotation marks, and are indented. References are appended, except in cases where evidence has been published on websites. In these cases, the web address is incorporated into the text. All websites were accessed in the first few days of February 2024.

3. The Importance of the Berrington Site For Breeding Skylarks

1. The British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) conducted a national Skylark survey in 1997. This found a maximum density of 5.97 pairs per 1-km square in arable areas on the Ordnance Survey National Grid. (Brown *et al*, 2000, CD10.26). This figure will be lower now, as a result of the 14% decline since the survey was undertaken.
2. The Shropshire population was estimated at just under 14,000 breeding pairs in 2011 (Smith 2019 (p.348), CD.10.20), a density of just under four pairs per square km.
3. A Bird Survey in 2022 on the proposed development site (32.95ha approx.) found 11 Skylark territories, a density of around 33 pairs / sq.km. (ADAS 2022, CD1.15).
4. The Breeding Season Relative Abundance map 2008-11 in the *Birds of Shropshire* (Smith, 2019, p.348, CD10.20) shows that the tetrad (2x2 kilometre square) containing the Berrington site is in the highest quartile of tetrads in Shropshire for density of Breeding Skylarks.
5. The breeding density of Skylarks on the Berrington site is therefore very high by national and local standards.
6. Skylark is Red Listed in the Birds of Conservation Concern in the UK 2021, because of a 56% population decline 1970-2018. The Breeding Bird Survey report for 2022 (BTO Research Report 756) published by BTO, the governmental Joint Nature Conservation Committee and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, <https://www.bto.org/our-science/publications/breeding-bird-survey-report/breeding-bird-survey-2022> (CD10.25 shows a 14% decline in the UK, and a 16% decline in England, between 1995 and 2021 (most recent data available).
7. The reasons for the decline are explained on the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) website, which states
 - i. "Skylarks can lay up to four clutches a year, but this has likely been limited by agricultural intensification in recent decades, and the switch from spring to autumn crop sowing in particular. This switch may also reduce overwinter survival due to loss of winter stubbles.

- ii. “There is good evidence that the most likely cause of the decline is the change from spring to autumn sowing of cereals. This practice restricts opportunities for late-season nesting attempts, because the crop is by then too tall. Chamberlain et al. (2000a) used habitat data from CBC surveys to show that the occurrence of autumn-sown, winter cereals increased from 33% to 78% between 1965 and 1995. Evans et al. (1995) and Wilson et al. (1997) all found that Skylarks deserted areas of autumn-sown crops as soon as the sward reached a critical height, which occurred before the end of the breeding season. Jenny (1990), Chamberlain et al. (1999, 2000a, 2000b) and Donald & Vickery (2000) all recorded low and seasonally declining densities of Skylarks in cereals and suggested that this was at least partly due to the effects of changing vegetation structure. As well as preventing nesting, crop development also influences the positioning of the nests and hence their productivity: as the crop develops the birds are forced to nest closer to tramlines with a consequent increase in nest predation rate (Donald & Vickery 2000, Morris & Gilroy 2008).”
8. If Skylarks give up attempting to nest when the surrounding crop height reaches around 60cm, they will certainly not be able to tolerate Solar Panels with a vertical height of 300 cm, as proposed in the Berrington development. This is confirmed by evidence in a paper on the website of Solar Energy UK (a “trade association working for and representing the entire solar and energy storage value chain”), written in 2022 or 2023, which states

“Preferring to nest in open fields, away from tall structures, Skylarks need clear sight lines in order to spot predators. The presence of solar arrays is therefore not conducive to nesting by Skylarks . . . confirmed nesting on solar farms has, to date, not been recorded”. <https://solarenergyuk.org/solar-farms-and-songbirds-could-skylarks-benefit-from-ground-mounted-solar/> (CD10.12)
 9. It appears that the Appellant has ceded that there will be no breeding Skylarks on the Solar Farm, if it is hoped that the Mitigation area will accommodate all 11 territories that will be lost, as well as the unknown number of pairs that nest on the Mitigation site already

4. Protection of S41 species

1. Section 41 of The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 says that the Secretary of State must publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat which in the Secretary of State's opinion are of principal importance for the purpose of conserving or enhancing biodiversity, and that the Secretary of State must take such steps as appear to the Secretary of State to be reasonably practicable to further the conservation of the living organisms and types of habitat included in the list. Skylarks are included on the list.
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/habitats-and-species-of-principal-importance-in-england>
2. At the time the planning application was first discussed with the Council's planners and ecologist (November 2022), NPPF (as revised on 20 July 2021) required that

“186. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

 1. if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;” (my emphasis)

3. Supplementary Guidance issued by Natural England, still on the Gov.UK website <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/wild-birds-advice-for-making-planning-decisions>, states
“Some wild birds are listed as rare and most threatened species under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006). You must have regard for the conservation of Section 41 species as part of your planning decision.”
4. NERC 2006 section 40 was amended by the Environment Act 2021, and the provisions were introduced in January 2023. Section 40(1) requires that a public authority “must from time to time consider what action the authority can properly take, consistently with the proper exercise of its functions, to further the general biodiversity objective”. This requires strategic and policy reviews.. Section 41(3) says that without prejudice to section 40(1), the Secretary of State must—(a) take such steps as appear to the Secretary of State to be reasonably practicable to further the conservation of the living organisms and types of habitat included in any list published under this section, or (b) promote the taking by others of such steps.. NPPF para 185 also says “plans should . . . promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species.”
5. Restoring the populations of the S41 species are the Government’s biodiversity targets, enshrined in international treaties.
6. I have found no reference anywhere, in any of the documents submitted with the original Planning Application or the Appeal, or the Council’s response, to the legal protection afforded to Skylark as a S41 species. This includes the *Skylark Mitigation Plan* (CD1.15) prepared for the Appellant by ADAS.
7. This important consideration is still missing from the Appellants Statement of Case.
8. The guidance in NPPF still says
186. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused (my emphasis).
9. The Council’s Core Strategy (CD5.1) says that development must protect and enhance the diversity, high quality and local character of Shropshire’s natural environment, and must not adversely affect the ecological values and functions of these assets or have a significant adverse impact on Shropshire’s environmental assets.
10. SAMDev policy MD12 (CD5.2) says that proposals which are likely to have a significant adverse effect, directly, indirectly or cumulatively, on priority species or habitats will only be permitted if it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no satisfactory alternative means of avoiding such impacts through re-design or by re-locating on an alternative site and the social or economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm to the asset.
11. If the Council Officers (Planners and Ecologists) had taken the S41 obligations and the other policy requirements into account when preparing their report for the Planning Committee, in my view they should have recommended refusal.

12. The Appellant's Statement of Case (Section 4.3) states
"It is noted that the Council's ecologist did confirm in writing on 9th May 2023 that it did not object to the application, subject to conditions and a s106 agreement for the management of the skylark compensation areas. At the Planning Committee meeting, against the advice of some Members and against the advice of the Case Officer, a Member of the Planning Committee insisted on including loss of skylark habitat as a reason for refusal, despite the agreed compensation immediately adjacent to the site that had been negotiated over many months with the Council's ecologists."
13. This is intended to suggest that the member of the Planning Committee was out of step. In fact, my comments above, about the failure to properly appreciate the statutory protection, and those below, incorrectly suggesting that Skylark plots are the same as breeding sites, show that the Council's Case Officer and Ecologist were remarkably ill-formed of their responsibilities. Fortunately and correctly, the Planning Committee did not agree with the views of the Council's ecologist and planning officer who had handled the case up to that point, and decided to refuse permission on the basis of ecology, as well as other reasons for refusal.
14. The Ecology part of the Appeal hinges on whether adequate Mitigation has been provided for the loss of 11 breeding territories. The evidence below proves that it has not been. The Council's local plan and NPPF 186 therefore requires that the Appeal should be refused on this basis alone.

5. The proposed Mitigation

1. The Appellant has proposed a Mitigation site to the north of the proposed development (CD1.15 and CD1.16). This must therefore provide space for the territories of all 11 pairs of Skylark displaced from the proposed development site. It must also continue to provide space for the number of pairs already resident on it. The Appellant has not surveyed the Mitigation land, in spite of clear guidance from Natural England (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/wild-birds-advice-for-making-planning-decisions-when-to-ask-for-a-survey>) that this must be done.
2. However, the Appellant's statement of case (CD4.2, para 5.4.6) comments
"In addition, Skylark were observed using this compensatory land during the breeding bird surveys of the development site but as these observations were not pertinent to the survey of the site, this data was not included in the survey report."
The failure to survey the Mitigation site means that we do not know the total number of territories that it needs to hold. The Appellant is therefore unable to present a case that the Mitigation site is suitable, and has not done so.
3. In fact it can be shown that the Mitigation site will be unable to provide anywhere near 11 territories.
4. Firstly, it must be understood that Skylark plots are designed to provide feeding sites in autumn-planted cereal crops. They do not provide nest sites, as the Solar Energy report cited above makes clear.
"Often misunderstood, 'Skylark plots' (undrilled patches within cropland measuring 5x5m at a rate of 2 per hectare) break up arable monocultures and increase invertebrate prey abundance but they do not provide nesting habitat in themselves."
5. ADAS shares this misunderstanding. Paragraph 5.4.4 of the Appellant's Statement of Case says "RSPB guidance (RSPB, 2023) states that each Skylark plot should

- cover a minimum area of 16 square meters. These will be created in the compensation area at a density of 1 plot per 0.5 ha.” It must be clearly understood that this “guidance” relates to the area needed for the purpose of the Skylark plots, to provide foraging sites, and not to the area needed for nesting sites and territories.
6. Other references to Skylark plots (CD10.6, CD10.7) confirm that they provide foraging sites, not nest sites
 7. The remainder of Section 5 is therefore misleading, and irrelevant to the need for the Mitigation site to support at least 11 breeding territories.
 8. The ADAS *Skylark Mitigation and Management Plan* (CD1.15) first introduced this misunderstanding. In Para 3.2 *Identification of suitable compensation areas* it blithely asserts
“The identified area amounted to a total of approximately 25 ha and will easily accommodate the minimum required area of 6 ha.”
 9. The area required to replace at least 11 breeding territories in the 44ha currently occupied is considerably more than 6ha, or indeed 25ha.
 10. By definition, “Skylark plots” can only be created in otherwise unsuitable breeding habitat, autumn planted cereals (see *The reasons for the decline of Skylark*, explained on the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) website, reproduced in paragraph 3.7 above). These reasons for decline include the switch from Spring-planted to Autumn -planted cereals, which grow too high to allow nesting to produce later broods.
 11. Neither the Appellant, nor ADAS, have explained how it is possible to incorporate Skylark plots into grazed fields. Indeed, Natural England guidance (CD10.7) says this option is only available in agri-environment schemes on arable land, temporary grassland and in winter cereal fields with an open aspect of more than 5ha
 12. The Appellant’s fall-back plan is to convert the Mitigation site into winter cereals with Skylark plots. While these crops grow too high for Skylarks to breed in throughout the season, the Appellant hopes to relocate all the 11 breeding territories from favoured habitat (the development site) into the least favoured habitat. No evidence has been submitted to show this is possible.
 13. Section 4.2 includes the provision that
“If any areas within the compensation area is (sic) used for a silage crop, it must not be cut between April June and any subsequent cuts must be at least seven weeks apart to enable success of later nests”
 14. A silage crop left uncut for that length of time is precisely the sort of vegetation that grows to 60cm, and precludes Skylark nesting attempts. It will also be too thick for the birds to forage through, to find invertebrate food on the ground. That this possibility is even contemplated indicates the lack of understanding of the management requirements for the Mitigation area.
 15. Section 4.3 *Habitat Management requirements (arable)* is redundant because it is based on the false premise that each Skylark plot is equal to a breeding territory. It is not.
 16. All sections from 4.4 onwards are redundant for the same reason.

6. The Function of Bird Breeding Territories

1. The following is a typical text-book description. Numerous other examples provide similar definitions:-

When birds establish territories in the spring, they do so by chasing out intruders. The birds they are most concerned about are those of their own species because birds of the same species compete for the same resources – nest sites, food, mates, etc.
(see e.g. <https://ornithology.com/ornithology-lectures/territoriality-of-birds>).
2. Because Skylarks are highly territorial, it follows that a Skylark plot can only be used for foraging if it is within the territory of a breeding pair. The territory needs to be large enough to provide all the food that a pair needs to raise (usually) three broods, and all nearby pairs will be excluded from the plot. Because of the size of each Skylark territory (several times the size of a Skylark plot), each territory will contain several (unshared) plots.
3. The size of a Skylark territory varies according to the crop type. BTO Research Report No. 129 (Wilson and Browne, 1993, CD10.24) states that
 - “1. The habitat selection, territory density, nesting success and diet of Skylarks breeding on one organic and one conventional farm in north Suffolk were investigated as a pilot study to examine the impact of organic farming practices on Skylark breeding populations.
 2. Territory density was higher on the organic than on the conventional farm, and this difference could be explained largely by differences between the two farms in field size, boundary characteristics, and cropping. Rotational and five-year set-aside, and organic cereals were the most attractive field types to Skylarks.Densities of territorial male Skylarks remained constant throughout the breeding season on all field types except conventional winter cereals. Here, most territories were abandoned in late April and early May when birds were expected to lay their first clutches.”
4. By definition, Skylark plots can only be provided in this least favoured conventional winter cereals.
5. The same BTO Research Report goes on to say:-
 - i. “Territory size varies greatly, but most territories cover 0.25 - 2 hectares. Pairs will shift or abandon their territories during the course of the season if vegetation structure becomes unsuitable. The above information is summarised from Cramp (1988).
 - ii. “Research on Skylarks nesting on arable farmland in Switzerland (Schlapfer 1988; Jenny 1990a,b,c) suggests that highest densities are reached where crop diversity is high so that different crop types provide suitable nesting habitat throughout the season. Where habitat is homogeneous over large areas, the distribution of territories is often clumped. Schlapfer (1988) found that dense vegetation exceeding 30-35cm high was avoided, and suggested that the reason for this was hindrance of movement at ground level. Poulsen (1993) found that winter cereals tended to support low territory densities (<0.1 per ha) with higher densities on spring cereals and grassland (0.1-0.2 per ha), and the greatest concentrations on five-year set aside land (0.2-0.5 per ha). Estimates of territory density according to crop type must always take into account field boundary structure since tall structures such as

hedgerows and woodland edge reduce the area of a field that Skylarks will use.”

6. The current Skylark site (the proposed development site) is relatively good habitat (spring cereals), but is unlikely to provide territories at the lower end of the size range quoted in the above research studies. The highest densities in these studies show that a combination of uncultivated field margins, organic spring-planted arable crops and set-aside are needed. These are not available in the current farming system of the land owner.
7. The size of 11 territories in the proposed development site (44ha) gives an average territory size of 4ha. The proposed Mitigation site is just over half that size (25ha). It is currently pasture grassland, split into four small fields divided by hedgerows. These hedgerows reduce the available area for nesting Skylarks (unless the hedges are removed). Such grassland, even managed with low stock densities, will not support the Skylarks densities on the current site. The BTO website (<https://www.bto.org/understanding-birds/birdfacts/skylark>) includes a chart, “Relative occurrence in different habitat types during the breeding season” which shows that frequency of use of pasture is only about 40% of use of arable. However, the proportion of arable land is much less than grassland. The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK is 17.0 million hectares in 2023 and accounts for 70% of the total area of the UK. The total croppable area is just over 6.0 million hectares in 2023 and accounts for just over a third (36%) of UAA.” (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/agricultural-land-use-in-the-united-kingdom/agricultural-land-use-in-united-kingdom-at-1-june-2023>)
8. As well as failing to survey the Mitigation site, neither the Appellant, or ADAS, have made any assessment or estimate of the number of Skylark territories that it will support if it is managed as low intensity grazing. They also have not explained how it is possible to incorporate Skylark plots into grazing land.
9. In fact, the Mitigation site will support far fewer Skylark territories in its current use than the current undeveloped site.

7. Other considerations

1. Conversion of the Mitigation site to arable land, which would be necessary to support higher densities of Skylarks, will involve ploughing and application of fertilizers. The Midland Mere & Mosses – Phase 1 (SSSI / RAMSAR) is located to the north of the proposed Mitigation area, on lower ground, as are Berrington Pool and Bomere, Shotton and Betton Pools SSSIs
2. NPPF requires the Planning Authority to consult Natural England if a proposed development affects an SSSI. The response to the Council’s consultation from Natural England (CD2.6) identifies all three sites with statutory protection as potentially affected by the proposals in the Planning Application, and advises the Council that
“there are potential likely significant effects on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes and further assessment is required”
3. There is no evidence in the documents associated with the Planning Application, or the Appeal, that the assessment required by Natural England has been considered, by either the Council or the Appellant. Indeed, the response from Natural England (CD2.6) was not included in the list of documents associated with

the Planning Application, or the appeal, on the Council's website. It appears to have been totally overlooked.

4. In fact, the conversion of the Mitigation site to arable land would almost certainly result in various forms of pollution to the SSSIs through run off (i.e. silt and fertiliser / pesticide) toward the designated sites.
5. Therefore, if any assessment had been made, it would have resulted in exclusion of the option of increasing the number of Skylark territories on the Mitigation site by converting it in to arable, and provided an additional reason why the Council's officers should have recommended that the original Planning Application be refused.
6. Further, if the Mitigation site was to be retained as grassland, but managed for Skylark, it would be necessary to remove the existing hedgerows, as they would reduce the available land for Skylark territories. This should be taken into account in the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation.
7. In this situation it is inappropriate to give any weight to the BNG calculation – conserving 11 territories for a S41 species on the *Red List of Breeding Birds of Conservation Concern* is far more important than any benefits that might (eventually) accrue from new hedgerows.
8. The Appellant is proposing that a S106 agreement is negotiated to regulate the management of the proposed Mitigation area. The Planning Documents listed in relation to the original Committee decision show that the Council Officers and (then) Ecologist acquiesced to ADAS assertions, and did not take S41 and other legal protections into account, or realise that Skylark plots were not an acceptable Mitigation for loss of 11 breeding territories. The Mitigation area would need to be carefully managed and monitored for the lifetime of the solar farm (40 years), with no vegetation allowed to grow above 60cm in the Skylark breeding season. In practice this will be an onerous obligation for the Appellant.
9. The documents reviewed suggest that the Appellant and their advisers, and the Council and its Ecologists who handled the application, did not have sufficient understanding of what this entails. If the Appellant still believes that 44ha of good habitat can be replaced with 25ha of very poor habitat, then it will be impossible to produce a draft potentially satisfactory S106 Management agreement which can be negotiated, implemented and enforced. This is another reason to reject the Appeal.
10. ADAS initially referred to the presence of the Pheasant shoot on the site as helping to provide a "safe haven" for the Skylarks. In fact pheasant shoots do very little predator control at a time that would benefit breeding Skylarks. However, if the Mitigation site is planted with winter cereals, it will also increase the likelihood of any Skylark nests being predated. Tramlines in the crop are a feature of managing such fields, and nests near to tramlines are more likely to be predated, because they are more easily accessible to mammalian predators.
11. The Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust (GWCT) website <https://www.gwct.org.uk/research/long-term-monitoring/national-gamebag-census/mammal-bags-comprehensive-overviews/fox/> refers to the number of foxes killed as part of predator control activities and reported through the National Gamebag Census (NGC). It states:

'There has been a continuous increase in the bag index since 1961, leading to it being more than three times higher in 2009 than in 1961 (Aebischer *et al* 2011: CD10.27): i.e. there were more than three times more foxes killed by gamekeepers in 1961 than 2009, in spite of all the ones killed in the intervening period.

12. Pheasant release, it should be noted, increased 10-fold over the same period. With considerable understatement, the website article concludes: 'The widespread rearing and releasing of gamebirds has probably improved fox food supply in autumn and winter.' What the website graph shows, firstly, is that foxes are preferentially attracted to where gamekeepers operate (i.e. where gamebirds are released), and secondly that, however many foxes are killed, there are always more at these sites the following year. "Control" does not keep pace with the population level supported by the increase in the food supply.
13. The Pheasant shoot will therefore increase the number of foxes on the site, year on year, at the start of the Skylark breeding season, and consequently increase the predation of Skylarks by foxes.

8. Conclusion

1. The density of breeding Skylarks in the proposed development area is very high by national and County standards. The species is listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006: and is protected through the planning system, and in the Council's policy documents.
2. The proposed development will destroy 11 Skylark breeding territories, and provide little or no realistic alternatives. The proposed Mitigation site has not been surveyed, so it not known if there are also additional territories that it needs to provide for. The territorial behaviour of Skylarks means that at least two, and probably more, "Skylark plots" will be incorporated into each territory, and other Skylarks will be excluded. The Mitigation site is only half the size of the development site, and will consist of a habitat supporting the lowest breeding density of Skylarks (pasture), so it is unrealistic to expect the Mitigation site to support more than a few territories.
3. The various different strands of my evidence show that the Appellant has not thought through the proposal, done the baseline work necessary, or has any respect for the need to maintain the biodiversity in the area..
4. The proposed development will have an Adverse ecological impact, as set out in section 3 of the Council's reasons for refusing Planning Permission.

9. Recommendation

That the Appeal is refused.



Leo Smith B.Sc. (Hons)
Shropshire Ornithological Society
(Member of Conservation Sub-committee and
Co-ordinator, Species Recovery Working Party)
leo@leosmith.org.uk,
4 February 2024

References

- Aebischer, N. J., Davey, P. D., & Kingdon, N. G. 2011. *National Gamebag Census: Mammal Trends to 2009*. Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust, Fordingbridge. ADAS Skylark Mitigation and Management Plan: Land South of Berrington, Shrewsbury (May 2023).
- BTO, the governmental Joint Nature Conservation Committee and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds - The Breeding Bird Survey report for 2022 (BTO Research Report 756)
- Browne, S., Vickery, J.A. & Chamberlain, D.E. (2000) Densities and population estimates of breeding Skylarks *Alauda arvensis* in Britain in 1997. *Bird Study* 47: 52–65. doi: [10.1080/00063650009461](https://doi.org/10.1080/00063650009461)
- Chamberlain, D.E., Vickery, J.A. & Gough, S. (2000a) Spatial and temporal distribution of breeding Skylarks *Alauda arvensis* in relation to crop type in periods of population increase and decrease. *Ardea* 88: 61–73.
- Chamberlain, D., Wilson, A., Browne, S. & Vickery, J. (1999) Effects of habitat type and management on the abundance of Skylarks in the breeding season. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 36: 856–870.
- Chamberlain, D.E., Vickery, J.A. & Gough, S. (2000a) Spatial and temporal distribution of breeding Skylarks *Alauda arvensis* in relation to crop type in periods of population increase and decrease. *Ardea* 88: 61–73.
- Chamberlain, D.E., Fuller, R.J., Bunce, R.G.H., Duckworth, J.C. & Shrubbs, M. (2000b) Changes in the abundance of farmland birds in relation to the timing of agricultural intensification in England and Wales. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 37: 771–788.
- Donald, P.F. & Vickery, J.A. (2000) The importance of cereal fields to breeding and wintering skylarks *Alauda arvensis* in the UK. In *Proceedings of the 1999 BOU Spring Conference: Ecology and Conservation of Lowland Farmland Birds* (eds Aebischer, N.J., Evans, A.D., Grice, P.V. & Vickery, J.A.), pp 140–150. British Ornithologists' Union, Tring.
- Evans, J., Wilson, J. & Browne, S. (1995) *The effect of organic farming regimes on breeding and winter bird populations – Part III. Habitat selection and breeding success of Skylarks (Alauda arvensis) on organic and conventional farmland*. Research Report 154. BTO, Thetford.
- Jenny, M. (1990) Populationsdynamik der Feldlerche *Alauda arvensis* in einer intensiv genutzten Agrarlandschaft der schweizerischen Mittellandes. *Ornithologische Beobachter* 8: 153–163.
- Morris, A.J. & Gilroy, J.J. (2008) Close to the edge: predation risks for two declining farmland passerines. *Ibis* 150: 168–177.
- Schlapfer, A. (1988) Population ecology of the skylark *Alauda arvensis* in intensively used farmland. *Der Ornithologische Beobachter* 85: 309-371.
- Smith, Leo *The Birds of Shropshire*, Liverpool University Press 2019 pp 347 -349

Wilson, J.D. & Browne, S.J. (1993) Habitat selection and breeding success of Skylarks *alauda arvensis* on organic and conventional farmland, BTO Research Report No. 129

Wilson, J.D., Evans, J., Browne, S.J. & King, J.R. (1997) Territory distribution and breeding success of skylarks *Alauda arvensis* on organic and intensive farmland in Southern England. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 34: 1462–1478.