

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE****Name:** Begtrup Vig og kystområder ved Helgenæs (H47)**Total site surface area (ha):** 1771 **NUTS region code:** DK00D
Project site surface area (ha): 203**Community protection status:** SPA¹ **NATURA 2000 Code:**
pSCI **NATURA 2000 Code:** DK00DX151**Other protection status:**

20 ha of the pSCI at Ørby Klint are protected by a Conservation Order.

A large part of the pSCI is protected under the Act on Nature Conservation (§ 3), nature protected area according to the Nature Conservation Act.

Scientific description of site:

The pSCI is situated on the southern and western site of the peninsula Helgenæs.

The coast at Fejrup contains steep slopes, cliffs and fine grass-lands grazed by cattle. The soils vary from sand to chalky plastic clay. At the foot of the slopes there are spring areas on clayey soil.

The subcontinental flora element is well represented within the site.

Importance of the site for the conservation of the species/habitat types targeted at regional, national and EU level (give quantifiable information wherever possible) :

The pSCI is of great national importance as the type of cliffs and grazed slopes are of limited occurrence. At regional level the pSCI is important in containing about 40 % of the habitat type 6120*.

¹ SPA= special protected area pSCI= potential sites for community interest



MAP OF THE SITE OR SITES

The map or, where relevant, maps, at a scale of 1:100.000 (or more precise if necessary).

They must show the following information :

- for Member States - the boundaries of the area proposed by the Member State under the Habitats Directive or classified under the Birds Directive. Always verify with the competent national authorities, that the boundaries you have are the official one for the sites targeted
- for 2004 accession countries and candidate countries – the boundaries of the protected area
- the boundaries of the project area
- the location of the principal actions listed in section C of the form

 *This map can be presented on a format larger than A4, if necessary.*

Map no:

7.1: Project area and pSCI.

7.2: Current distribution of targeted habitats.

7.3: Ownership.

7.4: Location of management and restoration.

7.5: Areas grazed; currently and foreseen at end of project.

THESE MAPS ARE CONSIDERED AS BEING AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE APPLI-
CATION.

THEY MUST BE OF GOOD QUALITY, SHOWING THE SCALE, AND CONTAIN ALL THE
REQUISITE INFORMATION LISTED ABOVE.



HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I {AND BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 4 (1996)} HABITAT TYPES PRESENT IN THE SITE AND DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT

Priority ? : Tick if the habitat type is a priority one according to Annex I of the Habitats Directive.

Code : Use only the NATURA 2000 codes (for habitats only listed in the Bern Convention resolution use the corresponding code)

Name : Name of the habitat type according to the Habitats Directive (or the Bern Convention resolution).

% : % cover of the habitat type over the whole project site.

Priority	Code	Name	%	Comments (conservation status, etc.)
DIRECTLY TARGETED HABITATS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I HABITAT TYPES				
X	6120	* Xeric sand calcareous grasslands	1*	Cover: 6 ha Representativity: A, Relative surface: B, Conservation status: A, Global assessment: A Inside project area 5 ha.
	6210	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies on calcareous substrates (Festuco-Brometalia) (* important orchid sites)	2*	Cover: 41 ha Representativity: A, Relative surface: B, Conservation status: B, Global assessment: A Inside project area 47 ha.
CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: DIRECTLY TARGETED HABITAT TYPES ACCORDING TO THE BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 4 (1996)				

* The percentages given is relative to the **total** area of the pSCI. Information of the FFH representation inside the project area is listed in the "comments" column.



**BIRDS DIRECTIVE ANNEX I {OR BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 6 (1998)}
SPECIES PRESENT IN THE SITE AND DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT**

Priority : *Tick if the species is a "priority for funding under LIFE" according to the ORNIS Committee (see list in Annex 2 of this brochure).*

Priority	SCIENTIFIC NAME (IN LATIN)	POPULATION SIZE FOR THE SITE (quantitative estimates)			
		RESIDENT	MIGRATORY		
			BREEDING	WINTERING	STAGING
DIRECTLY TARGETED ANNEX I SPECIES OF THE BIRDS DIRECTIVE					
CANDIDATE COUNTRIES: DIRECTLY TARGETED SPECIES ACCORDING TO THE BERN CONVENTION RESOLUTION N° 6 (1998)					
OTHER MIGRATORY SPECIES DIRECTLY TARGETED BY THE PROJECT					
Comments (conservation status if known, other listed species that will benefit etc) :					



MAIN THREATS TO THE HABITATS/SPECIES TARGETED WITHIN THE SITES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT

Threat 1:

Name of the threat:

Lack of grazing or inappropriate grazing regimes.

Description:

Traditional husbandry grazing has almost ceased in dry grasslands in Denmark. Most semi-natural grassland fragments are less attractive for grazing as they represent small distant places with relatively high cost of fencing and water supply for the livestock. On dry grasslands with lack of grazing or insufficient grazing pressure an overgrowth will take place, initially with tall grasses and herbal species invading from nearby areas including non-native species but also an initial overgrowth with scrubs and trees such as *Rosa sp.*, *Prunus spinosa* and *Abies alba*.

The microclimate will change resulting in unfavourable changes to the composition of the plant community and especially to the abundance of key plant species as well as insect species associated with the vegetation of open dry grassland. Summer grazing at a very high grazing pressure may be detrimental too. Although it may help controlling for potentially dominant herbs and grasses, this will often be at the expense of sensitive plant species and invertebrate species depending on flowering vegetation.

Location: (if relevant)

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible)

Grazing are needed for 142 ha of dry grassland at this site.

The structure and function of the areas dry grasslands are under threat as several plant species of the sub-continental flora as *Dianthus armeria*, *Medicago minima* and *Petrorhagia prolifera*, are in risk of disappearing from this site.

Threat 2:

Name of the threat:

Encroachment with woody species (shrubs and trees)

Description:

As a result of the influence of threat 1 'Lack of grazing or insufficient grazing pressure' overgrowth with shrubs and trees over a maximum acceptable threshold have taken place. As a consequence of reduced grass cover, grazing has ceased completely and a succession towards closed forest proceeds rapidly.

Overgrowth has been categorized into four degrees of overgrowth:

Overgrowth degree I: 5-25% cover of shrubs and trees

Overgrowth degree II: 25-50% cover of shrubs and trees

Overgrowth degree III: 50-75% cover of shrubs and trees

Overgrowth degree IV: > 75% cover of shrubs and trees

Location (if relevant)

The location of areas with overgrowth is shown on the site map.



Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):

Impact on at this site from overgrowth:

Overgrowth degree I: 17 ha

Overgrowth degree II: 0 ha

Overgrowth degree III: 14 ha

Overgrowth degree IV: 2 ha

Threat 5:

Name of the threat:

Low or no support for the conservation of dry grassland among landowners and the public

Description:

There is among landowners and their professional organisations as well as among the public in general a low level of understanding of the crucial importance of the unique qualities of dry grasslands. That goes both for their characteristics as habitat types as well as for their contribution to the conservation of biodiversity in Denmark and Europe. Dry grasslands does not have such spectacular appearances as other habitat types, and there is thus a need for promotion of the assets of dry grasslands among landowners and in the local communities in order to gain support for their conservation.

Location: (if relevant)

Not relevant

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):

The future protection of dry grassland habitats in Denmark will depend to a large degree on the cooperation between nature managers, experts and local landowners. The valuable grassland area is divided on a very large number of small remnant grassland fragments, and conservation efforts can thus not be focused in a few large reserves. The limited knowledge basis of local landowners is considered a serious constraint to a successful future conservation of grassland habitats.

Threat 6:

Name of the threat:

Insufficient management capacity

Description:

There are shortcomings in the capacity of staff of the counties nature conservation departments responsible for managing privately owned land and of the state forest districts of the Danish Forest and Nature Agency responsible for government owned land concerning management of dry grasslands. There is a need for training in the range of adequate management techniques and up-to-date knowledge on the latest research results as well as an exchange of experience between managers.

Location: (if relevant)

National level

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):

Insufficient capacity concerning management methods will lead to delays in implementation of adequate conservation measures and possibly introduction of inappropriate management measures.



Threat 7:

Name of the threat:

Adverse impacts from visitors (tourists)

Description:

At sites known to be visited by large number of people, either local or tourists, due to their natural beauty or proximity to mayor tourist attractions, deterioration is a threat to the favourable conservation status. Potential conflicts with visitors and grazing cattle, sheep or horses and the wear and tear from visitors might demotivate farmers from providing livestock for an appropriate grazing of the grasslands or from entering into management agreements at all.

Location: (if relevant)

Impact on habitat/species (quantify if possible):

Large number of tourists will damage the sensitive vegetation by the tear imposed by their movements on the ground. Key plant species may be subject of illegal picking. Litter will be thrown. Grazing will not be optimal.



PREVIOUS CONSERVATION EFFORTS ON THE SITES IN QUESTION

The Conservation Order for the subsite Ørby Klint only deals with the landscape and does not contain provisions mandating the county to perform management actions. Nature management actions has thus not previously been planned.

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE PROJECT

The pSCI is both publicly and privately owned. Aarhus County is managing the privately owned land. Some of the private landowners has been contacted and are positive towards removal of overgrowth and re-establishing of grazing.

The project area is privately owned. At Ørby Klint there are 3 owners.

The non-grazed area at Fejrup has 7 different owners. An enquiry to these owners is under preparation.

The general idea is for this part of the project site to create a large common grazing area combining the grazed area at Fejrup Klint together with an approx 20 ha large presently grazed area NE of the project area. The owner of this larger area is positive to the idea.

The government owned land is managed by the local Fussingø forest district which has and will cooperate closely with the Nature Conservation Department of the Aarhus County Administration on the management of the site.

Please refer to form 25 for restrictions due to socio-economic issues

RELATION BETWEEN THE PROPOSAL AND OTHER EU FUNDS

See Form 26 Complementary of other EU Funds



GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIES TARGETED

Name of the species:

Ecology of the species:

General distribution of the species at European and national level and population trends:

Size of the population target by the project (e.g. n° of individuals, % of European and/or national population):

Main threats to the population targeted:

Threat 1:

Name of the threat:

Description:

Impact on species:

Threat 2

Etc.

Conservation measures already taken or proposed for the species at Community or national level :



PROJECT AREA AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

Brief description of the project area:

Socio-economic context:

Relation between the proposal and other EU funds