

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Further Alterations to the London Plan

Consultation Draft of Further Alterations to the London Plan

**Copyright**

Greater London Authority
December 2013

Published by

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

enquiries: 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

Further copies of this document may be downloaded from the Greater London Authority Website at www.london.gov.uk, or by calling 0207983 4100.

AMEC Environment and Infrastructure UK Limited was commissioned by the Greater London Authority to undertake an independent Integrated Impact Assessment as an iterative process for the Further Alterations to the London Plan. This document constitutes a draft assessment of the alterations against the Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended), and therefore represents the views of AMEC E&I UK Ltd and not necessarily those of the Greater London Authority or the Mayor of London.

Report for

Celeste Giusti
Senior Strategic Planner
Spatial Strategy Team
Greater London Authority, City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

AMEC E&I UK Ltd

Canon Court, Abbey Lawn, Abbey Foregate,
Shrewsbury SY2 5DE, United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0) 1743 342 000
Fax +44 (0) 1743 342 010

Doc Reg No. 34869rr010i5

Issued by:

Mike Frost
AMEC E&I UK Ltd.

Approved by:

Richard Knightbridge
AMEC E&I UK Ltd.

Executive Summary

The Mayor is responsible for keeping under review the London Plan, which provides the statutory planning framework to guide London's future development. The Mayor is now proposing 'Further Alterations to the London Plan' (FALP) to reflect new demographic information that is emerging from the 2011 Census. The proposed alterations will be out for public consultation from 15 January 2014 and will comprise adjustments to existing policies and updates to the supporting information.

The London Plan was originally subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), in accordance with Regulation 102 of the *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010* (as amended), in 2009¹. This HRA concluded that the plan would have no adverse effects on any European sites due to the provision of appropriate protective policies and mitigation.

Amendments to a plan must also be subject to HRA to ensure that those amendments do not introduce new or additional impacts. It is widely accepted best-practice that HRA of strategic planning documents should be run as an iterative process alongside plan development: HRA is as much about guiding the development of the plan (and demonstrating that this has been done) as it is about (ultimately) assessing its effects.

This report summarises the data collection and analyses that have been undertaken to support an assessment of the proposed FALP, in accordance with Regulation 102. For consistency, since the London Plan has been previously subject to HRA the screening of the FALP follows the approach used within that document. It includes:

- a review and update of the baseline information on the European sites that may be affected by the plan;
- a review of the draft FALP to determine whether the changes are potentially significant, and whether those changes are likely to alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA;
- recommended measures to help ensure that the FALP, when finalised, does not have any significant effects on any European sites.

The majority of the FALP are only minor changes (updates of dates, terminology, etc) that do not alter the likely outcomes of the policy. Of those policies with substantial changes, the screening identified:

- those with no 'likely significant effects' as a result of the type of policy or the anticipated outcomes - in these cases the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid, provided that any mitigation specified within the 2009 HRA document is retained or strengthened by the FALP;

¹ <http://www.london.gov.uk/shaping-london/london-plan/docs/hra-final-report-oct09.pdf>

- those which are likely to have significant effects which should be abandoned or substantially re-worked.
- those that could result in significant effects but which are likely to be acceptable with minor wording changes, caveats or mitigation - in these cases suitable amendments are suggested which would ensure the plan is compliant if employed;
- those where significant effects are possible, but which cannot be fully assessed at this level as the precise effects will depend on implementation in lower tier plans or at the project level (in these cases, the policy is identified as requiring lower tier assessment).

Current guidance indicates that it is acceptable for higher tier plans to specify strategic mitigation measures that broadly identify what must be provided at the lower tier plan level, so allowing the HRA to conclude that there would be no adverse effects. Strategic mitigation, in accordance with the approach used in the 2009 HRA, is therefore proposed to address those FALP policies for which lower tier assessment is required.

There remain some aspects of the plan that cannot be assessed at this level in the planning hierarchy. As noted in Section 4.4 of the 2009 HRA, the London Plan is sufficiently flexible to allow lower tier plans and assessments to avoid impacts on European sites; this will ensure that policies and proposals set out in the London Plan can be delivered, whilst meeting the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. However, the 2009 HRA identifies recommendations for the scope of further (lower tier) assessment in Table 4.2, Sections 4.4.1 – 4.4.4, and Table 4.3; these would need to be complied with and it is recommended that the plan continue to reference the HRA accordingly.

In summary the FALP do not introduce any potentially significant effects over those identified and mitigated within the 2009 HRA. Some of the policies will require assessment at a lower tier (as before) but appropriate mitigating policies are included within the plan (e.g. Policy 7.19) to ensure that it will have no significant or adverse effects through its implementation.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	The London Plan	1
1.2	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	1
1.3	HRA of the FALP	2
1.3.1	Previous reporting and assessment	2
1.3.2	This report	2
2.	Approach	3
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	Approach	4
2.2.1	Baseline review	4
2.2.2	Screening of amendments	5
2.2.3	Uncertainty and 'down the line' assessment	6
3.	Baseline review	8
3.1	European sites	8
3.1.1	Designations	8
3.1.2	Site condition	10
3.1.3	Conservation objectives	15
3.1.4	Site and interest feature sensitivities	16
4.	Screening of the FALP	17
4.1	Policy review	17
4.1.1	Minor policy amendments	17
4.1.2	Screening	22
4.2	In combination effects	29
5.	Summary and Conclusions	31
Table 2.1	Policy 'types' that can usually be screened out	6
Table 3.1	European sites and interest features considered during the screening of the FALP (<i>see also Appendix B</i>)	8
Table 3.2	Summary of changes in European site condition between 2009 and 2013, based on the condition assessments of the component SSSIs	11
Table 3.3	European sites where condition has deteriorated since 2009 and summary of reasons	15

Table 4.1	Review for minor amendments	17
Table 4.2	Colour coding for screening of FALP	22
Table 4.3	Screening of potentially significant policy amendments and suggested mitigation / avoidance measures	23
Appendix A	European sites and associated protected areas	
Appendix B	European sites and interest features	
Appendix C	Reviewed plans and programmes	
Appendix D	Screening categories	
Appendix E	Figure showing European sites	

1. Introduction

1.1 The London Plan

The Mayor is responsible for keeping under review the London Plan, which provides the statutory planning framework to guide London's future development. The latest London Plan was published in 2011, with minor alterations published in October 2013. These changes are known as the Revised Early Minor Alterations (REMA). The REMA document incorporates the Early Minor Alterations (EMA) to the London Plan which were published for consultation in February 2012². The Mayor is now proposing 'Further Alterations to the London Plan' (FALP) to reflect new demographic information that is emerging from the 2011 Census. The proposed alterations will be out for public consultation from 15 January 2014 and will comprise adjustments to existing policies and updates to the supporting information.

1.2 Habitats Regulations Assessment

Regulation 102 of the *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010* (as amended) (the 'Habitats Regulations') requires that competent authorities assess the effects of land use plans on European sites³ to determine whether there will be any 'likely significant effects' (LSEs) on any European sites as a result of the plan's implementation (either on its own or 'in combination' with other plans or projects); if there are LSEs, there will be a need for the competent authority to undertake an Appropriate Assessment to determine whether or not there will be any adverse effects on the sites' integrity. The process by which the effects on European sites of a plan (or project or programme) are assessed is widely referred to (as in this report) as 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA).

Amendments to a plan must also be subject to HRA to ensure that the plan remains compliant and that those amendments do not introduce new or additional impacts, or make otherwise 'not significant' effects 'significant'. The Mayor has a statutory duty to prepare the London Plan and is therefore the 'competent authority' for this HRA.

² <http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/consultations/early-minor-alterations-to-the-london-plan>

³ Strictly, 'European sites' are any Special Area of Conservation (SAC) from the point at which the European Commission and the UK Government agree the site as a 'Site of Community Importance' (SCI); any classified Special Protection Area (SPA); any candidate SAC (cSAC); and (exceptionally) any other site or area that the Commission believes should be considered as an SAC but which has not been identified by the Government. However, the term is also commonly used when referring to potential SPAs (pSPAs), to which the provisions of Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/147/EC (the new wild birds directive) are applied; and to possible SACs (pSACs) and listed Ramsar Sites, to which the provisions of the Habitats Regulations are applied a matter of Government policy (NPPF para 118) when considering development proposals that may affect them. 'European site' is therefore used in this report in its broadest sense, as an umbrella term for all of the above designated sites.

Regulation 102 essentially provides a test that the final London Plan must pass; there is no requirement for HRA to be undertaken on draft plans or similar developmental stages. However, as with SEA it is widely accepted best-practice for HRA of strategic planning policy documents, such as the London Plan, to be run as an iterative process alongside the development of policies, with the emerging proposals or options continually assessed for their possible effects on European sites and modified or abandoned (as necessary) to ensure that the subsequently adopted plan is not likely to result in significant or adverse effects on any European sites, either alone or 'in combination' with other plans. This is undertaken in consultation with Natural England and other appropriate consultees. It is therefore important to recognise that the strategic HRA is as much about guiding the development of the plan (and demonstrating that this has been done) as it is about (ultimately) assessing its effects.

1.3 HRA of the FALP

1.3.1 Previous reporting and assessment

The London Plan was originally subject to HRA in 2009⁴. This concluded that the plan would have no significant effects on any European sites due to the provision of appropriate protective policies and mitigation. The subsequent amendments to the plan were considered too minor to alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA and were therefore screened out at an early stage, with agreement from Natural England.

1.3.2 This report

The Mayor has commissioned AMEC to undertake the necessary data collection and analyses to support an assessment of the proposed FALP, in accordance with Regulation 102 of the Habitats Regulations. For consistency, this report largely follows the approach used within the 2009 HRA. This report therefore includes:

- a review and update of the baseline information on the European sites that may be affected by the plan;
- a review of the draft FALP to determine whether the changes are significant, and whether those changes are likely to alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA;
- recommended measures to help ensure that the FALP when finalised do not have any significant effects on any European sites.

⁴ <http://www.london.gov.uk/shaping-london/london-plan/docs/hra-final-report-oct09.pdf>

2. Approach

2.1 Overview

An HRA involves determining whether there will be any LSEs on any European sites as a result of a plan's implementation (either on its own or 'in combination' with other plans or projects) and, if so, whether it can be concluded that there will be no adverse effects on the sites' integrity. European Commission guidance⁵ suggests a four-stage process for HRA, although not all stages will always be required (see Box 1).

Box 1 Stages of Habitats Regulations Assessment

Stage 1 – Screening:

This stage identifies the likely impacts upon a European Site of a project or plan, either alone or 'in combination' with other projects or plans, and considers whether these impacts are likely to be significant.

Stage 2 – Appropriate Assessment:

Where there are likely significant effects, this stage considers the effects of the plan or project on the integrity of the relevant European Sites, either alone or 'in combination' with other projects or plans, with respect to the sites' structure and function and their conservation objectives. Where it cannot be concluded that there will be no adverse effects on sites' integrity, it is necessary to consider potential mitigation for these effects.

Stage 3 – Assessment of Alternative Solutions:

Where adverse effects remain after the inclusion of mitigation, this stage examines alternative ways of achieving the objectives of the project or plan that avoid adverse impacts on the integrity of European Sites.

Stage 4 – Assessment Where No Alternative Solutions Exist and Where Adverse Impacts Remain:

This stage assesses compensatory measures where it is deemed that the project or plan should proceed for imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI). The EC guidance does not deal with the assessment of IROPI.

HABITATS
REGULATIONS
ASSESSMENT
(HRA)

It is preferable for sustainable policies to be developed from the beginning of the plan-making process rather than HRA being a purely retrospective assessment exercise towards the end. Emerging policies are therefore appraised and modified with the objective of being able to screen out (as part of Stage 1) as many policies as possible from having to be taken forward to Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment.

The following guidance has been used in the preparation of the Stage 1 screening assessment which is set out in this report:

- DTA Publications (2013) *The Habitats Regulation Handbook* [online]. Available at: <http://www.dtapublications.co.uk/handbook/>. Accessed 11.11.13.

⁵ *Methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC* (EC 2002).

- SNH (2012) *Habitats Regulations Appraisal of Plans: Guidance for plan-making bodies in Scotland*. Scottish Natural Heritage / David Tyldesley Associates.
- Tyldesley D (2010). *Draft Guidance for Plan Making Authorities in Wales: The Appraisal of Plans Under the Habitats Directive*. David Tyldesley and Associates, for the Countryside Council for Wales;
- DCLG (2006). *Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment. Guidance for Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents*. Department for Communities and Local Government, HMSO, London;
- English Nature, (1997-2001). *Habitats Regulations Guidance Notes 1-9*, Natural England, Peterborough;
- European Commission, (2002). *Methodological guidance on the provisions of Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC*. European Commission, Brussels;
- European Commission, (2001). *Assessment of plans and projects significantly affecting Natura 2000 sites*. European Commission, Brussels;
- European Communities, (2007). *Managing Natura 2000 sites: The provisions of Article 6 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC*. European Commission, Brussels.

2.2 Approach

There is a substantial body of assessment work already available for the London Plan, including the 2009 HRA. The screening of the FALP recognises that the London Plan has been previously subject to HRA and has been found compliant with the Regulations; this screening therefore follows the approach of the previous assessment but focuses on the changes to the plan that are proposed rather than a complete review and assessment of every policy.

2.2.1 Baseline review

The 2009 HRA Screening considered all European sites fully or partially within the Greater London Authority (GLA) area, and within 15km of the GLA boundary. The suitability of this spatial scope was reviewed as part of the FALP screening process and discussed with Natural England (on 5 November 2013), when it was agreed that it is suitably precautionary. The data on European sites that were included within the 2009 HRA were then reviewed to determine whether:

- any additional sites have been designated, or are in the process of being designated;
- any of the interest features, or the site conservation objectives, have changed; or
- the condition of the site or interest features, or their sensitivities or vulnerabilities, has changed.

2.2.2 Screening of amendments

Where policies have not been altered, we have retained the conclusions of the 2009 HRA (but being mindful of possible indirect or consequential effects resulting from the modification of linked policies⁶). Unchanged policies are therefore screened out, unless explicitly noted, except in respect of potential ‘within-plan’ in combination effects.

Following this, the FALP were initially reviewed to identify those changes that are minor or inconsequential; i.e. policies with:

- minor factual changes or updates of terminology (e.g. changes in dates; changes in tenses; changes in organisation / document names; etc.); or
- changes that do not change the type, scale or location of supported development; or
- changes that do not result in any significant alteration to the intention, purpose or objective of the policy or its likely outcomes.

For these policies it is assessed that the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid and so these amendments are ‘screened out’ of further assessment (except in respect of potential ‘within-plan’ in combination effects).

The remaining policy alterations were then examined in detail to identify those which could have a significant effect on a European site. The screening aimed to identify policies as having either:

- no LSE; or
- requiring modification to avoid LSEs; or
- LSEs which would require that the policy be abandoned or substantially re-worked if an adverse effect on site integrity is to be avoided.

This categorisation was used to guide the GLA in the development of the policies.

When considering the likely effects of a policy, it is recognised that some policy ‘types’ cannot affect any European sites. Different guidance documents suggest various classification and referencing systems to help identify those policies that can be safely screened out to ensure that the HRA focuses on the policies with any potential to result in LSEs. Table 2.1 summarises the characteristics of policies that can usually be screened out; additional guidance is provided in Annex B of the 2009 HRA and Appendix D to this report.

⁶ i.e. it may be possible for a ‘not significant’ effect in an unamended policy to be rendered ‘significant’ (in combination) by a change to another policy.

Table 2.1 Policy ‘types’ that can usually be screened out

Broad Policy Type	Notes
General statements of policy	The European Commission recognises* that plans or plan components that are general statements of policy or political aspirations cannot have significant effects
General design / guidance criteria	A general ‘criteria based’ policy expresses the tests or expectations of the plan-making body when it comes to consider particular proposals, or relate to design or other qualitative criteria which do not themselves lead to development (e.g. controls on building design).
External plans / projects	Plans or projects that are proposed by other plans and are referred to in the plan being assessed for completeness
Environmental protection policies	Policies designed to protect the natural or built environment will not usually have significant or adverse effects

* EC, 2000, Managing Natura 2000 sites: the provisions of Article 6 of the ‘Habitats’ Directive 92/43/EEC April 2000 at 4.3.2

2.2.3 Uncertainty and ‘down the line’ assessment

For most policies, even at the strategic level, it will be clear if adverse effects are likely, and in these instances the policy should not be included within the plan since plans should not include proposals which would be likely to fail the Habitats Regulations tests at the project application stage. For other options, however, the effects may be uncertain and it is therefore important that this uncertainty is addressed either through additional investigation or (if this is not possible) appropriate mitigation measures.

It is usually possible to incorporate caveats or ‘avoidance measures’ within policy text that are sufficient to ensure that significant adverse effects will not occur. However, for other policies this may not be possible because there is insufficient available information about the nature of the development that is being proposed through the policy to enable a robust conclusion to be reached about whether there will be any LSEs. In these instances, current guidance indicates that it may be appropriate and acceptable for assessment to be undertaken ‘down-the-line’ at a lower tier in the planning hierarchy. For this to be acceptable, the following conditions must be met:

- the higher tier plan appraisal cannot reasonably predict the effects on a European site in a meaningful way; whereas;
- the lower tier plan, which will identify more precisely the nature, scale or location of development, and thus its potential effects, retains enough flexibility within the terms of the higher tier plan over the exact location, scale or nature of the proposal to enable an adverse effect on site integrity to be avoided; and
- Habitats Regulations Appraisal of the Plan at the lower tier is required as a matter of law or Government policy⁷.

⁷ SNH (2012) *Habitats Regulations Appraisal of Plans: Guidance for plan-making bodies in Scotland*. Scottish Natural Heritage / David Tyldesley Associates

The 2009 HRA identified those policies where assessment would be required at a lower tier in the planning system, and recommended a bespoke overarching protection policy (Policy 7.19 within the London Plan) to resolve the uncertainty this would create. This approach has been followed within this HRA, with such policies identified and recommendations made for amendments to Policy 7.19.

3. Baseline review

3.1 European sites

3.1.1 Designations

The 2009 HRA Screening considered all European sites fully or partially within the GLA boundary, and within 15km of the boundary; this scope was reviewed as part of the FALP screening process and agreed with Natural England (5 November 2013). The sites and interest features considered during the screening of the FALP are summarised in Table 3.1, and detailed in Appendices B and F. The site locations are illustrated on Figure E1, Appendix E.

Table 3.1 European sites and interest features considered during the screening of the FALP (see also Appendix B)

Site	Summary of interest features [†]	Approx. distance from GLA boundary
Burnham Beeches SAC	Annex I features: Beech forests on acid soils*	8.5km
Epping Forest SAC	Annex I features: Beech forests on acid soils*; Dry heaths; Wet heaths Annex II features: Stag beetle*	Partly within GLA area
Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC	Annex I features: Dry heaths; Calcareous dry grassland and scrub; <i>Taxus baccata</i> woods*; Natural box scrub*; Beech forests on neutral to rich soils Annex II features: Great crested newt; Bechstein's bat	5.4km
Richmond Park SAC	Annex II features: Stag beetle*	Within GLA area
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	Annex I features: Depressions on peat substrates*; Dry heaths*; Wet heaths*	10.9km Partly outside study area
Wimbledon Common SAC	Annex I features: Dry heaths; Wet heaths Annex II features: Stag beetle*	Within GLA area
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC	Annex I features: Dry oak-dominated woodland*; Beech forests on acid soils Annex II features: Violet click beetle*	6.1km
Wormley Hoddesdonpark Woods SAC	Annex I features: Oak-hornbeam forests*	3.8km
Lee Valley SPA	Article 4.1 qualification: Bittern (W) Article 4.2 qualification: Gadwall (W); Shoveler (W)	Partly within GLA area
South West London Waterbodies SPA	Article 4.2 qualification: Gadwall (W); Shoveler (W)	Partly within GLA area
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	Article 4.1 qualification: Dartford warbler (B); Nightjar (B); Wood lark (B)	7.7km Partly outside study area

Table 3.1 (cont'd) European sites and interest features considered during the screening of the FALP (see also Appx. B)

Site	Summary of interest features [†]	Approx. distance from GLA boundary
Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	Article 4.1 qualification: Avocet (W); Hen harrier (W) Article 4.2 qualification: Black-tailed godwit (W-); Dunlin (ssp. <i>alpina</i>) (W-); Grey plover (W-); Knot (W-); Redshank (W-); Ringed plover (P,W+); Waterfowl assemblage (W)	8.2km Partly outside study area
Lee Valley Ramsar	Criterion 2: Nationally scarce plant species (whorled water-milfoil); rare or vulnerable invertebrate (<i>Micronecta minutissima</i> (a water-boatman)). Criterion 6: Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Gadwall, Shoveler)	Partly within GLA area
South West London Waterbodies Ramsar	Criterion 6: Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Gadwall, Shoveler)	Partly within GLA area
Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar	Criterion 2: Site supports: one endangered plant species; at least 14 nationally scarce wetland plants; over 20 British Red Data Book invertebrates. Criterion 5: Assemblages of international importance (45118 waterfowl) Criterion 6: Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Black-tailed godwit; Ringed plover; Grey plover; Knot Dunlin; Redshank)	8.2km Partly outside study area

Key

- [†] Interest feature names / criteria are abbreviated; see also Appendix B (Table B4)
- * Interest features (habitats or species) that are a primary reason for designation; all other habitats and species are qualifying features
- W Wintering species
- W- Wintering species included on original SPA citation but proposed for removal following the SPA Review
- W+ Wintering species not included on the original SPA citation but added following the SPA Review
- P Passage migrants
- B Breeding
- Annex I / II Habitats or species listed on Annex I or II (respectively) of *Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora* (the 'Habitats Directive')
- Article 4.1 / 4.2 Bird species qualifying under Article 4.1 or 4.2 of *Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds* (the 'new Wild Birds Directive')
- Criterion 2, 5, 6 Ramsar criteria; there are nine criteria used as a basis for selecting Ramsar sites; see Appendix B

There have been no additions, deletions or alterations to the designated sites since the 2009 HRA.

3.1.2 Site condition

Changes in condition assessment⁸ data between 2009 and 2013 for the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) that make up the European sites listed in Table 3.2 are summarised in Table 3., although it should be noted that direct comparison between years is not entirely possible due to minor data gaps in the condition assessment data reported in 2009. In addition, the condition data strictly relate to the SSSIs that coincide with the European site designations, rather than the European sites and features; not all units of a particular SSSI are part of the European site, and some SSSI units are only partly covered by a European site designation⁹. Table 3. therefore shows:

- the condition of the entire European site (as far as this can be estimated from the condition of the corresponding SSSI units)
- the condition of those parts of the European site within the 15km study area in 2009 (based on the condition of the corresponding SSSI units reported in the 2009 HRA).
- the current condition of those parts of the European site within the 15km study area (based on the current condition of the corresponding SSSI units).

⁸ In England, the condition of European sites and their interest features is usually determined through reference to the condition assessments for the units of those Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) that are coincident with the European site.

⁹ This means that the percentages given relating to the area of each European site that is in each condition category does not necessarily total 100%

Table 3.2 Summary of changes in European site condition between 2009 and 2013, based on the condition assessments of the component SSSIs (see key after table)

Site and component SSSIs within 15km	Condition of whole SAC (~%)*					2009 condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)					Current condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)				
	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total
Burnham Beeches SAC	0	0	37	63	100										
• Burnham Beeches SSSI									100	100			37	63	100
Epping Forest SAC	2	16	46	37	100										
• Epping Forest SSSI						10	26	34	30	100	2	16	45	37	100
Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SAC	0	1	53	46	100										
• Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SSSI							3	64	33	100		1	53	46	100
Richmond Park SAC	0	0	100	0	100										
• Richmond Park SSSI							86	8	6	100			100	0	100
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC	0	2	66	32	100										
• Chobham Common SSSI								100**					86	14	100
Wimbledon Common SAC	5	0	95	0	100										
• Wimbledon Common SSSI								59 [†]	40 [†]	99 [†]	5		95		100
Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC	0	0	52	49	101*										
• Windsor Forest & Great Park SSSI								57	43	100			51	49	100

Table 3.2 (cont'd.) Summary of changes in European site condition between 2009 and 2013, based on the condition assessments of the component SSSIs

Site and component SSSIs within 15km	Condition of whole SAC (~%)*					2009 condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)					Current condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)				
	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total
Wormley Hoddesdonpark Woods SAC	0.5	2	3	96	101.5*										
• Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Wood North SSSI									99 [†]	99 [†]	1	1	7	92	100
• Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Wood South SSSI								22 [†]	75 [†]	97 [†]		3		97	100
Lee Valley SPA	0	0	48	52	100										
• Amwell Quarry SSSI						-	-	-	-	-				100	100
• Rye Meads SSSI						-	-	-	-	-			60	40	100
• Turnford & Cheshunt Pits SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Walthamstow Reservoirs SSSI									100	100			100		100
South West London Waterbodies SPA	0	0	18	82	100										
• Kempton Park Reservoirs SSSI									100	100			100		100
• Knight & Bessborough Reservoirs SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Staines Moor SSSI								25 [†]	73 [†]	98 [†]				100	100
• Thorpe Park No. 1 Gravel Pit SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Wraysbury & Hythe End Gravel Pits SSSI									100	100			100		100
• Wraysbury No. 1 Gravel Pit SSSI						100				100			100		100
• Wraysbury Reservoir SSSI									100	100				100	100

Table 3.2 (cont'd.) Summary of changes in European site condition between 2009 and 2013, based on the condition assessments of the component SSSIs

Site and component SSSIs within 15km	Condition of whole SAC (~%)*					2009 condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)					Current condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)				
	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total
Thames Basin Heaths SPA	1	1	71	27	100										
• Chobham Common SSSI						15 [†]		65 [†]	15 [†]	95 [†]			86	14	100
• Horsell Common SSSI							12 [†]	39 [†]	40 [†]	91 [†]			83	17	100
• Ockham & Wisley Commons SSSI						2	17	81		100			61	39	100
Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	2	0	1	97	100										
• Mucking Flats & Marshes SSSI						-	-	-	-	-				100	100
• South Thames Estuary & Marshes SSSI								10 [†]	87 [†]	97 [†]	3		2	96	100
Lee Valley Ramsar	0	0	48	52	100										
• Amwell Quarry SSSI						-	-	-	-	-				100	100
• Rye Meads SSSI						-	-	-	-	-			60	40	100
• Turnford & Cheshunt Pits SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Walthamstow Reservoirs SSSI									100	100			100	0	100

Table 3.2 (cont'd.) Summary of changes in European site condition between 2009 and 2013, based on the condition assessments of the component SSSIs

Site and component SSSIs within 15km	Condition of whole SAC (~%)*					2009 condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)					Current condition of SSSI units within 15k (%)				
	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total	UnD	UnNC	UnR	F	Total
South West London Waterbodies Ramsar	0	0	18	82	100										
• Kempton Park Reservoirs SSSI									100	100			100		100
• Knight & Bessborough Reservoirs SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Staines Moor SSSI								25	73	98				100	100
• Thorpe Park No. 1 Gravel Pit SSSI									100	100				100	100
• Wraysbury & Hythe End Gravel Pits SSSI									100	100			100		100
• Wraysbury No. 1 Gravel Pit SSSI						100				100			100		100
• Wraysbury Reservoir SSSI									100	100				100	100
Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar	2	1	2	96	101*										
• Mucking Flats & Marshes SSSI														100	100
• South Thames Estuary & Marshes SSSI								10	87	97	2	1	3	94	100

Key

UnD Unfavourable declining UnR Unfavourable recovering

UnNC Unfavourable no change F Favourable

* Note: the total percentage sometimes exceeds 100% as the boundaries of the component SSSI units (which the condition assessments relate to) do not always match the European site boundaries exactly (i.e. the SSSIs are usually larger, but it is not possible to split SSSI units to determine the precise quantity of the European site that is in each condition category).

- Condition of SSSI not noted in 2009 HRA

† Percentages noted in 2009 HRA do not total 100%, probably due to boundary differences between the SSSI units, the European sites, and the 15km buffer

** Unfavourable status not classified therefore assumed to be 'unfavourable no change'

These data indicate that the condition of most of the SSSIs underpinning the European sites within the study area has broadly improved; those sites where there appears to have been a slight deterioration since 2009 are noted in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 European sites where condition has deteriorated since 2009 and summary of reasons

European site and component SSSI with deterioration	Reasons for apparent deterioration 2009 – 2013 <i>(based on Natural England assessments)</i>
Burnham Beeches SAC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burnham Beeches SSSI 	Parts of the beech woodland have just two main age classes, with no ancient trees, a lack of regeneration and no real understorey. This is likely to be a result of a change in assessment approach rather than an actual change in condition.
Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Wood SAC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Wood North SSSI 	Unit 2 of the SSSI is 'unfavourable recovering' due to an ongoing restoration scheme. Unit 15 is now 'unfavourable declining' due to damage by four-wheel drive vehicles affecting about a quarter of the unit's area, which was not reported or not apparent in 2009.
Thames Basin Heaths SAC	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chobham Common SSSI 	Several units have been downgraded from 'favourable' to 'unfavourable recovering', although the reason for this is not clear from the available data and it may reflect a reporting error or changes in assessment approach.
Lea Valley SPA / Ramsar	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walthamstow Reservoirs SSSI 	There has been a slight fall in the number of breeding grey heron and tufted duck since 2009 although the site habitats are in good condition and the fall in numbers reflects external factors rather than site management / condition.
Southwest London Waterbodies SPA / Ramsar	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kempton Park Reservoirs SSSI 	There has been a reduction in gadwall numbers; it is thought that infestation of the reservoir by the invasive plant <i>Crassula helmsii</i> (New Zealand pygmyweed) is having an adverse affect on feeding conditions for gadwall.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wraysbury & Hythe End Gravel Pits SSSI 	Data indicate a decline in gadwall since 2003, which may be related to maturation of the habitat and increasing availability of more suitable habitat elsewhere in the region. Gadwall numbers are being maintained across the region as a whole, however.

3.1.3 Conservation objectives

The **conservation objectives** for all of the sites have been revised by Natural England since 2009; currently, the conservation objectives for all sites are as follows:

For SACs:

Avoid the deterioration of the qualifying natural habitats and the habitats of qualifying species, and the significant disturbance of those qualifying species, ensuring the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes a full contribution to achieving Favourable Conservation Status of each of the qualifying features.

Subject to natural change, to maintain or restore:

- *the extent and distribution of qualifying natural habitats and habitats of qualifying species;*
- *the structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats and habitats of qualifying species;*
- *the supporting processes on which qualifying natural habitats and habitats of qualifying species rely;*
- *the populations of qualifying species;*
- *the distribution of qualifying species within the site.*

For SPAs:

Avoid the deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying features, and the significant disturbance of the qualifying features, ensuring the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes a full contribution to achieving the aims of the Birds Directive.

Subject to natural change, to maintain or restore:

- *the extent and distribution of the habitats of the qualifying features;*
- *the structure and function of the habitats of the qualifying features;*
- *the supporting processes on which the habitats of the qualifying features rely;*
- *the populations of the qualifying features;*
- *the distribution of the qualifying features within the site.*

The conservation objectives for Ramsar sites are taken to be the same as for the corresponding SACs / SPAs (where sites overlap). The conservation objectives are considered when assessing the potential effects of plans and policies on the sites; information on the sensitivities of the interest features also informs the assessment.

3.1.4 Site and interest feature sensitivities

There have been no significant changes in the sensitivities of the interest features, or threats to their integrity, from those noted in the 2009 baseline (see Table 3.1 and Section 3.2 of the 2009 HRA report for details of these sensitivities and threats).

4. Screening of the FALP

4.1 Policy review

Where policies have not been altered, the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid (but being mindful of possible indirect or consequential effects resulting from the modification of linked policies). Unchanged policies are therefore screened out, unless explicitly noted. Following this, the FALP were initially reviewed to identify those changes which are considered minor or inconsequential (i.e. the change will not affect the likely outcomes of the policy when implemented), with the remaining policy amendments subject to a more detailed screening which includes recommendations for avoidance measures or mitigation.

4.1.1 Minor policy amendments

Table 4.1 identifies those policies where the amendments are considered minor, and so unlikely to alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA, and those policies where the amendments are substantial or potentially significant. These FALP policies with minor amendments are screened as ‘no likely significant effect’ (LSE) changes and hence the conclusions (and mitigation requirements) of the 2009 HRA remain valid. New policies (e.g. Policy 5.4A) are always taken forward for screening.

Table 4.1 Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Chapter 1 – Context and strategy			
Policy 1.1- Delivering the Strategic Vision and Objectives for London	Policy change to roll forward Plan to 2036.	No	2009 HRA valid
Chapter 2 - London's Places			
Policy 2.2 – London and the wider metropolitan area	Policy change to add reference to sub-regional ‘partnerships’ and delete reference to Inter-Regional Forum and any successor body.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.4 - The 2012 Games and their legacy	Policy change to include the agreed purpose of the LLDC.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy and supporting text note the LLDC is preparing a Local Plan.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy and supporting text update the name of the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Outlines additional matters the Local Plan should plan for to reflect the significance of Stratford.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Outlines requirements for the matters that should be considered when the LLDC and boroughs are preparing Plans and making planning decisions.	Yes	Screen for LSE

Table 4.1 (cont'd.) Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Policy 2.7 – Outer London: Economy	Policy alteration to note new ways of shopping – internet and multi-channel and need to consider their impacts on town centres.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy and supporting text alterations to support consolidation and mixed used development and add policy emphasis to support the provision of higher density housing in town centres.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy alteration to provide more detail on the potential types of affordable workspaces.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.8 – Outer London: Transport	Policy alteration to note guidance on car parking. Supporting text seeks a more flexible approach.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 2.9 – Inner London	Policy change to ensure appropriate workspace for areas of changing economy.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.10 – Central Activities Zone – Strategic Priorities	No policy change, but diagram to be altered in line with policy objectives.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.11 - Central activities zone – strategic functions	Policy change to encourage boroughs to prepare additional guidance to support the functions of the CAZ.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas	No policy change, but diagram to be altered in line with policy objectives, including additional Opportunity Area and name changes.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Supporting text updated to reflect the projections.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.15 – Town centres	Policy alteration to note reduction in the rate of growth of comparison goods retail expenditure and new ways of shopping – internet and multi-channel and need to consider their impacts on town centres as well as surplus uses.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Policy change to ensure land uses in town centres are actively managed to ensure the efficient use of land/premises, including scope to redevelop surplus retail/offices for higher density housing/mixed use development.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Changes to map to reflect status and function of town centres following Town Centre Health Checks.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 2.18 – Green Infrastructure: The Network of Open and Green Spaces	Policy change note that in deficiency areas, green infrastructure should be provided to help 'address' this deficiency, instead of 'meet'.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Policy change to cross-reference the guidance on green infrastructure in the NNPF.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Inclusion of explanation of green infrastructure in supporting text.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Key Diagram	No policy change, but diagram to be altered in line with policy objectives to reflect changes to CAZ, town centres, OA, SOLDC.	No	2009 HRA valid

Table 4.1 (cont'd.) Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Chapter 3 - London's People			
Policy 3.2 - Improving health and addressing health inequalities	Insertion of the words 'for example'	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 3.3 – Increasing Housing Supply	New policy reference to 'sustainable development'.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Altered policy link to housing provision monitoring table. Table 3.1 – figures updated	No	2009 HRA valid
	Additional policy focus for potential housing provision in town centres with good transport links and opportunity areas.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 3.7 - Large residential developments	Insert a reference to increasing densities.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 3.8 – Housing choice	Change to policy to ensure appropriate housing provision is made for custom build and in the private rented sector.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Additional supporting text to note the projected increase in London's over 65 population.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Additional supporting text to note the delivery of student housing and work with the academic forum.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 3.11 - Affordable housing targets	Update affordable homes figure.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 3.16 – Social infrastructure	Insert the words social infrastructure	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 3.17 – Health and social care facilities	Policy update to note new role of public health in boroughs and links with planning.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 3.18 – Education facilities	Changes in terminology in the policy and support for new school provision.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Extend policy and supporting text to cover secondary schools.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Changes that encourage co-location of schools with housing	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 3.19 – Sports facilities	Changes in terminology in the policy and supporting text from flood lighting to sports lighting.	No	2009 HRA valid
Chapter 4 - London's Economy			
Policy 4.1 – Developing London's economy	Policy and supporting text change to ensure the benefits from sustainable growth and development through infrastructure provision are maximised.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 4.2 - Offices	Policy alteration to note that the Mayor will monitor the change of use from office to residential under permitted development rights and encourage the boroughs and stakeholders to do the same.	Yes	Screen for LSE

Table 4.1 (cont'd.) Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Policy 4.3 - Mixed use development and offices	New policies to support, where there is demand, small offices and the provision of offices in conjunction with housing schemes in the CAZ.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 4.5 – London's Visitor Infrastructure	Roll forward Plan to 2036	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 4.7 – Retail and Town centre development	Policy change, noting that future levels of development may involve consolidation.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 4.8 – Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector	Policy change to clarify that retailing includes related facilities and services.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy change to include local community assets.	No	2009 HRA valid
	Policy change to include additional measures for a proactive approach to retail planning.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 4.10 – New and emerging sectors	Policy change to support new technology, media, telecommunications and life sciences/medical sectors in London as well as a range of small, affordable and startup workspaces.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 4.11 – Encouraging a connected economy	Policy change to update the type of broadband and forms of communications.	No	2009 HRA valid
Chapter 5 - London's Response to Climate Change			
Policy 5.4A – Electricity and Gas supply	New policy and supporting text to promote the strategic provision of electricity and gas infrastructure to accommodate anticipated growth.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 5.16 - Waste self-sufficiency	Policy change to aim for self-sufficiency and zero biodegradable or recyclable waste to landfill from 2026 instead of 2031	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity	Policy change setting carbon performance criteria.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Change to waste projections.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 5.19 – Hazardous Waste	General updates to policy and clarification.	No	2009 HRA valid
Chapter 6 - London's Transport			
Policy 6.1 – Strategic Approach	No change to policy, but update to table in supporting text reflects changes in strategic transport priorities and funding.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 6.4	Update policy to move Crossrail 2 to a separate point and update text on the implementation of the London Overground.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 6.9 Cycling	Update policy to reflect the current delivery programme for cycle infrastructure.	No	2009 HRA valid
	New and amended policies to include a proactive approach to supporting cycling infrastructure through both planning decisions and LDF preparation.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Updated cycle parking standards	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 6.10 Walking	Policy update to reflect the formal name of the strategic walking routes.	No	2009 HRA valid

Table 4.1 (cont'd.) Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Policy 6.11 - Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion	Policy factual update to refer to the Roads Task Force report and London street-types framework	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 6.13 Parking	Updated car parking standards.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 6.14 Freight	Update in terminology. Additional policy reference to more innovative freight solutions and opportunities to minimise congestion impacts	Yes	Screen for LSE
Chapter 7 - London's Living Places and Spaces			
Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods	Policy change to clarify new concept and introduce the principles of lifetime neighbourhoods.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment	Policy change to reflect updated British Standard.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime	General policy changes to providing more detail and clarification.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.5 Public realm	Policy change to address management.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites	Policy update to reflect SPG on World Heritage Sites has been published.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 7.13 Safety, Security and Resilience to Emergency	Policy change to support collaborative working and identify needs for community safety.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing townscapes	Policy update to reflect the Explanatory Note to the Noise Policy Statement for England.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.18 Local open space	Policy change to address deficiencies.	Yes	Screen for LSE
	Policy change to link to NPPF and set out criteria for open space audits.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.20 Geological conservation	Policy update to reflect publication of new SPG.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands	Policy update to reflect publication of new SPG.	No	2009 HRA valid
Policy 7.23 - Burial spaces	Policy change to encourage re-use of burial space.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.27 Blue ribbon network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use	Policy change to seek the enhancement of waterway infrastructure and a more proactive approach where there is known demand.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 7.30 London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces	Policy update to link to new paragraph about Royal Docks in supporting text.	No	2009 HRA valid
Chapter 8 – Implementation, Monitoring and Review			
Policy 8.1 Implementation	New policy approach to support the development and delivery of infrastructure. New policy stating that the Mayor will use Mayoral Development Corporations (MDCs), Enterprise Zones (EZs) and further Tax Increment Finance (TIF) initiatives to assist with substantial development potential.	Yes	Screen for LSE
Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations	Policy change to widen scope regarding social infrastructure and include air quality improvements.	Yes	Screen for LSE

Table 4.1 (cont'd.) Review for minor amendments

Policy	Summary of proposed amendments (from GLA)	Significant alteration?	Conclusion
Annex			
A1 Opportunity and Intensification Areas	Updated to include new opportunity areas, update names and update potential numbers of homes and jobs to be delivered	Yes	Screen for LSE
A2 – Town Centres	Updated to reflect status and function of town centres	Yes	Screen for LSE
A4 Housing	Updated to reflect SHLLA.	Yes	Screen for LSE

4.1.2 Screening

Table 4.3 summarises the screening assessment undertaken on those policies with potentially significant alterations. Potential impact pathways are noted and recommendations for avoidance measures (policy changes) are made. It should be noted that the overarching ‘protective’ policies included within the London Plan (notably Policy 7.19), which were drafted to ensure that significant effects cannot occur, will be changed to include reference to new policies. The colour coding is as follows:

Table 4.2 Colour coding for screening of FALP

	No LSE – policy will not or cannot affect any European sites
	Policy requires mitigation to avoid significant effects (e.g. minor re-wording; cross-referencing to policy 7.19; lower tier assessment)
	Significant effects likely; policy should be abandoned or substantially re-worked

Table 4.3 Screening of potentially significant policy amendments and suggested mitigation / avoidance measures

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 2.4 - The 2012 Games and their legacy	<p>Outlines additional matters the Local Plan should plan for to reflect the significance of Stratford.</p> <p>Outlines requirements for the matters that should be considered when the LLDC and boroughs are preparing Plans and making planning decisions.</p>	Can only be assessed at lower tier	<p>The regeneration of the Olympic park and Stratford could impact on the Lee Valley SPA / Ramsar, the nearest component of which is approximately 5km from this area but is linked via the green corridors associated with the River Lea. The main risk will be increased visitor pressure on the SPA / Ramsar (although this is not thought to be significantly affecting these sites at the moment), although the potential for any effects can only be determined through lower tier assessments. It is arguable that the policy is a general statement of policy and a general criteria policy, and should therefore be screened out. Policies relating to greenspace should help avoid / minimise any impact. In addition, much of the regeneration will be driven by the LLDC's DPD, which has been subject to HRA.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to avoid LSE</p>
Policy 2.8 – Outer London: Transport	Policy alteration to note guidance on car parking. Supporting text seeks a more flexible approach.	No LSE	<p>The change is minor but arguably weakens policy 6.13 with regard to parking provision. If the net effect is to increase provision in some areas this may encourage an increase in car use over public transport, which could theoretically affect European sites that are sensitive to changes in air quality sensitive (Epping Forest SAC; Wimbledon Common SAC).</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to avoid LSE</p>
Policy 2.11 - Central activities zone – strategic functions	Policy change to encourage boroughs to prepare additional guidance to support the functions of the CAZ.	No LSE	Policy will not lead to development and simply encourages boroughs to produce guidance.
Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas	No policy change, but diagram to be altered in line with policy objectives, including additional Opportunity Area and name changes.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	<p>This policy is largely the same as previously set out, although a new opportunity area (OA) at Old Kent Road and two areas identified as 'intensification areas' (Canada Water; and Harrow and Wealdstone) have been added as OAs. In addition, the Old Oak Common / Park Royal opportunity area has been split into two OAs. These changes are unlikely to result in any additional effects over those identified in the 2009 HRA and therefore the conclusions of this remain valid. The Annex 1 supporting text for some OAs includes specific reference to European sites where there is a potential significant risk of impacts depending on how the policy is implemented; however, additional text will not be necessary for the four new OAs due to their location relative to the European sites. It should be noted that any effects on European sites are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 and specific additional text retained in Annex 1 regards European sites to ensure no LSE.</p>

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 2.15 – Town centres	<p>Policy alteration to note reduction in the rate of growth of comparison goods retail expenditure and new ways of shopping – internet and multi-channel and need to consider their impacts on town centres as well as surplus uses.</p> <p>Policy change to ensure land uses in town centres are actively managed to ensure the efficient use of land/premises, including scope to redevelop surplus retail/offices for higher density housing/mixed use development.</p>	No LSE	<p>Policy promotes development within town centres and provides a general statement of policy on this; effects are therefore unlikely for this reason. Effects will be dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans but although the policy also has the incidental effect of directing development away from European sites.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.</p>
Policy 2.18 – Green Infrastructure: The Network of Open and Green Spaces	<p>Policy change note that in deficiency areas, green infrastructure should be provided to help 'address' this deficiency, instead of 'meet'.</p> <p>Policy change to cross-reference the guidance on green infrastructure in the NPPF.</p> <p>Inclusion of explanation of green infrastructure in supporting text.</p>	No LSE	<p>The policy should have a weak positive effect on European sites by providing strategic mechanisms to manage and reduce visitor pressure on European sites, although it may be appropriate to strengthen the policy to emphasize the importance of greenspace creation and recognise the primary importance of biodiversity when considering European sites as part of the green space resource.</p>
Policy 3.3 – Increasing Housing Supply	<p>New policy reference to 'sustainable development'.</p> <p>Additional policy focus for potential housing provision in town centres with good transport links and opportunity areas.</p>	<p>Can only be assessed at lower tier</p> <p>Can only be assessed at lower tier</p>	<p>Strictly, the policy amendments really only reflect the changes in population projections; the allocations by borough are proportionally similar. It is considered that the overall quantum of development is likely to be achievable without affecting any European sites (particularly with regard to water resources (based on the data in the Thames Water Water Resources Management Plan) and waste water treatment). However, the changes in proposed housing numbers are substantial and it will be necessary to undertake assessments at lower tiers to determine the precise effects.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.</p> <p>This component of the policy increases the focus on town centres and opportunity housing development, which should help minimise effects on European sites; however, any effects are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.</p>

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 3.7 - Large residential developments	Insert a reference to increasing densities.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	This policy promotes greater housing density which could affect European sites depending on location and delivery; however, any effects are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level. Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.
Policy 3.8 – Housing choice	Change to policy to ensure appropriate housing provision is made for custom build and in the private rented sector.	No LSE	The policy change emphasises the role of the private rental sector in housing provision; the policy is a general criteria policy and would not have significant effects.
Policy 3.18 – Education facilities	Changes that encourage co-location of schools with housing	No LSE	This is a policy change but simply encourages the co-location of schools with housing; this should reduce travel, including by car, which may have positive effects. Significant negative effects are unlikely.
Policy 4.2 - Offices	Policy alteration to note that the Mayor will monitor the change of use from office to residential under permitted development rights and encourages the boroughs and stakeholders to do the same.	No LSE	Policy amendment is a proposal to monitor effects of a change in planning policy driven by external documents (the NPPF); this amendment cannot result in LSE.
Policy 5.4A – Electricity and Gas supply	New policy and supporting text to promote the strategic provision of electricity and gas infrastructure to accommodate anticipated growth.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	This is a new policy. The impacts will depend on how the policy is implemented by lower tier plans, particularly in the allocation of strategic sites and generating facilities (e.g. EFW plants). There is obviously some potential for energy infrastructure to affect European sites, depending on its scale, type and location (for example, EFW facilities could affect air quality and hence Epping Forest SAC or Wimbledon Common SAC) but this can only be meaningfully assessed at the lower tier. Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.
Policy 4.3 - Mixed use development and offices	New policies to support, where there is demand, small offices and the provision of offices in conjunction with housing schemes in the CAZ.	No LSE	This is a policy change but simply encourages the provision of offices near housing in the CAZ; this is some distance from any European sites and will have no LSE.
Policy 5.16 - Waste self-sufficiency	Policy change to aim for self-sufficiency and zero biodegradable or recyclable waste to landfill from 2026 instead of 2031	No LSE	General statement of policy
Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity	Policy change setting carbon performance criteria.	No LSE	The policy change relates to the requirement for new generation measures (notably EFW) to meet carbon performance criteria; this does not alter the likely effects of the policy significantly and hence will have no LSE.

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity	Change to waste projections.	2009 assessment valid (can only be assessed at lower tier)	Strictly, this is primarily an update of information rather than a change in policy, although the effect is to change the amount of waste that each borough must deal with (although each borough's percentage share of waste to be managed in London is the same as before). The likely effects of additional waste treatment can only be determined at the lower tier, when specific proposals or allocations are advanced. Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.
Policy 6.9 Cycling	New and amended policies to include a proactive approach to supporting cycling infrastructure through both planning decisions and LDF preparation. Update cycle parking standards	Can only be assessed at lower tier	The provision of cycling infrastructure could affect some European sites; however, any effects are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level. Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.
Policy 6.13 Parking	Updated car parking standards.	No LSE	See Policy 2.8
Policy 6.14 Freight	Update in terminology. Additional policy reference to more innovative freight solutions and opportunities to minimise congestion impacts.	No LSE	Reference to 'more innovative freight solutions' etc is primarily a general statement of policy rather than a policy that will promote or lead to a certain type of development. The aim to reduce congestion impacts should reduce air quality impacts.
Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods	Policy change to clarify new concept and introduce the principles of lifetime neighbourhoods.	No LSE	General statement of policy
	General clarification in policy and inclusion of three principles throughout the policy.	No LSE	General statement of policy
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime	General policy changes to providing more detail and clarification.	No LSE	General statement of policy / design criteria
Policy 7.5 Public realm	Policy change to address management.	No LSE	General statement of policy / design criteria
Policy 7.13 Safety, Security and Resilience to Emergency	Policy change to support collaborative working and identify needs for community safety.	No LSE	General statement of policy / design criteria

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing townscapes	Policy update to reflect the Explanatory Note to the Noise Policy Statement for England.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	<p>The policy changes are fairly substantial but reflect external policy and guidance (arguably, therefore the policy should be screened out). However, the focus of the policy is very much on human receptors and development rather than potential biodiversity receptors, and whilst many species will not be affected by, or will habituate to, noise disturbance some can be negatively impacted. Realistically, this is will only be a potential issue for the Lee Valley SPA and the South West London Waterbodies SPA (all other sites within London either do not have noise-sensitive interest features, or are likely to be too far away to be affected), and primarily in respect of new development but it is suggested that some reference to noise-sensitive biodiversity receptors be made, for example:</p> <p>Planning decisions:</p> <p>A. avoiding significant adverse noise impacts as a result of new development, including impacts on noise-sensitive biodiversity receptors</p> <p>LDF preparation:</p> <p>B. identify and nominate new Quiet Areas, and protect existing Quiet Areas in line with the procedure in Defra's draft Noise Action Plan for Agglomerations, reflecting also the noise-sensitivity of receptors at internationally important biodiversity conservation sites.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.</p>
Policy 7.18 Local open space	Policy change to address deficiencies.	No LSE	Minor alteration - 2009 HRA valid
	Policy change to link to NPPF and set out criteria for open space audits.	No LSE	General statement of policy / monitoring criteria
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature	Policy change to cross-reference additional policies	No LSE	Protective policy – should include reference to Policies 5.4A, 6.9, 7.27 and 8.1 (in addition to the policies already listed).
Policy 7.23 - Burial spaces	Policy change to encourage re-use of burial space.	No LSE	General statement of policy that will potentially reduce development pressure
Policy 7.27 Blue ribbon network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use	Policy change to seek the enhancement of waterway infrastructure and a more proactive approach where there is known demand.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	<p>The enhancement of waterways infrastructure could theoretically affect some European sites; however, any effects are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level.</p> <p>Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.</p>

Policy to be changed	Summary of changes	Screening	Notes and suggested mitigation / avoidance
Policy 8.1 Implementation	New policy approach to support the development and delivery of infrastructure. New policy stating that the Mayor will use Mayoral Development Corporations (MDCs), Enterprise Zones (EZs) and further Tax Increment Finance (TIF) initiatives to assist with substantial development potential.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	Infrastructure could theoretically affect some European sites; however, any effects are dependent on how the policy is implemented within lower tier plans and can only be meaningfully assessed at that level. Policy should be referenced in overarching policy 7.19 to ensure no LSE.
Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations	Policy change to widen scope regarding social infrastructure and include air quality improvements.	No LSE	General statement of policy / design criteria
A1 Opportunity and Intensification Areas	Updated to include new opportunity areas, update names and update potential numbers of homes and jobs to be delivered	Can only be assessed at lower tier	See Policy 2.13
A2 – Town Centres	Updated to reflect status and function of town centres	Can only be assessed at lower tier	See Policy 2.13
A4 Housing	Updated to reflect SHLLA.	Can only be assessed at lower tier	See Policy 2.13

4.2 In combination effects

The 2009 HRA identified those policies which would require lower tier assessment, and hence the potential ‘in combination’ effects that would require assessment at the lower tier also (see Table 4.3 of the 2009 HRA). The FALP does not alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA in respect of the ‘alone’ effects of the policy.

With regard to ‘within plan’ effects¹⁰, the potential for altered and unaltered policies to have ‘in combination’ effects on European sites has been reviewed and assessed, taking into account the conclusions of the 2009 HRA. The assessment focused on the altered policies (since these would be the ‘source’ of any new ‘in combination’ effect). It should be noted that most policies are not geographically explicit; nor do they provide for a specific quantum of development. As a result, it is not possible to explicitly identify and assess every potential ‘in combination’ effect between policies at this level: whilst potential effects are imaginable (e.g. increased development within the OAs combined with relaxation of parking standards could theoretically affect air quality) these cannot be meaningfully assessed since the effects will depend almost entirely on how the plan is implemented at the lower tier. In these instances the potential for in combination effects are managed and avoided by the inclusion of protective policies and the identification of potential effects that need to be considered by lower tier plans (see Sections 4.4.1 – 4.4.4, and Table 4.3 of the 2009 HRA). In addition, the protective policy 7.19 is sufficient and appropriate to ensure that in combination effects between plan policies will not occur as a result of policy implementation. It is considered that the plan has no internal conflicts or ‘in combination’ effects between policies that could result in significant effects on any European sites.

With regard to potential ‘in combination’ effects with other strategic plans, the list of plans and programmes provided by Appendix B of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) was used as a basis for identifying potential impact pathways. Plans that have been altered or updated since 2009 were identified and the potential for in combination effects with the FALP considered (see Appendix C for a list of plans). As noted, most of the policies within the London Plan are general statements of policy or similar, and are essentially ‘no effect’ policies that cannot have in combination effects. The in combination assessment therefore aims to identify those aspects of the FALP that could make ‘not significant’ effects in other plans significant. None of the FALP are likely to have significant effects alone, and the only changes to the plan that could theoretically provide additional ‘in combination’ effects over those identified in the 2009 HRA are those associated with the new OAs. As noted in Table 4.3, the new OAs will not affect any European sites due to their distance from the sites and therefore no additional in combination effects would be expected.

It should also be noted that plans adopted since 2009 will have also been subject to HRA, which would have necessarily included reference to the London Plan when considering ‘in combination’ effects. Since the FALP will not alter the effects of the London Plan on European sites it is considered that the avoidance and mitigation measures included within the other plans, as well as the London Plan, can be relied on to ensure no ‘in combination’ effects.

¹⁰ i.e. effects between the policies of the plan, rather than with external plans or projects.

In summary, it is considered that the London Plan is unlikely to have significant negative effects on any European sites in combination with any other adopted planning documents; the protective policies contained within the London Plan, and similar policies within other plans, will ensure this outcome, although the provisions of the 2009 HRA in relation to lower tier assessment remain valid.

5. Conclusions

The London Plan was originally subject to HRA in 2009, which concluded that the plan would have no significant effects on any European sites due to the provision of appropriate protective policies and mitigation. The FALP proposed by the Mayor have been screened for their potential to affect European sites, using the same approach used for the 2009 HRA. This screening has focused on the proposed changed policies (rather than every policy) and the type of change, and has identified the following broad categories of policy and potential effects:

- **Unchanged policies:** for these policies, the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid, provided that any mitigation specified within the 2009 HRA document is retained or strengthened by the FALP; these policies are therefore ‘screened out’ of further assessment (except in relation to potential effects ‘in combination’ with altered policies).
- **Policies with minor changes only** (updates of dates, terminology, etc): for these policies the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid, provided that any mitigation specified within the 2009 HRA document is retained or strengthened by the FALP; these are therefore ‘screened out’ of further assessment (except in relation to potential effects ‘in combination’ with altered policies).
- **Policies with substantial changes:** these policies were subject to a screening assessment to identify:
 - those with no ‘likely significant effects’ due to the type of policy or the anticipated outcomes - in these cases the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid, provided that any mitigation specified within the 2009 HRA document is retained or strengthened by the FALP;
 - those which are likely to have significant effects which should be abandoned or substantially re-worked;
 - those where significant effects are possible if not worded appropriately, but which are likely to be acceptable with minor wording changes, caveats or mitigation (in these cases suitable amendments are suggested which would ensure the plan is compliant if employed); and
 - those where significant effects are possible, but which cannot be fully assessed at this level as the precise effects will depend on implementation in lower tier plans (in these cases, the policy is identified as requiring lower tier assessment as per the 2009 HRA).

With regard to the latter category, the uncertainty this introduces has been previously addressed by the identification of a broad scope for the required lower tier HRAs and the inclusion of an overarching protective policy within the London Plan (Policy 7.19) which explicitly references the key policies to which it is of particular relevance. This policy states that:

Any proposals promoted or brought forward by the London Plan will not adversely affect the integrity of any European site of nature conservation importance (to include Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Ramsar, proposed and candidate sites) either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Whilst all development proposals must address this policy, it is of particular importance when considering the following policies within the London Plan: 1.1, 2.1- 2.17, 3.1, 3.3, 5.14, 5.15, 5.17,

5.20, 6.3, 7.14, 7.15, 7.25, and 7.29. Whilst all Opportunity and Intensification Areas must address the policy in general, specific locations requiring consideration are referenced in Annex 1.

Policy 7.19 should therefore be reviewed and updated to ensure that it also references those amended policies that cannot be fully assessed at this stage. The amended policies that require reference in Policy 7.19 are as follows:

- Policy 2.4 – The 2012 Games and their legacy (already referenced by 7.19);
- Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas (already referenced by 7.19);
- Policy 3.3 – Increasing Housing Supply (already referenced by 7.19);
- Policy 3.7 – Large residential developments (should be added to 7.19);
- Policy 5.4A – Electricity and Gas supply (new policy; should be added to 7.19);
- Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity (already referenced by 7.19);
- Policy 6.9 – Cycling (should be added to 7.19);
- Policy 7.15 – Reducing noise and enhancing townscapes (already referenced by 7.19);
- Policy 7.27 – Blue ribbon network: supporting infrastructure and recreational use (should be added to 7.19); and
- Policy 8.1 Implementation (should be added to 7.19).

Assuming that these additions are made it is concluded that the FALP will not result in any additional effects over those identified and mitigated within the 2009 HRA and plan, and therefore the conclusions of the 2009 HRA remain valid (i.e. there would be no adverse effects on any European sites as a result of the plan's implementation).

The addition of four new or amended Opportunity Areas (Canada Water, Harrow and Wealdstone, Old Oak Common and Park Royal) is unlikely to result in significant effects on any European sites, or alter the conclusions of the 2009 HRA, due to the distance of these areas from the sites. Protective guidance for European sites is included in the Annex I supporting text for relevant European sites, and this should be retained.

As noted, there are some aspects of the plan that cannot be assessed at this level in the planning hierarchy. Section 4.4 of the 2009 HRA notes that the London Plan is sufficiently flexible to allow lower tier plans and assessments to result in the avoidance of adverse likely significant effects on European sites; this will ensure that policies and proposals set out in the London Plan can be delivered, whilst meeting the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. However, the 2009 HRA identifies recommendations for the scope of further (lower tier) assessment in Table 4.2, Sections 4.4.1 – 4.4.4, and Table 4.3; these would need to be complied with and the plan should reference the 2009 HRA accordingly.

Appendix A

European sites and associated protected areas

Box A1 European sites and associated protected areas		
Special Area of Conservation	SAC	Designated under the EU Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, and implemented in the UK through the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), and the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended).
Sites of Community Importance	SCI	Sites of Community Importance (SCIs) are sites that have been adopted by the European Commission but not yet formally designated by the government of each country. Although not formally designated they are nevertheless fully protected by Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), and the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended).
Candidate SAC	cSAC	Candidate SACs (cSACs) are sites that have been submitted to the European Commission, but not yet formally adopted. Although these sites are still undergoing designation and adoption they are still fully protected by Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1995 (as amended).
Possible SACs	pSAC	Sites that have been formally advised to UK Government, but not yet submitted to the European Commission. As a matter of policy the Governments in England, Scotland and Wales extend the same protection to these sites in respect of new development as that afforded to SACs.
Draft SACs	dSAC	Areas that have been formally advised to UK government as suitable for selection as SACs, but have not been formally approved by government as sites for public consultation. These are not protected (unless covered by some other designation) and it is likely that their existence will not be established through desk study except through direct contact with the relevant statutory authority; however, the statutory authority is likely to take into account the proposed reasons for designation when considering potential impacts on them.
Special Protection Area	SPA	Designated under EU Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (the 'old Wild Birds Directive') and Directive 2009/147/EC on the Conservation of Wild Birds (the 'new Wild Birds Directive', which repeals the 'old Wild Birds Directive'), and protected by Article 6 of Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. These directives are implemented in the UK through the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), the Wildlife (Northern Ireland) Order 1985, the Nature Conservation and Amenity Lands (Northern Ireland) Order 1985 and The Conservation (Natural Habitats, & c.) (Northern Ireland) Regulations 1995 (as amended) and the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 2007.
Potential SPA	pSPA	These are sites that are still undergoing designation and have not been designated by the Secretary of State; however, ECJ case law indicates that these sites are protected under Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/147/EC (which in theory provides a higher level of protection than the Habitats Directive, which does not apply until the sites are designated as SPAs), and as a matter of policy the Governments in England, Scotland and Wales extend the same protection to these sites in respect of new development as that afforded to SPAs, and they may be protected by some other designation (e.g. SSSI).
Ramsar		The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention or Wetlands Convention) was adopted in Ramsar, Iran in February 1971. The UK ratified the Convention in 1976. In the UK Ramsar sites are generally underpinned by notification of these areas as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) (or Areas of Special Scientific Interest (ASSIs) in Northern Ireland). Ramsar sites therefore receive statutory protection under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and the Nature Conservation and Amenity Lands (Northern Ireland) Order 1985. However, as a matter of policy the Governments in England, Scotland and Wales extend the same protection to listed Ramsar sites in respect of new development as that afforded to SPAs and SACs.

Appendix B

European sites and interest features

Table B1 SACs and Interest Features within 15km (based on www.jncc.gov.uk) (Note: I = Annex I Habitat; II = Annexe II Species; * = Feature that is Primary Reason for site selection; all other features are Qualifying Features)

SAC	Interest Features	
Burnham Beeches	Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrublayer (<i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Ilici-Fagenion</i>)	I*
Epping Forest	Stag beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i>	II*
	Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrublayer (<i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Ilici-Fagenion</i>)	I*
	European dry heaths	I
	Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i>	I
Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment	European dry heaths	I
	Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>)	I
	Stable xerothermophilous formations with <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> on rock slopes (<i>Berberidion</i> p.p.)	I*
	<i>Asperulo-Fagetum</i> beech forests	I
	Great Crested Newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i>	II
	Bechstein's bat <i>Myotis bechsteini</i>	II
	<i>Taxus baccata</i> woods of the British Isles	I*
Richmond Park	Stag beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i>	II*
Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham	Depressions on peat substrates of the <i>Rhynchosporion</i>	I*
	European dry heaths	I*
	Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i>	I*
Wimbledon Common	European dry heaths	I
	Stag beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i>	II*
	Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i>	I
Windsor Forest and Great Park	Old acidophilous oak woods with <i>Quercus robur</i> on sandy plains	I*
	Violet click-beetle <i>Limoniscus violaceus</i>	II*
	Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrublayer (<i>Quercion robori-petraeae</i> or <i>Ilici-Fagenion</i>)	I
Wormley Hoddesdonpark Woods	Sub-Atlantic and medio-European oak or oak-hornbeam forests of the <i>Carpinion betuli</i>	I*

Table B2 SPAs and Interest Features (based on www.jncc.gov.uk) (Note: Art = Article 4.1 or 4.2 of the Birds Directive; B = Breeding; P = Passage; R = Resident; W = Wintering; () = Proposed for removal in SPA review; + = Added in SPA review)

SPA	Interest Features	Art.	B	P	R	W
Lee Valley	Bittern <i>Botaurus stellaris</i>	4.1				W
	Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i>	4.2				W
	Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i>	4.2				W
South West London Waterbodies	Gadwall <i>Anas strepera</i>	4.2				W
	Shoveler <i>Anas clypeata</i>	4.2				W
Thames Basin Heaths	Dartford warbler <i>Sylvia undata</i>	4.1	B			
	Nightjar <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i>	4.1	B			
	Wood lark <i>Lullula arborea</i>	4.1	B			
Thames Estuary and Marshes	Avocet <i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i>	4.1				W
	Black-tailed godwit <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i>	4.2				(W)
	Dunlin (ssp. alpina) <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i>	4.2				(W)
	Grey plover <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i>	4.2				(W)
	Hen harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	4.1				W
	Knot <i>Calidris canutus</i>	4.2				(W)
	Redshank <i>Tringa totanus</i>	4.2				(W)
	Ringed plover <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i>	4.2		P		W+
	Waterfowl assemblage	4.2				W

Table B3 Ramsar Sites (*cri* = *Criteria*)

Ramsar Site	Cri.	Features
Lee Valley	2	Nationally scarce plant species (whorled water-milfoil <i>Myriophyllum verticillatum</i>); rare or vulnerable invertebrate (<i>Micronecta minutissima</i> (a water-boatman)).
	6	Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Gadwall, Shoveler)
South West London Waterbodies	6	Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Gadwall, Shoveler)
Thames Estuary and Marshes	2	Site supports: one endangered plant species; at least 14 nationally scarce wetland plants; over 20 British Red Data Book invertebrates.
	5	Assemblages of international importance (45118 waterfowl)
	6	Species/populations occurring at levels of international importance (Black-tailed godwit; Ringed plover; Grey plover; Knot Dunlin; Redshank)

NOTES ON CRITERIA

- 1 Contains a representative, rare, or unique example of a natural or near-natural wetland type found within the biogeographic region.
- 2 Supports vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species or threatened ecological communities.
- 3 Supports populations of plant and/or animal species important for maintaining the biodiversity of a particular biogeographic region.
- 4 Supports plant and/or animal species at a critical stage in their life cycles, or provides refuge during adverse conditions.
- 5 Regularly supports 20,000 or more waterbirds.
- 6 Regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species or subspecies of waterbird.
- 7 Supports a significant proportion of indigenous fish subspecies, species or families, life-history stages, species interactions and/or populations that are representative of wetland benefits and/or values and thereby contributes to global biological diversity.
- 8 An important source of food for fish, spawning ground, nursery and/or migration path on which fish stocks, either within the wetland or elsewhere, depend.
- 9 Regularly supports 1% of the individuals in a population of one species or subspecies of wetland-dependent non-avian animal species.

Table B4 SAC features and abbreviations

Feature name	Abbreviation
<i>Asperulo-Fagetum</i> beech forests	Beech forests on acid soils
Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with <i>Ilex</i> and sometimes also <i>Taxus</i> in the shrublayer (<i>Quercion roburi-petraeae</i> or <i>Ilici-Fagenion</i>)	Beech forests on neutral to rich soils
Bechstein's bat <i>Myotis bechsteini</i>	Bechstein's bat
Depressions on peat substrates of the <i>Rhynchosporion</i>	Depressions on peat substrates
European dry heaths	European dry heaths
Great Crested Newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i>	Great Crested Newt
Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i>	Wet heaths
Old acidophilous oak woods with <i>Quercus robur</i> on sandy plains	Dry oak-dominated woodland
Semi-natural dry grasslands and scrubland facies: on calcareous substrates (<i>Festuco-Brometalia</i>)	Calcareous dry grassland and scrub
Stable xerothermophilous formations with <i>Buxus sempervirens</i> on rock slopes (<i>Berberidion</i> p.p.)	Natural box scrub
Stag beetle <i>Lucanus cervus</i>	Stag beetle
Sub-Atlantic and medio-European oak or oak-hornbeam forests of the <i>Carpinion betuli</i>	Oak-hornbeam forests
<i>Taxus baccata</i> woods of the British Isles	<i>Taxus baccata</i> woods
Violet click-beetle <i>Limoniscus violaceus</i>	Violet click-beetle

Appendix C

Reviewed plans and programmes

Appendix B of the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) provides a list of the plans, programmes and strategies that were reviewed as part of the IIA. Some of these plans and programmes are relevant for consideration for potential ‘in combination’ effects with the London Plan.

Recognising that an ‘in combination’ assessment was undertaken as part of the 2009 HRA, the assessment of the FALP has focused on those plans and programmes issued or updated since 2009 which have aspects that could operate ‘in combination’ with the London Plan. As with the screening of the London Plan and its policies, there are certain types of plan, programme or strategy that cannot have any effects ‘alone’ and which cannot therefore have ‘in combination’ effects. Current guidance suggests that these plans will generally be:

- general statements of policy or political intention; or
- concerned solely with the management or delivery (e.g. timing, phasing etc.) of proposals provided by another plan that has been subject to HRA; or
- concerned with the protection of European sites, including through provision of mitigation for other plan components.

It will generally be self-evident that these plans, programmes and strategies do not provide any clear mechanisms for affecting European sites. In addition, some other documents reviewed by the IIA (e.g. primary legislation; monitoring reports; etc) cannot operate ‘in combination’.

Table C1 summarises the potential effects of plans developed since 2009 which could have ‘in combination’ effects if the FALP are not suitably mitigated to avoid such effects. For all other plans, programmes and strategies identified by the IIA there will be no risk of ‘in combination’ effects for one or more of the reasons indicated above.

As noted, the review focuses on plans produced since 2009 since all plans prior to this were considered within the 2009 HRA, and also focuses on those plans likely to operate with the FALP (since plans developed since 2009 will have undergone HRA themselves, which would have included the London Plan within the baseline for considering ‘in combination’ effects). It should be noted that the measures outlined in the 2009 HRA will be sufficient to ensure no significant effects in relation to the FALP also, alone and in combination.

Table 5.1 Plans, programmes or strategies updated since 2009 (based on IIA; does not include documents that cannot operate in combination (e.g. primary legislation; monitoring reports; etc))

Plan, programme or strategy	Date	Possible 'in combination' effects with FALP?
The National Planning Policy Framework. Communities and Local Government	2012	No. General nationwide policy that is reflected in the FALP as appropriate
The Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance (various)	Various	No. All SPG is derived from the London Plan and so cannot operate in combination with it.
London Plan Implementation Plan 1. Mayor of London.	2013	No. General plan concerned with implementation of LP only.
Planning for school development: statement. DCLG	2011	No. General statement of policy
Borough Development Plan Documents (various)	Various	No. New plans accounted for the London Plan during development and FALP will not significantly alter the outcomes of this plan; no potential in combination effects with the FALP.
Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks (various)	Various	No. Derived from London Plan
London Housing Strategy. GLA	2010	No. Derived from London Plan
Planning policy for traveller sites. DCLG	2012	No. General nationwide policy that is reflected in the FALP as appropriate
Jobs and Growth Plan for London. GLA	2013	No. General statement of policy
The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy for London	2010	No. General statement of policy
Delivering London's Energy Future: the Mayor's climate change Mitigation and energy strategy. GLA	2011	No. General statement of policy
Securing London's water future: The Mayor's Water Strategy. GLA	2011	No. General statement of policy
Draft Water Resource Management Plan. Thames Water	2013	No. Individual options to resolve deficits all outside GLA area; deficit / headroom calculations allow for anticipated additional growth.
Affinity Water. Our Plan for Customers & Communities. Draft Water Resource Management Plan	2013	No. Individual options to resolve deficits all outside GLA area; deficit / headroom calculations allow for anticipated additional growth.
Making Business Sense of Waste: The Mayor's Business Waste Management Strategy. GLA (2011)	2011	No. General statement of policy
London's Wasted Resource: The Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy. GLA	2011	No. General statement of policy
Managing risks and increasing resilience: the Mayor's climate change adaptation strategy. GLA	2011	No. General statement of policy
Aviation policy framework. Department of Transport	2013	No. General statement of policy
River Action plan. Mayor of London, TfL	2012	
Mayor's Transport Strategy. GLA	2010	Subject to HRA; no potential in combination effects with the FALP
Mayor's Air Quality Strategy. GLA	2010	No. General statement of policy
London view management framework: supplementary planning guidance. GLA	2011	No. All SPG is derived from the London Plan and so cannot operate in combination with it.
Mayor's Cultural Strategy. GLA	2010	No. General statement of policy

Plan, programme or strategy	Date	Possible 'in combination' effects with FALP?
Elmbridge District Council Core Strategy	2011	Small risk of in combination visitor pressure on South West London Waterbodies SPA but no potential in combination effects with the FALP likely.
Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy	2012	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Kent County Council Local Transport Plan	2011	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Sevenoaks District Council Core Strategy	2011	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Sevenoaks District Council Development Management Plan (not adopted)	2013	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Dartford District Council Core Strategy	2011	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Thurrock Council Core Strategy	2011	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Hartsmere Borough Council Core Strategy	2013	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Three Rivers District Council Core Strategy	2011	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Strategy 2026	2012	No potential in combination effects with the FALP
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Local Plan (updated)	2011	Small risk of in combination visitor pressure on South West London Waterbodies SPA but no potential in combination effects with the FALP likely.

Appendix D

Screening categories

Tables D1 and D2 provide a brief summary of the key policy screening categories used in Natural England's draft HRA guidance (2009) and hence in the 2009 HRA, for information. The tables focus on those policy types that can be screened out (Table D1) and the category of policy where 'lower tier assessment' is appropriate (Table D2) since all of the 2009 LP policies fall into one of these groups. The full list of NE policy categories (including 'significant effect' categories) is provided in Appendix B of the 2009 HRA. The tables compare the NE categories to the following more recent HRA guidance:

- DTA Publications (2013) *The Habitats Regulation Handbook* [online]. Available at: <http://www.dtapublications.co.uk/handbook/>. Accessed 11.11.13.
- SNH (2012) *Habitats Regulations Appraisal of Plans: Guidance for plan-making bodies in Scotland*. Scottish Natural Heritage / David Tyldesley Associates.

Table D1 Policy types that can be screened out based on NE draft guidance (2009) and equivalent categories in more recent and adopted guidance

Policy categories in draft NE guidance (2009)			Policy categories in HRA handbook (2013)		Policy types in SNH guidance (2012)
Cat.			Cat		
			A	General statements of policy / general aspirations	General policy statements
			C	Policies referred to but not proposed by the plan	Projects referred to in, but not proposed by, the plan
A	No negative effect	A1 Policies that will not themselves lead to development e.g. because they relate to design or other qualitative criteria for development, or they are not a land use planning policy.	B	Policies listing general criteria for testing the acceptability / sustainability of proposals	Policies which will not themselves lead to development or other change
			F	Policies or proposals that cannot lead to development or other change	
		A2 Policies intend to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity.	D	Environmental protection / site safeguarding policies	Policies intended to protect the natural environment
		A3 Policies intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, where enhancement measures will not be likely to have any negative effect on a European site.	D	Environmental protection / site safeguarding policies	
		A4 Policies that positively steer development away from European sites and associated sensitive areas.	E	Policies or proposals that steer change in such a way as to protect European sites from adverse effects	For which effects on any particular European site cannot be identified, because the policy is too general
B	No significant effect	B Effects are trivial or 'de minimis', even if combined with other effects.	H	Policies or proposals the effects of which cannot undermine the conservation objectives (either alone or in combination)	Which make provision for change but which could have no conceivable effect

Table D2 Policies requiring lower tier assessment

Policy categories in draft NE guidance (2009)			Policy categories in HRA handbook (2013)		Policy types in SNH guidance (2012)
Cat.			Cat		
E	Cannot conclude No LSE at this stage – lower tier assessment	E1	A policy would have no effect where development could occur through the policy itself, because it is implemented through later policies in the same DPD, which are more detailed and therefore more appropriate to assess for their effects on European sites and associated sensitive areas. These kinds of policies may be found in the Core Strategy where a broad quantity of development may be specified as being delivered through a more specific policy in a later chapter or section of the DPD.	n/a	Strictly, these policies types are not separately identified in more recent guidance, but rather are considered as 'significant effect' policies which are then subject to appropriate assessment; at the AA stage the mitigation measures are applied, specifically, identification of potential adverse effects and how these will be avoided by a more detailed HRA at the lower tier. This is consistent with the approach used in the 2009 HRA.
		E2	A policy that makes provision for a quantity / type of development (and may indicate one or more broad locations e.g. a particular part of the plan area), but the detailed location of the development is to be selected following consideration of options in later, more site specific DPD. The consideration of options in the later DPD will need to assess potential effects on European sites.	n/a	

F	Cannot conclude No LSE at this stage – lower tier assessment	F	<p>Policies depend entirely on how they are implemented in due course, through the development management process. There is a theoretical possibility that if implemented in one or more particular ways, the proposal could possibly have a significant effect on a European site.</p> <p>In these specific circumstances where there is uncertainty about the way in which aspects of a plan may be implemented, it may be appropriate for policies to contain restrictions or caveats in order to exclude support for potentially damaging proposals. It is advised that the caveat could be added during the screening stage whereupon the policy could be reassessed and placed in Category A or B. Alternatively the policy could be taken forward to appropriate assessment to check that the caveat, when added, would avoid an adverse effect on the integrity of the European site.</p> <p>A caveat may relate to proposals not being in accordance with the development plan or may prevent the potentially damaging proposals from occurring unless the potential effect on the European site has been resolved. For example, the development cannot take place until related infrastructure is in place, having passed the tests of the Habitats Regulations.</p>	n/a	<p>Strictly, these policies types are not separately identified in more recent guidance, but rather are considered as 'significant effect' policies which are then subject to appropriate assessment; at the AA stage the mitigation measures are applied, specifically, identification of potential adverse effects and how these will be avoided by a more detailed HRA at the lower tier. This is consistent with the approach used in the 2009 HRA.</p>
---	--	---	--	-----	---

Appendix E

Figure showing European sites

