

## **Appendix G**

### **Appropriate Assessment**

#### **Appendix G for the Cabinet Report: Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan Publication/Submission Version**

**September 2012**

Appendix A	The Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan report
Appendix B	Consultation report
Appendix C	Consultation strategy
Appendix D	Consultation plan
Appendix E	Sustainability appraisal
Appendix F	Equality analysis
<b>Appendix G</b>	<b>Appropriate Assessment</b>
Appendix H	Schedule of proposed changes to the adopted policies map



## **Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan Publication/Submission version**

**Habitat Regulations Assessment:**

**Appropriate Assessment Screening**

**September 2012**

## CONTENTS

	Section	Page
1	Introduction	1
2	The need for Appropriate Assessment	1
3	Identifying likely Significant Effects	2
4	Methodology	2
5	Identification of relevant sites	4
6	Appraisal framework	8
7	Screening analysis of the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan	10
8	Conclusion	12
	References	

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of a screening exercise undertaken to determine whether stages 2 and 3 of the Appropriate Assessment (AA) process are needed for the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (AAP) Publication/Submission version. The council has also undertaken a separate Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) for the document.
- 1.2 The Peckham and Nunhead AAP establishes a vision for development in Peckham and Nunhead over the next ten to fifteen years and introduces new locally specific policies on a range of issues, including:
- The look and function of the town centre, including the mix of shops and other activities
  - The type of development on large sites
  - The size and design of new buildings
  - The amount and type of new homes to be built and their location
  - The impact of new development on the environment and traffic
  - The infrastructure needed to ensure growth in the area can be accommodated sustainably, including improvements to open spaces, schools, health facilities and leisure facilities
- 1.3 The proposed policies are in general conformity with existing policies in the Southwark Plan and the Core Strategy. An AA screening exercise was also carried out for the Core Strategy which found that there was no significant discernible adverse impact on European sites.

## **2 The need for Appropriate Assessment (AA)**

- 2.1 In October 2005, the European Court of Justice ruled that Appropriate Assessment (AA) must be carried out on all planning policy documents in the UK. The purpose of AA of planning policies is to ensure that the protection and integrity of European sites (also known as the Natura 2000 network) is part of the planning process at the regional and local level. It is the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to ensure that the AA process is carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.
- 2.2 The Natura 2000 network is a network of sites which are of exceptional importance in respect of rare, endangered or vulnerable natural habitats and species within the European Community and which must be protected. These sites, which are also referred to as 'European sites', consist of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Offshore Marine Site (OMS). There are no OMS designated at present.

- 2.3 Guidance from the DCLG on Appropriate Assessment states that: 'The purpose of Appropriate Assessment (AA) of land use plans is to ensure that protection of the integrity of 'European sites' is a part of the planning process at a regional and local level. The requirement for AA of plans or projects is outlined in Article 6(3) and (4) of the European Communities (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ("Habitats Directive").'
- 2.4 The DCLG guidance summarises the AA process prescribed in Article 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive into three main stages:
1. likely significant effects (AA task 1);
  2. appropriate assessment and ascertaining the effect on site integrity (AA task 2);
  3. mitigation and alternative solutions (AA task 3); and
- \*imperative reasons of overriding public interest.*
- 2.5 The test to identify whether a plan option is 'likely to have a significant effect' on a European site is also referred to as 'screening'. This determines whether stages 2 and 3 of the AA are required.

### **3 Identifying likely significant effects**

- 3.1 Screening for AA will determine if planning policy documents are likely to have a significant effect on the conservation objectives of the Natura sites. This will determine whether stages 2 and 3 of the AA are required. In considering whether the plan policy or site allocation is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura site, it should be noted that a site may be located either within or outside the area covered by the plan as significant effects may be incurred in cases where the area of the plan is some distance away.
- 3.2 If, following screening, significant adverse impacts are anticipated, a 'full' AA considers the potential for impacts in more detail and whether alternative measures can be adopted. If there are no viable alternatives, the planning policy can only be implemented if there are 'imperative reasons of overriding public interest'.

### **4 Methodology**

- 4.1 This screening follows the same methodology used to prepare the AA for the Core Strategy.
- 4.2 The legal requirement to undertake AAs is set out in the Habitats Directive. However, there is no standardised method for undertaking an AA. The council has followed the screening method used on the Appropriate Assessment of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan by 'Forum for the Future'. This report has since been updated through the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report (October 2009) which assesses the current version of the London Plan (July 2011).
- 4.3 This methodology used is the same for both screening reports and is based primarily on the draft guidance by Tydesley and Associates prepared for Natural

England - 'The Assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional Strategies under the Provisions of the Habitats Regulations' (2006).

- 4.4 Although it has been written for the assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies the council considers that all but two of the criteria this method employs are also suitable for the assessment of local development documents. Using the same methodology also helps ensure consistency between the AA of regional and local plan making.

## 5 Identification of relevant sites

- 5.1 Using the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) website, and in line with the methodology employed in the AA of Further Alterations to the London Plan, the council identified those Natura 2000 sites within a 10km zone extending from the boundary of the borough. SACs, SPAs, and RAMSARS were included. European sites were scoped into the study if they occurred either wholly or partially within this geographical area. The council identified that there are no Natura 2000 sites in Southwark. Three sites are partially within 10km of Southwark, as set out below:

<p><b>Identified conservation sites of EC importance</b></p> <p><u>Sites at least partially in Southwark</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Sites at least partially within 10km of Southwark</u></p> <p>Wimbledon Common (SAC)</p> <p>Richmond Park (SAC)</p> <p>Lee Valley (SPA)</p>
---

- 5.2 The information for these sites concerning the rationale for EU conservation has been taken from the 'Appropriate Assessment of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan' undertaken by 'Forum for the Future' which also includes supplementary information in order to assist in considering the vulnerability of sites to potential adverse impacts. This is presented in the table on the following pages.

### Site Description table

- 5.3 This information has been sourced from the Appropriate Assessment Screening report: 'Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan', by 'Forum for the Future' (September 2006). The contents of the table were compiled with reference to the sources listed below, and also informed by consultation with Natural England.

- Site name + Designation and code.  
Obtained from Natural England 'Natura 2000 Forms' and RAMSAR forms from the JNCC website.
- Qualifying features.  
Denotes the habitats and species for which the sites have been awarded EU conservation status. It is these qualifying features which the AA must safeguard. This information is obtained from 'Natura 2000' and RAMSAR forms. The qualifying features form the basis of Natural England's

'conservation objectives for the European interest on SSSIs', which were drawn upon for pertinent additional information.

- Current condition and threats  
Information pertaining to the current status of sites, recognised trends, and potential threats. From Natura 2000, RAMSAR, and Conservation Objectives forms.
- Result of July 2006 SSSI condition survey  
Further information on European sites which are also SSSIs - from Natural England's 2006 review of SSSI condition.
- Key ecosystem factors  
Denotes general ecological parameters of importance to maintaining site integrity. Summarised from the 'attributes' in the Conservation Objectives forms.

Site Name	Designation and code	Habitat	Species	Current Condition and Threats	Result of July 2006 SSSI condition survey	Key ecosystem factors
Wimbledon Common	SAC UK0030301	To maintain in favourable condition the: European dry heath, for which the area is considered to support a significant presence.  Northern Atlantic wet heath with Erica tetralix, for which the area is considered to support a significant presence.	To maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the population of: Stag beetle, for which this is one of only 4 known outstanding localities in the UK.	The site is located in an urban area and therefore experiences intensive recreational pressure which can result in damage to the sensitive heathland areas.  Air pollution is also thought to be having an impact on the quality of the heathland habitat.	Area favourable 40%  Area unfavourable but recovering 59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population size of species</li> <li>• Number of old broadleaved trees</li> <li>• Population structure of broadleaved trees</li> <li>• Condition of old broadleaved trees</li> <li>• State of decay</li> <li>• Quantity and size of fallen broadleaved dead wood</li> <li>• Position and degree of exposure of old broadleaved dead trees and stumps.</li> <li>• Condition and position of available dead timber.</li> </ul>
Richmond Park	SAC UK0030246		To maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the population of: Stag beetle, for which this is one of only 4 known	The site is surrounded by urban area and therefore experiences high levels of recreational pressure. This does not directly affect the European interest feature. The	Area favourable 6%  Area unfavourable recovering 8%  Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population size of species</li> <li>• Number of old broadleaved trees</li> <li>• Population structure of broadleaved trees</li> </ul>

			outstanding localities in the UK.	whole site has been declared an NNR.	unfavourable no change 86%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Condition of old broadleaved trees</li> <li>• State of decay</li> <li>• Quantity and size of fallen broadleaved dead wood</li> <li>• Position and degree of exposure of old broadleaved trees and stumps.</li> <li>• Condition and position of available</li> <li>• Dead timber.</li> </ul>
Lee Valley	SPA UK9012111 RAMSAR UK 11034	To maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the populations of an Annex I species* and populations of migratory bird species**, of European importance with particular reference to: Open water and surrounding marginal habitats.	*bittern ** gadwall shoveler  Under Ramsar criterion 2, the site also supports a nationally scarce plant species and a rare invertebrate.	Most of the site is in favourable condition. There are currently no factors having a significant adverse effect on the site's ecological character. However, a significant increase in recreational pressure could impact upon wintering wildfowl numbers	There are a number of SSSIs contained within the Lee Valley Ramsar site of which Walthamstow Reservoirs, Waltham Abbey and Turnford and Cheshunt Pits are 100% favourable. Walthamstow Marshes are 36% favourable and 63% unfavourable but recovering.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance</li> <li>• Extent and distribution of habitat</li> <li>• Landscape</li> <li>• Landform</li> <li>• Vegetation characteristics</li> <li>• Water area</li> <li>• Water depth</li> <li>• Food availability</li> </ul>

## 6 Appraisal Framework

- 6.1 The guidance in the Peckham and Nunhead AAP Publication/Submission Version has been analysed to assess whether it would be likely to result in significant adverse impacts on European sites. The draft Natural England guidance defines 'likely' as meaning 'probably, not merely a fanciful possibility'. The potentially adverse impacts were screened according to the approach set out in Appendix A and Figure 3 of the guidance. However criteria 2 and 3 were not considered because these are applicable to the assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies not Local Development Documents.
- 6.2 A precautionary approach was adopted so that the assessment also considered cumulative impacts therefore all potentially significant adverse impacts were assessed.

### Coding used for recording effects / impacts on European Sites

(from Tydesley and Associates, 2006, Annex 2)

<b>Coding used for recording effects/impacts on European Sites</b>
<b>Reason why policy will have no effect on a European Site</b>
1. The policy will not itself lead to development (e.g. it relates to design or other qualitative criteria for development, or it is not a land use planning policy)
2. <i>The policy makes provision for a quantum/type of development (and may or may not indicate one or more broad locations e.g. a county, or district, or sub-region) but the location of the development is to be selected following consideration of options in lower tier plans (development plan documents).</i>
3. <i>No development could occur through this policy alone, because it is implemented through subordinate policies that are more detailed and therefore more appropriate to assess for their effects on a European site and associated sensitive areas.</i>
4. Concentration of development in urban areas will not affect European Site and will help to steer development and land use change away from a European Site and associated sensitive areas.
5. The policy will help to steer development away from a European Site and associated sensitive areas, e.g. not developing in areas of flood risk or areas otherwise likely to be affected by climate change.
6. The policy is intended to protect the natural environment, including biodiversity.
7. The policy is intended to conserve or enhance the natural, built or historic environment, and enhancement measures will not be likely to have any effect on a European Site.
<b>Reason why policy could have a potential effect</b>
8. The DPD steers a quantum or type of development towards, or encourages development in, an area that includes a European Site or an area where development may indirectly affect a European Site.
<b>Reason why policy would be likely to have a significant effect</b>
9. The policy makes provision for a quantum, or kind of development that in the location(s) proposed would be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site. The proposal must be subject to appropriate assessment to establish, in light of the site's conservation objectives, whether it can be ascertained that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the site.

- 6.3 A Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been undertaken to assess the impact of the policies in the Peckham and Nunhead AAP Publication/Submission Version. This is set out below. The preparation of the Area Action Plan is considered likely to have no significant adverse effect on European sites therefore it is deemed to require no further AA (stages 2 and 3) to be undertaken.

## 7 Screening analysis of the Peckham and Nunhead AAP Publication/Submission Version

7.1 This section screens the policies proposed in the Peckham and Nunhead AAP Publication/Submission Version for impacts on Natura 2000 sites. The AAP has been assessed against the criteria provided in paragraph 6.2 and adapted from the Appropriate Assessment Screening report: 'Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan' (Forum for the Future, September 2006) which itself is based on draft guidance prepared by Tydesley and Associates for Natural England titled, 'The Assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional Strategies under the Provisions of the Habitats Regulations 2006.'

### Strategy Analysis

AAP Policy Number	Policies	Likely to have an impact	Why option will have no impact on Natura 2000 sites	Essential recommendations to avoid potential negative effects on European sites
Area wide strategies and guidance				
1	Peckham town centre and shopping	No	4	None
2	Arts, culture, leisure and entertainment	No	4	None
3	Local shops and services	No	4	None
4	Hot food takeaways	No	1	None
5	Markets	No	4	None
6	Business space	No	4	None
7	Community facilities	No	1	None
8	Schools	No	4	None
9	Health facilities	No	1	None
10	Sports facilities	No	4	None
11	Active travel	No	1	None
12	Public transport	No	1	None
13	The road network	No	1	None
14	Parking for shoppers and visitors	No	1	None
15	Residential parking	No	1	None
16	New homes	No	4	None
17	Affordable and private homes	No	1	None
18	Mix and design of new homes	No	1	None
19	Open spaces and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)	No	6	None

20	Trees	No	6	None
21	Energy	No	6	None
22	Waste, water, flooding and pollution	No	6	None
23	Public realm	No	7	None
24	Heritage	No	7	None
25	Built form	No	7	None
26	Building heights	No	1	None
<b>Character areas</b>				
<b>Peckham core action area</b>				
27	Land use	No	4	None
28	Transport and movement	No	1	None
29	Built environment	No	1	None
30	Natural environment	No	6	None
<b>Nunhead, Peckham Rye and Honor Oak</b>				
31	Land use	No	4	None
32	Transport and movement	No	1	None
33	Built environment	No	1	None
34	Natural environment	No	6	None
<b>Peckham South</b>				
35	Land use	No	4	None
36	Transport and movement	No	1	None
37	Built environment	No	1	None
38	Natural environment	No	6	None
<b>Peckham North</b>				
39	Land use	No	4	None
40	Transport and movement	No	1	None
41	Built Environment	No	1	None
42	Natural environment	No	6	None
<b>Peckham East</b>				
43	Land use	No	4	None
44	Transport and movement	No	1	None
45	Built Environment	No	1	None
46	Natural environment	No	6	None
<b>Sites in Peckham and Nunhead</b>				
47	Proposals sites	No	4	None
<b>Delivering: Working together to make it happen</b>				
48	Section 106 planning obligations and community infrastructure levy	No	1	None

## **8 Conclusion**

- 8.1 None of the policies or guidance set out in the AAP Publication/Submission Version was found likely to have any significant discernible adverse impact on European sites, either individually or cumulatively. In light of this, task 2 (appropriate assessment and ascertaining the effect on site integrity) and task 3 (mitigation and alternative solutions) of the Appropriate Assessment process are not considered necessary.

## **References**

Appropriate Assessment: Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Forum for the Future, September 2006.

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report - Consultation draft replacement London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), October 2009.

Planning for the Protection of European Sites: Appropriate Assessment Guidance for Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents, DCLG, August 2006.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (England and Wales) Regulations DEFRA 2010.

Tyldesley and Associates - prepared for Natural England Draft Guidance - The Assessment of Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional Strategies under the Provisions of the Habitats Regulations 2006.