

APPENDIX 4 – HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT SCREENING REPORT



PREPARED FOR ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES

Authored by Michael McCarthy
Reviewed by: Tom Whitworth
Approved by Mike Mair
Date March 2023
Version 1.2.2

Metis Consultants Ltd.
Spencer House
23 Sheen Road, Richmond
London, TW9 1BN
United Kingdom
t. 020 8948 0249
e. info@metisconsultants.co.uk
w. metisconsultants.co.uk

REVISION HISTORY

Ver	Date	Description	Prepared	Approved
1.0	March 2022	Prepared for client review	MMC	DC
1.1	May 2022	Prepared for final issue	MMC	MM
1.2	March 2023	Prepared following public consultation	NS	MM

LIMITATIONS

Metis Consultants Limited (Metis) have prepared this Report for the sole use of the Client. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by Metis. This Report is confidential and may not be disclosed by the Client nor relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Metis.

The conclusions and recommendations contained in this Report are based upon information provided by others and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested and that such information is accurate. Information obtained by Metis has not been independently verified by Metis, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

The work described in this Report is based on the conditions encountered and the information available during the period of production. The scope of this Report and the services are accordingly factually limited by these circumstances.

Metis disclaim any undertaking or obligation to advise any person of any change in any matter affecting the Report, which may come or be brought to Metis' attention after the date of the Report.

Certain statements made in the Report that are not historical facts may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the Report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. Metis specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this Report.

The Client should take appropriate professional legal advice prior to implementing any recommendations made within this Report that may impact on the legal exposure of the Client.

COPYRIGHT

© This Report is the copyright of Metis Consultants Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

CONTACT DETAILS

Metis Consultants Ltd.
Spencer House
23 Sheen Road, Richmond
London, TW9 1BN
t. 020 8948 0249
e. info@metisconsultants.co.uk
w. metisconsultants.co.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report is necessary to recognise the risks and consequences of which the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames (Kingston Borough) Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) could pose to Natura 2000 sites. Natura 2000 sites are areas protected under the Habitat Regulations act and include any existing or proposed Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar Sites. To assess the impact of the LFRMS on the Natura 2000 sites, the strategic objectives of the strategy and any of their associated actions will be assessed against each site. If any significant negative effects are discovered within this Screening Report, then the HRA must be progressed onto further stages as part of a full HRA.

Since there are no Natura 2000 sites within the Kingston Borough boundary, it is imperative that any sites in close proximity to the borough which may share connections between their natural ecosystems are not overlooked. Eight sites have been chosen following their inclusion in a previous [2014 HRA](#) for Sutton, which acts as part of a Shared Environment Service with Kingston for local flood risk management. In the 2014 HRA, the sites were said to be chosen since they were sites that could be affected by water levels or pollution and which could lie within the catchment, or downstream, of local flooding events in the Sutton Borough. The eight sites are Richmond Park (SAC), Wimbledon Common (SAC), South West London Waterbodies (SPA and Ramsar), Windsor Forest and Great Park (SAC), Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods (SAC), Lee Valley (SPA and Ramsar), Thames Estuary & Marshes (SPA and Ramsar), and Epping Forest (SAC).

A screening analysis was performed to assess each of the LFRMS strategic objectives against all of the Natura 2000 sites to identify if there are any potential harmful effects to these sites as a result of each strategic objective. A harmful effect could be classed as a disruption to the natural processes which support the sites' features, a reduction in the amount or quality of designated habitats or species, or a limitation to the potential of restoring the designated habitats or species in the future. Following the screening analysis section of the HRA, it is evident that none of the proposed LFRMS strategic objectives will impose negative effects to the identified Natura 2000 sites. In contrast, the strategic objectives have been shown to both directly and indirectly provide benefits to the European sites through either enhancing their quality or offering further protection. Therefore, it has been concluded that the HRA for the LFRMS does not require progression onto any further appropriate assessment stages and will not require a full HRA.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PURPOSE OF SCREENING	1
1.2	METHODOLOGY	1
1.3	HRA CONSULTATION QUESTIONS	2
1.4	LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	2
1.4.1	LFRMS SUMMARY	2
1.4.2	LOCAL AREA INFORMATION	2
1.4.3	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES	3
1.5	CONSULTATION PROCESS	3
2	IDENTIFICATION OF RELEVANT SITES	4
2.1	INTRODUCTION TO THE SITES	4
2.2	SITES WITHIN KINGSTON BOROUGH	4
2.3	SITES IN PROXIMITY TO KINGSTON BOROUGH	4
2.3.1	RICHMOND PARK (SITE 1)	4
2.3.2	WIMBLEDON COMMON (SITE 2)	5
2.3.3	SOUTHWEST LONDON WATERBODIES (SITE 3)	5
2.3.4	WINDSOR FOREST AND GREAT PARK (SITE 4)	6
2.3.5	WORMLEY HODDESDONPARK WOODS (SITE 5)	6
2.3.6	LEE VALLEY (SITE 6)	7
2.3.7	THAMES ESTUARY AND MARSHES (SITE 7)	8
2.3.8	EPPING FOREST (SITE 8)	9
2.4	CLASSIFIED SITES CONSULTATION QUESTIONS	9
3	SCREENING ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	10
3.1	SCREENING ANALYSIS SUMMARY	10
3.2	SCREENING ANALYSIS	10
3.3	SCREENING ANALYSIS OUTCOMES	11
3.3.1	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE A	11
3.3.2	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE B	11
3.3.3	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE C	11
3.3.4	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE D	11
3.3.5	LFRMS STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE E	11
3.4	SCREENING ANALYSIS CONSULTATION QUESTIONS	12
4	CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS	13
4.1	CONCLUSIONS	13
4.2	CONSULTATION OF THE HRA	13
4.3	CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER COMMENTS CONSULTATION QUESTIONS	13
	APPENDIX A – MAP OF NATURA 2000 SITES WITH PROXIMITY TO KINGSTON BOROUGH	14

FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1-1 Summary table of HRA stages and their purpose..... 1
Table 2-2 Wimbledon Common (Site 2) summary..... 5
Table 2-3 Southwest London Waterbodies (Site 3) summary..... 5
Table 2-4 Windsor Forest and Great Parks (Site 4) summary..... 6
Table 2-5 Wormley Hoddesdonpark Woods (Site 5) summary..... 6
Table 2-6 Lee Valley (Site 6) summary..... 7
Table 2-7 Thames Estuary & Marshes (Site 7) summary 8
Table 2-8 Epping Forest (Site 8) summary..... 9
Table 3-1 Scoring matrix of LFRMS strategy objectives against HRA outcome criteria..... 10
Table 3-2 Legend criteria for Table 3-1 10

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Definition
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
EA	Environment Agency
FWMA	Flood and Water Management Act 2010
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Kingston	Kingston Council
Kingston Borough	Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
LFRMS	Local Flood Risk Management Strategy
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
Natura 2000 sites	Also known as European sites, a network of core breeding and resting sites for rare and threatened species, and some rare natural habitat which are protected in their own right
Ramsar	Ramsar Sites are wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar Convention
RMA	Risk Management Authority
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SEA	Strategic Environment Assessment
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
Statutory Consultee	Natural England
Sutton	Sutton Council
Sutton Borough	London Borough of Sutton
TWUL	Thames Water Utilities Limited

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of screening

The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report is necessary to recognise the risks and consequences of which the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames (Kingston Borough) Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) could pose to habitats and protected areas. These implications would include any impacts from the strategic objectives of the LFRMS and any of their associated actions. The screening stage of a HRA is used to gather evidence of any significant or likely impact which may then require progression onto the appropriate assessment phase.

A HRA is required under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017), also known as Habitats Regulations, and must be undertaken to assess whether a plan or proposal will cause any considerable harm to any designated European sites (Natura 2000 sites). The reason this HRA is required is because a LFRMS is considered a plan. Natura 2000 sites are areas protected under the Habitat Regulations and include any existing or proposed Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar Sites. Any areas which have been designated to compensate for any damage to a Natura 2000 site should also be considered in a HRA.

1.2 Methodology

The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), along with Natural England and additional Welsh governing bodies have published guidance which establishes a three-stage process to complete a full HRA. Task 1 identifies any potential significant effects, Task 2 assesses ways in which the significant effects identified can be mitigated, and Task 3 considers any exemptions.

This document will complete Task 1, producing a HRA Screening Report to determine whether the proposed strategic objectives and their associated actions within the LFRMS could have significant adverse effects on Kingston Borough or its surrounding area. If any significant effects are discovered within this Screening Report, then the HRA must be progressed onto Tasks 2 and 3. This HRA Screening Report has been reviewed by strategic stakeholder Natural England who are a statutory consultee, and also the Kingston LLFA who are an internal stakeholder. Beyond this, the LFRMS document and all its appendices, including this HRA Screening Report will undertake a public consultation where a variety of other stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide feedback on the documents. The full process of the HRA is outlined below in [Table 1-1](#) Summary table of HRA stages and their purpose.

Table 1-1 Summary table of HRA stages and their purpose

HRA Stage	Purpose
Task 1 - Screening	To check if the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the site's conservation objectives.
Task 2 - Appropriate Assessment	To assess the likely significant effects of the proposal in more detail and identify ways to avoid or minimise any effects.
Task 3 - Derogation	To consider if proposals that would have an adverse effect on a European site quality for exemption.

1.3 HRA consultation questions

A requirement of this HRA Screening Report was that a number of questions were to be directed at the statutory consultation body, Natural England. The questions that were sent to Natural England can be found at the bottom of their relevant sections as well as within the full list below. Natural England responded to these questions and stated that no changes were required.

Identifying relevant sites

1. Do you feel we have included all of the most relevant Natura 2000 sites which may be significantly affected by the implementation of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy? If not, please state other sites which you believe we have missed.
2. Do you feel we have included all relevant information for these sites?

Screening analysis

3. Do you have any comments on the method for the assessment of the HRA sites against the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy strategic objectives?
4. Do you agree with the screening analysis for each of the objectives? If not, please give reasons as to why you would screen a certain objective differently.

Conclusions and further comments

5. Do you have any comments on the conclusions that we have made in this HRA Screening Report of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy?
6. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for this HRA Screening Report?

1.4 Local Flood Risk Management Strategy

1.4.1 LFRMS summary

Kingston was granted the role of Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) under the [Flood and Water Management Act \(FWMA\) \(2010\)](#). This LLFA role entails the statutory responsibility to develop, maintain and apply a LFRMS which sets out their aims and objectives in managing local flood risk within their borough. Subsequent documents consist of an Action Plan outlining the delivery of these actions, a monitoring and reviewing plan to track progress, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report, and this document, the HRA Screening Report. The HRA Screening Report is a statutory requirement of any LFRMS where there are potential impacts to local Natura 2000 sites, and its purpose is outlined earlier in Section [1.1](#).

1.4.2 Local area information

Kingston Borough is the southwestern most of London's 32 boroughs and shares its northwest border along which the River Thames flows, with its neighbour the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames. Other neighbouring boroughs include the London Boroughs of Merton (east), Wandsworth (northeast), and Sutton (southeast), the latter of which Kingston operates as a combined LLFA within the Shared Environment Service and thus shares the management of local flood risk. The River Thames runs northwards through Kingston Borough along the borough's western edge, and acts as a divide between itself and the London Borough of Richmond upon

Thames to the west. Elmbridge Borough Council and Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, within Surrey County Council, also share a borough boundary with Kingston Borough in the southwest.

1.4.3 LFRMS strategic objectives

A list of Kingston’s five LFRMS Strategic objectives can be found below. They will later be assessed in Section 3.2 against each of the sensitive Natura 2000 sites identified. This will help to distinguish whether the objectives and their associated actions would have an effect on the sites. Kingston has a collaborative partnership with the Sutton Council (Sutton) and as such, the strategic objectives have been shared across both boroughs to aid in the delivery of their flood risk management duties.

- A. Improve our knowledge and understanding of the different risks of flooding in Kingston Borough / Sutton Borough.
- B. Proactively encourage sustainable solutions for the management of local flood risk which take account of climate change.
- C. Use planning powers to appropriately mitigate flood risk to or caused by developments across Kingston Borough / Sutton Borough.
- D. Educate, encourage, and empower local residents, businesses and landowners to take action on reducing flood risk.
- E. Nurture collaborative partnerships with key organisations and Risk Management Authorities (RMAs), including for funding and resources.

1.5 Consultation process

The HRA Screening Report underwent a statutory consultation process in April and May 2022, where the statutory consultee Natural England were consulted. The 6 HRA consultation questions which were posed to Natural England are listed in Section 1.3 can also be found repeated under their relevant task sections throughout this Screening Report. Public consultation occurred between December 2022 and January 2023 and all of the participating community, internal and strategic stakeholders were given an opportunity to provide feedback on any/all of the LFRMS documents including this HRA Screening Report. Similarly to the statutory consultation, any necessary changes following the public consultation have been made prior to the final version of the LFRMS and associated documents being published.

2 IDENTIFICATION OF RELEVANT SITES

2.1 Introduction to the sites

The first stage of the HRA screening process is to identify any Natura 2000 sites within the Kingston Borough boundary. Section 2.3 will examine the sites which have been previously included in a HRA Screening Report from Kingston / Sutton. The examination will be completed using information from [Natural England](#), the [Joint Nature Conservation Committee \(JNCC\)](#) and [Defra Magic Map](#). Additionally, a map of the Natura 2000 sites in proximity to Kingston Borough can be viewed in [Appendix A – Map of Natura 2000 sites with proximity to Kingston Borough](#).

2.2 Sites within Kingston Borough

There are no Natura 2000 sites located within Kingston Borough, but there are several sites in proximity to Kingston Borough which are detailed in the following section. It is imperative that any sites in close proximity to the borough which may share connections between their natural ecosystems are not overlooked. These sites were chosen following their inclusion in a previous [2014 HRA for Sutton](#), which acts as part of a Shared Environment Service with Kingston for local flood risk management. In the 2014 HRA, the sites were said to be chosen since they were sites that could be affected by water levels or pollution and which could lie within the catchment or downstream of local flooding events in Sutton Borough.

2.3 Sites in proximity to Kingston Borough

2.3.1 Richmond Park (Site 1)

Table 2-1 Richmond Park (Site 1) summary

Site name	Richmond Park
Site designation	SAC
EU code	UK0030246
Area (Ha)	846.27
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S1083 Stag beetle, <i>Lucanus cervus</i>
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (1.5%) • Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fens (0.5%) • Heath, Scrub, Maquis and Garrigue, Phygrana (25%) • Dry grassland, Steppes (18%) • Humid grassland, Mesophile grassland (5%) • Improved grassland (20%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (25%) • Mixed woodland (5%)
Current pressure and/or threats	No current pressures and/or threats affecting the Natura 2000 feature(s) have been identified on this site
Supplementary evidence	Richmond Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Site Improvement Plan – Richmond Park

2.3.2 Wimbledon Common (Site 2)

Table 2-1 Wimbledon Common (Site 2) summary

Site name	Wimbledon Common
Site designation	SAC
Eu code	UK0030301
Area (ha)	351.38
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> • H4030 European dry heaths • S1083 Stag beetle, <i>Lucanus cervus</i>
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (1%) • Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fens (0.5%) • Heath, Scrub, Maquis and Garrigue, <i>Phygrana</i> (5%) • Dry grassland, Steppes (45%) • Improved grassland (3.5%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (45%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public access / disturbance, affecting H4010, H4030, S1083 • Habitat fragmentation, affecting S1083 • Invasive species. affecting H4010, H4030, S1083 • Air pollution (impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition), affecting H4010 and H4030
Supplementary evidence	European Site Conservation Objectives for Wimbledon Common SAC - UK0030301 Site Improvement Plan – Wimbledon Common

2.3.3 Southwest London Waterbodies (Site 3)

Table 2-2 South West London Waterbodies (Site 3) summary

Site name	South West London Waterbodies
Site designation	SPA and Ramsar
Eu code	UK9012171
Area (ha)	830.26
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<p>SPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gadwall, <i>Anas strepera</i> - A051, nb • Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> - A056, nb <p>Ramsar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gadwall, <i>Anas strepera</i> - Wintering • Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> - Wintering
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland water bodies (Standing water, running water) 70% • Improved grassland (20%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (5%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public access / disturbance, affecting A051 and A056 • Changes in species distributions, affecting A051 and A056 • Invasive species, affecting A051 and A056 • Natural changes to site conditions, affecting A051 and A056 • Fisheries: fish stocking, affecting A051 and A056 • Inappropriate weed control, affecting A051 and A056

Supplementary evidence	Standard Data Form – UK9012171 European Site Conservation Objectives for Southwest London Waterbodies SPA - UK9012171 Site Improvement Plan – South West London Waterbodies
-------------------------------	---

2.3.4 Windsor Forest and Great Park (Site 4)

Table 2-3 Windsor Forest and Great Park (Site 4) summary

Site name	Windsor Forest and Great Park
Site designation	SAC
Eu code	UK0012586
Area (ha)	1685.92
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H9120 Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex • H9190 Old acidophilous oak woods with Q. robur on snady plains • S1079 Violet click beetle, <i>Limoniscus violaceus</i>
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (0.5%) • Dry grassland, Steppes (4.5%) • Mixed woodland (95%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry and woodland management, affecting H9120, H9190 and S1079 • Invasive species, affecting H9190 and S1079 • Disease, affecting H9190 • Air pollution (impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition), affecting H9120 and H9190
Supplementary evidence	Windsor Forest and Great Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC) European Site Conservation Objectives for Windsor Forest & Great Park SAC - UK0012586 Site Improvement Plan – Windsor Forest and Great Park

2.3.5 Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods (Site 5)

Table 2-4 Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods (Site 5) summary

Site name	Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods
Site designation	SAC
Eu code	UK0013696
Area (ha)	336.47
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H9160 Sub-Atlantic and medio-European oak or oak-hornbeam forests
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heath, Scrub, Maquis and Garrigue, Phygrana (2%) • Dry grassland, Steppes (3%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (90%) • Coniferous woodland (3%) • Mixed woodland (2%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disease, affecting H9160 • Invasive species, affecting H9160

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution (impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition), affecting H9160 • Deer, affecting H9160 • Vehicles (illicit), affecting H9160 • Forestry and woodland management, affecting H9160 • Public access / disruption, affecting H9160
Supplementary evidence	Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods - SAC European Site Conservation Objectives for Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods SAC - UK0013696 Site Improvement Plan – Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods

2.3.6 Lee Valley (Site 6)

Table 2-5 Lee Valley (Site 6) summary

Site name	Lee Valley
Site designation	SPA and Ramsar
EU code	UK9012111
Area (Ha)	448
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<p>SPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bittern, <i>Botaurus stellaris</i> - A021, nb • Gadwall, <i>Anas strepera</i> - A051, nb • Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> - A056, nb <p>Ramsar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gadwall, <i>Anas strepera</i> - Wintering • Shoveler, <i>Anas clypeata</i> - Wintering • Water boatman, <i>Micronecta minutissima</i> • Whorled water-milfoil, <i>Myriophyllum verticillatum</i>
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fen (4%) • Other land (including Towns, Villages, Roads, Waste places, Mines, Industrial sites) (1%) • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (67%) • Humid grassland, Mesophile grassland (8%) • Improved grassland (10%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (10%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water pollution, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Hydrological changes, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Public access / disturbance, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Inappropriate scrub control, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Fisheries: fish stock, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Invasive species, affecting A021, A051 and A056 • Inappropriate cutting / mowing, affecting A021 • Air pollution (impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition), affecting A021
Supplementary evidence	Standard Data Form - UK9012111 Site Improvement Plan – Lee Valley

2.3.7 Thames Estuary and Marshes (Site 7)

Table 2-6 Thames Estuary & Marshes (Site 7) summary

Site name	Thames Estuary & Marshes
Site designation	SPA and Ramsar
Eu code	UK9012021
Area (ha)	4802.47
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<p>SPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avocet, <i>Recurvirostra avosetta</i> - A132-A, nb • Black-tailed godwit, <i>Limosa limosa islandica</i> - A616, nb • Dunlin, <i>Calidris alpina alpina</i> - A672, nb • Grey plover, <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> - A141, nb • Hen harrier, <i>Circus cyaneus</i> - A082, nb • Knot, <i>Calidris canutus</i> - A143, nb • Redshank, <i>Tringa totanus</i> - A162, nb • Ringed plover, <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> - A137, nb • Waterbird assemblage <p>Ramsar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black-tailed godwit, <i>Limosa limosa</i> - Wintering • Dunlin, <i>Calidris alpina</i> - Wintering • Grey plover, <i>Pluvialis squatarola</i> - Wintering • Knot, <i>Calidris canutus</i> - Wintering • Redshank, <i>Tringa totanus</i> - Wintering • Ringed plover, <i>Charadrius hiaticula</i> - Passage • Waterbird assemblage - Wintering • Wetland invertebrate assemblage • Wetland plant assemblage
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry grassland, Steppes (1.9%) • Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fens (3.7%) • Shingle, Sea cliffs, Islets (0.9%) • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (5.6%) • Humid grassland, Mesophile grassland (29.1%) • Salt marshes, Salt pastures, Salt steppes (1.5%) • Tidal rivers, Estuaries, Mud flats, Sand flats, Lagoons (including saltwork basins) (57.3%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal squeeze, affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage • Public access / disturbance, affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage • Invasive species, affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage • Changes in species distributions, affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage • Fisheries: commercial marine and estuarine, affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage • Vehicles (illicit) affecting A132, A141, A082, A143, A162, A137 and waterbird assemblage

Supplementary evidence	Standard Data Form – UK9012021 European Site Conservation Objectives for Thames Estuary & Marshes SPA - UK9012021 Site Improvement Plan – Greater Thames Complex
-------------------------------	--

2.3.8 Epping Forest (Site 8)

Table 2-7 Epping Forest (Site 8) summary

Site name	Epping Forest
Site designation	SAC
Eu code	UK0012720
Area (ha)	1630.74
Qualifying species and/or habitat features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H4010 Northern Atlantic wet heaths with Erica tetralix • H4030 European dry heaths • H9120 Atlantic acidophilous beech forests with Ilex • S1083 Stag beetle, <i>Lucanus cervus</i>
General site character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inland water bodies (Standing water, Running water) (6%) • Bogs, Marshes, Water fringed vegetation, Fens (0.2%) • Heath, Scrub, Maquis and Garrigue, Phygrana (3.8%) • Dry grassland, Steppes (20%) • Broad-leaved deciduous woodland (70%)
Current pressure and/or threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution (impact of atmospheric nitrogen deposition), affecting H4010, H4030 and H9120 • Under grazing, affecting H4010 and H4030 • Public access / disturbance, affecting H4010, H4030 and H9120 • Changes in species distributions, affecting H9120 • Inappropriate water levels, affecting H4010 • Water pollution, affecting H4010 • Invasive species, affecting H4010 and H9120 • Disease, affecting H9120
Supplementary evidence	Epping Forest - SAC Site Improvement Plan – Epping Forest

2.4 Classified sites consultation questions

Questions asked during the consultation exercise based upon the screening analysis conducted:

1. Do you feel we have included all of the most relevant Natura 2000 sites which may be significantly affected by the implementation of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy? If not, please state other sites which you believe we have missed?
2. Do you feel we have included all relevant information for these sites?

3 SCREENING ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

3.1 Screening analysis summary

The screening analysis will evaluate each of the proposed LFRMS strategic objectives against the sites in close proximity to Kingston Borough which were identified in 2.3. Each HRA site will be assessed against the LFRMS strategic objectives to determine their level of effect. This will be either no effect, a potential effect, a potential significant effect, or an uncertainty regarding the possible level of effect on any of the Natura 2000 sites. The LFRMS strategic objectives will then be screened to reach a conclusion of whether progression onto a further appropriate stage of assessment is required.

3.2 Screening analysis

Firstly, the LFRMS strategic objectives are analysed to assess whether there will be any potential harmful effect to any of the Natura 2000 sites recognised in Section 2.3. A harmful effect could be classed as a disruption to the natural processes which support the sites’ features, a reduction in the amount or quality of designated habitats or species, or a limitation to the potential of restoring the designated habitats or species in the future. Following this, in Section 3.3 evidence will be provided to clarify these decisions, before arriving at a conclusion to determine whether the objective can be screened out of the HRA process.

Table 3-1 Scoring matrix of LFRMS strategy objectives against HRA outcome criteria presents the outcomes of each strategic objective against each of the sites. The criteria used within the matrix is explained in *Table 3-2* Legend criteria for Table 3-1. As seen below, none of the LFRMS strategic objectives will have an effect on any of the eight Natura 2000 sites in proximity to Kingston Borough.

Table 3-1 Scoring matrix of LFRMS strategy objectives against HRA outcome criteria

		HRA Site Number							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
LFRMS Strategy Objective	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3-2 Legend criteria for Table 3-1

0	The strategic objective will have no effect on a Natura 2000 site.
-	The strategic objective could have a potential effect on a Natura 2000 site.
--	The strategic objective could have a potential significant effect on a Natura 2000 site.
?	Uncertain

3.3 Screening analysis outcomes

3.3.1 LFRMS strategic objective A

This strategic objective is unlikely to have any negative impacts on the European sites. The objective's focus is to improve the knowledge and understanding of the different risks of flooding to Kingston Borough. The improved knowledge and renewed understanding of various flood risks to Kingston Borough is likely to assist in the protection of the European sites in proximity to Kingston Borough, conserving the sensitive habitats and potentially even providing further ecological benefits. Consequently, this LFRMS strategic objective has been screened out at this stage of the HRA.

3.3.2 LFRMS strategic objective B

This strategic objective is unlikely to have any negative impacts on the European sites. The objective's aim is to proactively encourage sustainable solutions for local flood risk management which also account for climate change. Through more sustainable solutions to managing local flood risk management, the local Natura 2000 sites are likely to benefit from less emission heavy, hard engineering flood management approaches. Furthermore, through taking climate change into consideration, it is more likely that local flood risk management in Kingston Borough will remain sustainable in the future and minimise the potential for future flood related impacts to European sites. Therefore, this LFRMS strategic objective has been screened out at this stage of the HRA.

3.3.3 LFRMS strategic objective C

This strategic objective is unlikely to have any negative impacts on the European sites. The emphasis of this objective is to appropriately use planning powers to mitigate developments against flooding across Kingston Borough. Planning policy should ensure that surface water runoff is not increased as a result of new development and should decrease for the redevelopment of brownfield sites, reducing any potential flood risk to these sites. This will be beneficial to European sites close to proposed developments in Kingston Borough such as Richmond Park and Wimbledon Common, as they are less likely to be impacted by surface water which could be diverted away from developments. Therefore, this LFRMS strategic objective has been screened out at this stage of the HRA.

3.3.4 LFRMS strategic objective D

This strategic objective is to educate, encourage and empower local residents, businesses and landowners to take action on reducing flood risk. It is unlikely to generate any negative impacts to any European sites. By educating Kingston Borough residents on flood risk, they could be more inclined to protect their local European sites from flooding and could therefore help raise further awareness of the risks of flooding to these sites. Subsequently, this LFRMS strategic objective has been screened out at this stage of the HRA.

3.3.5 LFRMS strategic objective E

This strategic objective is unlikely to have any negative impacts to European sites near Kingston Borough. The aim of this objective is to nurture collaborative partnerships with key organisations and RMAs, including for funding and resources. Through encouraging collaborative work between LLFAs and environmentally conscious organisations such as Natural England, more efficient work

can be done to protect European sites from flooding. Therefore, this LFRMS strategic objective has been screened out at this stage of the HRA.

3.4 Screening analysis consultation questions

Questions asked during the consultation exercise based upon the screening analysis conducted:

3. Do you have any comments on the method for the assessment of the HRA sites against the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy strategic objectives?
4. Do you agree with the screening analysis for each of the objectives? If not, please give reasons as to why you would screen a certain objective differently.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

4.1 Conclusions

Following the screening analysis section of the HRA, it is evident that none of the proposed LFRMS strategic objectives will impose negative effects to the identified Natura 2000 sites. In contrast, the strategic objectives have been shown to both directly and indirectly provide benefits to the European sites through either enhancing or offering further protection. Therefore, it has been concluded that the HRA for the LFRMS does not require progression onto any further appropriate assessment stages and will not require a full HRA.

4.2 Consultation of the HRA

The Statutory consultation for this HRA Screening Report took place across April and May 2022, where the statutory consultee Natural England were consulted. Natural England responded with no further comments.

The final stage of this HRA Screening Report was to undergo a public consultation period where the community stakeholders and any remaining strategic and internal stakeholders who had not been consulted until this stage would have an opportunity to feedback on the contents and outcomes of the LFRMS, including any of its accompanying material such as this HRA Screening Report. The public consultation occurred through the medium of an online questionnaire between December 2022 and January 2023, and there was a period of four weeks during which any stakeholders could participate. The feedback received from the stakeholders was incorporated into the final versions of the LFRMS output documents, including this HRA Screening Report. More information about the public consultation can be found in the Sutton LFRMS Communications Strategy.

4.3 Conclusions and further comments consultation questions

Questions asked during the consultation exercises based upon conclusions and this HRA Screening Report as a whole:

5. Do you have any comments on the conclusions that we have made in this HRA Screening Report of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy?
6. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for this HRA Screening Report?

APPENDIX A – MAP OF NATURA 2000 SITES WITH PROXIMITY TO KINGSTON BOROUGH

