

## **Environmental Impact Assessment Directive Review Wildlife and Countryside Link position paper**

### **1. Summary**

- Environmental Impact Assessment has been a crucial tool in the protection of the UK and Europe's environment for many years.
- Link broadly welcomes the proposed changes to the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, but proposes a range of further measures to strengthen its implementation.

### **2. Wildlife and Countryside Link**

Wildlife and Countryside Link (Link) brings together 40 voluntary organisations concerned with the conservation and protection of wildlife, countryside and the marine environment. Our members practise and advocate environmentally sensitive land management, and encourage respect for and enjoyment of natural landscapes and features, the historic environment and biodiversity. Taken together our members have the support of over eight million people in the UK and manage over 750,000 hectares of land.

This response is supported by the following nine organisations:

- Amphibian and Reptile Conservation
- Buglife – The Invertebrate Conservation Trust
- Butterfly Conservation
- Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- The Wildlife Trusts
- Woodland Trust
- Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust
- WWF

### **3. Background**

The purpose of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is to ensure that decisions as to whether to consent certain projects are made with full knowledge of that project's likely significant environmental effects. EIA does not prevent projects happening, but it serves to identify likely negative environmental effects and how they should be prevented, reduced or offset, and any positive effects enhanced. This reduces risk to the environment, can help improve the overall quality of development and reduces the risks and costs to developers and decision-makers by highlighting significant issues early in the consenting process. EIA also requires public consultation, and that the results of the consultation are taken into account by the decision-maker.

EIA has been in use internationally for more than 40 years; the UK and Europe it has been a crucial tool providing a high level of protection to the environment since the original Directive was adopted in 1985.

Experience in EIA has grown significantly since 1985, and the Directive has been amended several times (in 1997, 2003 and 2009, and then codified into a single 'new' Directive in 2011). However, experience has also highlighted a number of shortcomings, and in 2009 the European Commission decided that the EIA Directive should be updated and simplified. Extensive consultation took place in the summer of 2009. Coinciding with the start of the Review, the Commission produced a report, highlighting areas for improvements and making

recommendations for how to do so. Link members have significant experience of EIA in the UK, and contributed to the Commission's consultation.<sup>1</sup>

In the UK, about 500 projects each year are subject to EIA. About two-thirds of projects of these are dealt with through the town and country planning system, so this represents less than 0.1% of all planning applications. This is the lowest rate per head of population among the larger EU member states (IEMA, 2011). These projects are by their nature likely to impose significant costs on the environment. UK planning law and policy is a devolved responsibility; although domestic planning law and policy in each country provide some environmental safeguards, these are no substitute for the environmental protection provided by EIA, which has become an integral part of the planning system.

The response of the UK Government, led by the Department of Communities and Local Government, has so far been very disappointing. The Secretary of State's [Written Ministerial Statement](#) of 6 December and the accompanying explanatory memorandum are highly critical of the proposals and focus on the perceived cost and regulatory burden.

The Government's position must start from recognising the importance of a high quality environment to economic development and human well-being. Its focus must be on achieving good environmental outcomes, not on a narrow definition of costs to the planning system which does not recognise the environmental costs imposed by poor development. The Government must also recognise that EIA is a vital and integral part of the environmental protection toolkit, helping to implement a variety of global and European environmental objectives, as well as those contained in the England Biodiversity Strategy, *Biodiversity 2020*. Any attempt to water it down would be short-sighted, and would be strongly opposed by Link.

In short, EIA is a vital and integral means of protecting the UK's environment.

Link broadly welcomes the proposed changes to the Directive, but proposes a range of further measures to strengthen its implementation

#### **4. Proposed changes to the Directive**

Link broadly welcomes many of the proposed changes to the Directive, published in October 2012, but recommends a number of further changes to strengthen its implementation. All references are to the Commission's proposals (2012/0297 (COD)).

##### **4.1. Biodiversity**

We welcome the **explicit reference to 'biodiversity'** (not just 'flora' and 'fauna'), along with more specific references to species and habitats protected under the Habitats and Wild Birds Directives, climate change and other issues (Article 3a), as well as new references to biodiversity in screening (Annex IIA 3b, Annex III 1c and h, 2b) and the content of environmental statements (Annex IV 1b, 4, 5b). However, for clarity and strengthening we recommend both a **definition of biodiversity** in Article 1, based on the Convention on Biological Diversity, and reference to the desirability of **avoiding any net loss of biodiversity** (see Preamble, paragraphs 7 and 8).

EIA requires the developer to describe the main measures to prevent, reduce and, if possible, offset significant adverse effects (Annex IV 7). We recommend that this **mitigation hierarchy should be strengthened** to emphasise a preference for avoiding harm, and offsetting only as a last resort.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/review.htm>.

Semi-natural grasslands in Europe are under threat from intensive agriculture. Although projects for the use of uncultivated land or semi-natural areas for intensive agriculture are currently included in Annex II, many such projects fail to be screened in because thresholds are inappropriately high. We welcome the proposed inclusion in Annex III 2c of permanent pastures and agriculture areas with a high nature value, but we recommend that **semi-natural grasslands and pastures** are also referred to specifically in Annex II 1b.

#### 4.2. Exemptions

Exemptions generally weaken the implementation of the Directive. Although the Commission's proposals in Article 1 (4) are a step in the right direction, we recommend that this paragraph should be **deleted completely**. If not deleted in its entirety, it should be made clear that the exemptions, as a derogation from the general requirements of the Directive, should be interpreted restrictively.

#### 4.3. Screening (deciding which projects need an EIA)

We **oppose** the proposal that the information provided by the developer for screening purposes must include **mitigation measures** (Article 4 (3)), as developers will tend to provide a document which looks like a full environmental statement in order to get the project screened out, thereby avoiding consideration of alternatives, consultation with environmental authorities and public participation.

We recommend, as a failsafe measure, that the competent authority can only decide that EIA is not required where it is convinced as to the **absence of likely significant effects** of the project on the environment. We recommend **public participation in screening**, and a reasonable minimum timeframe for this to take place.

**Public participation** should also **be required when Member States set Annex II thresholds** and decide to **exempt specific projects under Article 2 (4)**, prior to making the decision.

#### 4.4. Scoping (deciding what the EIA should cover)

We welcome mandatory pre-application scoping, in consultation with the environmental authorities (Article 5(2)). We recommend this provision is extended to **require public participation at the scoping stage**.

#### 4.5. Public participation

In addition to the points above, we propose a number of further changes to ensure that the Directive is fully compliant with the requirements of the Aarhus Convention. The current Directive can be interpreted such that public participation can take place after construction work has already started, so we recommend a **revised definition of development consent** to deal with this.

The Aarhus Convention requires 'due account' to be taken of the outcome of the public participation procedure<sup>2</sup>, but the current Directive only requires it to be 'taken into consideration' (Article 8(1)). We recommend that '**due account**' is used instead. This will also give the entire EIA process more significance in the development consent procedure.

The Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee found that the EIA Directive lacks provisions clearly requiring the public concerned to be provided with effective remedies, including **injunctive**

<sup>2</sup> Article 6(8) Aarhus Convention.

**relief.**<sup>3</sup> This is not included in the Commission's proposals and we recommend that this point is addressed, with a timeframe for the public to start review proceedings (such as the three month maximum timeframe for judicial reviews proceedings in England and Wales).

#### 4.6. Alternatives

We support **mandatory assessment of 'reasonable alternatives'**, rather than just alternatives which the developer has studied (Article 5(2)). These alternatives must include the 'least environmentally impacting one' (Annex IV (2), which contains further details on the information to be provided).

#### 4.7. Accredited and technically competent experts

We welcome the proposal for mandatory use of 'accredited and technically competent experts' either by the developer or the competent authority (Article 5(3)). However, more could be done to secure the independence and professionalism of the experts, so we recommend that both the developer and the competent authority are required to use accredited and technically competent experts (but not the same one), and that **financial and professional penalties** are introduced for experts whose work is found to be seriously in error. We recommend establishing a completely independent body, such as **a national EIA commission**, to review environmental statements.

#### 4.8. Monitoring and compliance

We support the requirement (Article 8(2)), that the development consent includes measures to **monitor significant adverse environmental impacts**, with further specification in Annex IV (7). Monitoring should be carried out independently and the **results made publicly available** (by the proposed national EIA commission – see 4.7). However, there are no requirements for corrective action where developments result in net biodiversity loss or have other significant adverse environmental impacts. We recommend introducing a requirement for the developer to take **corrective action** where monitoring shows that mitigation and compensation measures are not working or there are significant adverse environmental impacts. Measures should also include financial penalties when promises regarding mitigation and compensation are not kept or when gross negligence can be shown to have affected the assessment.

#### 4.9. One-stop Shop

We also support in principle the proposal to introduce an EIA 'one-stop-shop', allowing the co-ordination or integration of assessment procedures under the EIA Directive and other EU legislation (Article 2 (3)). However, the drafting of this section needs to be improved to give clarity that the **determination of different requirements** (e.g. under the Birds and Habitats Directives) **must be discrete**, as very different legal tests are involved, and that the proposed joint procedure does not result in the appointed authority issuing decisions in relation to matters outside its expertise.

#### 4.10. Unconventional gas extraction

Shale gas, coal bed methane and underground coal gasification operations pose risks for groundwater, biodiversity and climate change. These unconventional gas extraction operations are expanding across Europe. As novel and potentially risky operations, impacts on the environment are poorly understood but potentially significant. These operations must be listed in

<sup>3</sup> ECE/MP.PP/2008/5/Add.10, 2 May 2008, [http://www.unece.org/unecdev.colorado.iway.ch/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2008/pp/mop3/ece\\_mp\\_pp\\_2008\\_5\\_add\\_10\\_e.pdf](http://www.unece.org/unecdev.colorado.iway.ch/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2008/pp/mop3/ece_mp_pp_2008_5_add_10_e.pdf).

Annex I of the Directive to ensure the potential impacts are properly assessed and taken into account in all cases.

**Wildlife and Countryside Link  
March 2013**



Wildlife and Countryside Link  
89 Albert Embankment, London, SE1 7TP  
W: [www.wcl.org.uk](http://www.wcl.org.uk)

Wildlife and Countryside Link is a registered  
charity (No. 1107460) and a company limited  
by guarantee in England and Wales (No.3889519)