

EU ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND PLANNING LAW ASPECTS  
OF LARGE-SCALE PROJECTS

*Edited by*  
Bernard VANHEUSDEN  
Lorenzo SQUINTANI



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd  
Sheraton House | Castle Park  
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom  
Tel.: +44 1223 370 170 | Fax: +44 1223 370 169  
Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk  
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

*Distribution for the UK and Ireland:*  
NBN International  
Airport Business Centre, 10 Thornbury Road  
Plymouth, PL6 7PP  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1752 202 301 | Fax: +44 1752 202 331  
Email: orders@nbninternational.com

*Distribution for Europe and all other countries:*  
Intersentia Publishing nv  
Groenstraat 31  
2640 Mortsel  
Belgium  
Tel.: +32 3 680 15 50 | Fax: +32 3 658 71 21  
Email: mail@intersentia.be

*Distribution for the USA and Canada:*  
International Specialized Book Services  
920 NE 58<sup>th</sup> Ave Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97213  
USA  
Tel.: +1 800 944 6190 (toll free) | Fax: +1 503 280 8832  
Email: info@isbs.com

## EU Environmental and Planning Law Aspects of Large-Scale Projects

© The editors and contributors severally 2016

The editors and contributors have asserted the right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as authors of this work.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from Intersentia, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be covered by the above should be addressed to Intersentia at the address above.

Cover image: © hxdyl – Thinkstock

ISBN 978-1-78068-381-2  
D/2016/7849/40  
NUR 828



British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

# CONTENTS

## Introduction

Bernard VANHEUSDEN and Lorenzo SQUINTANI . . . . . 1

## PART I. GENERAL

### Chapter 1.

#### Environmental Aspects of State Aid for Energy Investment Projects

Marcin STOCZKIEWICZ . . . . . 11

1. Introduction . . . . . 11
  - 1.1. Thematic Context and Scope of Analysis . . . . . 11
  - 1.2. Key Questions and the Structure of an Analysis . . . . . 14
2. EU Environmental Policy and State Aid Rules . . . . . 14
3. ‘Polluter Pays’ and ‘Integration’ as Principles Linking Environmental Objectives with Competition Rules . . . . . 15
  - 3.1. The ‘Polluter Pays’ Principle and State Aid . . . . . 16
  - 3.2. Integration Principle and State Aid . . . . . 17
4. State Aid for Energy Investment Projects in Environment and Energy Guidelines 2014–2020 . . . . . 21
  - 4.1. General Remarks . . . . . 21
  - 4.2. Positive Integration . . . . . 21
  - 4.3. Negative Integration . . . . . 22
5. Conclusions . . . . . 24

### Chapter 2.

#### The New 2014 Regulation on Noise-Related Restrictions at EU Airports. Help or Hurdle to Noise Management?

Delphine MISONNE . . . . . 27

1. Introduction . . . . . 27
2. Current Framework . . . . . 29
  - 2.1. Influence of ICAO . . . . . 29
  - 2.2. Balanced Approach . . . . . 30
  - 2.3. New Avenue for Litigation . . . . . 31

3.	New Regulation .....	34
3.1.	<i>Ratio Legis</i> .....	34
3.2.	Operating Restrictions .....	35
3.3.	A Process under Close Supervision.....	36
3.3.1.	Notifications.....	37
3.3.2.	Extensive Consultations .....	38
3.4.	Balanced but also Cost-Effective Approach.....	39
3.5.	Authorities that are Independent from All Stakeholders.....	41
4.	Assessment .....	42

**Chapter 3.**

**The EU and the Participation of Civil Society in Large Projects**

	Ludwig KRÄMER .....	45
1.	Introduction .....	45
2.	Large Projects in EU Environmental Law .....	45
3.	Participation and Consultation.....	47
4.	Participation in EU Large, in Particular Trans-European Projects.....	49
4.1.	Trans-European Energy Projects .....	50
4.2.	Trans-European Transport Projects .....	52
4.3.	Concerned Citizens and Trans-European Projects.....	52
4.4.	Ways Ahead .....	54
5.	Conclusion .....	56

**Chapter 4.**

**From Host to Investor: Enhancing the Sustainability of CDM Forest Carbon Projects**

	Yixin XU.....	57
1.	Introduction .....	57
2.	Current Regulatory and Private Sustainability Assessment .....	61
2.1.	Host Countries' Regulatory Sustainability Assessment.....	62
2.1.1.	The Main Project Players and CDM Project Cycle .....	62
2.1.2.	Regulatory Sustainability Assessment in the National Approval Procedure.....	64
2.1.3.	Problems of Host Countries' Sustainability Assessments ...	66
2.2.	Private Forest Certification Schemes in CDM Forest Projects.....	68
2.2.1.	The Market of Private Forest Certification Schemes.....	69
2.2.2.	Forest Stewardship Council.....	70
2.2.3.	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standard .....	71
2.2.4.	Problems of Private Forest Certification Schemes in CDM Forest Projects .....	72

2.3.	CDM Voluntary Tool for Describing Sustainable Development Co-Benefits .....	73
3.	Suggestions Proposed by Previous Scholars. ....	74
3.1.	International versus National Regulatory Approach .....	74
3.2.	Promoting Incentives for Conserving Forests Ecosystem Services .....	75
3.3.	<i>Ex-Post</i> Environmental Sustainability Assessment.....	77
3.4.	Increase Local Participation and Power Decentralisation.....	77
4.	Policy Analysis.....	78
5.	Conclusion .....	82

PART II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

**Chapter 5.**

**Legislative Validation in Times of Environmental Democracy:  
Going Beyond the Deadlock or a Road to Nowhere?**

	Hendrik SCHOUKENS .....	85
1.	Introduction .....	85
2.	Legislative Validation, EIA and Aarhus: ' <i>Ceci n'est pas une pipe?</i> '.....	89
2.1.	The Basics of EIA in the European Union: the Backbone of Sustainable Spatial Development? .....	89
2.2.	Access to Justice in Relation to EIA Rules .....	90
2.3.	The Exemption Offered by Article 1(4) of the EIA Directive .....	93
3.	Strict Judicial Scrutiny: Aarhus Shows its Teeth to the Walloon Region (in Theory ...). ....	96
3.1.	The Re-Emergence of Article 1(4) in a Belgian Large Infrastructure Case .....	96
3.2.	' <i>No pasarán!</i> ' says the Court in Luxembourg and the Belgian Constitutional Court in Brussels .....	98
3.3.	The Irony of it All? .....	101
4.	A More Generous Approach: UK Supreme Court Endorses the HS2 Hybrid Bill.....	106
4.1.	A New Twist to a Long-Standing Debate ... ..	106
4.2.	UK Supreme Court Opts for a Middle Ground .....	108
4.3.	Common Sense or Splendid Isolation? .....	111
5.	Concluding Remarks .....	115

**Chapter 6.**

**Controversies about Projects or Plans Passed by Law in Spain.  
Environmental Impact Assessment, Right to Take Part and Access to  
Justice on Environmental Issues**

José Ignacio CUBERO MARCOS and Unai ABERASTURI GORRIÑO.....	119
1. Introduction .....	119
2. The Right to Participate on Environmental Matters .....	121
2.1. Aarhus Convention .....	121
2.2. European Union Law.....	123
2.3. Spanish Legislation .....	124
3. The Effects of the Projects and Plans Passed by a Legislative Act Both on the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Strategic Environmental Assessment .....	125
3.1. The Foundation of the Environmental Impact Assessment .....	126
3.2. Adequate Procedure to Participate and Coordinate Public Authorities .....	128
3.2.1. The European Union Case Law's Approach .....	128
3.2.2. Objections to the CJEU's Case Law: the Right to Participate in the EIA and the Strategic Environmental Assessment .....	130
3.3. Single Legislative Acts and EIA Legislation .....	131
3.3.1. Single Legislative Acts: Concept and Characteristics .....	131
3.3.2. The Recent Jurisprudence of the Spanish Constitutional Court .....	133
3.3.3. Some Critical Observations Related to Participation and the Procedure. ....	135
4. Access to Justice on Environmental Matters .....	137
4.1. The Right to Appeal.....	137
4.2. The Single Legislative Acts and the Right to Access to Justice on Environmental Issues .....	139
5. Conclusions.....	141

**Chapter 7.**

**The Implementation of the Second Pillar of the Aarhus Convention  
in Italy: The Need for Reform and for Introduction of the So-Called  
'Deliberative Arenas'**

Viviana MOLASCHI .....	143
1. Preliminary Remarks on the Scope of the Article: Public Participation in the Environmental Field.....	143
1.1. The Interest in Studying 'Deliberative Arenas'.....	146
2. The Aarhus Convention: a Brief Outline.....	148

3.	The Implementation of the Second Pillar of the Aarhus Convention in the Italian Environmental Code: the Regulation of the ‘Ordinary’ EIA and the Sea . . . . .	149
4.	Public Participation in the ‘Special’ EIA Concerning Major Works. . . . .	154
5.	The Example of the Law of Tuscany n. 46 of 2013 on Regional Public Debate and Promotion of Participation in the Elaboration of Regional and Local Policies . . . . .	156
6.	Conclusions: Participatory Gaps and Criticalities of Italian Environmental Legislation: the Need for Reform and for Introduction of Deliberative Arenas . . . . .	161

PART III. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**Chapter 8.**

**Trans-Boundary Environmental Impact Assessment in Cross-Border Oil and Gas Pipelines: What Lessons Can Be Learned from the Espoo Convention and the EU EIA Directive**

	Mehdi Piri DAMAGH . . . . .	169
1.	Introduction . . . . .	169
2.	The Current Legal Framework of Trans-Boundary EIA for Cross-Border Pipelines in the EU . . . . .	174
	2.1. The Espoo Convention . . . . .	174
	2.2. The EU EIA Directive . . . . .	175
	2.3. The TEN-E Regulation . . . . .	177
3.	An Analysis of Applying Trans-Boundary EIA to Cross-Border Pipelines . . . . .	178
	3.1. A Critique: Challenges of Applying Trans-Boundary EIA to the Cross-Border Pipelines, the Case Study of the Nord Stream Gas Pipeline . . . . .	179
	3.2. Applying the Espoo Convention and EU EIA Directive in the Context of Such Challenges . . . . .	183
	3.2.1. The Assessment of Alternatives . . . . .	184
	3.2.2. Trans-Boundary EIA in Cases Involving Non-EU Member States and Countries that are not Parties to the Espoo Convention . . . . .	185
	3.2.3. Complying with National EIA Requirements . . . . .	186
	3.2.4. The Overall Assessment of the Project . . . . .	187
4.	Conclusions . . . . .	187

**Chapter 9.**

**Environmental Impact Assessment to Support Marine Innovation:  
The ‘Rochdale Envelope’ and ‘Deploy & Monitor’ in the UK’s Ocean  
Energy Industry**

Glen WRIGHT .....	189
1. Environmental Impact Assessment for Ocean Energy .....	190
1.1. Case Study: Marine Current Turbines, Northern Ireland .....	193
2. Issues with EIA for Ocean Energy Projects .....	194
3. Introducing Risk into the Regulatory Framework .....	195
4. Case Study: the UK .....	197
4.1. Rochdale Envelope .....	198
4.2. Deploy & Monitor .....	203
5. Challenges .....	208
6. Future Development .....	210
7. Conclusion .....	212

PART IV. WATER

**Chapter 10.**

**The Case for Smart Governance in European Water Law**

David SALM .....	215
1. Introduction .....	215
2. The Water Framework Directive’s Regime .....	217
2.1. Historical Overview .....	217
2.2. River Basin Districts .....	219
2.3. River Basin Management Plans and Programmes of Measures. . .	219
2.4. The Prohibition of Deterioration .....	220
2.5. The Imperative of Improving .....	221
2.6. Interim Findings .....	223
3. The <i>Weservertiefung</i> Case .....	224
3.1. The <i>Bundesverwaltungsgericht</i> ’s Questions to the ECJ .....	224
3.2. Advocate General <i>Jääskinen</i> ’s Opinion .....	225
3.2.1. Article 4 WFD as a Self-Executing Norm .....	226
3.2.2. The Interpretation of ‘Deterioration’ and ‘Good Status’ . . .	227
3.3. The ECJ’s Judgment .....	230
3.4. Consequences for Large-Scale Industrial Projects .....	231
4. The Case for Smart Governance .....	233



**Chapter 11.****Coal-Fired Power Plants under EU Water Law: The Phasing-Out Requirement of Priority Hazardous Substances – An Obstacle to the Permission of Coal-Fired Power Plants?**

Lisa LÖFFLER.....	237
1. Introduction.....	237
2. Facts and Figures Concerning Coal-Fired Power Plants.....	238
3. The Phasing-Out requirement of Mercury and its Different Interpretation.....	239
3.1. The Phasing-Out Requirement under EU Water Law.....	241
3.2. The Time Frame for the Implementation of the Phasing-Out Requirement.....	241
3.3. The Legal Effect of the Phasing-Out Requirement.....	244
3.3.1. Arguments Against Direct Legal Effect.....	244
3.3.2. Arguments in Favour of a Direct Legal Effect.....	245
4. Summary.....	247

**Chapter 12.****The Permissibility of Projects for Interbasin Water Transfer under the Prism of the EU Water and Environmental Legislation**

Vasiliki (Vicky) KARAGEORGOU.....	249
1. Introduction.....	249
2. Lessons Learned by the Implementation of the IBTs Worldwide.....	251
2.1. Brief Analysis of the Schemes.....	251
2.2. Remarks Concerning the Implications of IBTs.....	254
3. Assessing the IBTs under the Prism of the New Regulatory Concepts in Water and Environmental Law, with Emphasis on the Developments at EU Level.....	256
3.1. The ‘Paradigm Shift’ in Water Law and its Relevance for Assessing IBTs.....	256
3.2. The Relevant Principles, Criteria and Instruments for Assessing IBTs under the EU Water and Environmental Law.....	259
3.2.1. The Critical Principles and Rules in EU Water Law.....	259
3.2.2. The Critical Principles and Instruments in EU Environmental Law.....	263
4. The Case of Acheloos under the Prism of its Legal and Governance Perspectives.....	264
4.1. Background Information for the Acheloos Diversion Scheme....	264
4.2. The Jurisprudence of the Council of State before the Request for a Preliminary Ruling.....	265
4.3. The CJEU Ruling in the <i>Acheloos</i> Case.....	268

4.4. The Decision of the Council of State after the CJEU Ruling.....	273
5. Concluding Remarks .....	275

PART V. NATURE

**Chapter 13.**

**Assessment and Authorisation of Plans and Projects Having a Significant Impact on Natura 2000 Sites**

Nicolas DE SADELEER .....	281
1. Introduction .....	281
2. Appropriate Impact Assessment (Article 6(3) First Phrase) .....	286
2.1. Introductory Comments .....	286
2.2. Which Plans and which Projects are Subject to an AIA?.....	286
2.2.1. Broad Interpretation of the Concepts .....	286
2.2.2. Projects and Plans that Are Likely to Have a Significant Impact .....	288
2.2.3. Screening: Prior Assessment of the Plan or Project's Significance .....	291
2.2.4. Advantages and Drawbacks of Screening Methods.....	292
2.2.5. Splitting of Plans and Projects.....	294
2.3. Content of the AIA.....	295
2.3.1. Background Against which the Appropriate Assessment Must Be Carried Out .....	295
2.3.2. Soundness of the Appropriate Assessment .....	295
2.3.3. Best Scientific Knowledge in the Field .....	296
2.3.4. Material Range of Effects .....	298
2.3.5. Uncertain Effects .....	299
2.3.6. Geographical Range of Effects .....	300
2.3.7. Concluding Remarks.....	300
3. Substantive Decision Criterion (Article 6(3) Second Phrase) .....	300
3.1. Introductory Comments.....	300
3.2. Impact of Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive on National Procedural Law .....	301
3.2.1. Express Authorisation.....	301
3.2.2. Stage at which Formal Consent Must Be Granted to the Developer .....	302
3.2.3. Circumventing Formal Administrative Consent by Legislative Acts .....	302
3.3. Plan and Project that can be Authorised in as Much as it Will not Affect Site's Integrity .....	303
3.3.1. No Adverse Effects on Site's Integrity .....	303
3.3.2. Precautionary Decision-Making .....	305

3.3.3. Participatory Decision-Making .....	307
3.3.4. Statement of Reasons .....	307
4. Derogatory Regime (Article 6(4)) .....	308
4.1. Introductory Comments.....	308
4.1.1. Derogation Mechanism Following Negative Findings in Assessment .....	308
4.1.2. First Condition: Absence of Alternative Solutions .....	309
4.1.3. Second Condition: Weighing Interests.....	310
4.1.3.1. Non-Priority Habitats and Species.....	311
4.1.3.2. Priority Habitats and Species.....	311
4.1.3.3. Derogations Interpreted in the Light of the Objective of Sustainable Development.....	312
4.1.3.4. Procedural Requirements .....	314
4.1.4. Mitigation Measures .....	314
4.1.5. Compensatory Measures .....	315
5. AIA, EIA, and SEA: How to Square the Circle? .....	315
6. Conclusions.....	318

**Chapter 14.**

**Compensatory Measures for Large-Scale Projects in European Nature Conservation Law after the *Briels* Case**

Geert VAN HOORICK.....	321
1. Introduction .....	321
2. Text of Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive.....	322
3. Compensatory vs. Mitigation Measures – the <i>Briels</i> Case.....	323
4. Compensatory Measures vs. Usual Nature Conservation Measures. ...	326
5. Compensation Beforehand; Compensation vs. Nature Development Measures and Habitat Banking.....	327
6. Biological Integrity vs. Man-Made Nature – the <i>Acheloos River</i> Case ..	328
7. Conclusions.....	330

**PART VI. LAND USE**

**Chapter 15.**

**Land Use Regulation in the UK and the Role of the Court**

Elizabeth DUNN.....	335
1. Introduction .....	335
2. Overview of Planning in England and Wales .....	336
3. Principles of High Court Challenges.....	338
3.1. How Do High Court Challenges Work?.....	340
3.2. Permission .....	341

3.3.	Remedies.....	341
3.4.	Separation of Powers in England and Wales and the Rule of Law.....	342
4.	The European Convention on Human Rights and High Court Challenges.....	343
4.1.	<i>Alconbury</i> and the Right to a Fair and Public Hearing.....	343
4.2.	The Role of Democratic Accountability.....	344
4.3.	The Scope of Judicial Review – What is ‘Full Jurisdiction’?.....	346
4.4.	Access to a Fair and Public Hearing Post- <i>Alconbury</i> .....	348
4.4.1.	Separation of Powers.....	348
4.4.2.	Planning Act 2008 Challenges.....	349
5.	Developments in Judicial Review and European Influence.....	349
5.1.	Standing.....	350
5.2.	European Mandatory Requirements.....	351
5.3.	Aarhus Convention.....	353
5.3.1.	Time Limits for Judicial Review.....	353
5.3.2.	Costs.....	354
5.4.	Social Influences.....	356
6.	Reform of the Judicial Review Process and the New Planning Court ..	357
6.1.	Origins.....	357
6.2.	Reforms.....	359
6.2.1.	The Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015 (CJCA).....	359
6.2.1.1.	Making a Challenge.....	359
6.2.1.2.	Financing a Challenge.....	359
6.2.1.3.	Determining a Challenge.....	360
6.2.2.	The Introduction of the Planning Court.....	361
6.2.2.1.	‘Significant Cases’ and Target Timescales.....	362
6.2.2.2.	New Case Management Powers.....	363
7.	Conclusion.....	364

## Chapter 16.

### Public Participation in Land Management Law-Making Process in the Basque Country: Effects on Soil and Other Natural Resources

Iñaki LASAGABASTER and María del Carmen BOLAÑO..... 367

1.	Introduction.....	367
2.	Clarification of the Meaning of Land Management.....	369
3.	Land Management in the Basque Country.....	371
3.1.	Guidelines for Land Management.....	372
3.1.1.	Specific Analysis of the Land Use Matrix.....	373
3.2.	Land District Plans.....	376
3.3.	Land Sector Plans.....	377

4.	Practical Analysis of the Land Management Set in the Basque Legal Instruments .....	377
4.1.	Energy Policy and Wind Farms .....	377
4.2.	Policy on Large Projects and the Trade Act.....	379
4.3.	Construction of Golf Courses.....	380
4.4.	Privatisation of Urban Planning as a Public Service.....	381
5.	Urban and Territory Plans: Participation and Information .....	382
6.	Conclusion .....	382

**Conclusion.**

**Reconciling Conflicting Values: A Call For Research on Instruments to Achieve Quasi-Sustainability**

Lorenzo SQUINTANI and Bernard VANHEUSDEN.....	385
-----------------------------------------------	-----