

**European Community Directive
on the Conservation of Natural Habitats
and of Wild Fauna and Flora
(92/43/EEC)**

**Fourth Report by the United Kingdom
under Article 17**

on the implementation of the Directive
from January 2013 to December 2018

Supporting documentation for the
conservation status assessment for the habitat:

**H3130 - Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters
with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and/or
of the *Isoëto-Nanojuncetea***

ENGLAND

IMPORTANT NOTE - PLEASE READ

- The information in this document is a country-level contribution to the UK Report on the conservation status of this habitat, submitted to the European Commission as part of the 2019 UK Reporting under Article 17 of the EU Habitats Directive.
- The 2019 Article 17 UK Approach document provides details on how this supporting information was used to produce the UK Report.
- The UK Report on the conservation status of this habitat is provided in a separate document.
- The reporting fields and options used are aligned to those set out in the European Commission guidance.
- Explanatory notes (where provided) by the country are included at the end. These provide an audit trail of relevant supporting information.
- Some of the reporting fields have been left blank because either: (i) there was insufficient information to complete the field; (ii) completion of the field was not obligatory; and/or (iii) the field was only relevant at UK-level (sections 10 Future prospects and 11 Conclusions).
- For technical reasons, the country-level future trends for Range, Area covered by habitat and Structure and functions are only available in a separate spreadsheet that contains all the country-level supporting information.
- The country-level reporting information for all habitats and species is also available in spreadsheet format.

Visit the JNCC website, <https://jncc.gov.uk/article17>, for further information on UK Article 17 reporting.

Report on the main results of the surveillance under Article 17 for Annex I habitat types (Annex D)

NATIONAL LEVEL

1. General information

1.1 Member State	UK (England information only)
1.2 Habitat code	3130 - Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the Lit

2. Maps

2.1 Year or period	1983-
2.3 Distribution map	Yes
2.3 Distribution map Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
2.4 Additional maps	No

BIOGEOGRAPHICAL LEVEL

3. Biogeographical and marine regions

3.1 Biogeographical or marine region where the habitat occurs	Atlantic (ATL)
3.2 Sources of information	Hughes M, Hornby DD, Bennion H, Kernan, M, Hilton J et al. (2004) The development of a GIS-based inventory of standing waters in Great Britain together with a risk-based prioritisation protocol. Water, Air and Soil Pollution: Focus 4:73-84. Williams, P., Biggs, J., Crowe, A., Murphy, J., Nicolet, P., Weatherby, A., Dunbar M., (2010) Ponds Report from 2007. CS Technical Report No. 7/07 Carvalho, L. and Moss, B. (1998) Lake SSSIs subject to eutrophication: environmental audit. English Nature Freshwater Series No. 3. Peterborough: English Nature. Environment Agency (2016) Water Framework Directive Surface Water Bodies in England: Classification Status and Objectives - Cycle 2, data from 2013 -2016 Natural England CMSi condition data Mainstone C.,& Burn A. (2011) Relationships between ecological objectives and associated decision-making under the Habitats and Water Framework Directives. Discussion paper, Natural England. Burgess, A, Goldsmith, B and Goodrich, S. (2014) Interpretation of Water Framework Directive Macrophyte Data for CSM Condition Assessment. Report to Natural England Maberly, S.C., De Ville, M.M., Thackeray, S. J., Ciar, D., Clarke, M., Fletcher, J. M., James, J.B., Keenan P. Mackay, E.B., Patel, M., Tanna, B., Winfield, I. J., Bell, K., Clark, R., Jackson, A., Muir, J., Ramsden, R., Thompson, J., Titterton, H., Webb, P. 2016 A survey of the status of the lakes of the English Lake District: The Lakes Tour 2015.Report to United Utilities. Tomlinson, M., Perrow M., Harwood A., Berridge R., (2017) Quantifying fish populations in SSSI lakes phase 2: site-specific reporting of the role of fish in lake management. Report to Natural England. Hall, R. A. (2018) Explanatory notes for the standing water analysis and reporting for Article 17 round 4. Natural England paper.

4. Range

4.1 Surface area (in km ²)
4.2 Short-term trend Period

Report on the main results of the surveillance under Article 17 for Annex I habitat types (Annex D)

4.3 Short-term trend Direction	Stable (0)		
4.4 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	
4.5 Short-term trend Method used			
4.6 Long-term trend Period			
4.7 Long-term trend Direction			
4.8 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	
4.9 Long-term trend Method used			
4.10 Favourable reference range	a) Area (km ²) b) Operator c) Unknown d) Method	No	
4.11 Change and reason for change in surface area of range	Improved knowledge/more accurate data The change is mainly due to:	Improved knowledge/more accurate data	
4.12 Additional information			

5. Area covered by habitat

5.1 Year or period	1983-1983-		
5.2 Surface area (in km ²)	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Best single value 89.47
5.3 Type of estimate	Best estimate		
5.4 Surface area Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate		
5.5 Short-term trend Period	2007-2018		
5.6 Short-term trend Direction	Stable (0)		
5.7 Short-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Confidence interval
5.8 Short-term trend Method used	Based mainly on expert opinion with very limited data		
5.9 Long-term trend Period			
5.10 Long-term trend Direction			
5.11 Long-term trend Magnitude	a) Minimum	b) Maximum	c) Confidence interval
5.12 Long-term trend Method used			
5.13 Favourable reference area	a) Area (km ²) b) Operator c) Unknown d) Method	No	
5.14 Change and reason for change in surface area of range	Improved knowledge/more accurate data The change is mainly due to:	Improved knowledge/more accurate data	
5.15 Additional information			

6. Structure and functions

6.1 Condition of habitat	a) Area in good condition (km ²)	Minimum 18.54	Maximum 18.54
	b) Area in not-good condition (km ²)	Minimum 47.59	Maximum 47.59
	c) Area where condition is not known (km ²)	Minimum 23.34	Maximum 23.34

Report on the main results of the surveillance under Article 17 for Annex I habitat types (Annex D)

6.2 Condition of habitat Method used	Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate
6.3 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Period	2007-2018
6.4 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Direction	Stable (0)
6.5 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition Method used	Based mainly on extrapolation from a limited amount of data
6.6 Typical species	Has the list of typical species changed in comparison to the previous reporting period? No
6.7 Typical species Method used	
6.8 Additional information	

7. Main pressures and threats

7.1 Characterisation of pressures/threats

Pressure	Ranking
Agricultural activities generating diffuse pollution to surface or ground waters (A26)	H
Agricultural activities generating point source pollution to surface or ground waters (A25)	H
Discharge of urban waste water (excluding storm overflows and/or urban run-offs) generating pollution to surface or ground water (F12)	M
Invasive alien species of Union concern (I01)	M
Other invasive alien species (other than species of Union concern) (I02)	H
Modification of hydrological flow (K04)	H
Management of fishing stocks and game (G08)	H
Sports, tourism and leisure activities (F07)	M
Temperature changes (e.g. rise of temperature & extremes) due to climate change (N01)	M
Abstraction from groundwater, surface water or mixed water (K01)	M
Threat	Ranking
Agricultural activities generating diffuse pollution to surface or ground waters (A26)	H
Agricultural activities generating point source pollution to surface or ground waters (A25)	H
Discharge of urban waste water (excluding storm overflows and/or urban run-offs) generating pollution to surface or ground water (F12)	M
Invasive alien species of Union concern (I01)	M
Other invasive alien species (other than species of Union concern) (I02)	H
Modification of hydrological flow (K04)	H
Management of fishing stocks and game (G08)	H

Report on the main results of the surveillance under Article 17 for Annex I habitat types (Annex D)

Sports, tourism and leisure activities (F07) M

Temperature changes (e.g. rise of temperature & extremes) due to climate change (N01) M

Abstraction from groundwater, surface water or mixed water (K01) M

7.2 Sources of information

7.3 Additional information

8. Conservation measures

8.1 Status of measures

a) Are measures needed? Yes

b) Indicate the status of measures Measures identified, but none yet taken

8.2 Main purpose of the measures taken Restore the habitat of the species (related to 'Habitat for the species')

8.3 Location of the measures taken Both inside and outside Natura 2000

8.4 Response to the measures Long-term results (after 2030)

8.5 List of main conservation measures

Reduce/eliminate point pollution to surface or ground waters from agricultural activities (CA10)

Reduce diffuse pollution to surface or ground waters from agricultural activities (CA11)

Management, control or eradication of other invasive alien species (CI03)

Restore habitats impacted by multi-purpose hydrological changes (CJ03)

Reducing the impact of (re-) stocking for fishing and hunting, of artificial feeding and predator control (CG03)

Reduce/eliminate point source pollution to surface or ground waters from industrial, commercial, residential and recreational areas and activities (CF04)

Management, control or eradication of established invasive alien species of Union concern (CI02)

Reduce impact of outdoor sports, leisure and recreational activities (CF03)

Implement climate change adaptation measures (CN02)

Reduce impact of multi-purpose hydrological changes (CJ02)

8.6 Additional information

9. Future prospects

9.1 Future prospects of parameters

a) Range

b) Area

c) Structure and functions

9.2 Additional information

10. Conclusions

10.1. Range

10.2. Area

10.3. Specific structure and functions (incl. typical species)

10.4. Future prospects

Report on the main results of the surveillance under Article 17 for Annex I habitat types (Annex D)

10.5 Overall assessment of Conservation Status

10.6 Overall trend in Conservation Status

10.7 Change and reasons for change in conservation status and conservation status trend

a) Overall assessment of conservation status

No change

The change is mainly due to:

b) Overall trend in conservation status

No change

The change is mainly due to:

10.8 Additional information

11. Natura 2000 (pSCIs, SCIs, SACs) coverage for Annex I habitat types

11.1 Surface area of the habitat type inside the pSCIs, SCIs and SACs network (in km² in biogeographical/marine region)

a) Minimum

b) Maximum

c) Best single value 25.92

11.2 Type of estimate

Best estimate

11.3 Surface area of the habitat type inside the network Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

11.4 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition within the network Direction

Stable (0)

11.5 Short-term trend of habitat area in good condition within network Method used

Complete survey or a statistically robust estimate

11.6 Additional information

12. Complementary information

12.1 Justification of % thresholds for trends

12.2 Other relevant information

Distribution Map




Figure 1: UK distribution map for H3130 - Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and/or of the *Isoëto-Nanojuncetea*. Coastline boundary derived from the Oil and Gas Authority's OGA and Lloyd's Register SNS Regional Geological Maps (Open Source). Open Government Licence v3 (OGL). Contains data © 2017 Oil and Gas Authority.

The 10km grid square distribution map is based on available habitat records which are considered to be representative of the distribution within the current reporting period. For further details see the 2019 Article17 UK Approach document.

Range Map




Figure 2: UK range map for H3130 - Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation of the *Littorelletea uniflorae* and/or of the *Isoëto-Nanojuncetea*. Coastline boundary derived from the Oil and Gas Authority's OGA and Lloyd's Register SNS Regional Geological Maps (Open Source). Open Government Licence v3 (OGL). Contains data © 2017 Oil and Gas Authority.

The range map has been produced by applying a bespoke range mapping tool for Article 17 reporting (produced by JNCC) to the 10km grid square distribution map presented in Figure 1. The alpha value for this habitat was 25km. For further details see the 2019 Article 17 UK Approach document.

Explanatory Notes

Habitat code: 3130

Field label	Note
2.1 Year or period	The GB lakes database was used, this is based on OS Land-Form PANORAMA(R) contour data at 1:50,000. Data capture took place in 1983. Lake type is inferred from catchment geology and measured alkalinity data. The database itself was produced in 2004.
2.3 Distribution map; Method used	Small lakes and ponds are likely to be under-represented, water bodies with surface areas as small as 0.5 ha appear accurately represented in this data set, but although smaller water bodies exist in the dataset (the smallest being 0.02 ha), their representation is somewhat generalised. It is therefore acknowledged that there will be less confidence in the results for the smaller water bodies. This is important as more than half the lakes and ponds (of all types) identified in England are less than 1 ha.

Habitat code: 3130 Region code: ATL

Field label	Note
4.3 Short term trend; Direction	Lakes are rarely 'lost' in the conventional sense, although small water bodies may be infilled or drained. However, many lakes have been severely degraded to the extent that they no longer support characteristic plant or animal communities. Degraded sites are not considered lost because of the way in which lake types are defined. As a consequence, area and range assessments show no significant change over time in spite of nutrient enrichment and other impacts. Very small water bodies of this habitat type have been lost through land drainage and infilling activity, but others have been created (Williams et al., 2007) as have larger water bodies created for resource extraction. As the water bodies that are lost are generally small and their natural occurrence is more frequent in the landscape the area and range of H3130 is likely to have remained relatively constant. This is not to suggest that the loss of small water bodies in the landscape is of no consequence, as they often form essential stepping stones and refuges from other pressures creating a network of freshwater habitat supporting an extensive range of biodiversity.
4.11 Change and reason for change in surface area of range	It is presumed that in previous reporting rounds the only sites included were those where the natural trophic state of a water body and its vegetation were known, this will have resulted in a large under-estimate of the natural range of this habitat type. This will have centred around SSSIs with reasonable survey information available. Using the data from the GB lakes database provides a more comprehensive picture of where this habitat type naturally occurs and extends beyond the designated sites network. Consequently the range and area will look larger in this reporting round than in previous rounds. This belies a relatively stable range and extent with large water bodies remaining unchanged. Small water bodies are much more likely to be created or infilled, but these changes will not be picked up in this analysis. As ponds individually cover a small area and are relatively widespread they are unlikely to change the overall metrics greatly.
5.1 Year or period	comments made under 2.1 apply here
5.4 Surface area; Method used	Comments made under 2.3 apply here
5.6 Short term trend; Direction	Comments made under 4.3 apply here
5.14 Change and reason for change in surface area	Comments made under 4.11 apply here

6.2 Condition of habitat;
Method used

Assessment of the condition of SACs and nationally designated sites provides a direct source of data on the condition of H3130 habitat. These assessments are based on evaluation of the environmental integrity of the habitat (in relation to water quality, hydrology, morphology, non-native species and some aspects of the status of the characteristic biological community). Beyond SACs and nationally designated sites, the main source of data on habitat condition is the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The WFD reports on the ecological status of lakes. Lakes of less than 50ha in surface area are generally not designated as WFD waterbodies, unless they are SACs or SSSIs or have been otherwise considered to have special importance. Consequently the condition of a large part of the H3130 habitat resource remains unknown. Ecological status is defined in terms of a number of biological quality elements: the macrophytes, phytoplankton, diatoms and macroinvertebrates, as well as the nutrient status of waterbodies. A number of environmental standards are also defined that support ecological status. Status categories are high, good, moderate, poor and bad. There is no simple relationship between favourable condition of H3130 habitat (as defined for use in SACs and nationally designated sites) and ecological status classes. In fact, some attributes of habitat condition used in the assessment of SACs and nationally designated sites are not directly addressed by ecological status assessment (e.g. impacts on marginal habitat, impacts on physical habitat quality including habitat extent, hydrological modifications and the presence of non-native species). Phosphorus targets used to assess favourable condition of H3130 within SACs and SSSIs can be similar to those for good ecological status. For other indicators, favourable condition targets are often similar to those for high ecological status. However, it can generally be said that if a water body is not reaching good ecological status it will not be at favourable condition, yet if it is at good ecological status it may or may not be at favourable condition. As not all biological quality elements or environmental parameters are recorded at all sites monitored for WFD purposes summarising what this data means in terms of favourable condition is inherently difficult. Consequently a decision was made to include all water bodies considered to be at good ecological status as in favourable condition, it needs to be acknowledged that this is likely to lead to some water bodies being considered to be in favourable condition when they are not, however it does allow these two data sources to be combined to produce a single simple summary metric (see Hall, 2018). Whilst the assessment of the sites reported as in favourable or unfavourable condition is based on survey information 26% of the habitat (by area) is not monitored.

6.4 Short term trend of
habitat area in good
condition; Direction

Despite conservation measures implemented to improve the condition of H3130, no lakes are yet to move into favourable condition as a consequence, hence the condition of structure and function is reported as stable. This is at least in part due to the long time it takes lakes to recover from the various pressures upon them. Some improvements have been made, but these are insufficient to change condition from unfavourable to favourable.

6.5 Short term trend of
habitat area in good
condition; Method used

Recent condition assessments, reports and knowledge of action undertaken at these sites inform the assessment as stable, although what is going on in the lakes not monitored (36% of the habitat resource) is unknown.

7.1 Characterisation of
pressures/ threats

K04: modifications to hydrological flow has been taken to mean a range of human induced changes in hydraulic conditions often described as inappropriate water levels through designated site reporting.

8.1 Status of measures

Whilst the status of measures is reported as identified, but not yet undertaken this belies a more complicated picture. Most sites within the designated sites network have had a number of measures undertaken on them and further measures have been identified, whether these will be sufficient to restore the lake is still unclear. Outside of WFD water bodies and designated sites, little action to assess condition, identify measures or undertake any such measures has occurred.

8.4 Response to the measures	Whilst the response to the measures is reported as long-term, it is likely that improvements will be seen before then, but it is unlikely that these improvements will be sufficient to move lakes into favourable condition until after 2030, due to the long time it takes lakes to recover.
9.1 Future prospects of parameters	Comments made under 8.4 apply here.
11.3 Surface area of the habitat type inside the network; Method used	Unlike previous attempts to calculate the area of H3130 in SACs the individual lakes within SACs were identified in the GB lakes database and the area of the lake from the database was used rather than the area of the SAC or unit it occurred in. Thus there is more confidence that this figure represents actual lake habitat. Some SACs include ditches which support this habitat, these have not been included in these figures as there are no figures available for the area of ditch in an SAC, which is likely to make a relatively small contribution to the area figures overall.
11.5 Short term trend of habitat area in good condition within the network; Method used	The trend in N2K lake habitat is informed by the condition assessments taken at these sites particularly those by Burgess et al (2014), and the survey data and data reviews of Maberly et al (2015) and Phillips et al (2015) all describing a similar picture of some improvements, but none sufficient to change a lake from 'not good' condition to 'good' condition.