Annex A

CORE OBJECTIVES FOR THE POOLE AND CHRISTCHURCH BAYS SMP

COASTAL PLANNING

"To inform the statutory planning process and related coastal zone planning"

COASTAL PROCESSES

"To ensure that future policies for coastal defence do not adversely interfere with the behaviour of the natural processes within the plan or across plan boundaries"

"To promote co-ordinated monitoring of coastal processes and/or regular shoreline surveys throughout the sub-cell to improve knowledge and understanding of the coastal environment, including identifying gaps in knowledge and proposing future research"

CONSERVATION

"To ensure compatability with national and local biodiversity targets by protecting and where possible enhancing nature conservation interest and in particular to safeguard the integrity of sites of regional, national or international interest"

"To determine sensible and sustainable options for the management of important earth heritage and archaeological assets where applicable"

EDUCATION

"To develop an improved public awareness of the behaviour of the coast and the influences they and others have on it"

PROCESS UNIT ISSUES

Area 5F-1 Hurst Spit to Hengistbury Head Long Groyne (Christchurch Bay)

Physical Processes

- Will piecemeal intervention continue to exacerbate the erosion problem in this Unit?.
- There has been a recent marked increase in erosion rates at Hordle Cliffs.
- What would be the implications of managing retreat to the west of Milford on Sea to Hordle Cliffs, at Beckton Bunny and at Naish Farm
- Littoral transport is moving material offshore from Hurst Spit to Shingles Bank, which is a significant sediment sink for coarse grained material within Christchurch Bay
- There does not appear to be an obvious natural feedback mechanism to return material from Shingles bank back onshore or sufficient sediment supply within the Bay.
- Implications of introducing beach recharge along the only unprotected stretch of coastline at Naish Farm.
- Planning of defence schemes have historically not properly taken into account the effects on the whole Bay
- Need to continue to protect Hurst Spit and vulnerable areas behind

Conservation

- How coastal defences may interrelate with obligatory requirements set out in EC Directives (Annex 1 – Habitats and Annexe 2 – Species) at the Solent and Southampton Water proposed SPA and the Solent Maritime proposed SAC
- Need to consider coastal archaeological resources from terrestrial sites through to sub-tidal areas (wrecks) and acknowledge the archaeological importance of the eroding coastline west of Hurst Spit for liberating archaeological assets.
- Preserve the geological importance of the International Geological Stratotype between Highcliffe Castle and Milford-on-Sea
- Hurst Spit's protection is important not only for the protection of shingle habitats but also for the protection of saltmarsh behind the spit

Development on the Coast

- Concern raised by Naish Estate (Hobourne Ltd) over loss of private land due to increased erosion.
- NFU's objective to maintain the existing coastline and to protect dwellings adjacent to the shoreline.
- Need to continue to protect Hurst Spit Castle as an asset.
- Need for the SMP to acknowledge the incidences of land subsidence further inland from the cliff top at Barton

Use of the Coast

- Possible adverse impacts of continued/increased erosion on tourism and the local economy in the Naish and Barton areas.
- Provision of safe access to the shoreline zone in order to accommodate leisure pursuits especially around Barton on Sea where appropriate
- Any future coastal scheme must aim to balance engineering stabilisation requirements with the need to minimise impact on sediment transport and to improve coastal access in the unit

PROCESS UNIT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY TESTS

Area 5F-1 Hurst Spit to Hengistbury Head Long Groyne (Christchurch Bay)

Critical Process Unit Objectives

1. Where a coastal defence strategy may reduce the supply or transport of littoral sediments to the shoreline, this should not have detrimental impacts on immediate and adjacent beach levels within Christchurch Bay.

2. Coastal defence schemes should not interfere with sediment transport pathways operating within Christchurch Bay, unless paramount to the protection of life and critical assets.

3. Where appropriate and economically viable, strategic coastal defence options should ensure the protection of life and residential property along the Highcliffe, Barton and Milford on Sea frontage using sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods

4. Strategic coastal defence options should be based on a sound geomorphological understanding of Christchurch Bay and be compatible with the strategies set for adjacent lengths of coast.

Strategy Test Statements

- Coastal defence options should minimise the loss, or reduction in area, of international or nationally important terrestrial or marine habitats, nor jeopardise the sustainability of earth heritage sites.

- Coastal defence options should not detract from the landscape quality of the immediate or adjacent coastline.

- Coastal defence provision should seek to not adversely affect areas of known, or potential, archaeological or historical value.

- Coastal defence options should not increase the risks of erosion or flooding to other developed areas nor to non-developed areas where natural land loss or inundation is not preferred for strategic or economic reasons.

- Coastal defence options should seek not to adversely affect the amenity, touristic and / or commercial value of an area over the long term by indirectly impacting on the economies of those stakeholders using the coast (eg: shipping fishing, tourism or recreation).

- Coastal defence options should seek to improve coastal access where appropriate

- Coastal defence options should not compromise inshore fisheries at Mudeford

PROCESS UNIT ISSUES

Area 5F-2 Christchurch Harbour

Physical Processes

- Increased rates of siltation experienced in the Harbour
- Possible impacts of dredging for navigation impacting on natural coastal processes
- Breaching of the spit at the harbour entrance during periods of high river flow.
- Potential contribution of fine sediments from fluvial sources into Christchurch Harbour,
- Importance of Mudeford Sandbank in protecting Christchurch Harbour from flooding

Conservation

- How coastal defences may interrelate with obligatory requirements set out in EC Directives (Annex 1 – Habitats and Annexe 2 – Species) at the Dorset Heathlands proposed SPA
- Seek opportunities for habitat enhancement including restoration and re-creation of soft habitats within the Harbour
- Need to consider the options for protecting Hengistbury Head and other Scheduled Monuments in the Harbour as sea levels rise
- Importance of fluvially derived fine material in maintaining the growth of mudflats and saltmarshes in Christchurch Harbour
- Conservation implications for floral species linked to stabilisation of the Mudeford Spit
- Implications of managed retreat and increased flooding frequency at Stanpit Marsh and the landfill site behind
- Importance of maintaining sediment supply around Hengistbury Head to stabilise rare eel grass beds in Christchurch Bay
- Importance of mudflats as bird feeding areas in Christchurch Harbour

Development on the Coast

- NFU's objective to maintain the existing coastline and to protect dwellings adjacent to the shoreline.
- Increase in flooding along the perimeter of Christchurch Harbour when storm surges coincide with high spring tides (and high freshwater flows).
- Implications of increased erosion and more frequent flooding at Stanpit Marsh and the threat to the dis-used landfill site behind

Use of the Coast

- Provision of safe access to the intertidal zone in order to accommodate leisure pursuits where appropriate
- High tourism and recreational use of the harbour should not be jeopardised during summer months by recommended coastal defence works.
- Future dredging requirements for navigation and for commercial fisheries

PROCESS UNIT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY TESTS

Area 5F-2 Christchurch Harbour

Critical Process Unit Objectives

1. Coastal defence schemes should not adversely interfere with sediment transport pathways operating within or at the mouth of Christchurch Harbour, unless paramount to the protection of life and critical assets.

2. Where appropriate and economically viable, strategic coastal defence options should ensure the protection of life and property along the periphery of Christchurch Harbour using sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods.

3. Strategic coastal defence options should not be detrimental to the Harbour as a whole

Strategy Test Statements

- Coastal defence options should minimise the loss, or reduction in the area, of international or nationally important terrestrial or marine habitats.

- Coastal defence options should not detract from the aesthetic quality of the immediate or adjacent coastline, especially those areas designated for historical importance.

- Coastal defence provision should seek to not adversely affect areas of known, or potential, archaeological or historical value.

- Coastal defence options should not increase the risks of erosion or flooding to other developed areas nor to non-developed areas in Christchurch Harbour where natural land loss or inundation is not preferred for strategic or economic reasons.

- Coastal defence provision should seek not to adversely affect the amenity, touristic and / or commercial value of Christchurch Harbour over the long tem by indirectly impacting on the economies of those stakeholders using the coast (eg: shipping and navigation, fishing, tourism or recreation).

PROCESS UNIT ISSUES

Area 5F-3 Hengistbury Head Long Groyne to Sandbanks Ferry Slipway

Physical Processes

- Breaching of Double Dykes and the threat of continued erosion of Hengistbury Head and future flooding implications in Christchurch Harbour
- Importance of maintaining present beach levels for coast protection and tourist reasons
- Effect of the Swash Channel on sediment transport

Conservation

- How coastal defences may interrelate with obligatory requirements set out in EC Directives (Annex 1 – Habitats and Annexe 2 – Species) at the Dorset Heaths proposed SAC and Dorset Heathlands proposed SPA
- Seek opportunities for habitat enhancement including restoration and re-creation of soft habitats along the cliff tops or further inland
- Need to consider coastal archaeological resources from terrestrial sites through to sub-tidal areas, in particular at Hengistbury Head where the volume of shingle to the west of the Long Groyne is diminishing due to a lack of supply
- Need to highlight nationally and internationally important protected species (eg: Sand Lizard) and the problems of coastal defence on cliff and sand dune development.
- Implications of accelerated erosion and sea level rise at Hengistbury Head
- Importance of maintaining sediment drift in Poole Bay to protect the eel grass beds off Hengistbury Head
- Importance of establishing a strategy to preserve Hengistbury Head as a site for geological conservation and thus as a provider of littoral material whilst seeking to protect various coastal habitats from natural erosion.

Development on the Coast

- Impact of artificial cliff drainage on the hydrology of wetland areas (cliff seepages and reed beds)
- Possibilities of marine habitat enhancement through the encouragement of marine species colonisation on hard substrates (ie:new and existing defences or piers)

Use of the Coast

- Provision of safe access to the intertidal zone in order to accommodate leisure pursuits where appropriate
- Preservation of the beaches in Poole Bay is vital to the local economy
- Impact of increased visitor pressure on habitats for sand lizards in Poole Bay

PROCESS UNIT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY TESTS

Area 5F-3 Hengistbury Head Long Groyne to Sandbanks Ferry Slipway

Critical Process Unit Objectives

1. Where a coastal defence strategy may reduce the supply or transport of littoral sediments to the shoreline, this should not have detrimental impacts on immediate and adjacent beach levels within Poole Bay.

2. Where appropriate and economically viable, strategic coastal defence options should ensure the protection of life and property along the seaward section of the Bournemouth and Poole conurbation using sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods

3. Strategic coastal defence options should be based on a sound geomorphological understanding of Poole Bay and be compatible with the strategies set for adjacent lengths of coast.

Strategy Test Statements

- Coastal defence options should not cause the loss, or reduce the area, of international or nationally important terrestrial or marine habitats in Poole Bay.

- Coastal defence options should not compromise the existence of valuable habitats, or geological sites, such that it has adverse impacts on their sustainability or the existence of rare faunal/floral species.

- Coastal defence options should seek to not adversely affect areas of known, or potential, archaeological or historical value.

- Coastal defence options should not increase the risks of erosion or flooding to other developed areas along this frontage

- Coastal defence provision should seek not to adversely affect the amenity, touristic and / or commercial value of an area over the long term by indirectly impacting on the economies of those stakeholders using the coast (eg: shipping fishing, tourism or recreation).

PROCESS UNIT ISSUES

Area 5F-4 Poole Harbour

Physical Processes

- Accelerated erosion on Brownsea Island
- Poor flushing characteristics in the Harbour causing sediments to accumulate
- Perception of increased siltation rates within Lytchett Bay and Poole Harbour in general (Lytchett Minster Town Council)
- Current and future changes in tide levels and wave action adjacent to Poole Town Quay
- Saltmarsh loss which has exposed south and west facing coasts to increased erosion.
- Implications of Port and Harbour dredging regimes on existing and future coastal defences and littoral processes operating within the Harbour

Conservation

- How coastal defences may interrelate with obligatory requirements set out in EC Directives (Annex 1 – Habitats and Annexe 2 – Species) at the Dorset Heaths and Studland Dunes possible SAC and the Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour proposed SPA .
- Seek opportunities for habitat enhancement including restoration and re-creation of soft habitats
- Concern raised over the conservation of Poole Harbour SSSI as development pressure increases
- Need to minimise and mitigate against adverse impacts, brought about by coastal defence schemes, on archaeological remains.consider coastal archaeological resources from terrestrial sites through to sub-tidal areas
- Importance of continued saline intrusion or overtopping of saltwater at Luscombe Valley to maintain the ecological interest.
- Continuation of erosion at Ham Common to maintain ecological and geological interests.
- Die back of marshes to the south west of Poole Harbour

Development on the Coast

- NFU's objective to maintain assets and to protect shoreline dwellings (south of Harbour)
- Proposed boat haven and breakwater at Poole Quay
- Protection of the developed Old Town of Poole from flooding on high tides and wave action.
- Current levels of protection afforded to Poole is 1:20 year return period, well below the indicative standard of 1:200 years.
- Flooding along the perimeter of Poole Harbour when storm surges and spring tides coincide
- Coastal squeeze as a result of sea level rise likely to be felt most at Holes Bay, Lytchett Bay and the western side of Poole Harbour adjacent to the railway line.
- Ecological implications for Poole Harbour of possible future dredging of contaminated sediments at Holes Bay

Use of the Coast

- Problem of protecting existing land uses (both agricultural and developed) in Poole Harbour.
- Improve foreshore management to better control public access.
- Improve, where appropriate, public access to the shoreline within the Harbour
- Importance of a good beach at Rockley Sands for tourism and the nearby caravan park
- Importance of Poole Harbour as a nursery ground for shellfish

PROCESS UNIT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY TESTS

Area 5F-4 Poole Harbour

Critical Process Unit Objectives

1. Coastal defence options should not significantly alter estuarine processes unless paramount to the protection of life, critical assets or navigation in Poole Harbour
2. Strategic coastal defence options should be able to adapt to the onset of sea level rise without compromising the protection of life and property in Poole Harbour
3. Strategic coastal defence options should appreciate the implications of its implementation on adjacent stretches of coast and acknowledge the Harbour as an inter-linked hydrodynamical unit
4. Implications of changes to dredging regime should be appropriately studied

Strategy Test Statements

- Coastal defence options should minimise the loss, or reduction in the area, of international or nationally important terrestrial or marine habitats in Poole Harbour where possible
- Coastal defence options should minimise interference with the overall coastal processes or saline interaction /prevention requirements integral to the formation / existence of valuable habitats
- Coastal defence options should not detract from the landscape quality of the immediate coastline.
- Coastal defence options should not adversely affect areas of known archaeological / historical value
- Coastal defence options should not increase the risks of erosion or flooding to other developed areas nor to non-developed areas in Poole Harbour where natural land loss or inundation is not preferred for strategic, environmental or economic reasons.
- Coastal defence options should seek not to adversely affect the amenity, touristic and / or commercial value of Poole Harbour over the long term (and parts thereof) by indirectly impacting on the economies of those stakeholders using the coast (eg: navigation, fishing, recreation)
- Coastal defence options should seek to improve access in Poole Harbour where appropriate

PROCESS UNIT ISSUES

Area 5F-5 South Haven Point to Durlston Head

Physical Processes

- Cliff instability caused by groundwater flow and draining of surface water into the ground to the north of Swanage Bay
- Importance of natural littoral drift and retention of the beach in Swanage Bay for coastal defence and the economy of Swanage.
- Impact on beach levels caused by the construction of the outfall jetty at the southern half of Swanage Bay in 1993
- Accretion and erosion at Studland and the implications of preventing littoral drift to the dunes further north

Conservation

- English Nature intentions to extend the SSSI designation in Swanage Bay to include sections of the Wealden Clays exposed in the cliff line.
- Problems of incorporating cliff drainage schemes in important geological SSSI sites
- How coastal defences may interrelate with obligatory requirements set out in EC Directives (Annex 1 – Habitats and Annexe 2 – Species) at the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs candidate SAC, the Dorset Heaths and Studland Dunes possible SAC and the Dorset Heaths pSPA
- Seek opportunities for habitat enhancement including restoration and re-creation of soft habitats adjacent to the dunes or along the cliff tops.
- Need to consider archaeological importance of the barrows located at the east of Ballard Down
- Need to highlight nationally and internationally important protected species (eg: Sand Lizard) and the problems of coastal defence on cliff and sand dune development.
- Recent establishment of lobster breeding grounds (artificial reef structure at Studland)
- Need for continued littoral drift to protect and stabilise the eel grass beds in Studland Bay

Development on the Coast

- Pressure to raise the sea defence adjacent to the Swanage Sailing Club
- Concern over the condition of sewage pipe at Peveril Point
- Problems of surface water drainage in the Swanage area and the implications this has on development, coastal defence and conservation
- NFU's objective to maintain the existing coastline and to protect dwellings on the shoreline.
- Concern over erosion at Studland Beach and the possible options of car park relocation
- Accessibility of beach at Studland Beach is now a problem especially at high tide.
- Development of the flood alleviation outfall stone pier on Swanage beach has impacted on beach levels to the north and south of it.
- Concern over the safety of the flats on Durlston Cliffs

Use of the Coast

- Need to improve/repair the coastal path adjacent to the Wessex Water scheme on Peveril Downs.
- Dredging of Poole swash channel affecting the local sediment dynamics including Studland Bay
- Need to review visitor management at Studland Beach.
- Provision of safe access to the intertidal zone in order to accommodate leisure pursuits

PROCESS UNIT OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGY TESTS

Area 5F-5 South Haven Point to Durlston Head

Critical Process Unit Objectives

1. Where a coastal defence strategy may reduce the supply or transport of littoral sediments to the shoreline, this should not have detrimental impacts on immediate and adjacent beach levels within Studland Bay, Swanage Bay or Durlston Bay.

2. Where appropriate and economically viable, strategic coastal defence options should ensure the protection of life and property along developed frontages using sustainable and environmentally acceptable methods

3. Strategic coastal defence options should be based on a sound geomorphological understanding of Studland Bay, Swanage Bay or Durlston Bay and be compatible with the strategies set for the wider Poole Bay area.

Strategy Test Statements

- Coastal defence options should minimise the loss, or reduce the area, of international or nationally important terrestrial or marine habitats, nor jeopardise important earth heritage sites.

- Coastal defence options should seek not to interfere with processes integral to the existence of valuable habitats or geological sites, such that it has adverse impacts on their sustainability.

- Coastal defence options should not detract from the aesthetic and landscape quality of the immediate or adjacent coastline.

- Coastal defence options should not adversely affect areas of known archaeological or historical value where possible.

- Coastal defence options should not increase the risks of erosion or flooding to other developed areas nor to non-developed areas (eg:Studland Dunes) where natural land loss or inundation may not be preferred for strategic or economic reasons.

- Coastal defence provision should not adversely affect the amenity, touristic and / or commercial value of the Swanage and Studland Area by indirectly impacting on the economies of those stakeholders using the coast (eg: fishing, tourism or recreation).

- Coastal defence options should not compromise or damage the lobster breeding ground that has developed off Studland or inshore fisheries off Hook Sand.