

Quality Review Panel (QRP)				
Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	If the option proposed is as current position and simply maintains the status quo, how can the plan be promoting a positive impact? Examples in PD22 are heritage features 3 and 46 and also transport links towards the end of PD22. (An impact is the likely effect the plan will have on the receiving environment).	Please check in Appendix 1 where a significant number of minor positive impacts are being recorded although there is no change in management.	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	The majority of minor positive impacts relate to change in management. However, those few which have been recorded (e.g. in PD22) in which no change in management will occur has been classified as minor positive to highlight the policy decision making process in choosing a policy which will continue to maintain the status quo for that particular section of coastline. For example, maintaining a HTL policy will have a positive impact by protecting infrastructure, assets and social-economic assets behind defended areas, as the alternative of NAI would result in their loss due to flooding and erosion. Impacts associated with SMP are assessed against the future (do nothing) scenario. However, Table 4.1 of the SoEP has been updated to reflect any confusion for some policy units in line with the response/comment by the QRP.
Main ER	The appendix refers to two distinct reports: the 'SEA scoping' report and 'Environmental' Report, the former undergoing a four week consultation period. Comments on the SEA Scoping Report have been included, but not the report itself. Does the Theme Review form part of the SEA Scoping report?	Please include the SEA Scoping report / clarify how the Theme Review relates to the Sea Scoping Report.	Andy Parsons, Halcrow Ltd	The main section of the SEA Scoping Report (the Baseline) has been included in the ER. We feel by adding the whole document it not add any value and will make the whole ER a very lengthy document. The Theme Review highlights the key features associated with the natural and built environment that may be potentially effected by SMP policy options and the Scoping Report expands on these features in more detail in line with the requirements of the SEA.
Section 4.2.3.4 of ER	Brownsea island: policy option for the three epochs is do nothing (with local maintenance) – this will impact on the designated features of Poole Harbour Special Protection Area (SPA). Although alternative habitat is mentioned, no options are given in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or SMP.	Options for habitat recreation are required.	Mike Quigley, Natural England	More details regarding habitat compensation related to International Designated Sites such as SPAs are addressed in the HRA and SMP Action Plan which states that further investigations to identify potential sites to recreate compensatory habitat is to be implemented.
Table 4.3 PDZ 3 Flag Head Chine/Cliff to Handfast Point (Assessment Summary)	Sand Banks Village to South Haven Point, Luscombe Valley to Lower Hamworthy, Holton Railway Line SEA Objective G - are three x's an acceptable outcome?	Three x's is the worst case scenario, some justification of this should be provided.	Mike Quigley, Natural England	Major Negative Impacts involve those associated with International Designated Sites and as such the HRA has concluded an adverse effect of HTL on the Poole Harbour SPA. Thus, the table reflects both the HRA and SEA assessments.
Page 10 of ER	Top paragraph: refers to the SMP2 having followed the "spirit of SEA". SEA process was either followed or not - this statement gives more cause for concern than reassurance and raises doubts about whether the process is understood.	Please reconsider the use of this statement.	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	It can be ensured that the ER followed the SEA processes as highlighted throughout Sections 1 and 2 of the ER. The wording "spirit of SEA" is a softer expression of saying we have undertaken the SEA in accordance with the SEA Directive and appropriate guidelines (e.g. the SEA Practical Guidance, ODPM, 2006).
Page 11 of ER	Last sentence in the last but one para. SEA is not expected to contain scheme detail as it is at strategic level and is not an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). What is the writer trying to say? Similar statement in blue paragraph at the end.	Please consider intended meaning of current text and clarify.	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	The SEA is a high strategic assessment. As such the level of detail for site specific locations regarding the attended options for example, MR of the shoreline at a particular location which may involve the reconstruction and positioning of flood defence walling, will not be assessed individually in detail under the SEA in terms of construction options, impacts on the local surrounding environment.
Page 14 of ER	Fourth para (SEA Objectives).	Please delete the word ' <u>Natural</u> ' from the heading, Natural Environment Objectives. Also please clarify where the objectives for the rest of the environment are?	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	The SEA objectives on page 14 are overarching, with detailed objectives for various aspects of the environment addressed in Table 2.2. The wording of Natural Environment Objectives was to distinguish if from the 'built environment'.

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Main ER	<p>The overall SEA is concise, clearly structured and well illustrated, employing a systematic assessment methodology. However, it stops short of delivering the full analysis required in an Environmental Report (ER). There are three omissions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) explanation of the the role (and future stages) of SEA, 2) explanation of how the assessment of likely impacts has affected the decision making and 3) clear recommendation of the measures required to mitigate impacts, (see 1, 2, and 3 below) <p>1. (a.) The SEA Report once published cannot be amended or added to: any change or revision must be in the form of an Addendum. Reference noted alludes to process which is not compliant.</p> <p>(b.) Clearer explanation of ongoing process would be helpful to the reader (please see NEAS summary in Operational Instruction 80-09.)</p> <p>(c.) The Report is described as 'draft' in the title pages - it can only be <u>the ER</u> once published. (SEA process doesn't follow the draft and final stages of the SMP2 process).</p>	<p>Review the wording in Lines 4/5 and any other reference points throughout the document. Explain process accurately in Addendum.</p>	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	The stages of the SEA have been provided in Section 1 of the SoEP.

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Main ER	<p>2. Tables 4.1 to 4.4 show there are likely to be quite a few moderately significant negative impacts on the natural environment and landscape. The brief analysis of impacts which follows fails to show how these have influenced decision making, what the possible trade-offs were and if not avoidable, how the negative impacts are to be mitigated. For example, in PDZ2, it's not possible to understand how the potential for impacts (either positive or negative) follows through into the choice of options and where unavoidable, how these impacts will be mitigated. Quantification of the significance of the impacts is also lost when translated into the summary, i.e. why did one impact influence options choice whilst others were thought less important?</p> <p>3. Where are the recommendations of monitoring (page 9) and/or mitigation measures which "will be clearly stated in this Report" according to text on page 12? The SMP2 is required to have ownership of these measures. Please refer to sections on mitigation measures in ODPM guidance (listed as a reference document on page 2).</p>	<p>2. Please address the reporting of impacts in Chapter 4 systematically and in more depth. Please explain how decisions were made and how likely impacts have affected the options choice. Explain the likelihood and significance of impacts in relation to the choices made and the mitigation.</p>	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	<p>PDZ 1 Hurst Spit and Milford CBY.A.1 to CBY.A.4 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is HTL and MR. It is considered that without maintaining the integrity of Hurst Spit through HTL, the consequences to the intertidal area behind the spit would be of greater scale and significance under a policy of NAI, while MR would result in immediate loss and displacement of supporting intertidal habitats to the north of the spit, as well as accelerate and exacerbate the in-combination effect of coastal squeeze on the intertidal habitats.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment is limited by the availability of detailed data on the amount and extent of habitat likely to be affected by sea level rise (though this work has been undertaken and provided within the North Solent SMP2). Detailed model result data to provide a robust indication of the scale of the potential extensive changes that could take place as a result of, for example, the NAI policy is also limited.</p>
			<p>PDZ 2 Mudford Spit to Southbourne: CBY.E.1 to PBY.E.5 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is HTL and MR. The key designated habitats within this management area are heathland (primary and supporting habitat) and grassland habitats (supporting habitat) on Hengistbury Head. Without any intervention, the whole of Hengistbury Head would be completely eroded by the end of the 3rd epoch, resulting in the complete loss of the designated site area in this zone. Consequently, though some 3ha of grassland and heathland habitat would be lost as a result of MR, the majority of the functional site unit would be protected by the HTL policy and resulting and managed coastline (further information can be found in the corresponding Habitat Regulation Assessment Report.</p>	
			<p>PDZ 3 Open Coast: PBY/STU. H.1 to PBY/STU.H.7 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is HTL, ATL and NAI. From a strategic examination of the policy options a complete NAI policy would have significant effects on nationally important economic and social infrastructure associated with this management area including Sandbanks. The combined approach of the preferred HTL/NAI policy provides a balance whereby natural processes are allowed to prevail along key sites (e.g. Jurassic Coast), whilst maintaining the economic infrastructure and assets essential for the region.</p> <p>A summary of the total areas of habitat potentially impacted upon associated with the Poole Harbour SPA is provided in the above table of this Annex based on the Habitat Regulation Assessment Report.</p>	
			<p>PDZ 3 Main Harbour North: PHB. I.1 to PHB. I.5 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is HTL. From a strategic examination of the policy options NAI or MR policy would have significant effects on nationally important economic and social infrastructure associated with this management area including essential key business districts of lower Hamworthy.</p> <p>A summary of total habitat potentially impacted upon associated with the Poole Harbour SPA is provided in the above table of this Annex based on the Habitat Regulation Assessment Report.</p>	
			<p>PDZ 3 Main Harbour South: PHB. K.1 to PHB. K.2 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is NAI. Quantification of the significance of the impacts associated with the Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heaths SAC is provided in the above table of this Annex based on the Habitat Regulation Assessment Report.</p>	

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
				<p>PDZ 3 Upper Estuary: PHB.J.1 to PHB.J.5 – The long term policy plan for this section of coastline is NAI and MR. From a strategic examination of the policy options it is apparent that a complete NAI policy would have significant effects on nationally important economic and social infrastructure. The combined approach of the preferred HTL/MR/NAI policy provides a balance whereby the Site is allowed or even helped (with MR) to migrate its intertidal habitats in line with sea level rise, whilst maintaining the economic infrastructure and assets essential for the region.</p> <p>A summary of total habitat potentially impacted upon associated with the Poole Harbour SPA, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heaths SAC is provided in the above table of this Annex based on the Habitat Regulation Assessment Report.</p> <p>It should be noted, that only minor negative impacts were associated with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive.</p>
Table 1.2 of ER (ATL Option)	Are not negative impacts in lines 1 and 3 the same?	Please clarify difference, if there is a difference - otherwise delete one.	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	Noted that they can express similar negative impacts, although a reduction in extent of coastal habitat, will lead to increased coastal squeeze.
Page 13 and 28 (Table 4.1) of ER	Significance criteria explained on page 13 are not applied until Table 4.1 on page 28. As it stands, there is no key to the table.	Either a key is needed to Table 4.1 or the criteria should be moved closer to 4.1.	Liz Galloway, Environment Agency	Noted.

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Public Consultation				
General	The key issue raised is that the ER does not supply quantified habitat loss in particular for Poole Harbour (PDZ 3).		Natural England	Based on the detailed assessment/results of the HRA the following potential losses in key habitat features will occur for the Natura 2000 sites of Poole Harbour: Lowland heathland and grassland - 3 ha; Intertidal (including mudflats and saltmarsh zone) - 325 ha; Grazing marsh - 353 ha; Dry heathland and Atlantic wet heath - 36 ha.
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	The preferred option of HTL at South Haven Point will not extend to the long term protection of Shell Bay car park nor the Ferry Office. The likelihood is that both facilities will be under threat from the sea in the third epoch because of the preferred option of NAI for Shell Bay (PBY/STU H.5). The National Trust's policy is to allow the road and slipway to be protected to ensure continuity of the important transport link but does not extend to protecting the car park. We would expect the Ferry Office (not in Trust ownership) to be relocated if and when necessary as will be required with National Trust infrastructure.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted.
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	SMP2 Management Unit PBY/STU H.6: The key issues identified in the ER which indicates that the village of Studland is at risk by the end of the third epoch is at odds with a study that the National Trust commissioned in 2005. The study was carried out by Halcrow and the subsequent report 'Managing Managed Re-alignment' did not indicate that the village was under threat. The report looked at the extent of erosion along the coast taking the geology and geomorphology into account. The report indicated that the National Trust's visitor facilities were seriously threatened and that there would be some cliff erosion at South Beach and Middle Beach (PBY/STU H.6 & H.7). A few National Trust owned properties as well as grazing land might also be lost. To extend the threat to the village of Studland will cause unnecessary concern to the residents and businesses and will inevitably lead to demands for protective measures through all three epochs.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	The response contradicts to what is in the ER Section 4.2.3.1. The overall plan will ensure no additional properties associated with the settlements of Sandbanks and Studland lie within the tidal flood zone in comparison to the current number. Flood and erosion risk to settlements will not increase as standard of defence will be maintained at or above current standard. In addition, local assets will either be protected or lost through the NAI policy around Studland (e.g. the South West Coast path). Examples of protected local assets for this management area include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Royal Motor Yacht Club, boat moorings, landing stages (Poole Harbour); - Recreational areas; - Coastal Roads such as Shore Road/Bank Road (Poole Harbour); - Water front access (Poole Harbour); and - Ferry service facilities (Shell Bay).
Section 2.4 of ER	With reference to the objective of preventing or minimising coastal erosion on recreational assets - this is only possible where the preferred management option is HTL. At Studland there will inevitably be changes, loss of current visitor facilities and changes to and possible loss of beaches.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	This is acknowledged, although those assets which may be under risk in response to NAI will be monitored for any deterioration so appropriate mitigation/adaptation if possible can be implemented.
Section 2.4 of ER	With reference to the targets of 'no deterioration of heritage assets, listed buildings and SM's' - this is not possible where the preferred option is NAI.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	This is acknowledged, although those heritage sites within close proximity to eroded cliffs will be monitored for any deterioration so appropriate mitigation if possible can be implemented.
Page 19 of ER	The defences only defend visitor infrastructure. Reference to sports facilities must be removed.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted.
Page 47 of ER	Studland Dunes to Training Bank: SEA Objective A - The NAI option will lead to a minor negative impact. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 47 of ER	SEA Objective B is also likely to lead to a small negative impact where the preferred option is NAI. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 47 of ER	SEA Objective D is also likely to lead to a small negative impact where the preferred option is NAI. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Page 48 of ER	Redend Point to Handfast Point. SEA Objective A, the policy of NAI will cause a minor negative impact. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 48 of ER	Objective B will also lead to a minor negative impact. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 48 of ER	Objective C will also lead to a minor negative impact. Please replace the '?' with an 'x'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 48 of ER	Objective G should lead to a minor positive impact. Please replace the '?' with a '√'.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted and updated in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Page 71 of ER	PDZ4 should include Fort Henry at Redend Point.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	The long term policy for the stretch of shoreline associated with Fort Henry, Redend Point is NAI and thus erosion may cause damage or loss of the Fort. This has been highlighted in this SoEP (Section 7).
Page 71 of ER	PDZ4 should include two round barrows on Ballard Down.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	The long term policy for the stretch of shoreline associated with Ballard Downs is NAI and thus erosion may cause damage or loss of the barrows. This has been highlighted in this SoEP (Section 7).
Annex I, Page 23 PBY/STU H.5a	Annex I, Page 23, PBY/STU H.5a (should be PBY/STU H.4): Ferry Office/car park.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted.
Annex I, Page 23 PBY/STU H.5a	Policy Impact Assessment under 'local assets' must be revised to indicate that visitor facilities and coastguard lookout points are likely to be lost altogether by the end of the first epoch. Indeed, it is likely that they will have to be relocated within the first epoch.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted.
Annex I, Page 23 PBY/STU H.5a	Dorset Heaths (Wareham & Studland) and Studland Dunes SAC: Likely that there will be a net loss of the nationally rare dune heath habitat with the NAI option by the end of the third epoch. Minor negative impact should be recorded.		Douglas Whyte, National Trust	Noted.
Table 4.1	Confused by 2 cell option columns being highlighted simultaneously in summary assessment table.		Toney Flux, National Trust	Noted and made clear in this SoEP (see Table 4.1).
Section 4.2.3.1	Should it not read: HTL, MR and NAI rather than ATL in Section 4.2.3.1. No ATL options have been selected.		Toney Flux, National Trust	HTL/A is a policy option for some policy units in PDZ 2 (PBY.G.1 - G.4) and PDZ3 (PBY/STU. H.1).
Section 4.2.3.4	Suggest delete "and a replacement habitat for the lagoon created" (Section 4.2.3.4). Whilst this will still be the clear aspiration, we cannot be so definite as to say that it will certainly happen.		Toney Flux, National Trust	Noted.
Main ER- Acronyms	IROPI has been left out: Imperative reasons of over-riding public interest.		Toney Flux, National Trust	IROPI is examined in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appendix J).
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	Following public consultation and new information about the flood mapping for Lytchett Bay, which suggests flood risk to 20 properties in epoch one, 85 properties in epoch two and 283 properties in epoch three, the CSG would like to suggest a sub-section in this area; Policy Unit J.2.a with the proposed policy of MR, HTL, HTL.		CSG	The intertidal habitats of Lytchett Bay will be affected by coastal squeeze and this is likely to be exacerbated by continued sea level rise under the policy of HTL for PHB J.2a. However, these losses could be offset by gains from the unconstrained migration of saltmarsh habitats or MR creating saltmarsh habitats. The policy of HTL associated with J.2.a will further protect the railway structure, there minor positive impact.

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	Following public consultation, concerns from Natural England and new information about the flood and erosion mapping for Holes Bay, the CSG would like to suggest a sub-section in this area; Policy Unit I.3.a with the proposed policy of NAI, NAI, NAI.		Natural England	The policy of NAI associated with Holes Bay (PHB I.3.a) will allow for the natural adaptation of habitats to a changing coastline (minor positive impact), although potential for some loss of foot print extents under NAI associated with Upton County Park (minor negative).
Annex 1 Detailed Assessment	The SMP or the accompanying SEA does not adequately cover the historic environment for Hampshire (PDZ 1).		English Heritage	<p>These concerns have subsequently been addressed by the assessment of additional HER data for Hampshire (Annex II and III).</p> <p>It was concluded from this assessment that the policy of HTL along CBY. A.1 will have a minor positive impact by protecting the sites from flooding and erosion: Hurst Castle, Lighthouse, Cottage; and various archaeological sites (e.g. Battery, Maritime). However, the following heritage sites associated with the Hampshire have the potential to be impacted upon by the policies which allow for continued erosion such as NAI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 Listed buildings (Grade II) at Milford-on-Sea (including White House Hospital); - Various archaeological sites (e.g. Air Raid Shelter, Water Meadows); - Wreck of schooner Lanoma (1951); - Various archaeological sites (e.g. field systems, military camps); - Grade II Listed Building (e.g. Naish Farm); and - Various archaeological sites.

Document Reference	Response	Action Required	Response provided by:	Action/Comment
See Response column	The SMP2 plan for managed realignment (MR) for Solent Beach is only satisfactory if the scheme for improving the Long Groyne widens the beach significantly at Double Dykes. That would be sustainability, however if MR does not create a wide beach as far west as the Dykes, then a consequential narrowing of the isthmus would not be consistent with the SEA objectives.		Hengistbury Residents Association	Based on Section 4 Policy Development Zone 2 of the SMP document for Poole and Christchurch Bays, the overall long term policy for Mudeford Spit to Southbourne is to sustain the overall influence of this section of the coast, ensuring that over the period of the SMP2 the Solent Beach isthmus and Mudeford Spit are safeguarded. Specifically, the aim is to maintain the position of the Long Groyne, with the potential for this structure to be extended and reshaped to allow better management of adjacent sections of the coast. Maintaining the Long Groyne and managing the width of Solent Beach is an inherent part of the strategy to retain Hengistbury Head and this would also potentially include increasing the beach width in front of Double Dyke and thus further delaying a sea breach at this site.
	Page 57, Para 3, Line 6 - Reed beds and islands created in Poole Park Lake.		Borough of Poole - ST	Tables edited.
	Annexe 1 - Print in tables very small.			Noted.
	Annexe 1, PBY1 - Sandbanks (SNC1): sand dunes built in front of this with CPA funds.			Noted.
	Annexe 2, Page 6 - Literal drift line incorrect for Poole.			Noted.
	Page 19, Para 4, Line 4 - It is not clear that this line refers only to Brownsea Island and not the whole of Poole Harbour.			For clarity: A small amount of rock armour along with steel piled defences front the buildings on the eastern end of Brownsea Island. A defence structure was built along the south shore of Brownsea Island some 30 to 40 years ago, however, indications are that these have failed and are to be removed (T. Flux, pers. comms., 2009).
	Page 25, Para 1 - Also Bournemouth STW.			Noted.
	Page 25, Para 3, Line 1 - Has Christchurch Harbour been dredged? When?			A major dredging exercise associated with Christchurch Harbour occurred in the 1937 to the straighten out the water flow from Clay Pool to the harbour. Several minor dredging exercises have been carried out since to improve the depth of water and for flood alleviation.
	Page 25, Para 4, Line 8 - Will the reef improve sailing?			Noted. Its more than likley the reef will not improve sailing, although will provide a diverse range in water conditions for other wind sport activities such as kite-surfing and windsurfing.
Page 33, Para 3, Line 12 - Are all of these breeds of fish found in Poole Harbour as well as Christchurch?		Most likely yes, as they were referenced from the Christchurch Harbour and Waterways Management Plan (2008) and Poole Harbour Aquatic Management Plan (2006).		