

Appendix G Policy appraisal

Final version 2.4
15 October 2010

Appendix G – contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| G1 Introduction | 1 |
| G1.1 Approach | 1 |
| G1.2 Considerations of sites not requiring full appraisal | 2 |
| G1.2.1 Appraisal of hold the line in sites with no pressure | 2 |
| G2 Management Unit A: Stour and Orwell | 8 |
| G2.1 Policy appraisal results | 9 |
| G3 Management Unit B: Hamford Water | 47 |
| G3.1 Policy appraisal results | 48 |
| G4 Management Unit C: Tendring peninsula | 64 |
| G4.1 Policy appraisal results | 65 |
| G5 Management Unit D: Colne estuary | 70 |
| G5.1 Policy appraisal results | 71 |
| G6 Management Unit E: Mersea Island | 95 |
| G6.1 Policy appraisal results | 96 |
| G7 Management Unit F: Blackwater estuary | 105 |
| G7.1 Policy appraisal results | 106 |
| G8 Management Unit G: Dengie peninsula | 124 |
| G8.1 Policy appraisal results | 125 |
| G9 Management Unit H: Crouch and Roach | 126 |
| G9.1 Policy appraisal results | 127 |
| G10 Management Unit I: Foulness, Potton and Rushley islands | 150 |
| G10.1 Policy appraisal results | 151 |
| G11 Management Unit J: Southend-on-Sea | 156 |
| G11.1 Policy appraisal results | 157 |











G1 Introduction

G1.1 Approach

This appendix contains the results of the policy appraisal for the SMP policies. The underlying appraisal method is explained in appendix E and is supported by the technical analysis presented in the other appendices. More information on the reasoning behind the plan and the policy selection is provided in the main SMP document, sections 3 and 4.

This appendix outlines how the policies score against the principles and criteria for each management unit. Within each management unit an appraisal matrix is presented, indicating the overall results of the appraisal. In addition to this, the reasoning for the scores is explained in the subsequent detailed policy appraisal tables. The detailed appraisal tables are only presented for those policy development zones (PDZs) that needed appraising as illustrated by the outcome of the theme review (appendix D) and refinement of coastal policy context (appendix E).

The symbols below represent the principles appraised and shown on the appraisal matrix tables.

| | |
|---|--|
|  | Balance flood and erosion management with assets and benefits protected |
|  | Utilise potential opportunities and account for impacts upon wider coastal processes |
|  | Allow time for adaptation of communities, individuals and organisations. |
|  | Support communities and sustainable development by managing risk. |
|  | Social and economic value of Essex and South Suffolk to wider society |
|  | Conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity |
|  | Historic environment and its value for heritage, culture and the local economy |
|  | Maintaining access to the coast |
|  | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk |
|  | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape |

Section G1.2 presents considerations behind the scoring of sites where full appraisal was not required.

G1.2 Considerations of sites not requiring full appraisal

G1.2.1 Appraisal of hold the line in sites with no pressure

The coastal policy context and the refinement and coastal policy context (sections E3.1 and E3.2 of appendix E) outline the process through which the PDZs that needed full appraisal were selected. Table G 1 lists all PDZs for which the draft policy is continuing a hold the line policy. These are generally PDZs where the defences are not under pressure. Table G 2 presents a generic overview of how well the hold the line policy performs against each principle.

The overall scores for all PDZs (with generic and full appraisal) within the management units (MUs) are presented in sections G2 to G11 in the policy appraisal results tables. The two overarching principles 'Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk' and 'Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape' were appraised at MU level due to their large-scale nature (see the appraisal tables in the following sections).

Table G 1 Hold the line PDZs for which full individual appraisal was not required

| Management Unit (MU) | Policy Development Zone (PDZ) |
|------------------------------|---|
| A. Stour & Orwell | A1 (Felixstowe port) A3b (Levington Creek) A5 (Ipswich) A9a,d,f (Northern Stour – flood defence) A10a,c,e (Southern Stour – flood defence) A11a (Harwich harbour) A11b (Harwich town) |
| B. Hamford Water | B1 (South Dovercourt) B3 (Oakley Creek to Kirby-le-Soken) B4b (Coles Creek to the Martello tower) |
| C. Tendring | C1 (Walton-on-the-Naze and Frinton-on-Sea) C3 (Clacton-on-Sea) |
| D. Colne Estuary | D1a (Stone Point) D4 (Brightlingsea) D6a (South of Wivenhoe) D7 (Colne barrier) D8b (Fingringhoe and Langenhoe) D8c (Langenhoehall Marsh) |

| Management Unit (MU) | Policy Development Zone (PDZ) |
|------------------------------|---|
| E. Mersea Island | E1 (Landward Frontage) E3 (West Mersea) E4b (Pyefleet inner channel) |
| F. Blackwater | F1 (Strood to Salcott-cum-Virley) F2 (Salcott Creek) F4 (Tollesbury) F6 (Goldhanger to Heybridge) F7 (Heybridge Basin) F8 (Maldon inner estuary) F9a (South Maldon) F9b (Northey Island) F10 (Maylandsea) F11a (Mayland Creek west) F11c (Mayland Creek east) F13 (St. Lawrence) F15 (Bradwell Creek) |
| G. Dengie | G1 (Bradwell-on-Sea) G2 (Bradwell Marshes) G3 (Dengie Marshes) |
| H. Crouch & Roach | H1 (Burnham-on-Crouch) H3 (North Fambridge and South Woodham Ferrers) H4 (South Woodham Ferrers, Battlesbridge and Hullbridge) H5 (Eastwards of Brandy Hole) H6 (Landward of Brandy Hole Reach) H7 (South Fambridge) H8a (South bank of Longpole, Shortpole and Raypitts Reaches (Canewdon west)) H12 (Stambridge) H13 (Rochford) H14 (Barling Marsh) H15 (Little Wakering) H16 (Great Wakering) |
| I. Foulness | I1a (Foulness) I1b (Potton) |
| J. Southend | J1 (Southend-on-Sea) |

Table G 2 Generic appraisal of hold the line policy on sites with no pressure

| Principle / criterion | |
|---|---|
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | Overarching principle scored at management unit level (see the appraisal tables in the following sections). |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and property | Sustaining the defended land will allow flood and erosion protection to people and properties in communities to continue. Maintaining the defences would also allow future development. This principle will have a positive score over the three epochs. |
| Impact on future opportunities | |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | <p>This principle has been appraised through the application of general assumptions.</p> <p>Positive scores (9, 8 and 7) are attributed for frontages with a large extent of foreshore in front of the defence.</p> <p>Neutral scores (6, 5 and 4) are attributed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Frontages where there is no foreshore but there is no pressure on defences. - Frontages within constrained estuaries (rapid raising ground and no room for adaptation). NAI or MR would not improve sustainability of defences or processes. - Accreting foreshores, where HtL is unlikely to have significant impacts or has uncertain impacts on the continuation of accretion. <p>Negative scores (3, 2 and 1) are</p> |

| Principle / criterion | |
|--|--|
| | attributed to: - Eroding frontages - Frontages currently under pressure and HtL is unlikely to improve sustainability of defences. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Positive scores (9, 8 and 7) are attributed when there are no expected significant impacts on adjacent frontages. Neutral scores (6, 5 and 4) are attributed when there are some impacts on adjacent frontages. A negative score is attributed to Dengie G1, where holding the line prevents sediment availability for adjacent frontages. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Positive scores are attributed when the HtL sustains or allows the continuation of cross-shore activities such as navigation. Neutral scores (6, 5 and 4) are attributed when there are some impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Where the aim is to sustain the use of defended land there would be no need for adaptation so a positive score will be attributed to all three epochs. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | |
| Impact on infrastructure | This principle will have a positive score for all three epochs because all infrastructure, services and communities will remain protected ensuring all current day socio-economic activities continue. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | |
| Impact on public services | |
| Impact on communities | |
| Impact on deprived communities | |

| Principle / criterion | |
|---|--|
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | This principle will have a positive score for all three epochs because socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance landward of defences will remain protected. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | <p>This principle has been appraised through the application of general assumptions:</p> <p>Neutral scores (5) were attributed to any HtL PDZ under the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intertidal habitats seawards of the defences. - Intertidal habitats seawards of the defences and freshwater habitats landwards of the defences. <p>Positive scores would be attributed if there were freshwater habitats landwards of the defences and no intertidal habitats seawards of the defence.</p> <p>An overall underlying assumption is that negative impacts can only be reported on particular sites where we know that there would be adverse impact to habitats or birds under HtL taking full account of longshore impacts from and on the PDZ. This has been analysed as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>Scoring for frontages adjacent to sites designated under the Habitats or Birds Directives should be regarded as an initial indicative appraisal. This scoring is based on a 'decision rules' approach to habitat composition and policy selection. It is not supported by any detailed assessment of the effects of policy on the integrity of</p> |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites, undesignated sites, mosaic habitats and the wider coastal countryside | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | |











| Principle / criterion | |
|---|--|
| | <p>such sites. This appraisal will follow under the auspices of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>No scores (grey) were attributed to frontages with no designated habitats (freshwater or intertidal) landward and seaward of the defences.</p> |
| <p>To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape</p> | |
| <p>Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historical environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape</p> | <p>Overarching principle scored at management unit level (see the appraisal tables in the following sections).</p> |
| <p>To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area</p> | |
| <p>Impact on historic environment and its wider value</p> | <p>This principle will have a positive score for all three epochs because all historic assets landward of the defences will remain protected.</p> |
| <p>To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access</p> | |
| <p>Impact on access to and along the coast</p> | <p>This principle will have a positive score for all three epochs because roads, paths, tracks and access points to and from the sea will remain protected.</p> |

G2 Management Unit A: Stour and Orwell

The overall intent of management for the Stour and Orwell is to support and enhance the natural development of the estuaries while continuing to defend all existing dwellings and infrastructure and facilitating adaptation or limited local intervention where needed. For most of the shoreline, the current management approach will be continued: holding the current alignment where there are defences and continuing a no active intervention approach for higher ground frontages. For some of the frontages however, a change of approach is required.











The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G2.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast | | |
| A. Stour and Orwell | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1 (Felixstowe) | AtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | |
| A2 (Trimley Marsh) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 7 | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 8 | |
| A3a (Loom Pit Lake) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | | | | | | 6 | 7 | | | | | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 8 | |
| A3b (Levington Creek) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A4a (Northern Orwell east) | MR1 | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 7 | | 4 | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | |
| A4b (Northern Orwell west) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | 9 | 9 | | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| A5 (Ipswich) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | |
| A6 (The Strand) | MR1 | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 7 | | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 8 | |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| A7a (Southern Orwell west) | NAI | 8 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | 9 | 9 | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | | |
| A7b (Southern Orwell east) | MR1 | | 7 | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 7 | | | | | 7 | 7 | | | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 9 |
| A8a (Shotley Marshes west) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| A8b (Shotley Marshes east) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| A8c (Shotley Gate) | MR1 | | 4 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | | 9 | 9 | | | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| A9a (Northern Stour – flood defence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A9b (Northern Stour – not erosional) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | |
| A9c (Northern Stour - erosional) | MR1 | | | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 7 | | | | | 7 | 7 | 9 | | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 9 |
| A9d (Northern Stour – flood) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| defence) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A9e (Northern Stour – erosional) | MR1 | 8 | | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 7 | | | | 7 | 7 | 9 | 8 | | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 9 |
| A9f (Northern Stour – flood defence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A10a (Southern Stour – flood defence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A10b (Southern Stour – not erosional) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | |
| A10c (Southern Stour – flood defence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A10d (Southern Stour – erosional) | MR1 | | | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 7 | | | | 7 | 7 | | | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 9 |
| A10e (Southern Stour – flood defence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| A10f (Southern Stour – erosional) | MR1 | | | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 7 | | | | | 7 | 7 | | | 9 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 9 |
| A10g (Southern Stour – not erosional) | NAI | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | |
| A11a (Harwich harbour) | ATL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| A11b (Harwich town) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Impacts on other defended frontages of the Orwell estuary. | 7 | Realignment will release pressure on the defences in A8. Widening the outer estuary is likely to be beneficial for the entire Orwell estuary. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | | No significant impact. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Seven hectares of grade 2 and 174 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land Trimley Marshes nature reserve and visitor centre. No known fisheries. | 1 | Seven hectares of grade 2 and 174 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land, and the nature reserve are at risk as the frontage is realigned. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 65 hectares of the Stour and Orwell estuaries are Ramsar and SPA and the Orwell Estuary SSSI is within the realignment area. | 6 | Creation of 196 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, the present day 65 hectares of freshwater habitats would be lost. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets, within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Mudflats and sub-tidal habitats (UK BAP areas). | 7 | Expected creation of 196 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP habitats) landward of the defences, including areas not currently designated. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological., geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 3 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 8 | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path lost as frontage is realigned but access to the shoreline is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Impacts on other defended frontages of the Orwell estuary. | 7 | Realignment will release pressure on the defences in A8. Widening the outer estuary is likely to be beneficial for the entire Orwell estuary. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | | No significant impact. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | No agricultural land within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 15 hectares of the Stour and Orwell estuaries are Ramsar and SPA and the Orwell Estuary SSSI is within the realignment area. Stour and Orwell estuaries are Ramsar and SPA and the Orwell Estuary SSSI seaward of the defences. | 6 | Creation of 15 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, the present day 15 hectares of freshwater habitats would be lost. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wide coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Three hectares of lowland meadows within the realignment area. Mudflats and sub-tidal habitats (UK BAP areas). | 7 | Expected creation of 15 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP habitats) landward of the defences. Habitat change at the lowland meadows. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 4 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 8 | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path lost as frontage is realigned but access to the shoreline is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A4a - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 6 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards availability of sediment. | 6 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A4a - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Park, footpaths and agricultural land at risk of erosion. | 9 | Gradual increase of risk, so sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Edge of Orwell country park. Limited grade 3 and 4 agricultural land. | 7 | Limitation of loss of park area and agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A4a - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological., geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A4a - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 9 | Footpath sustained in current location. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A6 - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within flood / erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the flood / erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 9 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A6 - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards available sediment. | 9 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Increasing flooding frequency of B1456 road | 9 | Flooding already occurring, but increase is gradual, so sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | B1456 road in flood risk area. | 7 | Impact reduced by limited intervention or adaptation. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | No socio-economic activities within erosion / flood risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion / flood risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion / flood risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion / flood risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A6 - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 9 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 9 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological., geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A6 - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the flood / erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk footpath in flood risk area. | 8 | Impact reduced by limited intervention or adaptation. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A7b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | Limited number of properties in predicted flood zone for later epochs. | 7 | Reduced impact due to adaptation. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A7b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 6 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards available sediment. | 6 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Marina plus facilities and footpath at risk of erosion. Properties at risk of flooding in later epochs. | 9 | Gradual increase of risk, so sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Pin Mill marina. | 7 | Limitation of impact on marina. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A7b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A7b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 9 | Footpath sustained in current location. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Impacts on other defended frontages of the Orwell estuary. | 7 | Realignment will release pressure on the defences in A2. Widening the outer estuary is likely to be beneficial for the entire Orwell estuary. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | | No significant impact. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 10 hectares of grade 2, 55 hectares of grade 3 and nine hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Campsite. | 1 | Loss of 10 hectares of grade 2, 55 hectares of grade 3 and nine hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within the realignment area. | | |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 51 hectares of the Stour and Orwell estuaries is Ramsar and SPA and the Orwell Estuary SSSI is within the realignment area. | 6 | Creation of 75 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, around 51 hectares of freshwater habitats would be lost as a result. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 51 hectares of reedbeds and 36 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh. | 5 | Expected creation of 75 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP habitats) landward of the defences, including areas not currently designated. Currently designated BAP habitats will be converted from one type to another, so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 3 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 8 | Stour and Orwell Walk lost as frontage is realigned but access to the shoreline is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Impacts on other defended frontages of the Orwell estuary. | 7 | Realignment will release pressure on the defences in A2. Widening the outer estuary is likely to be beneficial for the entire Orwell estuary. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 5 | No significant impact. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Seven hectares of grade 2, 50 hectares of grade 3 and 46 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Campsite. | 1 | Loss of seven hectares of grade 2, 50 hectares of grade 3 and 46 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 66 hectares of the Stour and Orwell estuaries is Ramsar and SPA and the Orwell Estuary SSSI is within the realignment area. | 6 | Creation of around 103 hectares of new intertidal habitat. However, around 66 hectares of freshwater habitat would be affected. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 65 hectares of coastal grazing marsh and reedbeds. | 5 | Expected creation of around 103 hectares of intertidal habitats, but loss of 65 hectares of coastal grazing marsh and reedbeds, including areas not currently designated. Currently designated BAP habitats will be converted from one type to another, so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 8 | Stour and Orwell Walk lost as frontage is realigned but access to the shoreline is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8c - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8c - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are properties or gardens in the potential erosion risk area. Note the main cause of cliff erosion is possibly non-coastal. | 7 | Reduced impact due to adaptation. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 6 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards available sediment. | 6 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Cliff top properties and footpaths at risk of erosion. | 9 | Gradual increase of risk, therefore sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8c - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | Shotley Gate quayside and access to marina. | 7 | Limitation of impact by local intervention and facilitated adaptation. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Quayside facilities. | 7 | Limitation of impact by local intervention and facilitated adaptation. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | Shotley Gate. | 7 | Limitation of impact by local intervention and facilitated adaptation. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8c - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on the achievement of management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated listed buildings or historic sites within the erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A8c - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths including Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 9 | Footpath sustained in current location. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A9c,e - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 6 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A9c,e - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards available sediment. | 6 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Footpaths and agricultural land at risk of erosion. | 9 | Gradual increase of risk, so sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Limited but high value (grade 1) agricultural land. | 7 | Limitation of loss of agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A9c,e - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | The Stour Estuary SSSI at Stutton Cliff and Harkstead Cliff. | 9 | Geological exposures will remain largely undefended keeping them in favourable condition. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A9c,e - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths incl. Stour and Orwell Walk long distance path. | 9 | Footpath sustained in current location |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A10d,f - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A10d,f - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Cliff erosion. | 6 | Some limited impact on coastal processes. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Erosion likely to contribute towards available sediment. | 6 | Sediment availability from erosion likely to be slightly reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Dredging of the channel to the ports of Felixstowe and Harwich. | 9 | No changes to current activities. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Beach huts, agricultural land and footpaths at risk of erosion. | 9 | Gradual increase of risk, so sufficient time. Adaptation facilitated as part of the policy. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Beach huts plus their access and limited grade 2 and 3 agricultural land within erosion risk area. | 7 | Limitation of damage through local intervention and adaptation. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |











| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A10d,f - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation. | 7 | Natural beauty remains largely unmanaged. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ A10d,f - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the erosion risk area. | 7 | Some loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths including Essex Way long distance path. | 9 | Footpath sustained in current location. |

G3 Management Unit B: Hamford Water

The overall intent of management for Hamford Water is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood defence to most of the defended land, including all dwellings and key infrastructure at risk of flooding, combined with a gradual increase of natural processes by realigning defences that are under pressure.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| B5 (Walton Channel) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| B6a (Naze Cliffs north) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | |
| B6b (Naze Cliffs south) | MR1 | | | | 6 | 6 | | 9 | | 9 | | | | 5 | 5 | 7 | | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 7 | |

*Appraisal has not been undertaken for PDZ B4a because the project is ongoing and the decision for realignment has preceded the SMP.

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of Hamford Water. | 7 | No significant impacts. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment sub-PDZs | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | There is currently 89 hectares of grade 2, 12 hectares of grade 3 and 174 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. No known fisheries. | 1 | Loss of 89 hectares of grade 2, 12 hectares of grade 3 and 174 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. Hamford Water Ramsar site, SPA, SSSI and NNR cover all areas seaward of the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 372 hectares of intertidal habitats. However there may be some off-site impacts on SPA-cited bird species. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 8 | Expected creation of 372 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP). |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological sites within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone in the realignment area. | 8 | Access to the banks of Hamford Water will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences not under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of Hamford Water. | 5 | No significant impacts. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment sub-PDZs. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | No agricultural land. | 1 | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 43 hectares of SSSI, Ramsar and SPA within the realignment area. Hamford Water Ramsar, SPA, SSSI and NNR cover all areas seaward of the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 43 hectares of intertidal habitats. However, loss of 43 hectares of freshwater habitats beneficial to SPA bird species. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 43 hectares of coastal grazing marsh within the realignment area. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 65 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 43 hectares of coastal grazing marsh. Conversion of one habitat type into another so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological sites within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B3a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone in the realignment area. | 8 | Access to the banks of Hamford Water will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Undercutting of defences adjacent to the Walton Channel and wave pressures. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Hamford Water estuary. | 7 | Beneficial for surrounding intertidal habitats on frontages B3a and B4. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Some adaptation required for John West nature reserve. | 8 | Adaptation required. Time for adaptation would require further discussion. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area apart from an Anglian Water asset at B5. | | Anglian Water asset will remain protected. No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | There are currently 22 hectares of grade 3 and 79 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. John Weston nature reserve. Area likely to play a part of the Tendring £256,000 tourism value. The Titchmarsh marina, the campsite and caravan park at Walton-on-the-Naze fall outside the realignment area. No known fisheries. | 1 | Loss of two hectares of grade 3 and 79 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land and parts of the John Weston nature reserve. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. Bird watching. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 31 hectares of Hamford Water Ramsar, SPA and SSSI. Nature reserve landward of defence. Hamford Water Ramsar, SPA, SSSI and NNR cover all areas seaward of the defences. | 7 | Creation of 122 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, this will come at the expense of about 31 hectares of freshwater habitats. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 31 hectares of freshwater marsh. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 122 hectares of intertidal habitats, albeit with loss of 31 hectares of freshwater marsh. Overall, there is the creation of a larger extent of BAP habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological sites within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone in the realignment area. | 8 | Access to the banks of Hamford Water will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B6b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and property | There are no properties at erosion risk. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | The Naze provides sediment - northward transport to Hamford Water. | 6 | Limited local reduction of sediment provision. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B6b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The Naze provides sediment - northward transport to Hamford Water | 6 | Limited local reduction of sediment provision. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Naze tower and associated facilities plus footpath at risk of erosion. | 9 | Need for adaptation prevented by limited intervention. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Naze tower and associated facilities within erosion risk area, which is likely to be an element of the Tendring £256,000 tourism value. | 9 | Loss of Naze tower prevented. Tourism value increased by planned interpretation signage. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| | No deprived communities within erosion risk area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B6b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | The Naze is a protected geological SSSI. | 5 | Limited local reduction of natural erosion. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wide coastal countryside | The Naze is a BAP maritime cliff.. | 6 | Limited local reduction of natural erosion. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | The Naze is a geological SSSI. | 7 | Limited local reduction of natural erosion. Local mitigation to sustain geological interest is intended. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ B6b - Managed realignment (MR1) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | Naze tower, a grade II* listed building, protected from erosion. | 8 | Loss of Naze tower prevented. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths at risk of erosion. | 7 | Need for realignment reduced by limited intervention. |

G4 Management Unit C: Tendring peninsula

The overall intent of management for Tendring is to sustain and support the viability of the seaside towns and their communities, tourism and commercial activities. This means continuing the current management approach: holding the current alignment where there are defences. Although the defences are under pressure, holding the line is necessary to sustain the sea front that is essential to the viability of Walton-on-the-Naze and Frinton-on-Sea (C1) and Clacton-on-Sea (C3) as coastal towns and the Tendring frontage as a whole. Working with communities will be encouraged to move gradually to more sustainable flood risk management for the low-lying parts of the frontage.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G4.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| C. Tendring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C1 (Walton-on-the-Naze and Frinton-on-Sea) | Hold the Line | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| C2 (Holland-on-Sea) | Hold the line /Managed Realignment | 8 | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 5 | | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| C3 (Clacton-on-Sea) | Hold the Line | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| C4 (Seawick, Jaywick and St Osyth Marsh) | Hold the line /Managed Realignment | Not appraised because the policy has been determined outside the SMP (in the Local Development Framework) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

For PDZ C2 the current line will be held in epoch 1 and epoch 2. In epoch 3 there is a dual policy of either Managed realignment or Hold the line. In either case flood defence to the dwellings, roads and sewerage treatment works will be continued. The standard of protection will be maintained or upgraded.

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ C2 - Managed realignment | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are under pressure from wave action. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced, as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Tendring peninsula. | 7 | Beach sediment availability to C3 and C1 may improve. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ C2 - Managed realignment | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment sub-PDZs apart from an Anglian Water asset. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Holland Haven country park is within the realignment area as well as 36 hectares of grade 3 and 157 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Area likely to play a part in the Tendring £256,000 tourism value. Frinton-on-Sea golf club. No known fisheries. | 1 | Holland Haven country park lost as defences are realigned. Frinton-on-Sea golf club lost as defences are realigned. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ C2 - Managed realignment | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 95 hectares of Holland Haven Marshes SSSI and Holland Haven Local Nature Reserve. No designations seaward of the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 193 hectares of intertidal habitat. However, loss of 95 hectares of freshwater habitat. Overall net gain of habitat. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the Environmental assessments) | 56 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of 193 hectares of intertidal habitat. However, loss of 56 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh. Overall net gain of habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |











| Detailed appraisal: PDZ C2 - Managed realignment | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | B1032, other roads, tracks and paths. | 8 | Access to along Holland Haven will be maintained. |

G5 Management Unit D: Colne estuary












The overall intent of management for the Colne estuary is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood defence to most of the defended land, including all dwellings and key infrastructure at risk of flooding, combined with a gradual increase in natural processes by realigning defences that are under pressure and/or where the value of the protected features is unlikely to justify continued maintenance.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G5.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast | |
| D. Colne Estuary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D1a (Stone Point) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 3 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | |
| D1b (Point Clear to St Osyth Creek) | MR2 | | | | | 9 | 5 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | 8 | | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| D2 (Along the southern bank of Flag Creek) | MR2 | | | | | 9 | 5 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 5 | | 8 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 |
| D3 (Flag Creek to northern bank to Brightlingsea) | MR2 | | | | | 9 | 5 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | 8 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 8 |
| D4 (Brightlingsea) | HtL | | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| D5 (Westmarsh Point to where the frontage meets the B1029) | MR2 | 8 | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 9 | 9 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | |
| D6a (South of Wivenhoe) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D6b (B1029 to Wivenhoe) | MR2 | | | | 6 | 6 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| D7 (Colne Barrier) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| D8a (Inner Colne west bank) | MR2 | | | | 6 | 6 | | | | 1 | | | | | 7 | 5 | | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| D8b (Fingringhoe and Langenhoe) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| D8c (Langenhoe Hall Marsh) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D1b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Colne estuary, Brightlingsea Creek and St Osyth Creek. | 5 | Increased tidal prism in Brightlingsea Creek and likely to increase siltation of St Osyth Creek. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D1b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment sub-PDZs. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Golf course at Point Clear is within the realignment area along with 16 hectares of grade 3 and four hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Oyster fisheries. Area with recreational activities including barge sailing. Recreation centre located on coast. The Colchester tourist industry is worth £140,000. | 1 | Loss of 16 hectares of grade 3 and four hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. In addition, the golf course at Point Clear lost as defences are realigned. Uncertain impact on the £140,000 tourist industry. Impact on fisheries and recreational activities. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D1b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Designated sites are outside the defences. Colne Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and the Essex Estuaries SAC, However 1.5 hectares of freshwater marsh landwards of the defence. | 7 | Expected creation of 34 hectares of intertidal habitats. However, 1.5 hectares of freshwater marsh would be lost. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the Environmental assessments) | 1.5 hectares of freshwater marsh. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 34 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 1.5 hectares of freshwater marsh. Overall creation of a larger extent of BAP habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D1b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 4 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Coastal footpath that follows the defence line around St Osyth Stone Point. | 8 | Access to the banks of Brightlingsea Creek will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Brightlingsea Creek. | 5 | Increased tidal prism and likely siltation of the inner creek. Likely reduction of intertidal erosion at D4 |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 51 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land Oyster fisheries. Area with recreational activities including barge sailing. Colchester tourist industry is worth £140,000. | 1 | 51 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land is lost as defences are realigned. Uncertain impact on the £140,000 tourist industry. Impact on fisheries and recreational activities. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | The Essex Estuaries SAC is located seaward of the current defences as well Colne Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI. 60 hectares of the Colne Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI within the flood cell. | 5 | Expected creation of around 71 hectares of intertidal habitats, albeit with loss of 60 hectares of freshwater habitat. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 56 hectares of grazing marsh within the realignment area. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 71 hectares of new intertidal habitats. Loss of 56 hectares of grazing marsh. Conversion of one habitat type into another so no net loss. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | One footpath | 8 | Access to the banks of Flag Creek is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans, there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present, the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded. | 9 | As defences are, realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Colne estuary and Brightlingsea Creek. | 5 | Realignment of defences will increase the tidal prism of Brightlingsea Creek. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 41 hectares of grade 3 and 31 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Oyster fisheries. Area with recreational activities including barge sailing. Colchester tourist industry is worth £140,000. | 1 | 41 hectares of grade 3 and 31 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land lost as defences are realigned. Uncertain impact on the £140,000 tourist industry. Impact on fisheries and recreational activities. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. | 8 | Expected creation of 72 hectares of intertidal habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | No BAP habitats within the realignment area. | 8 | Expected creation of 72 hectares of intertidal habitats. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | No footpaths in the realignment area. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded due to channel widening and resulting undercutting of defences. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the upper Colne estuary. | 7 | Realignment of defences will increase the tidal prism within Colne estuary, likely to reduce erosion along the defences. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area apart from Anglian Water asset. | | Anglian Water asset will remain protected. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 125 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. Oyster fisheries. Area with recreational activities including barge sailing. Colchester tourist industry is worth £140,000. | 1 | 125 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. Uncertain impact on the £140,000 tourist industry. Impact on fisheries and recreational activities. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 18 hectares of Ramsar site, SSSI and SPA. 11 hectares of SAC. | 6 | Expected creation of around 125 hectares of intertidal habitats. Potential negative impact on 18 hectares of Ramsar site, SSSI and SPA. 11 hectares of SAC. Loss of freshwater water grassland potentially used by waders. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 36 hectares of freshwater marsh. | 7 | Expected creation 125 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 36 hectares of reedbeds. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated heritage assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | No footpaths in the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D6b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Local accretion and <i>Spartina</i> formation by the Colne barrier and some erosion southwards of the barrier. No defences under pressure. | 6 | As defences are realigned, the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. Creation of intertidal areas, which is likely to reduce erosion and allow expansion of <i>Spartina</i> formation. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Inner Colne estuary, particularly at D8a and D7. | 6 | Although there are no defences under pressure at the inner estuary realignment is likely relieve any constraints and improve sustainability of the defences. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D6b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | The B1027 and other roads within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 30 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land within the realignment area. Navigation. | 1 | Loss of 30 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land. No significant impacts on navigation. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No relevant communities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D6b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 30 hectares of SSSI within the realignment area. | 5 | Expected creation of around of 40 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 30 hectares of freshwater water grassland. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 30 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh within the realignment area | 5 | Expected creation of 40 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 30 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh. BAP habitats convert into one type to another so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D6b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the estuary banks within the realignment area. | 8 | Access will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Local accretion and <i>Spartina</i> formation by the Colne barrier and some erosion southwards of the barrier. No defences under pressure. | 6 | As defences are realigned, the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. Creation of intertidal areas, which is likely to reduce erosion and allow expansion of <i>Spartina</i> formation. Increase of tidal prism. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Inner Colne estuary, particularly at D6 and D7. | 6 | Although there are no defences under pressure at the inner estuary realignment is likely relieve any constraints and improve sustainability of the defences. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No relevant communities or properties. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No relevant infrastructure | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 11 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land within the realignment area. | 1 | Loss of 11 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No relevant communities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Colne Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and the Essex Estuaries SAC cover most areas seaward of the frontage. No designations within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of around 40 hectares of intertidal habitats. Some impacts on the fringes of Fingringhoe Wick Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 15 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh landwards of the defences. Saltmarsh and mudflats seaward of the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 40 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 15 hectares of coastal and flood plain grazing marsh. BAP habitats convert from one type to another so no net loss. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ D8a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 3 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the estuary banks within the realignment area. | 8 | Access will be maintained. |

G6 Management Unit E: Mersea Island

The overall intent of management for Mersea Island is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood and erosion risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood and erosion defence to all dwellings, key infrastructure and tourism facilities at risk of flooding and erosion, combined with a gradual increase of natural processes by realigning defences that are under pressure.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document gives a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G6.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| E. Mersea Island | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E1 (Landward Frontage) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | |
| E2 (Seaward frontage between North Barn and West Mersea) | MR2 | | | | 7 | | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 7 | 5 | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| E3 (West Mersea) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| E4a (North Mersea (Strood Channel)) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 5 | 5 | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 7 | 5 | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| E4b (Pyefleet Inner Channel) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure. | 7 | Area constrained by existing coastal environment (high energy). |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the seaward frontage of Mersea Island. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on Infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area apart from two sewage treatment works. | | Sewage treatment works will remain protected. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 38 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land in the realignment area. No known fisheries. Two camping and caravan sites. | 1 | 42 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land is at risk as defences are realigned. Camping and caravan site at risk as defences are realigned. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. | 4 | Expected creation of 42 hectares of intertidal habitats. Some impact on fringing habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 28 hectares of grazing marsh within the realignment area. | 5 | Expected creation of 42 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 28 hectares of grazing marsh. Conversion of BAP habitat from one type into another. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological sites within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E2 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | One car park, footpaths and tracks. | 8 | Footpaths lost as defences are realigned but access to the shoreline of Mersea Island is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E4a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E4a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Strood Channel. | 5 | Likely to have an impact on Strood channel. The nature of the impact is uncertain. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Channel navigation and oyster fisheries. | 5 | Likely to have an impact on navigation and fisheries on the Strood channel. The nature of the impact is uncertain. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on Infrastructure | Anglian Water assets within the realignment area. | | Anglian water assets will remain protected |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E4a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Two hectares of grade 2 and 31 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land Oyster fisheries behind Mersea Island. Best shelter berth on east coast | 1 | Two hectares of grade 2 and 31 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land at risk as defences are realigned. Oyster fisheries and berth facilities may be affected by changes to channel dynamics. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No relevant deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of 45 hectares of intertidal habitats. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E4a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 9ha of grazing marsh. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside of the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 45 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of nine hectares of grazing marsh. Conversion of BAP habitat from one type into another. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological sites within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |











| Detailed appraisal: PDZ E4a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath on the bank of the Strood Channel. | 8 | Footpath lost as defences are realigned but access is maintained. |

G7 Management Unit F: Blackwater estuary











The overall intent of management for the Blackwater estuary is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood and erosion risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood and erosion defence to all dwellings, key infrastructure and tourism facilities at risk of flooding and erosion, combined with a gradual increase in natural processes by realigning defences that are under pressure and/or where the value of the protected features is unlikely to justify continued maintenance.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document gives a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G7.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast | |
| F. Blackwater | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F1 (Strood to Salcott-cum Virley) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F2 (Salcott Creek) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F3 (South bank of the Salcott Channel to Tollesbury Fleet) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | |
| F4 (Tollesbury) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| F5 (Tollesbury Wick Marshes to Goldhanger) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| F6 (Goldhanger to Heybridge) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F7 (Heybridge Basin) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F8 (Maldon Inner estuary) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F9a (South Maldon) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F9b (Northey Island) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F10 (Maylandsea) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F11a (Mayland Creek west) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| F11b (Mayland Creek) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | |
| F11c (Mayland Creek east) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F12 (Steeple) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 4 | | | 8 | | 1 | 3 | | | 9 | 7 | | | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| F13 (St. Lawrence) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| F14 (St. Lawrence to Bradwell-on-Sea) | MR2 | 8 | | | 9 | 5 | | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| F15 (Bradwell Creek) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Old Hall Marshes located between two creeks, sustains the flow in the creeks and provides shelter for saltings north of Tollesbury. Saltmarsh is being eroded and defences are under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Old Hall Marshes, located between two creeks, sustains the flow in the creeks and provides shelter for saltings north of Tollesbury. | 7 | Realignment of defences will increase the tidal prism in the Salcott Channel and is likely to reduce erosion. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 69 hectares of grade 3 and 288 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Old Hall Marshes RSPB reserve. | 1 | Loss of 69 hectares of grade 3 and 288 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land and possible adverse impacts to Old Hall Marshes RSPB reserve. |
| Impact on public services | No relevant public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 385 hectares of Ramsar site, SPA, SSSI. 36 hectares of SAC. Outside the defences: Colne Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and the Essex Estuaries SAC. | 5 | Expected creation of 385 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 385 hectares of freshwater habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside | 316 hectares of grazing marshes and 39 hectares of reedbeds. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 385 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 316 hectares of grazing marshes and 39 hectares of reedbeds. Conversion of one habitat type into another so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F3 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | Two scheduled monuments (decoy ponds) within the realignment area. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along Old Hall Marshes. | 8 | Part of the footpath is lost as the defences are realigned but access is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Saltmarsh is being eroded and defences are under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The mouth of the Blackwater estuary. | 7 | Relief of wave pressure for adjacent frontages. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 110 hectares of grade 3 and 98 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Oyster fisheries in the Blackwater estuary. | 1 | Loss of 110 hectares of grade 3 and 98 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. Oyster fisheries may be affected by changes to channel dynamics. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No relevant public services within the realignment area. | | |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 200 hectares of Blackwater Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI within the realignment area. Blackwater Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI seaward of the defences. The Essex Estuaries SAC is located seaward of the current defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 210 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 200 hectares of freshwater habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 181 hectares of coastal grazing marsh within the realignment area. Mudflats and saltmarsh outside the defences. | 5 | Expected creation of 210 hectares of intertidal habitats. Loss of 181 hectares of grazing marshes. Conversion of one habitat type into another so no net loss. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F5 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 1 | Loss of historic areas. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath along Tollesbury Wick Marshes and along the bank of the Blackwater estuary. | 8 | Part of the footpath is lost as the defences are realigned but access is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F12 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Mayland Creek. | 4 | Realignment of the defence will increase the tidal prism and likely to promote siltation in the Mayland Creek. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F12 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 143 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land within the realignment area. Caravan park and campsite at Canney Park. Oyster fisheries in the Blackwater estuary. Shore base for sailing. | 1 | Loss of 143 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. Caravan park and campsite at Canney Park remains protected. Oyster fisheries may be affected by changes to channel dynamics. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | Irrigation reservoir within the realignment area. | 3 | Loss of the irrigation reservoir. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F12 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 33 hectares of Blackwater Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI within the realignment area. Blackwater Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI seaward of the defences. The Essex Estuaries SAC is entirely located seaward of the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 159 hectares of intertidal habitats. However, this will come at the expense of around 33 hectares of freshwater habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 42 hectares of coastal grazing marsh. Mudflats and saltmarsh outside the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 159 hectares of intertidal habitats, albeit with loss of 42 hectares of freshwater marsh. Overall there is the creation of a larger extent of BAP habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F12 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath along the current defence line and access track to the Canney House campsite and caravan park. | 8 | Some of the footpath along the current defence line would be lost as the defences are realigned but access would be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F14 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F14 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Saltmarsh is being eroded and defences are under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Blackwater Estuary and St Lawrence Creek. | 5 | Realignment of the defence will increase the tidal prism and likely to promote siltation in the St Lawrence Creek. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F14 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Beacon Hill leisure park. 48 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Camping and caravan site at St Lawrence Bay. | 1 | Beacon Hill leisure park remains protected. As defences are realigned 48 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land would be at risk. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | Blackwater Estuary Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI seaward of the defences. The Essex Estuaries SAC is entirely located seaward of the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 49 hectares of intertidal habitats. However there may be some off-site impacts on SPA-cited bird species. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F14 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Saltmarsh and mudflat outside the defences. | 8 | Expected creation of 49 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP). |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ F14 - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath along the current defences. | 8 | Footpath will be lost as defences are realigned but access will be maintained. |

G8 Management Unit G: Dengie peninsula

The overall intent of management for the Dengie peninsula is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities, including agriculture. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood defence to all of the defended land.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description including maps of the plan for each management unit.

G8.1 Policy appraisal results













| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| G. Dengie Peninsula | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G1 (Bradwell-on-Sea) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 2 | 2 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | |
| G2 (Bradwell Marshes) | HtL | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| G3 (Dengie Marshes) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |











G9 Management Unit H: Crouch and Roach

The overall intent of management for the Crouch and Roach estuaries is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood and erosion risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood and erosion defence to all dwellings, key infrastructure and tourism facilities at risk of flooding and erosion, combined with a gradual increase in natural processes by realigning some of the defences that are under pressure.











The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description including maps of the plan for each management unit.

G9.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| H. Crouch & Roach | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H1 (Burnham-on-Crouch) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H2a (From Burnham-on-Crouch to Bridgemarsh) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 5 | 9 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | |
| H2b (Bridgemarsh to North Fambridge) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | |
| H3 (North Fambridge and South Woodham Ferrers) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| H4 (South Woodham Ferrers, Battlesbridge and Hullbridge) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H5 (Eastwards of Brandy Hole) | HtL | 8 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H6 (Landward of Brandy Hole Reach) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H7 (South Fambridge) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H8a (South bank of Longpole, Shortpole and Raypitts Reaches) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 2 | 2 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | 3 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| H8b (Canewdon) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| H9 (Paglesham Creek) | NAI | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | |
| H10 (Wallasea) | MR2 | Not appraised because the policy has been determined outside the SMP (by RSPB) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H11a (Paglesham Churchend) | MR2 | 8 | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| H11b (Paglesham Eastend) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| H12 (Stambridge) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H13 (Rochford) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H14 (Barling Marsh) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 2 | 2 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | | | | 4 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| H15 (Little Wakering) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| H16 (Great Wakering) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Crouch estuary. | 7 | Realignment of mid-Crouch is likely to have a positive impact to the inner estuary, that is reduced siltation and uncertain impact on the outer estuary and likely to reduce defence pressure for H8. No foreseen Essex-wide impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 33 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Marina and moorings along this frontage. Recreational activities include bird watching. | 1 | Loss of 33 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 16 hectares of Crouch and Roach Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and five hectares of SAC within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of 37 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, this will come at the expense of around 16 hectares of freshwater habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | No BAP habitats within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of 37 hectares of new intertidal habitats. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | The Cliff, Burnham-on-Crouch geological SSSI. | 9 | It remains unprotected. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No listed buildings or historic sites within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic areas. Scores attributed by English Heritage. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath along the bank of the Crouch estuary. | 8 | Part of the footpath is lost as defences are realigned but access is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Crouch estuary. | 7 | Realignment of mid-Crouch is likely to have a positive impact on the inner estuary, that is reduced siltation and uncertain impact on the outer estuary and likely to reduce defence pressure for H8. No foreseen Essex-wide impacts. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 137 hectares of grade 3 and 170 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Marina and moorings along this frontage. Recreational activities include bird watching | 1 | Loss 137 hectares of grade 3 and 170 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 199 hectares of Crouch and Roach Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI within the realignment area. The Roach and Crouch Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI outside the defences. The Essex Estuaries SAC is located entirely outside of the defences. | 7 | Creation of 312 hectares of new intertidal habitats. However, this will come at the expense of around 199 hectares of freshwater habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 216 hectares of grazing marsh in the realignment area. Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 7 | Creation of 312 hectares of new intertidal habitats, albeit with loss of 216 hectares of freshwater marsh. Overall there is the creation of a larger extent of BAP habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H2b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpath along the bank of the Crouch estuary. | 8 | Part of the footpath is lost as defences are realigned but access is maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Crouch estuary. | 7 | Realignment of mid-Crouch is likely to have a positive impact to the inner estuary that is, reduced siltation and uncertain impact on the outer estuary and likely to reduce defence pressure for H2. No foreseen Essex-wide impacts. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | 284 hectares of grade 3 and three hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. No known fisheries. Slipway and moorings. | 1 | 284 hectares of grade 3 and three hectares of grade 4 agricultural land at risk as defences are realigned. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | 49 hectares of Crouch and Roach Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and 12 hectares of SAC within the realignment area. | 7 | Expected creation of 297 hectares of intertidal habitats. However, 49 hectares of Crouch and Roach Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and 12 hectares of SAC within the realignment area may be affected. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | 35 hectares of coastal grazing marsh. | 8 | Expected creation of 297 hectares of intertidal habitats, albeit with loss of 35 hectares of freshwater marsh. Overall there is the creation of a larger extent of BAP habitat. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant features. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 1 | Loss of historic environment. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H8b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone. | 8 | Some of the footpaths will be lost as the defences are realigned but access will be maintained. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The Roach estuary and Paglesham Pool and Wallasea Island. | 7 | Realignment of mid-Roach is likely to have a positive impact on the inner estuary that is, reduced siltation, uncertain impact on the outer estuary and no foreseen Essex-wide impacts. Likely to reduce defence pressure on H14 and Potton Island. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Moorings at Paglesham. 47 hectares of grade 1, 127 hectares of grade 2, 78 hectares of grade 3 and 12 hectares of grade 5 agricultural land. Recreational fishing. | 1 | Loss of 47 hectares of grade 1, 127 hectares of grade 2, 78 hectares of grade 3 and 12 hectares of grade 5 agricultural land. Realignment likely to impact on navigation and recreational fishing. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. The Roach and Crouch Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and the Essex Estuaries SAC outside the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 266 hectares of intertidal habitats. However there may be some off-site impacts on SPA-cited bird species. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 8 | Expected creation of 266 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP). |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11a - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone. | 8 | Footpath along the bank of Paglesham Pool is lost as defences are realigned along with others across the tidal flood zone. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|---|---|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction between the land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | There are no properties within the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | Defences are currently under pressure. | 9 | As defences are realigned pressure is reduced as the newly formed intertidal area will act as a natural defence. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The Roach estuary and Paglesham Reach. | 7 | Realignment of mid-Roach is likely to have a positive impact on the inner estuary that is, reduced siltation, uncertain impact on the outer estuary and no foreseen Essex-wide impacts. Likely to reduce defence pressure on H14 and Potton Island. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | No adaptation of properties, dwellings or communities will be required. | 8 | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | Moorings at Paglesham. Nine hectares of grade 2 and 63 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. Recreational fishing. | 1 | Loss of nine hectares of grade 2 and 63 hectares of grade 3 agricultural land. Realignment likely to impact on navigation and recreational fishing. |
| Impact on public services (including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services) | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | No communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To support and promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. The Roach and Crouch Estuaries Ramsar site, SPA and SSSI and the Essex Estuaries SAC outside the defences. | 7 | Expected creation of 72 hectares of intertidal habitats. However there may be some off-site impacts on SPA-cited bird species. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside. (Mosaic and undesignated habitats are considered by the environmental assessments) | Saltmarsh and mudflats outside the defences. | 8 | Expected creation of 72 hectares of intertidal habitats (UK BAP). |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No relevant geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ H11b - Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets within the realignment area. Refer to historic environment scoring note. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Footpaths along the current defences and across the tidal flood zone. | 8 | Footpath along the bank of Paglesham Pool is lost as defences are realigned along with others across the tidal flood zone. |

G10 Management Unit I: Foulness, Potton and Rushley islands

The overall intent of management for the islands is to sustain and support the viability of communities, tourism and commercial activities while creating new intertidal habitats and focusing flood risk management on frontages where it is most needed. The policy to achieve this intent is to maintain flood defence to Foulness and Potton islands, including all dwellings and key infrastructure at risk of flooding, combined with a gradual increase of natural processes by realigning the defences of Rushley Island.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document give a more detailed description including maps of the plan for each management unit.

G10.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation |
| I. Foulness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I1a (Foulness) | HtL | | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | | | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| I1b (Potton) | HtL | 8 | 9 | | 2 | 2 | | 9 | | 9 | | 9 | | 4 | 5 | | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| I1c (Rushley) | MR2 | | | | 9 | 7 | | 8 | | 1 | | | | 9 | 9 | | | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ I1c – Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To develop policies appropriate to the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast and its dynamic interaction of land and sea | | | |
| Impact of policy package on the diverse character of the Essex and South Suffolk coast | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| Impact of policy package on dynamic interaction of land and sea | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |
| To balance flood and erosion management with the assets and benefits that it protects | | | |
| Level of flood and erosion risk to people and properties | Rushley Farm within the realignment area. | 2 | One property protected from flooding. |
| Impact on future opportunities | According to Local Development Plans there are no plans in place for the proposed realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To seek opportunities for managing the shoreline through natural coastal processes and take full account of longshore and cross-shore impacts | | | |
| Use of natural processes (saltmarsh, longshore interaction) | At present the defences are under pressure and saltmarsh is being eroded due to channel widening and resulting undercutting of defences. | 9 | Development of intertidal areas throughout the island. |
| Positive and negative impact on other frontages | The rest of the Roach estuary. | 7 | As defences are realigned pressure throughout the Roach is reduced. |
| Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | No relevant activities. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ I1c – Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To provide time and information for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt to any anticipated coastal change | | | |
| Adequacy of time available for communities, individuals and partner organisations to adapt | Ministry of Defence complex at Rushley Farm. | 8 | At least 16 years for adaptation will be provided. |
| To support communities and sustainable development for the people living around the Essex and South Suffolk shoreline by managing the risk to community activities and infrastructure | | | |
| Impact on infrastructure | No infrastructure within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on socio-economic activities | MOD-related activities. 40 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. | 1 | Loss of 40 hectares of grade 4 agricultural land. MOD-related activities likely to be affected. |
| Impact on public services | No public services within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| Impact on communities | Rushley Farm. | 2 | Loss or relocation of Rushley Farm. |
| Impact on deprived communities | No deprived communities within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To promote the social and economic values of the Essex and South Suffolk coast to wider society | | | |
| Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | No features of regional, national or international importance within the realignment area. | | No foreseen impacts. |

| Detailed appraisal: PDZ I1c – Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity | | | |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated habitats and species, keeping them in favourable condition (including no significant loss of extent or populations) | No designated sites within the realignment area. | 9 | Expected creation of 54 hectares of intertidal habitats. |
| Impact on achieving national and local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within both designated sites and the wider coastal countryside | No designated sites within the realignment area. | 9 | Expected creation of 54 hectares of intertidal habitats. |
| Impact on achieving management objectives for designated geological sites, keeping them in favourable condition | No geological designations. | | No foreseen impacts. |
| To contribute to maintaining and enhancing the evolving character of the coastal landscape | | | |
| Impact on the character of the coastal landscape, including consideration of geological, geomorphological, historic environment and cultural features and the role of settlements in the landscape | - | - | Score attributed at MU level. See policy appraisal results tables. |











| Detailed appraisal: PDZ I1c – Managed realignment (MR2) | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Principle/criterion | Current situation | Impact by 2105 | |
| | | Score | Explanation |
| To support protection and promotion of the historic environment and its value for the heritage, culture and economy of the area | | | |
| Impact on historic environment and its wider value | No designated historic assets in the realignment area. | 2 | Loss of historic environment. |
| To support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and enhancing access | | | |
| Impact on access to and along the coast | Paths and tracks within the realignment area. | 8 | Access will be maintained. |

G11 Management Unit J: Southend-on-Sea

The overall intent of management for Southend-on-Sea is to sustain and support the viability of the seaside towns and their communities, tourism and commercial activities. This means continuing the current management approach: holding the current alignment where there are defences. Although the defences are under pressure, holding the line is necessary to sustain the sea front which is essential to the viability of Southend-on-Sea as a seaside resort.

The policy statements in section 4 of the main document provide a more detailed description and maps of the plan for each management unit.

G11.1 Policy appraisal results

| Policy Development Zone | Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | Policies appropriate to the diverse nature of Essex and South Suffolk | Flood and erosion risk to people and property | Future opportunities | Use of natural processes | Positive and negative impact on other frontages | Cross-shore impact on near-shore activities | Time available for adaptation for communities, individuals and partner organisations | Infrastructure | Socio-economic activities | Public services | Communities | Deprived communities | Impact on socio-economic features of regional, national or international significance | Designated habitats and species | Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets | Designated geological sites | Maintaining the evolving nature of the coastal landscape | Designated Heritage Assets | Significant undesignated heritage assets | Quality of Preservation | Archaeological Potential | Historic Landscape | Expected Scale of Mitigation | Impact on access to and along the coast |
| J. Southend-on-Sea | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J1 (Southend-on-Sea) | HtL | 7 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |