

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	x	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	10
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpaths, 2 sailing centres, holiday cottages
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	housing road
Length of current defence	1666 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	295 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	no

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		x
20 - 49	??	
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF "NO" for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

East Chidham C

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

Private

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years	5	0	N/A	?	N/A
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Lack of benefit-cost leads to abandon at the end of residual life, exit strategy required.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	0	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	5	0	yes	yes	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low but part of complex of sites	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	6
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpath
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	road
Length of current defence	917 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	106 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	no

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49			x		Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Bosham B

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

EA

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	5	0	N/A	?	N/A
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Assume EA defence, abandon at end of life of defence. Exit Strategy required.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	2	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	5	0	yes	yes	?

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box		
Non-designated	x	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box	
Yes	
No	x

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	none
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpath
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	water storage issue
Length of current defence	240 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	none
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	none

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box		
	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		x
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +	???	

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box	
Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) **Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?**

Cross box		
Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site: West Wittering

Coastal Cell: Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by CDC

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years	13	13 (MITIGATION)	N/A	?	N/A
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

50-100 year re-alignment recommended. SPA small % site and scrubby and would not require habitat replacement.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	6	5			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	6	7	X	X	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	x
Low	

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	part SPA/RAMSAR	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	100
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	coastal path
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	residential, recreation
Length of current defence	1000 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	1000 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	flood storage and amenity issues

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	partial yes
No	full no

IF "NO" for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign	partial ok	If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q15 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q15. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99	partial				Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. What is the name of the designated site?

European Site	Chichester Harbour and Langstone Harbour SPA Ramsar
National Site	SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?	partial yes	yes	yes	
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated 'freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE	yes	yes	yes	
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE	yes	yes	yes	
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?	n/a			
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?	n/a			
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?				

Q18. On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99	partial				Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:	Ella Nore
Coastal Cell:	Chichester Harbour
Defence maintained by	Private

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	5	0	0	?	N/A
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Lack of benefit-cost results in the site being categorized as abandonment at the end of residual life.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	3	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	5	0			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	x	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approx 4 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	housing
Length of current defence	155 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	200 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19	x	x
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Horse Pond

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

Private

FINAL RESULT

Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	6	0	0		N/A
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

SPA accept change. There is no benefit-cost, therefore the site has been categorised as abandon.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	5	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	6	0			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box		
Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	x	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	
Length of current defence	288 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	Not required
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		x natural spit?
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF "NO" for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) **Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?**

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q15 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q15. **Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH***

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. **What is the name of the designated site?**

European Site	Langstone Harbour and Chichester Harbour SPA
National Site	North Solent SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?				
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated ' freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE				
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE				
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?				
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?				
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?				

Q18. **On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned**

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Itchenor

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

EA

FINAL RESULT

Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years	11	0	N/A	??	N/A
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Potential re-aligned defence much longer than current line, but neither likely to meet benefit-cost, hence abandon at end of life defence. 50 properties at risk. Low quality environmental site.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	4	7			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	3	8	no	no	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	50
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpath
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	housing
Length of current defence	528 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	2096 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49	1:20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49			x		Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Birdham

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

Private: marina

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	25	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Non-designated SPA roost site. Isolated from coast by marina. Defence will be maintained long term by marina. Best left as roost site, could become more saline with time.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	12	9			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	13	12	yes	no	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box		
Non-designated	x but SPA roost	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box	
Yes	
No	x

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Marina
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	
Length of current defence	
Length of any potential realigned defence	
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box		
	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +	x	x

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box	
Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box		
Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +			x		Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE (no benefit-cost)					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:	Fishbourne A
Coastal Cell:	Chichester Harbour
Defence maintained by	Private

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years	21	0	0	?	N/A
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	x				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Defences fail 20-50, no benefit-cost although re-aligned route much shorter. Therefore, abandon. Reedbed SSSI, part SPA, accept habitat change since can continue to meet objectives.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	11	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	20	1	yes	yes	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	partly	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	none
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpath
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	road
Length of current defence	1500 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	221 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49		x
50 - 99	x	
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF “NO” for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q15 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q15. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49			x		Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. What is the name of the designated site?

European Site	Part Chichester Harbour and Langstone Harbour SPA, Ramsar
National Site	Chichester SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+	
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?	yes	yes	no	no	
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated 'freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE	yes	yes			
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE	yes	yes			
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?	n/a				
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?	n/a				
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?	no				

Q18. On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site: Fishbourne B

Coastal Cell: Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by EA

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Although only 6 houses, meets benefit-cost on existing and re-aligned route because of sewerage works. Existing route is shorter, therefore hold the line. Non-designated site.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	3	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	10	0	x	MOSTLY	

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	6
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpath
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	Road, sewerage works
Length of current defence	480 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	682 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	no

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	

IF "NO" for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Go to Q8 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE				x	

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Appledram

Coastal Cell:

Chichester Harbour

Defence maintained by

Environment Agency

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE	11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Rationale for choice of final epoch

It is argued that Sewerage works warrants defence. More expensive to re-align, so Hold the Line.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	7	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	11	0			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box		
Non-designated	x	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box	
Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	3
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	footpaths
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	STW
Length of current defence	300 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	821 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	no

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box		
	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49	x	x
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box	
Yes	x (STW)
No	

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	x
No	

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet cost-benefit) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box		
Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign	x	Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE				x	

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Medmerry

Coastal Cell:

Pagham Harbour

Defence maintained by

EA

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	347	347	0	0	N/A
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

No benefit-cost for current line but benefit-cost for re-alignment. SSSI affected, however, NE advise that habitat change is acceptable. SDCP has followed the Pagham to East Head Strategy secondary line of defence for full re-alignment (East Bank option 2)

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	169	95			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	214	133			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	x
Medium	
Low	

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	x (accept small area SSSI)	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	100 +
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Campsite ???
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	Housing, sewerage works, small landfill
Length of current defence	4098 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	4038 m (partial)
realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	Few residential properties

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19	x	x
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

N/a

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	x
No	

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign	x	If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19	x				Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Pagham South

Coastal Cell:

Pagham Harbour

Defence maintained by

EA

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years	22	22	0	0	N/A
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Current line doesn't meet benefit-cost but much smaller secondary defence, required to protect main access route to Selsey, would. This leads to a CA adopted re-alignment at end of residual life. Approximately 3ha is designated SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR. In 100 years 2ha would change to saltmarsh and NE advise that this would be acceptable within the conservation objectives.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	14	1			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	19	3			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	+ (small part designated)	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approx 10 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Footpath, popular recreational area
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	Few houses, light industry
Length of current defence	1500 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	365 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49		x
50 - 99		
100 +		

N/a

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood))?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	x
No	

IF "NO" for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign	x	If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49	x				Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site: Church Norton

Coastal Cell: Pagham Harbour

Defence maintained by CA (EA/CDC)

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	21	0	21	0	+
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	X				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

No benefit-cost therefore CA abandon. NE assume site can maintain its function up to 50 years as shingle bank migrates over site. After this, assume current SPA function lost and replacement habitat needed.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	13	1			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	19	2			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	x	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approx 10 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	??
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	Housing
Length of current defence	1127 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	855 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19	x	x
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF "NO" for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q15 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q15. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. What is the name of the designated site?

European Site	Pagham Harbour SPA and RAMSAR
National Site	Pagham Harbour SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?	Yes	No		
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated 'freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE	Yes	Yes	No	
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE	Yes	Yes	No	
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?	No	Yes		
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?	Yes			
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?	No			

Q18. On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site:

Keynor Rife

Coastal Cell:

Pagham Harbour

Defence maintained by

EA

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE	14	N/A	0	0	N/A

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Assume benefit-cost on existing line. Much cheaper to hold existing line, therefore not currently economically viable to re-align. Were it to be re-aligned, replacement habitat required. In this instance, sustainable to hold the existing line and protect freshwater habitat up to 100 years.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	8	2			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	8	6			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	x	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approx 30 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Footpath, popular tourist attraction
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	Housing
Length of current defence	200 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	1490 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19	??	??
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF "NO" for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign	x	Go to Q15 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q15. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE				x	

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. What is the name of the designated site?

European Site	Pagham Harbour SPA and RAMSAR
National Site	Pagham Harbour SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?				
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated ' freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE				
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE				
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?				
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?				
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?				

Q18. On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site: Sidlesham

Coastal Cell: Pagham Harbour

Defence maintained by Private

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	8	0	0	0	N/A
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost	X				
HOLD THE LINE					

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Assuming no benefit-cost therefore abandon.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	2	0			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	9	0			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	
Medium	
Low	x

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated	x	go to SECTION B
Designated		go to SECTION C

SECTION B NON DESIGNATED SITES

Flood Risk

Q2. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets?

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q8. and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q3. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approximately 10 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Footpaths and popular tourist attraction
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	housing
Length of current defence	1466 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	768 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q4a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q4b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		x
20 - 49		
50 - 99		
100 +		

N/a

Q5. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	
No	x

Q6. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	
No	x

IF “NO” for both Q5 and Q6, go to Q8 to record when to ABANDON (Exit Strategy required)

Q7. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign		Go to Q8 and chose “HOLD THE LINE”

Q8. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19			x		Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

MATRIX A - Placing of Potential Habitat Creation Sites into Epochs

SECTION A – to be completed by SDCP project team

Name of Potential Habitat Creation Site: **Bremere and Pagham Rife**

Coastal Cell: **Pagham Harbour**

Defence maintained by **EA**

FINAL RESULT Final choice of epoch category -

	Number of Hectares Creation	Number of Hectares that can be used for compensation/ mitigation	Number of Hectares of any replacement freshwater habitat	No of Hectares of replacement habitat that can be found on site	Tick box in which epoch the replacement freshwater habitat should be started
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years					
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years					
ABANDON as no benefit-cost					
HOLD THE LINE	196	If ever re-aligned – 120 mitigation and 76 compensation	If ever realigned - 120	0	N/A

Rationale for choice of final epoch

Because of land drainage problems this site would probably continue to be defended along the existing, shorter length of defence. If it was ever re-aligned then replacement habitat needed for 60% of site that is SPA. If Operating Authority manage site, they would need to find 120 ha of freshwater habitat. Very low lying site, therefore re-alignment would not support SPA roosting function.

Environmental Benefit of Realigning over 100 years – this section to be filled in before asking Q1.

	Hectares Saltmarsh	Hectares Mudflat	Natural transitions Cross box	Self sustaining Cross box	Opps for freshwater habitat
EPOCH A - 0 - 19 Years	50	137			
EPOCH B - 20 - 49 Years					
EPOCH C - 50 - 99 years					
EPOCH D 100 + years	33	163			

As a result of the above, is the environmental benefit of realigning High, Medium or Low?

High	x
Medium	
Low	

Cross box

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COASTAL MANAGERS

MAIN ROUTING QUESTION

Q1. Would any realignment be over all or part of designated site? Depending on the answer please go to the appropriate section.

Cross Box

Non-designated		go to SECTION B
Designated	x (60%)	go to SECTION C

SECTION C DESIGNATED SITE behind sea wall

Flood Risk

Q9. Using Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood), would realignment cause any flood risk to built assets

Cross box

Yes	x
No	

IF NO GO TO Q15 and consider placing in low EPOCH

Q10. Please put as much detail as possible relating to flood risk and potential realignment to help you decide in what EPOCH to realign the site.

Number of properties	Approximately 10 properties
Recreational site – Country park, footpaths, informal recreation	Footpath, tourist attraction
Type of infrastructure – housing, industrial, road, landfill	housing
Length of current defence	1050 m
Length of any potential realigned defence	1264 m
Realignment cause further risk to property/infrastructure	No

Q11a. In what EPOCH below will the standard of service need to be improved – in other words, given sea level rise, when will the defence need to be raised to provide an adequate standard?

Q11b. In what EPOCH below will the defence fail, given your estimates of standard of protection (condition) and residual life

Cross box

	a) Service	b) Residual life
0 - 19		
20 - 49	x	x
50 - 99		
100 +		

Q12. Do you predict that at the time it would need capital expenditure it will meet benefit-cost (according to EA flood Zone Flood Zone 3 (1:200 probability flood)?

Cross box

Yes	x because of upstream flooding
No	

Q13. So, would the re-aligned route meet benefit-cost?

Yes	x because of upstream flooding
No	

IF “NO” for both Q12 and Q13, go to Q15 to record when to abandon (Exit Strategy required)

Q14. (This only applies if the current or re-aligned route (or both), meet benefit-cost) Would the benefit-cost be better, the same or worse on a realigned route?

Cross box

Better benefit-cost to realign		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Same		If YES, chose epoch in Q8 based on Q4.
Worse benefit-cost to realign	x	Go to Q15 and chose "HOLD THE LINE"

Q15. Given the above, when can the site be realigned to protect infrastructure, assuming funds available, and if so in what EPOCH*

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99					Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE				x	

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable.
- If however the benefit-cost would be worse to realign and particularly if site is small (ie: relative cost would be particularly high, consider placing in Category D or as "HOLD THE LINE"

Designations behind sea wall (Remaining questions to be filled in by NE)

Q16. What is the name of the designated site?

European Site	Pagham Harbour SPA and RAMSAR
National Site	Pagham Harbour SSSI

Q17. Nature conservation, European site (ES) and SSSI issues

	0-19	20-49	50-99	100+
(ES) Is it economically viable to maintain the defences in situ and at what standard of defence?				
(ES/SSSI) Over time will the designated ' freshwater habitat' behind sea wall continue to meet its conservation objectives given above standard of defence/ predicted saline intrusion. Consider RTE	No			
(ES/SSSI) If habitat were to change in response to a reduction in flood defence, would it be acceptable for the conservation objectives. Consider RTE	No			
(ES) If replacement freshwater habitat required, at what time should this be available as fully functional habitat?	Yes			
(ES) When would it be necessary to begin to create replacement 'freshwater habitat' (ie how long would it take to create) ?	Now?			
Is it necessary to extend the time of the defence to allow replacement habitat to be created?				

Q18. On the basis of the nature conservation issues when could the site be realigned?

	Re-align	RTE	Abandon	HTL	EPOCH
0 - 19					Epoch A
20 - 49					Epoch B
50 - 99	x				Epoch C
100 +					Epoch D
HOLD THE LINE					

***GUIDE TO ANSWERING THE ABOVE QUESTION:**

- recommend realigning when current life of defences no longer acceptable
- If habitat is rare, may need to allow enough time to acquire and develop replacement habitat.

SOLENT DYNAMIC COAST PROJECT

Appendix 3

TR 11

January 2008



Saltgrass Lane: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Intertidal mudflats and atlantic salt meadows (AP, EN)- part SSSI, Ramsar and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Important amenity value Area used for walking, bird watching, fishing and bait digging.
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Numerous paths run through the site. NFDC looking to enhance access
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private owners, NFDC and HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Land owned by both NFDC & HCC, plus numerous private owners
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	15.9 ha (SDCP)
Total	24	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Avon Water: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	(AP, EN), SSSI, SPA and Ramsar
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	The Lymington and Keyhaven marshes contain archaeological relics of what was once a thriving sea salt industry & numerous grade 2 listed buildings (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	2	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1/2	Area used for walking, bird watching, fishing and bait digging.
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Numerous paths run through the site. NFDC looking to enhance access (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Private owners, NFDC and HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Land owned by both NFDC & HCC, plus numerous private owners
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	40 ha (SDCP)
Total	23	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Keyhaven & Pennington a: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Intertidal mudflats and atlantic salt meadows (AP, EN), SSSI, Ramsar and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	The Lymington and Keyhaven marshes contain archaeological relics of what was once a thriving sea salt industry & numerous grade 2 listed buildings (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1/2	Area used for walking, bird watching, fishing and bait digging.
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Numerous paths run through the site. NFDC looking to enhance access
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private owners, NFDC and HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Land owned by both NFDC & HCC, plus numerous private owners (HCC/WSCC)
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	24 ha (SDCP)
Total	21	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Keyhaven & Pennington _b: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Intertidal mudflats and atlantic salt meadows (AP, EN), SSSI, Ramsar, SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	The Lymington and Keyhaven marshes contain archaeological relics of what was once a thriving sea salt industry & numerous grade 2 listed buildings (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1/2	Important amenity value Area used for walking, bird watching, fishing and bait digging.
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Numerous paths run through the site. NFDC looking to enhance access
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private owners, NFDC and HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Land owned by both NFDC & HCC, plus numerous private owners
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	6	101 Ha (SDCP)
Total	23	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Lymington Reedbeds: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Freshwater river valley marshes (AP, EN), Ramsar and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	1	Abstractions further upstream (EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	1	Sewage and domestic (EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	The area is used for fishing and birdwatching,
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	2	Do not think that you could get down to the shore on a right of way, only permissive
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	HWT owns majority and private landowners
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Many separate private landowners
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	35.6 ha (SDCP)
Total	24	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Karen McHugh

Warren Farm & Needs Ore Point a: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	At present grazing marsh and lagoons (AP, EN)-SSSI, Ramsar, SPA and SAC
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	1	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Privately owned
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	3	Privately owned (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private land owners
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	2	Private owner and estate
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	12.3ha (SDCP)
Total	26	

Consulted: Andrew Colenutt

Beaulieu_Warren: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	At present grazing marsh and lagoons (AP, EN), Ramsar, SSSI SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	Numerous domestic consents (SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Bird sanctuary
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	3	Privately owned (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private land owners
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Beaulieu Estate
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	6	193 ha (SDCP)
Total	27	

Consulted: Andrew Colenutt

Warren Farm & Needs Ore Point_b: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	At present grazing marsh and lagoons (AP, EN), Ramsar, SSSI and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SSCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Bird sanctuary
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	3	Privately owned (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Private land owners
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	4	44.3 ha (SDCP)
Total	27	

Consulted: Andrew Colenutt

Stansore Point: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Unused coastal grazing area (AP, EN), Ramsar, SSSI and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	Abstraction site at northern tip of site (SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	No consents (SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	1	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	The Country park would be severed unless an alternative route was provided
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Footpath runs across site frontage, would need to be diverted (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Cadland Estate leased to HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	Cadland Estate
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	15.9 ha (SDCP)
Total	25	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Stanswood Valley: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Valley marsh (AP, EN) SSSI
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	2 listed buildings lie on the site perimeter (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	2	An abstraction site lies just within the site(EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	Stanswood valley has a few domestic discharges. (EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	1	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	The area is private and there is no access along the foreshore
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	3	No Rights of way across the foreshore and Solent Way goes further inland
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Owned by private landowner who is open to the possibility of managed realignment
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	Cadland Estate
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	13.7 ha (SDCP)
Total	27	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Andrew Colenutt

Titchfield Haven: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	River floodplain (AP, EN), most of site covered by, SSSI, SPA and Ramsar
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	1	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	1	Sewerage pumping station at north of site (SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	1	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1	The area provides an open area for the new residential areas
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	RoW run along the western boundary of site. Solent Way runs across the frontage of site
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	(HCC/WSCC)
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	2	Primarily HCC small proportion owned by HWT
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	6	170 ha (SDCP)
Total	23	

Hook Lake:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Freshwater habitat (AP, EN) SPA, SAC, SSSI and Ramsar
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Several archaeological sites (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	Hook is a popular recreational facility
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Solent way runs across the site frontage and RoW run through the site (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	Majority owned by HCC potentially small areas held privately
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		4	46 ha (SDCP)
Total		29	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Karen McHugh

Gillies:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
	Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	3	(SDCP, AP)
	EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
	Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)
	Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
	What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
	Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	1	(SDCP)
	Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
	Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1	Sports ground would be lost The frontage is a popular recreation area
	Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Rights of Way runs down the western side of the site and along the frontage (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
	Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Hampshire County Council
	Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	
Additional Issues			
	What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	1	2.2 Ha (SDCP)
Total		27	

Wicor:	Criteria	Score	
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	3	(AP)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	1	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	(Coastal path)	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	2	No right of way on the website but Ian noted coastal path (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	FBC and HCC	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	1	1 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	28		

Portchester Rec:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Recreational Park
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Monument (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		1	“Recreation ground”
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Coastal path (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	FBC and HCC
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		2	8.1 ha (SDCP)
Total		26	

Farlington Marshes: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated	1	Freshwater grazing marshes, lagoons and saline lagoon (SSSI, SPA and RAMSAR) (A.P, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Archaeological feature present on site (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Large recreational area north of the A27, also the marshes are popular with walkers and bird watchers (AP)
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	2	Solent way runs along the perimeter of the site (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Owned by Portsmouth city council, managed by wildlife trust
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	5	74 ha (SDCP)
Total	27	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss, Karen McHugh

Southmoor: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	(A.P, EN) SSSI, RAMSAR, SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Numerous sites of archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Industrial area, has limited value as a recreational site (OS map)
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Numerous rights of way run through the site area (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Havant Borough Council
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	13.9 Ha (SDCP)
Total	29	

West Northney:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Agricultural high grade / Recreational/Designation	3	(AP, EN)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1	Whilst the site itself is not an important amenity site, the coastal ‘billy’ path is very popular and would be disturbed if realignment were to occur	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	The Hayling Island ‘billy’ path borders the site. The path would need to be relocated to the back boarder of the site.	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Hampshire County Council	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	2	7Ha (SDCP)	
Total	29		

Stoke (W. Hayling):	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designation		2	Pasture land (A.P, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC) Hearth Monument
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(AP, SDCP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		1	(AP, SDCP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Land mainly pasture and thus low recreational value
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		2	Hayling Island Billy path runs through the site, would need to re-routed.
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	Hampshire County Council
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	4.6 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

Fleet (W. Hayling):	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		1	Pasture land (A.P, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Pasture land
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		2	Billy Path runs through site (HCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	Hampshire County Council
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	2.3 ha (SDCP)
Total		26	

Newtown (W. Hayling):	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	SPA, RAMSAR, SSSI (A.P, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	The area is popular in the summer and has a recreational use (HCC)
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		2	Permissive footpath runs along the eastern perimeter of site (Hayling Billy)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	Coffin Mew & Clover
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		2	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	1.6 Ha (SDCP)
Total		25	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss

North Common:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		1	Area is partly unused land and recreation ground (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled building		2	(HCC/WSCC) The wadeway is in the vicinity but not sure this would be affected. CHC would be able to comment. Archaeological site just outside boundary in harbour may be affected.
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		1	Part of the site lies on an existing well used recreation field (AP)
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way, 1 Permissive, 0 Rights of Way		3	None (HCC/WSCC) There is a footpath adjacent to the site but no RoW through.
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	Field = Private owner. HCC and HBC own potential saltmarsh section
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	See above
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	10.4 Ha (SDCP)
Total		26	

Consulted: Rachael Bayliss

Warblington:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational / Designated	2	Marginal agricultural economic unit (AP, EN), SSSI	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	Listed buildings archaeology. Warblington castle lies behind the site (O.S map, HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	1	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	It is believed that the site could benefit amenity wise from realignment (Atkins)	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/ Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	2	Solent Way runs along rear of the site (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	HBC owns the land, leased to a tenant farmer	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	1	4.8 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	27		

Conigar Point:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		3	(AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		2	Informal path (HCC/WSCC)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	Havant Borough Council
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	4.1 Ha
Total		29	

North Hayling Northney Farm:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		1	Grazing and arable land (AP, EN), Ramsar, SSI and SPA cover half of site
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Area is very rural and thus does not provide recreational value for the area (OS map).
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/ Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	Two, possibly three landowners
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		4	46 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

Verner Common A:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designated	1	Grazing land (AP, EN) and designated (SSSI, Ramsar and SPA)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	1	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Recreational value is low due to the land being privately owned and access not being permitted	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Right of way (footpath- HCC)	
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	2		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	2	6 ha (SDCP)	
Total	26		

Verner Common B:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designated		2	Grazing land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		1	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Recreational value is low due to the land being privately owned and access not being permitted
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		2	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	2.4 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

Pound Marsh:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		2	Arable land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	Part of the site is used as a boating lake and is very well used over summer months (O.S map)
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/ Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	(HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		2	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	10.2 Ha (SDCP)
Total		27	

Tournerbury Marsh:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		1	Open marsh land (AP, EN), partly designated (SSSI, Ramsar and SPA)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	Tourner Bury fort is located near the site (O.S map, (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		4	44 Ha (SDCP)
Total		29	

Selsmore:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		3	Open land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Archaeological site present (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(EA, SDCP)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP and AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP and AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		1	The area is used for off season boat storage and is heavily used as access to the boating areas
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	A right of way (restricted byway)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	3.7 Ha
Total		23	

Thorney Island A:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	(AP, EN) 1 because MOD land	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	1	Only access to the site is the perimeter footpath, thus no recreational use of majority of site (HCC)	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Rights of Way runs along the perimeter of site (HCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Ministry of Defence	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	4	63.3 ha (SDCP)	
Total	28		

Thorney Island B:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	(AP, EN) designated (SSSI, SPA and Ramsar)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(EA, SDCP)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	1	(EA, SDCP)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP and AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP and AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Only access to the site is the perimeter footpath, thus no recreational use of majority of site (HCC)	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Rights of Way runs along the perimeter of site (HCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	Ministry of Defence	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	6	190 ha (SDCP)	
Total	25		

Thorney Island C:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Small part of site covered by SSSI, Ramsar and SPA and MoD land(A.P, NE)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Archaeological site (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, A.P)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, A.P)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	MoD land
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		2	Ministry of Defence
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? - 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	11.9 ha (SDCP)
Total		27	

Prinstead:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		2	Coastal grazing land (OS map, AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	Archaeological sites of interest just on edge of the site (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Mainly agricultural land, limited recreational use
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3?	?
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		2	8.6 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

Nutbourne: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Small area designated, majority is arable land (A.P, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	Domestic consents are found in the north east of the site outside secondary defence (SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Area is almost completely arable, minor disturbance for bird watchers
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Two footpaths (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	25.6 ha (SDCP)
Total	26	

West Chidham:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	2	The land is used for mixed farming (AP, EA) small part designated SSSI, Ramsar and SPA	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Numerous sites of archaeological interest These have been mapped and recorded by CHC as part of their proposed realignment scheme (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	1	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Site is arable and not used particularly for recreational purposes and footpath will be realigned	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Coastal path (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	2	CHC	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	CHC	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	37 (SDCP)	
Total	27		

East Chidham A:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designated	2	Arable and grazing land (AP, EN)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	Southern area of site has a limited creek network, the northern area of the site has only agricultural drainage (SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Disabled public access –dedicated toilet, car park	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	(HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	1	4.7 hectares (SDCP)	
Total	24		

East Chidham B:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated		2	Arable and grazing land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		1	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	Southern area of site has a limited creek network, the northern area of the site has only agricultural drainage (SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		1	Sailing centre/holiday cottages
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? - 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Two (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	3 landowners
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	16.6 hectares (SDCP)
Total		23	

East Chidham c:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use		2	Arable and grazing land (AP, EN)
- 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade, 1 Recreational/Designated			
EU Designation		3	(NE)
- 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required			
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc)		2	Archaeological site (HCC/WSCC)
- 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings			
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site?		3	(SDCP, EA)
- 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present			
What consent discharges are located on the site		3	(SDCP, EA)
- 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents			
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites		3	(SDCP, AP)
- 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes			
Evidence of relict creeks		2	Southern area of site has a limited creek network, the northern area of the site has only agricultural drainage (SDCP, AP)
- 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident			
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area		2	
- 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High			
Are any Rights of Way in the site area?		1	(HCC/WSCC)
- 3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way			
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person		1	More than three
- 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners			
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present?		1	4.7 hectares (SDCP)
6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha			
Total		24	

Bosham B:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designated		2	Mainly agricultural land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	Footpath/birds
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Two (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		1	4.8 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

West Wittering:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Primarily agricultural land, designated SSSI, SPA, SAC and Ramsar (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		2	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		1	During the summer the area is thronged with tourists drawn by the beach and numerous recreational pursuits enjoyed in the area
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	West Wittering Estate Co
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	13.6 hectares (SDCP)
Total		25	

Ella Nore:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	3	Unused coastal grazing land (AP, EN)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	The area has a minor archaeological sites of interest outside secondary defence (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	Extensive salt marsh fronts the site (SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Agricultural use of land ensures limited recreational use	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Right of Way (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Farmer	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	2	5.1 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	27		

Horse Pond:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Coastal grazing marsh (A.P, EN), SSSI, Ramsar and SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)- an archaeological site on perimeter of site
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP and A.P)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	The site frontage has extensive relict creeks (SDCP and A.P)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	The area is used by walkers and birdwatchers
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		2	5.8 ha (SDCP)
Total		28	

West Itchenor:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		3	Area is open land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		3	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? - 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	11.5 ha (SDCP)
Total		31	

Birdham:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designated	3	EA tidal floodplain (AP, EA)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	3	(HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2		
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	Church Commissioners	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	25 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	30		

Fishbourne A:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Small areas within the site are designated (SSSI< SPA and Ramsar), majority of land is arable (A.P, EN)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	There are major Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	Domestic consents found on the area (SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2	Footpath, bird/reedbed	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Footpath (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3	Other owners adjacent	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	21.3 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	27		

Fishbourne B:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	1	Small areas within the site are designated, majority of land is arable (A.P, EN)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	There are major Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	Domestic consents found on the area (SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2		
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Footpath runs through site and edge (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	2	9.8 ha (SDCP)	
Total	26		

Appledram:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designated	1	Small areas within the site are designated, majority of land is arable (A.P, NE)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	There are major Archaeological sites of interest (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	Domestic consents found on the area (SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, A.P)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	2		
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Footpath runs through site and edge (HCC/WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	3		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	10.7 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	27		

Medmerry:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural,1 Recreational/Designation	2	Grazing marsh and arable land (AP, EN) (small amount SPA, SSSI and Ramsar)	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Listed buildings are in the vicinity (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	1	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	1	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2/3	If sites joins with Pagham Harbour then 3. If not, 2. (SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	3	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Agricultural use of land	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Right of way (footpath – WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1		
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	6	347 ha (SDCP)	
Total	27		

Pagham South:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		2	Arable land (AP, EN)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		3	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Agricultural use of land
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Right of way (footpath –WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	Part of site is privately owned- un-sure about rest
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		2	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	22.2 ha (SDCP)
Total		29	

Church Norton:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural low grade,1 Recreational/Designation	1	Grazing marsh and arable land (AP, EN) Ramsar, SSSI, SPA	
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	1	(NE)	
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	1	Listed buildings and sites with archaeological importance (HCC/WSCC)	
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)	
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	2	(SDCP, EA)	
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	2	(SDCP, AP)	
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Agricultural land, fronted by sandy beach, which during peak times is used as a recreational area.	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Right of way (footpath –WSCC)	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1		
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Assumed more than two owners	
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	3	21 Ha (SDCP)	
Total	21		

Keynor Rife:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1/Recreational/Designation		1	Grazing marsh and arable land (AP, EN) SSSI, SPA Ramsar
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		1	Tide Mill is adjacent to site (HCC/WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		3	(EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		2	
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		3	
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	Assumed more than two owners
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		3	13.3 ha (SDCP)
Total		24	

Sidlesham: Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment		
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation	2	Agricultural land (SDCP)
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required	3	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings	2	Weapons (WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present	3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents	3	(SDCP, EA)
Physical		
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes	3	(SDCP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident	1	(SDCP)
Amenity and Recreation		
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High	3	Agricultural land
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way	1	Right of way (WSCC)
Stakeholders		
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown	1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners	1	Assumed more than two owners
Additional Issues		
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40- 10 ha, 2: sites between 10ha – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha	2	8 Ha (SDCP)
Total	25	

Bremere and Pagham Rife:	Criteria	Score	Comments
Environment			
Land Use - 3 Unused sites, 2 Agricultural, 1 Recreational/Designation		1	Grazing marsh and arable land (AP, EN) SSSI, Ramsar, SPA
EU Designation - 3 no replacement freshwater habitat required, 1 replacement freshwater habitat required		1	(NE)
Cultural heritage interest (listed buildings, archaeological interests etc) - 3 undesignated, 2 Archaeological site, 1 listed buildings/scheduled buildings		3	(WSCC)
Are there any licensed abstractions located on the site? - 3 No abstractions, 2 Less than three, 1 More than 3 abstractions present		3	(SDCP, EA)
What consent discharges are located on the site - 3 No consent discharges, 2 Domestic consents, 1 Sewage consents		2	(SDCP, EA)
Physical			
Proximity of adjacent salt marshes as a seed supply for new sites - 3 extensive salt marshes immediately adjacent to site, 2 limited salt marshes near by, 1 no extent salt marshes		3	(SDCP, AP)
Evidence of relict creeks - 3 extensive former creek system visible, 2 limited creek network visible, 1 no drainage evident		2	(SDCP, AP)
Amenity and Recreation			
Would there be any loss of amenity value to the site? What is the recreational use of the area - 3 Low, 2 Medium, 1 High		3	Agricultural land, is used sparingly by walkers and birdwatchers
Are any Rights of Way in the site area? -3 No rights of way, 2 Solent Way/Permissive, 1 Rights of Way		1	Right of Way (footpath WSCC)
Stakeholders			
Who owns the land, 3 Wildlife Trust, 2 statutory authority, 1 private owner or Unknown		1	
Is the land owned by more than 1 person - 3 one owner, 2 two owners / leaseholders, 1 more than two owners		1	Assumed more than two owners
Additional Issues			
What is the size of the area within secondary defences if present? 6: sites greater than 100 ha, 5: sites between 100-70 ha, 4: sites between 70-40 ha, 3: sites between 40-10 ha, 2: sites between 10 – 5ha, 1: sites less than 5ha		6	196 ha (SDCP)
Total		27	