

# E Open coast SMP management boundaries

## CONTENTS

E.1	Requirement of the review.....	E-2
E.1.1	Introduction .....	E-2
E.1.2	Reasons for review .....	E-2
E.1.3	Review of boundaries .....	E-2
E.1.4	SMPs and Futurecoast boundaries .....	E-3

Annex E1: Review of SMP1 boundaries

Annex E2: SMPs and Futurecoast boundaries

## ***E.1 Requirement of the review***

### ***E.1.1 Introduction***

This is a review of the appropriateness of existing SMP boundaries and makes recommendations of suitable changes to these boundaries based upon process/ shoreline evolution characteristics alone, including the possibility of merging some SMPs. This review takes into account findings from the Futurecoast study (Halcrow, 2002) and the English Nature internal report "Shoreline Management Plans: advice on key boundary locations" (Halcrow, 2001).

It is intended that this document is a guide rather than dictating any changes to the SMP boundaries, which may be based on reasons other than process/shoreline evolution characteristics.

### ***E.1.2 Reasons for review***

Development of the first round of Shoreline Management Plans (SMPs) was based upon littoral cell boundaries, which had previously been defined at zones of sediment convergence and divergence. The review of the first round of SMPs (MAFF, 2000) identified that there were a number of locations where the existing SMP boundaries were inappropriate, for example where boundaries divided major estuaries or landforms.

### ***E.1.3 Review of boundaries***

Annex E1 contains a summary review of the existing SMP boundaries for each of the present SMP areas. The information contained within these tables, for each SMP, is as follows:

<b>BOUNDARY:</b>	
Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?	This identifies whether there is a <u>fundamental</u> problem / issue with the existing boundary and the reasons for this.
Should a boundary change be considered?	This identifies whether there could be an improvement or advantage from moving a boundary, even where a fundamental change is not necessary, and outlines the reasons why.
<b>SMP AREA</b>	
Are there other boundaries to consider?	This identifies areas where it may be possible to divide the SMP further, or merge with other SMP areas.
Are there major inter-SMP considerations?	This identifies any fundamental need to consider other areas outside of the SMP, e.g. due to strong sediment linkages, or where evolution of the coastline will have a major impact on another SMP area.
Should the SMP area be altered?	This concludes/ summarises the statements made above and identifies the key changes that would be recommended.
<b>ESTUARIES</b>	
This section identifies the key estuaries in the SMP area and refers to Appendix F, which provides guidance to enable determination of whether, and how, estuarine shores should be included in the SMP process.	

#### *E.1.4 SMPs and Futurecoast boundaries*

The Table presented in Annex E2 lists the *existing* SMP boundaries and includes a comparison with the systems and statements defined in the Futurecoast study (Halcrow, 2002).

Sub-division of the coast for SMP purposes is not based on the same criteria as used for Futurecoast, therefore the units defined by Futurecoast are not expected to be strictly adhered to in the SMPs. However the information contained in Futurecoast will be used in the baseline understanding of coastal behaviour and dynamics (Task 2.1, see Volume 2).

## Annex E1: Review of SMP1 boundaries

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>St Abb's Head to The Tyne (1a)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: St Abb's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There is no problem with the existing boundary as it is a hard igneous headland and there are little wider-scale interactions.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
As this coastline is fundamentally controlled by the geology, the boundary could be moved to the English border.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: River Tyne</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The underlying geology is the dominant control of shoreline evolution, with little wider-scale interactions. Beaches along the frontage between St Abb's Head and The Tyne tend to be locally derived. There is very little transport across the mouth of the Tyne river and the position of the Tyne is relatively fixed by the underlying geology.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The coastline could be divided further as it is predominately geology-controlled, but there would be no advantage in doing so.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Some</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. Although the Tyne exerts only a low influence on the shoreline evolution, it is important that the Tyne is included in the SMP process; therefore a decision should be made as to which SMP area to include it within.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
The boundaries set are suitable, but the northern boundary could be changed to the English border, if desired.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate appendix on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Tyne, Tweed, Aln, Coquet, Wansbeck and the Blyth.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>River Tyne to Seaham Harbour (1b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: River Tyne</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There is very little transport across the mouth of the Tyne river and the position of the Tyne is relatively fixed by the underlying geology.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
This is convenient boundary, which, due to the coastal form and the limited interactions at the wider scale, is appropriate.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Seaham Harbour</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
However, there is no clear process reason for selecting this as a boundary. The coastline is characterised by embayments separated by rock headlands are harbour arms, with a generally low to moderate southward drift, with Seaham representing one boundary to such an embayment (Hartlepool could have been set as an alternative boundary). It is suggested that the boundary could be moved to Saltburn, i.e. combining sub-cells 1b and 1c.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The combining of sub-cells 1b and 1c could improve efficiency.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The character of this coast mean that alternative boundaries could be set at the embayments that are present, however there would be no advantage of doing this. [A key point is that Tees Bay needs to be included as a whole, therefore a boundary splitting the River Tees would be highly discouraged.]	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Should be considered</i></b>
The combination of sub-cells 1b and 1c should be seriously considered.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to The Wear.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Seaham Harbour to Saltburn (1c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Seaham Harbour</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
However, there is no clear process reason for selecting this as a boundary. The coastline is characterised by embayments separated by rock headlands are harbour arms, with a generally low to moderate southward drift, with Seaham representing one boundary to such an embayment. It is suggested that sub-cells 1b and 1c could be combined.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is suggested that sub-cells 1b and 1c could be combined, by changing Boundary 1 to River Tyne.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Saltburn</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Saltburn is the approximate limit of influence of the Tees Estuary. To the south of Saltburn the coastline is geologically controlled and there are very little wider-scale interactions.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is essential that Tees Bay be considered as a whole, i.e. within one SMP.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
However, assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Should be considered</i></b>
The combination of sub-cells 1b and 1c should be seriously considered.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Tees Estuary.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Saltburn to Flamborough Head (1d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Saltburn</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Saltburn is the approximate limit of influence of the Tees Estuary. This SMP unit is geologically controlled and there are very little wider-scale interactions.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Saltburn is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Flamborough Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Flamborough Head is a resistant chalk headland that acts as a partial barrier to sediment transport. It divides a predominately hard-rock coastline to the north and softer deposits to the south.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Flamborough Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
As littoral drift is low and there is little interaction between embayments, other boundaries could be set, but there would be no advantage of doing so.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
However, assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The boundaries set are appropriate SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Esk Estuary.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Flamborough Head to Donna Nook (2a &amp; b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Flamborough Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Flamborough Head is a resistant chalk headland that acts as a partial barrier to sediment transport. It divides a predominately hard-rock coastline to the north and softer deposits to the south.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Flamborough Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Donna Nook</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
The boundaries need to meet the boundaries of the Humber Estuary SMP; it would therefore be reasonable to change the boundary to Spurn Head. An alternative would be to combine this area with 2c, with the southern boundary set at Gibraltar Point. Spurn Head is a strong, although dynamic, control on the coastal alignment of the Holderness coast. There is a bedload pathway across the Humber, under average conditions it is relatively weak, but there is a feed of predominately sand, or finer, sediment to the Lincolnshire coast during high-energy events. This material is likely to be moved down as far south as the Wash. Although there is a drift-divide at Donna Nook this is an important temporary sediment store/ source area for the Lincolnshire coast.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Any further division of the SMP would be strongly discouraged because of the large-scale behavioural trend of the Holderness coastline.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is essential to ensure a clear link with the Humber Estuary and there therefore needs to be close SMP links. There is also a link to sub-cell 2c (and beyond), and therefore if the two are not combined, there also needs to be careful integration of the two SMPs. A recommendation would be to consider completing this SMP prior to 2c.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Should be considered</i></b>
The minor change from Donna Nook to Spurn Head should be considered, but with the acknowledgement that strong links are maintained with the Humber Estuary SMP and the Lincolnshire SMP.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Humber Estuary.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Donna Nook to Gibraltar Point (2c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Donna Nook</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The SMP boundaries should coincide with those of the Humber Estuary SMP, which is currently set at Donna Nook.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
An alternative would be to combine this area with 2a & b.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Gibraltar Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Although there are close links with the Wash, Gibraltar Point is a convenient boundary and together with its associated offshore sandbanks, it forms a 'headland' at the mouth of the Wash. It is a control on the alignment of the Lincolnshire coast. The Wash can be considered as a separate management unit because it is a very different environment.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is appropriate to consider the Wash as a single SMP management unit and Gibraltar Point is a suitable choice of boundary for the Wash.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Any further sub-division of the coastal would be strongly discouraged because of the sediment linkages in this area.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There must be explicit consideration of the sediment linkages between the Holderness, Humber Estuary and Wash SMP areas. A recommendation would be for this SMP to follow the SMP for 2b, but be completed prior to 2d.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Both boundaries are suitable, but it should be ensured that the northern boundary at Donna Nook is coincident with that set for the Humber Estuary SMP.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Humber Estuary.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Gibraltar Point to Snettisham (2d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Gibraltar Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Although there are close links with the Wash, Gibraltar Point is a convenient boundary and together with its associated offshore sandbanks, it forms a 'headland' at the mouth of the Wash. It is a control on the coastline alignment of the Lincolnshire coast. The Wash can be considered as a separate management unit because it is a very different environment.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
This is an appropriate boundary for the Wash SMP.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Snettisham</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary needs to be reviewed because the Wash needs to be considered as a whole system. A possible change would be to move the boundary to Hunstanton, where sandstone and chalk cliffs outcrop that constrain the north-eastern side of the entrance to the Wash. Alternatively the boundary could be moved to Weybourne (combining 2d and 3a) because of the commonalties in geomorphology and the longshore sediment links.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It would not be advisable to divide the SMP further, although the merge with sub-cell 3a discussed above should be considered.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There are strong sediment links along this coastline there therefore needs to be consideration of adjacent SMP areas. The sequencing the SMPs should be considered with a recommendation that this area be undertaken following the SMPs for 2a, 2b, 2c and 3a.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The Snettisham boundary should be changed, considering the alternatives suggested above.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Wash.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Snettisham to Sheringham (3a)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Snettisham</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary needs to be reviewed because the Wash needs to be considered as a whole system. A possible change would be to move the boundary to Hunstanton, where sandstone and chalk cliffs outcrop that constrain the north-eastern side of the entrance to the Wash. Alternatively the boundary could be moved to the start of the cliffs (approximately at) Weybourne/Kelling (combining 2d and 3a) because of the commonalities in geomorphology and the longshore sediment links.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Sheringham</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes (minor)</i></b>
This boundary was originally defined due to the sediment null point/drift divide. However, this point is known to shift in position between Weybourne and Cromer. A more suitable boundary would be at Weybourne/Kelling, where there is also a change in geomorphology and coastal system from shingle barrier to cliffed coastline.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Further division of the SMP would not be recommended although the merging with sub-cell 2d should be considered.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There is a close sediment link to the Wash, which needs to be explicitly considered particularly if the two SMPs are not merged. The sequencing the SMPs should be considered with a recommendation that this area be undertaken prior to 2d.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
A change to Snettisham boundary should be carefully considered, with two possibilities identified: moving it to Hunstanton or merging 2d and 3a. There should also be a minor change by moving the Sheringham boundary to Weybourne/Kelling.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
None.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Sheringham to Lowestoft (3b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Sheringham</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes (minor)</i></b>
This boundary was originally defined due to the sediment null point/drift divide. However, this point is known to shift in position between Weybourne and Cromer. A more suitable boundary would be at Weybourne/Kelling, where there is also a change in geomorphology and coastal system from shingle barrier to cliffed coastline.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Lowestoft</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Ideally the coast between Weybourne and Landguard Point (Felixstowe) should be considered, because of the drift-aligned nature of this coastline and therefore the strong sediment linkages, but this could be impracticable. Lowestoft therefore represents a reasonable boundary to the SMP area as it is the approximate limit to the nearshore / offshore bank system, which is an important sediment linkage.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary at Lowestoft could be moved to Benacre Ness, as this is more accurately the southern limit of the nearshore bank system. However, Benacre Ness is a moving feature and therefore could be difficult to define as a boundary. An alternative could be to move the boundary to Landguard Point, thus combining SMPs for 3b and 3c.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There could feasibly be further sub-division of this coast, but the strong sediment linkages would need to be explicitly considered and therefore this would not be recommended. The merging of SMPs for sub-cells 3b and 3c should also be considered due to the strong sediment linkages along this coastline.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
This is a drift-aligned shoreline therefore full consideration of the interactions is required and processes should be considered beyond the southern boundary to at least Benacre Ness.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The northern boundary at Sheringham should be moved to Weybourne/Kelling and consideration should be given to the possibility of moving the southern boundary to Benacre Ness. There is also the possibility of merging with sub-cell 3c if considered practicable.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Yare and Waveney estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Lowestoft to Harwich (3c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Lowestoft</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Ideally the coast between Weybourne and Landguard Point (Felixstowe) should be considered as a whole, because of the drift-aligned nature of this coastline, but this could be impracticable. Lowestoft therefore represents a reasonable boundary to the SMP area as it is the approximate limit to the nearshore / offshore bank system, which is an important sediment linkage.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary at Lowestoft could be moved to Benacre Ness, as this is more accurately the southern limit of the nearshore bank system. However, Benacre Ness is a moving feature and therefore could be difficult to define as a boundary. An alternative could be to combine SMPs for 3b and 3c and therefore remove this boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Harwich</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The shoreline to Felixstowe is drift aligned, with common characteristics, whereas to the south of Felixstowe, the influence of the Thames Estuary and other former tributaries become increasingly important and there are changes in geomorphology.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes (minor)</i></b>
A minor change to Landguard Point should be considered, so that the Stour-Orwell Estuary falls within the SMP for 3d.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There could feasibly be further sub-division of this coast, e.g. at Thorpe Ness or Shingle Street, but the strong sediment linkages would need to be explicitly considered and therefore this would not be recommended. The merging of SMPs for sub-cells 3b and 3c should also be considered due to the strong sediment linkages along this coastline.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There are strong sediment linkages, therefore adjacent SMPs should be considered and conclusions fully integrated. A recommendation would be for SMP 3b to be completed prior to 3c, as drift is predominately southwards.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Should be considered (minor)</i></b>
Consideration should be given to the possibility of redefining the southern boundary to Landguard Point and merging with sub-cell 3b.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Blyth, Alde/Ore/Butley and Deben estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Harwich to Canvey Island (3d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Harwich</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Harwich represents the approximate outer limit of the influence of the Thames Estuary and therefore there is a change in coastal environment from a drift-aligned coast to a lower energy estuarine environment. Harwich provides an anchor to shore alignment for areas to the south. There is also little shingle transport across the mouth of the estuary and therefore not much sediment linkage with the SMP for area 3c; Harwich Channel is recognised as a naturally occurring drift break point.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
A minor redefinition to Landguard Point should be considered, so that the SMPs coincide and the Stour-Orwell Estuary falls within one SMP area.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Canvey Island</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There is no substantial link in terms of sediment supply between the coast to the north and that to the south of the Thames.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
The current boundary splits the Thames Estuary in two. Although there is no substantial link in terms of sediment supply between the coast to the north and that to the south of the Thames, it may be better to consider the whole of the Thames Estuary (including outer reaches) as one, by extending the boundary to Whitstable, which marks a change in geomorphology. To the west of Whitstable the coastal evolution is estuarine dominated, whereas to the east the coastal alignment is more determined by the underlying geology and the controlling influence of the Isle of Thanet.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The estuaries could be used to break up the coastline into smaller, self-contained frontages, but for long-term planning this would not be recommended.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Should be considered</i></b>
The northern boundary could be redefined from Harwich to Landguard Point. It may be desirable to change the Canvey Island boundary, particularly to ensure that boundaries coincide with those defined for other initiatives, e.g. the Thames Estuary Flood Management Strategy.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Orwell/ Stour, Hamford Water, Colne, Blackwater, Crouch/Roach and Thames estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Canvey Island to South Foreland (4a &amp; b)</b>	
<b>BOUNDARY 1: Canvey Island</b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: No</b>
There is no substantial link in terms of sediment supply between the coast to the north and that to the south of the Thames.	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: Possibly</b>
The current boundary splits the Thames Estuary in two. Although there is no substantial link in terms of sediment supply between the coast to the north and that to the south of the Thames, it may be better to consider the whole of the Thames Estuary (including outer reaches) as one, by extending the boundary to Whitstable, which marks a change in geomorphology. To the west of Whitstable the coastal evolution is estuarine dominated, whereas to the east the coastal alignment is more determined by the underlying geology and the controlling influence of the Isle of Thanet.	
<b>BOUNDARY 2: South Foreland</b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: No</b>
South Foreland represents a chalk headland control and as such marks an appropriate boundary. Although there is potential for sand and shingle to be transported around South Foreland from the west, there is little actual transport due to the general lack of available sediment.	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Despite the change in orientation and therefore forcing conditions at North Foreland, there is a long term potential for a breach around the back of North Foreland, reopening Wantsum Channel and resulting in The Isle of Thanet becoming an island again. This would have big implications for both coasts and therefore it is appropriate to combine these areas.	
<b>SMP AREA</b>	
<b>Are there other boundaries to consider?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
North Foreland could be a substitute boundary as it is a control of the easterly extent of the Thames basin, it makes a distinct change in coastal orientation and is also a drift divide; with very little sediment moving around the headland to reach the coast to the south. The possibility of a breach around the back of the foreland would, however, need to be considered in both SMPs should such this division be made.	
<b>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b>Should the SMP area be altered?</b>	<b>: Should be considered</b>
In conjunction with 3d, a possible change in the western boundary could be considered, but the South Foreland boundary is appropriate.	
<b>ESTUARIES</b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Medway, Swale and Stour-Pegwell estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>South Foreland to Beachy Head (4c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: South Foreland</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
South Foreland represents a chalk headland control and as such marks an appropriate boundary. Although there is potential for sand and shingle to be transported around South Foreland from the west, there is little actual transport due to the general lack of available sediment.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Some possibility of moving boundary west to Sandgate, as this frontage is not strongly linked to Dungeness; however this would have no advantage for the SMP to the north, so is not recommended.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Beachy Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Beachy Head is a resistant chalk headland that acts as a partial barrier to sediment transport, although little contemporary movement actually occurs. It divides a predominately hard-rock coastline to the north and softer deposits to the south.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Beachy Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Whilst a headland structure, Dungeness foreland is the key geomorphological feature on this coastline and the current boundaries allow consideration of the entire foreland together with its potential sediment sources to the west and any outputs to the east.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. In the past there were sediment inputs to this frontage around Beachy Head; however a lack of contemporary sediment sources means these are no longer significant.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is possible to consider the frontage to the east of Sandgate separately from the Dungeness dominated area to the east; however there are no real advantages in subdividing the frontage.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to River Rother.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Beachy Head to Selsey Bill (4d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Beachy Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Beachy Head is a resistant chalk headland that acts as a partial barrier to sediment transport. It divides a predominately hard-rock coastline to the north and softer deposits to the south.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Beachy Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Selsey Bill</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Selsey Bill forms a headland and acts as a control on the development of the shorelines to the east and west. The Bill is formed of soft erodable materials, although it is currently heavily protected, and its presence, as a headland, is largely due to protective presence of a limestone ridge (the Mixon Reef) approximately 3 km offshore, representing a remnant of the former position of the coastline. Over time, the reef will exert a reducing influence on Selsey due to deepening water (associated with sea level rise) and increasing distance from the shoreline (retreat of Selsey). However, Selsey Bill remains the primary control on shoreline processes in this area is will remain so over the timescales of the SMP.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
In addition to the 'soft' nature of the Selsey Bill headland there is also a threat of breaching through into Pagham Harbour from the Medmerry shoreline to the west. This creates a potential linkage between the two frontages, which could potentially be addressed by moving the boundary west to East Wittering. However, this would mean that Selsey Bill itself was not included in the SMP to the west, which would be a disadvantage given its influence on that frontage. Also, regardless of a breach through into Pagham Harbour, it is likely that Selsey Bill would remain as a strong control on the adjacent shorelines.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Given the weak contemporary sediment transport across this large embayment, it would be possible to split the frontage internally (possibly at Brighton where there is a change from low-lying to predominantly cliff morphology), however this would offer no significant benefits to the SMP unless it was administratively preferable.	

**Are there major inter-SMP considerations?****: Yes**

Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. See above for details of strong linkages across/around Selsey Bill that need to be taken into consideration in both SMPs. These linkages, and the potential significance of the long-term management decisions at Medmerry for both frontages, suggest that it may be preferable to undertake the Bracklesham Bay SMP first. This would mean that decisions made for the Pagham frontage would be based upon knowledge of the long-term strategy for Medmerry. (It is recognised that this sequence of SMP production is not practicable for SMP2, but should be considered for future revisions.)

**Should the SMP area be altered?****: No**

This forms a continuous frontage with potential linkages throughout. Selsey Bill should be retained due to its headland influence.

**ESTUARIES**

See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Cuckmere Haven, Ouse, Adur, Arun and Pagham Harbour.

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Selsey Bill to River Hamble (5a &amp; 5b part)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Selsey Bill</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
<p>Selsey Bill forms a headland and acts as a control on the development of the shorelines to the east and west. The Bill is formed of soft erodable materials and its presence, as a headland, is largely due to protective presence of a limestone ridge (the Mixon Reef) approximately 3 km offshore, representing a remnant of the former position of the coastline. Over time, the reef will exert a reducing influence on Selsey due to deepening water (associated with sea level rise) and increasing distance from the shoreline (retreat of Selsey). However, Selsey Bill remains the primary SMP control on shoreline processes in this area as it will remain so over the timescales of the SMP.</p>	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
<p>In addition to the 'soft' nature of the Selsey Bill headland there is also a real threat of breaching through into Pagham Harbour from the Medmerry shoreline to the west. This creates a potential linkage between the two frontages, which could potentially be addressed by moving the boundary west to East Wittering. However, this would mean that Selsey Bill itself was not included in the SMP to the west, which would be a disadvantage given its influence on that frontage. Also, regardless of a breach through into Pagham Harbour, it is likely that Selsey Bill would remain as a strong control on the adjacent shorelines.</p>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: River Hamble</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
<p>The frontage between Selsey Bill and Gilkicker Point forms a discreet embayment within the northern Solent shoreline. It is recommended that the River Hamble boundary be either moved east to Gilkicker Point (to create a Bracklesham Bay SMP) or removed entirely to create a larger Solent SMP between Hurst Spit and Selsey Bill (possibly also including the north coast of the Isle of Wight). It is likely that a move to Gilkicker Point would be preferable both administratively and physically (so the Bracklesham Bay SMP could concentrate on the interactions between open coast and the three major estuaries of Portsmouth, Langstone and Chichester Harbours).</p>	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
If boundary moved to Gilkicker Point, then there is no requirement for further sub-division.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
<p>Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. If the west boundary is moved to Gilkicker Point there will remain a strong requirement to gain/use a full appreciation of the processes operating in the Solent as a whole, which this frontage is strongly linked to. If the boundary were to</p>	

remain at the River Hamble then it is vital that the Southampton Water processes, and wider Solent, are fully considered in the SMP.

The linkages across Selsey Bill, and the potential significance of the long-term management decisions at Medmerry, suggest that it may be preferable to undertake the Bracklesham Bay SMP before the South Downs SMP. This would mean that decisions made for the Pagham frontage would be based upon knowledge of the long-term strategy for Medmerry. (It is recognised that this sequence of SMP production is not practicable for SMP2, but should be considered for future revisions.)

**Should the SMP area be altered? : Yes**

It is recommended that the western boundary be moved to Gilkicker Point.

### ***ESTUARIES***

See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Chichester Harbour, Langstone Harbour and Portsmouth Harbour.

## SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN

---

### River Hamble to Hurst Spit (5b part & 5c)

#### ***BOUNDARY 1: River Hamble***

***Does the boundary NEED to change?*** : Yes

This boundary creates a division within Southampton Water, and it is strongly recommended that this estuary be contained entirely within one SMP. The hydrodynamic processes of the Solent and Southampton Water operate across the mouth of the River Hamble, with the main change in function occurring at Gilkicker Point where the influence of open-coast (non Solent) processes increases within Bracklesham Bay. It is recommended that the River Hamble boundary be either moved east to Gilkicker Point (to include Southampton Water within a single SMP) or removed entirely to create a larger Solent SMP between Hurst Spit and Selsey Bill (possibly also including the north coast of the Isle of Wight). It is likely that a move to Gilkicker Point would be preferable both administratively and physically (so the Gilkicker Point to Hurst Spit SMP could concentrate on the largely estuarine nature of this area of the north Solent coastline).

***Should a boundary change be considered?*** : Yes

See above.

#### ***BOUNDARY 2: Hurst Spit***

***Does the boundary NEED to change?*** : Possibly

This shingle spit is strongly linked to the frontages on either side of it: by sediment feed from the Christchurch Bay frontage; and, through the fundamental control it exerts upon the physical environment of the Western Solent. However, the major geomorphological differences between these two frontages means there would be little advantage in considering both Christchurch Bay and the Western Solent in a single SMP. To ensure that the maintenance of Hurst Spit is properly considered in the Solent SMP, it may be appropriate to move the boundary (for this SMP) west into Christchurch Bay (Chewton Bunny the County/District boundary was used in SMP1), and create an overlap with the adjacent SMP.

***Should a boundary change be considered?*** : Yes

Movement of the boundary west into Christchurch Bay would ensure the key processes of sediment transport that form/maintain Hurst Spit are considered within the Solent SMP, the policies of which will be strongly dependant upon the influence of the spit. It would also be possible to achieve this understanding by ensuring process studies considered Christchurch Bay, whilst not necessarily looking to set policies for the Christchurch Bay frontage. However, it is important to note that such a change would be inappropriate for the adjacent SMP, which must consider Hurst Spit in the context of Christchurch Bay.

**SMP AREA****Are there other boundaries to consider? : Yes**

There is a geomorphological boundary between the Western Solent and Southampton Water at Calshot Spit, which primarily marks a reduction in the influence of Hurst Spit. It would technically be possible to sub-divide the SMP at Calshot Spit, however there would again be issues surrounding the spit associated with formative influences to the south and the area of influence to the north. As such, this sub-division is not recommended.

**Are there major inter-SMP considerations? : Yes**

Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. As outlined above, the influence of the Solent crosses the recommended boundary at Gilkicker Point so process studies need to understand this influence from the east. More significantly, full consideration should be given to the importance of sediment inputs from Christchurch Bay in maintaining Hurst Spit. This latter point may be best addressed by sequencing the production of SMPs so that Christchurch Bay is undertaken first, and the Solent SMP then has a full understanding of the long-term evolution of Hurst Spit.

**Should the SMP area be altered? : Yes**

The boundary at the mouth of the River Hamble should be moved to Gilkicker Point. The Hurst Spit boundary can remain as it is, although the influences from Christchurch Bay must be considered.

**ESTUARIES**

See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Southampton Water, Beaulieu River and Lymington River.

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Isle of Wight (5d &amp; 5e)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Not applicable</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Not applicable</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
<p>It would be possible to consider sub-dividing the island into a north and south SMPs, similar to the sub-cells defined. These divisions are at The Needles and Bembridge Foreland. The Needles headland is a strong littoral transport boundary and also marks a significant change in shoreline exposure between the south-west and north-east coasts. Bembridge Foreland is a less significant boundary and Culver Cliff (to the south) actually forms a greater sediment transport boundary.</p>	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
<p>Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. The hydrodynamic environments of the north and south Isle of Wight coasts are significantly different, with the exposed south and sheltered north. In terms of process understanding it is important that consideration of the north coast is made in the context of the wider Solent environment. As such, it is possible that a 'Solent SMP' could be considered, combining the north Isle of Wight with the Hurst Spit to Gilkicker Point SMP, but the actual sediment linkages across the Solent and the potential for changes in shoreline controls are not sufficient to make this a strong recommendation.</p>	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
<p>Sediment transport divisions on the island coastline do not provide sufficient justification for sub-dividing this SMP, particularly given that a single authority administers the islands coastline.</p>	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
<p>See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Western Year, Newtown Harbour, Medina, Wootton Creek and Bembridge Harbour.</p>	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Hurst Spit to Durlston Head (5f)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Hurst Spit</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Processes of longshore sediment transport within Christchurch Bay create Hurst Spit, and thus it should be considered as part of this bay. It is important that the whole spit is considered in this SMP to ensure its coherent management.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Durlston Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Durlston Head is a resistant limestone headland (part of the Isle of Purbeck) that acts as a barrier to sediment transport.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The boundary here is the whole Isle of Purbeck but, as the main headland on the Isle, Durlston Head provides an appropriate point.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Within Poole and Christchurch Bays there are a number of headlands that could potentially be used to sub-divide the SMP area. The most significant are at Hengistbury Head, Handfast Point and Peveril Point. Of these, Handfast Point and Peveril Point provide significant sediment transport boundaries, but the bays which these create (Durlston and Swanage Bays) are too small to realistically be considered for discrete SMPs. Hengistbury Head provides a strong headland influence on Christchurch Bay, but is not a strong sediment transport barrier which, together with the potential for a breach around the Head through Christchurch Harbour, means that it would be an inappropriate boundary.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. The fundamental control that Hurst Spit exerts over the Solent environment, and its importance in providing shelter to the Solent shoreline, must be recognised in this SMP.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
This is an appropriate SMP area, including significant sediment linkages across the frontage feeding through to Hurst Spit.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Christchurch Harbour and Poole Harbour.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Durlston Head to Portland Bill (5g)</b>	
<b>BOUNDARY 1:</b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Durlston Head is a resistant limestone headland (part of the Isle of Purbeck) that acts as a barrier to sediment transport.	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: No</b>
The boundary here is the whole Isle of Purbeck but, as the main headland on the Isle, Durlston Head provides an appropriate point.	
<b>BOUNDARY 2: <i>Portland Bill</i></b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Portland Bill provides a significant, geologically controlled, headland control on the adjacent shorelines.	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
The possibility of a breach, through the section of Chesil Beach that connects the Isle of Portland to the mainland, creates a strong potential linkage between the Chesil Beach frontage and Weymouth Bay and the coast to the east. If a permanent breach were to occur, the Isle of Portland would continue to provide some shelter to the coast to the east, however the increased exposure of Weymouth Bay to SW surges would be of great significant for shoreline management. To address this possible linkage, and ensure coherent management of the Portland-mainland link, it may be appropriate to consider the Chesil Beach and Weymouth frontages in one SMP. This could be achieved by moving this boundary either east to a point around, say, Ringstead (although this would create an additional very short SMP to the east), or west to either Eype (end of Chesil Beach) or Beer Head (next significant headland), creating an SMP centred on Portland.	
<b>SMP AREA</b>	
<b>Are there other boundaries to consider?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Within the existing boundaries the shoreline is dominated by hard rock, with little significant alongshore sediment linkage.	
<b>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. As outlined above, the potential for a breach through the east end of Chesil Beach must be considered within this SMP.	
<b>Should the SMP area be altered?</b>	<b>: Possibly</b>
It may be appropriate to include the frontages either side of Portland Bill, to account for the breach potential at the east end of Chesil Beach.	
<b>ESTUARIES</b>	
No significant estuaries present.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Portland Bill to Rame Head (6a,b &amp; c Portland Bill)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Portland Bill</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Portland Bill provides a significant, geologically controlled, headland control on the adjacent shorelines.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The possibility of a breach, through the section of Chesil Beach that connects the Isle of Portland to the mainland, creates a strong potential linkage between the Chesil Beach frontage and Weymouth Bay and the coast to the east. If a permanent breach were to occur, the Isle of Portland would continue to provide some shelter to the coast to the east, however the increased exposure of Weymouth Bay to SW surges would be of great significant for shoreline management. To address this possible linkage, and ensure coherent management of the Portland-mainland link, it may be appropriate to consider the Chesil Beach and Weymouth frontages on one SMP? This could be achieved by moving this boundary either east to a point around, say, Ringstead (although this would create a very short SMP to the east), or west to either Eype (end of Chesil Beach) or Beer Head (next significant headland), creating an SMP centred on Portland.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Rame Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Rame Head provides a strong, geologically controlled, headland influence on the adjacent shorelines.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There are a large number of features within this frontage that could be considered for use as an SMP boundary. On geomorphological grounds, it may be appropriate to consider moving the boundary to Start Point (creating a Lyme Bay SMP), as the coast to the west of this point is similar to that of the South Cornwall coast, although there are no strong linkages along this frontage that would necessitate such a move. It would also be possible to consider moving the Rame Head boundary to the Devon-Cornwall administrative boundary, at the River Tamar. Whilst the Tamar does not provide a strong a process boundary, there are no significant alongshore interactions here.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
As outlined above there are a number of internal divisions within this SMP frontage, represented by headland features. Other locations within the SMP area could be considered as boundaries, if preferable for administrative purposes (e.g. Beer Head, Straight Point, Hope's Nose or Berry Head), although there is no strong reason to change.	

**Are there major inter-SMP considerations?****: Yes**

Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. As outlined above, the potential for a breach through the east end of Chesil Beach, and its impacts on the area to the east must be considered within this SMP.

**Should the SMP area be altered?****: Possibly**

Consideration needs to be given to issues surrounding the possibility of a breach through the east end of Chesil Beach, affecting the coast to the east of Portland Bill. Also, it would be possible to alter the western boundary if it were administratively desirable (e.g. move to the County boundary).

**ESTUARIES**

See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Axe, Exe, Teign, Otter, Dart, Kingsbridge, Avon, Erme, Yealm, and Tamar/Tavy/Plym.

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Rame Head to Lizard Point (6d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Rame Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Rame Head provides a strong, geologically controlled, headland influence on the adjacent shorelines.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
On geomorphological grounds, it may be appropriate to consider moving the boundary to Start Point, as the coast to the west of this point is similar to that of the South Cornwall coast, although there are no strong linkages along this frontage that would necessitate such a move. It would also be possible to consider moving the Rame Head boundary to the Devon-Cornwall administrative boundary, at the River Tamar. Whilst the Tamar does not provide a strong a process boundary, there are no significant alongshore interactions here.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Lizard Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Lizard Point is a hard igneous headland, marking a significant change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport. It also creates a south Cornwall SMP.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
There is very little large-scale interaction on any of the Cornish coastline due to its hard rocky, headland dominated, form. As such Lizard Point, whilst a major headland, does not actually form a boundary in any significant processes, and it would be reasonable to take any one of the many other headlands on the Cornish coast. It is likely that the choice of any possible alternative would be based on administrative boundaries.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
This coastline is essentially composed of a number of self-contained bays, separated by long lengths of rocky coast along which there is very little process linkage. As such, most of these bays can be considered as individual SMPs, with insignificant/no linkage to adjacent areas.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Any change would be driven by administrative requirements alone. Consideration could be given to creating a Cornwall SMP by combining the three SMPs covering its coastline.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Looe, Fowey, Fal and Helford.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Lizard Point to Land's End (6e)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Lizard Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Lizard Point is a hard igneous headland, marking a significant change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport. It also creates a south Cornwall SMP.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>Possibly</i></b>
There is very little large-scale interaction on any of the Cornish coastline due to its hard rocky, headland dominated, form. As such Lizard Point, whilst a major headland, does not actually form a boundary in any significant processes, and it would be reasonable to take any one of the many other headlands on the Cornish coast. It is likely that the choice of any possible alternative would be based on administrative boundaries.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Land's End</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Land's End is also a hard igneous headland, marking a significant change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
As stated above for Lizard Point, the weak process linkages on the Cornish coast mean that it would be reasonable to choose a location most appropriate for administrative purposes. May be appropriate to choose Penlee Point as the western edge of Mounts Bay.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Within the Lizard Point to Land's End frontage there are significant rock coast lengths, along the Lizard and Penwith peninsulas, but a low lying frontage within Mounts Bay which is distinct from the adjacent areas.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Any change would be driven by administrative requirements alone. Consideration could be given to creating a Cornwall SMP by combining the three SMPs covering its coastline.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
No significant estuaries present.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<hr/>	
<b>Isles of Scilly</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Not applicable</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Not applicable</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: N/A</i></b>
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It would be possible to consider each of the main islands (e.g. St Mary's, St Martin's, Tresco, Bryher and St Agnes) as separate SMPs, however the similarities between their form (granite geology with extensive sand deposits) and the processes operating, means that there is no reason to consider such sub-division.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. Whilst there are process linkages between individual islands, their separation from the mainland by a wide and deep channel of open sea, results in their being no process connection with any mainland frontage.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is logical to consider the islands together, and no linkages exist to the mainland.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
No significant estuaries present.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Land's End to Hartland Point (7a &amp; b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Land's End</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Land's End is a hard igneous headland, marking a significant change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport. It also creates a south Cornwall SMP.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>Possibly</i></b>
There is very little large-scale interaction on any of this coastline due to its hard rocky, headland dominated, form. As such Land's End, whilst a major headland, does not actually form a boundary in any significant processes, and it would be reasonable to take any one of the many other headlands on the Cornish coast. It is likely that the choice of any possible alternative would be based on administrative boundaries.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Hartland Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Hartland Point is a hard headland, formed of inter-bedded sandstones and shales, marking a change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
As stated above for Land's End, the weak process linkages on this coast mean that it would be reasonable to choose a location most appropriate for administrative purposes, e.g. the Cornwall-Devon administrative boundary. However, Hartland Point marks the start of Barnstable Bay, which should be retained in a single SMP as it forms a distinct coastal system.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
This coastline is essentially composed of a number of self-contained bays, separated by long lengths of rocky coast along which there is very little process linkage. As such, most of these bays can be considered as individual SMPs, with no/insignificant linkage to adjacent areas.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Any change would be driven by administrative requirements alone. Consideration could be given to creating a Cornwall SMP by combining the three SMPs covering its coastline. If this option was pursued, it would be recommended that the rocky coast between Marsland and Hartland Point be included in the SMP to the north, representing an extension of the headland feature of Hartland.	

***ESTUARIES***

See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Hayle, Gannel and Camel.

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Hartland Point to Brean Down (7c &amp; d)</b>	
<b>BOUNDARY 1: Hartland Point</b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Hartland Point is a hard headland, formed of inter-bedded sandstones and shales, marking a significant change in coastline orientation, around which there is no significant sediment transport.	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: No</b>
Hartland Point marks the start of Barnstable Bay, which should be retained in a single SMP as it forms a distinct coastal system.	
<b>BOUNDARY 2: Brean Down</b>	
<b>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</b>	<b>: Possibly</b>
Whilst Brean Down marks a suitable boundary between Bridgwater Bay and the Severn Estuary, it is notable that a potential breach of the dunes to the south of Brean would potentially affect Weston Bay, to the north. To take account of this potential linkage it may be preferable to move the boundary to the north to either Anchor Head (next headland to the north) or Sand Point (a better Bridgwater – Severn boundary, but again has outflanking issues).	
<b>Should a boundary change be considered?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
Based on the above, a change to Anchor Head (north of Weston-super-Mare) is considered as this would avoid outflanking issues, and would provide a reasonable divide between the open-coast Bridgwater frontage and the Severn Estuary.	
<b>SMP AREA</b>	
<b>Are there other boundaries to consider?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
This area contains a number of self-contained frontages that could reasonably be considered separately to the remainder of the coastline. These include Barnstable Bay, Croyde Bay and Morte Bay. A sub-division based on any of these bays (e.g. at Morte Point) would be reasonable. Although extensively rocky, there is a general sediment linkage along the remainder of the coastline.	
<b>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</b>	<b>: Yes</b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. If Brean Down is retained as the eastern boundary it will be important to consider a potential breach into Weston Bay. It is also important that the process interactions between the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel are appreciated in SMP development.	
<b>Should the SMP area be altered?</b>	<b>: Possibly</b>
Consider moving boundary from Brean Down to Anchor Head.	
<b>ESTUARIES</b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Taw/Torridge and River Parrett.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Brean Down to Lavernock Point (7e &amp; 8a)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Brean Down</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Whilst Brean Down marks a suitable boundary between Bridgwater Bay and the Severn Estuary, it is notable that a potential breach of the dunes to the south of Brean would potentially affect Weston Bay, to the north. To take account of this potential linkage it may be preferable to move the boundary to the north to either Anchor Head (next headland to the north) or Sand Point (a better Bridgwater – Severn boundary, but again has outflanking issues).	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Based on the above, a change to Anchor Head (north of Weston-super-Mare) is considered as this would avoid outflanking issues, and would provide a reasonable divide between the open-coast Bridgwater frontage and the Severn Estuary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Lavernock Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There are no interactions across this point that indicate this boundary is unacceptable.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Consider changing to Penarth Head. Geomorphology changes at Penarth Head, and differences in shoreline, which occur either side of Cardiff Bay, would suggest that Penarth Head might represent a more logical boundary.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There are no significant alongshore features that would warrant sub-division of this frontage, however it will be important to set an appropriate up-estuary boundary.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. At Brean Down it will be important to recognise the potential for a breach through from the shoreline to the south. It is also important that the process interactions between the Severn Estuary and the Bristol Channel are appreciated in SMP development.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possibly</i></b>
Consider changes of both boundaries, to Anchor Point and Penarth Head.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Severn Estuary.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Lavernock Point to Worm's Head (8b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Lavernock Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There are no interactions across this point that indicate this boundary is unacceptable.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Consider changing to Penarth Head. Geomorphology changes at Penarth Head, and differences in shoreline, which occur either side of Cardiff Bay, would suggest that Penarth Head might represent a more logical boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Worm's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There are no interactions across this point that indicate this boundary is unacceptable.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Marks change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems that form a logical subdivision of the shoreline.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Further subdivision (e.g. Nash Point and Mumbles Head) not recommended due to lack of certainty on extent of sediment interaction between shoreline and offshore.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No – minor only</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. Interactions between Bristol Channel and Severn Estuary sediment movements should be considered. Any issues relating to the Helwick Bank could be important to both this and the SMP to the west.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Desirable</i></b>
Minor change to boundary at Lavernock Point (to Penarth Head) is recommended	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Ogmore, Afan, Neath and Tawe.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Worm's Head to St Govan's Head (8c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Worm's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There are no interactions across this point that indicate this boundary is unacceptable.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Marks change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems that form a logical subdivision of the shoreline.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: St Govan's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
Due to lack of interactions further east there is no requirement for the SMP limit to be located here (see below) and could be moved further east to Caldey Island.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
Difference in Coastal Behavioural Systems and lack of interactions offer potential to split SMPs at Caldey Island. However, any weak potential for sediment transport around Giltar Point should first be reviewed in more detail.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No – minor only</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. Issues relating to the Helwick Bank could be important to both this and the SMP to the east.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible but not required</i></b>
No real justification on process grounds but scope to move SMP boundary from St Govan's Head to Caldey Island if desired for administrative reasons (subject to review of potential sediment interactions around Giltar Point).	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Loughor and Tywi.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>St Govan's Head to St Ann's Head (8d (part))</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: St Govan's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
Due to lack of interactions further east there is no requirement for the SMP limit to be located here and could be moved further east to Caldey Island (but see comments for Worm's Head to St Govan's Head SMP).	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: St Ann's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
The boundary for <u>this</u> SMP should be considered to be Studdock Point rather than St Ann's Head, unless Milford Haven is included in which case the actual boundaries on both sides should be reviewed.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
No requirement to have SMP boundaries at St Govans Head or St Ann's Head. SMP boundaries could be set at any one of many locations between Caldey Island and Cemaes Head, depending upon practical limits.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible but not required</i></b>
No real justification on process grounds but scope to move eastern SMP boundary from St Govan's Head to Caldey Island (subject to review of potential sediment interactions around Giltar Point), and extend/combine SMPs through moving western boundary to a series of possible locations between St. Ann's Head and Cemaes Head. It may be desirable to redefine existing western boundary as Studdock Point, albeit depending upon inclusion of any shoreline within Milford Haven.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Milford Haven.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>St Ann's Head to Teifi Estuary (8d (part) &amp; 9a (part))</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: St Ann's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
If Milford Haven is included, the actual boundary position on both sides of the estuary should be reviewed.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Teifi Estuary</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
However, the boundary for <u>this</u> SMP should perhaps be emphasised as being Cemaes Head rather than Teifi Estuary. There are no strong interactions across this point.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
This marks a difference in shoreline, with little activity to the south, but increasing sediment supply and movement to the north together with greater interactions between the shoreline and offshore.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible</i></b>
No requirement to have SMP boundaries at St Ann's Head, or St David's Head (previously defined Cell and Coastal Behavioural System boundaries) due to inactivity of the larger system. SMP boundaries could be set at any one of many locations between Caldey Island and Cemaes Head, depending upon practical limits.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. The offshore sediment interactions between this and the SMP to the north should be reviewed although these are probably minor.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Possible but not required</i></b>
No real justification on process grounds but scope to move eastern SMP boundary from St Ann's Head to St Govan's Head or even Caldey Island (subject to review of potential sediment interactions around Giltar Point). Also possible to subdivide SMP through introducing boundaries at a series of possible locations between St. Anne's Head and Cemaes Head. It may be desirable to redefine existing western boundary as Cemaes Head to distinguish exclusion of Teifi Estuary from this SMP.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Nyfer.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Teifi Estuary to Dyfi Estuary (9a (part))</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Teifi Estuary</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
There are no strong interactions with the shoreline to the south.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
This marks a difference in shoreline, with little activity to the south, but increasing sediment supply and movement to the north together with greater interactions between the shoreline and offshore.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Dyfi Estuary</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b>: Yes</b>
This is one of a series of similar and probably interconnected behavioural systems that extend northwards to Afon Glaslyn. The estuary area is probably influential upon, and influenced by, areas to the north and as such should not be disassociated from them in developing long-term management strategies.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b>: Yes</b>
See above	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
There are increasing stronger interactions within the coastal behaviour unit north of the Teifi Estuary, therefore any subdivision of the shoreline is not recommended.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b>: Yes</b>
See above – there is a need to consider process and interactions in conjunction with the area to the north, presently defined as a separate SMP. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b>: Yes</b>
It is recommended that this SMP should be combined with that to the north, which extends to Bardsey Sound.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Teifi and Dyfi.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Dyfi Estuary to Bardsey Sound (9a (part) &amp; 9b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Dyfi Estuary</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The estuary area immediately to the south of the boundary is one of a series of similar and probably interconnected behavioural systems that extend northwards to Afon Glaslyn. The estuary area is probably influential upon, and influenced by, this SMP area and as such should not be disassociated from this in developing long-term management strategies.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Bardsey Sound (Ynys Enlli)</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Marks change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems that form a logical subdivision of the shoreline.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
There should be no subdivision of the SMP between the Dyfi and Glaslyn Estuary systems, and the shoreline west of here is also potentially linked by the same sediment systems. Consequently there is little scope for sub-division anywhere east of Penrhyn Du or Trwyn Cilan, which offers no distinct advantage over the present, and more appropriate, boundary at Ynys Enlli.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above – there is a need to consider process and interactions in conjunction with the area to the south, presently defined as a separate SMP. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is recommended that this SMP should be combined with that to the south to incorporate the Dyfi Estuary, and by virtue of interactions within that SMP, to include the shoreline down to the Teifi Estuary.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Dysynni, Artro, Mawddach, and Glaslyn.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Ynys Enlli to Great Orme's Head (10a, 10b &amp; 10c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Ynys Enlli (Bardsey)</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
Due to hard geology constraining shoreline change and lack of sediment movements, this is an adequate boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
Marks change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems that form a logical subdivision of the shoreline.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Great Orme's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary NEED to change?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
Hard geology of the headland with little sediment exchange between this area and the SMP to the east makes this an acceptable boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
Marks change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems that form a logical subdivision of the shoreline.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
It is important that the SMP considers the Menai Straits and the areas to the north and south (Conwy Bay and Caernarfon Bay together. Potentially, a large part of the Isle of Anglesey, north from Cwningar Bodowen (Aberffraw) clockwise to Puffin Island, could be considered separately, although this would not seem a practical subdivision of the SMP.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
Some fine sediment exchange may take place with the SMP to the east and assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b>: No</b>
There is scope to consider some parts of this shoreline separately, i.e. parts of Anglesey, but no logical reason to sub-divide the SMP in this way unless desired for administrative reasons.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Conwy.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Great Orme's Head to Formby Point (11a)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Great Orme's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Hard geology of the headland with little sediment exchange between this area and the SMP to the east makes this an acceptable boundary.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
The boundary marks a change between two distinct coastal behavioural systems and as such forms a logical sub-division of the shoreline.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Formby Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary was originally set at a drift-divide but divides a coastal dune system, which is affected by both the Mersey Estuary to the south and the Ribble Estuary to the north. It is therefore recommended that the boundary be moved to River Wyre (i.e. combine 11a and 11b), to encompass the Dee, Mersey and Ribble Estuaries, which exert fundamental control on this coastline.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to the dominant influence of the estuaries, further division would not be recommended.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>:</i></b>
It is important to integrate SMPs for the estuaries, which are a key control on coastal evolution. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary at Great Orme's Head is appropriate, but it is recommended that the boundary at Formby Point be changed, because it divides a coastal dune system and splits the Dee, Mersey, and Ribble Estuary system.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See Separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Dee, Mersey and Ribble estuaries.	
As stated above, these estuaries have an important influence on coastal processes and shoreline evolution in this area.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Formby Point to Rossall Point (11b)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Formby Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary was originally set at a drift-divide but divides a coastal dune system, which is affected by both the Mersey Estuary to the south and the Ribble Estuary to the north. It is therefore recommended that the boundary be moved to River Wyre (i.e. combine 11a and 11b), to encompass the Dee, Mersey and Ribble Estuaries, which exert fundamental control on this coastline.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Rossall Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is appropriate to consider Morecambe Bay (11c) as a single SMP management area and Rossall Point is an appropriate boundary to the Bay.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes - minor</i></b>
Consideration should be given to moving the boundary to the west bank of the River Wyre, because although there is transport of sand eastwards across the mouth of the River Wyre, this point marks a change from an open coast environment to an estuarine/enclosed bay environment.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Due to the dominant influence of the estuaries, further division would not be recommended.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is important to take account of SMPs for the Ribble Estuary and Morecambe Bay. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is recommended that the boundary at Formby Point be changed, because it divides a coastal dune system and splits the Dee, Mersey, and Ribble Estuary system. A minor change to the boundary at Rossall Point is also suggested for consideration.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See Separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to the Ribble and Wyre Estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Rossall Point to Earnse Point, Walney Island (11c)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Rossall Point</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
It is appropriate to consider Morecambe Bay as a single SMP management area and Rossall Point is an appropriate boundary to the Bay.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes - minor</i></b>
Consideration should be given to moving the boundary to the west bank of the River Wyre, because although there is transport of sand eastwards across the mouth of the River Wyre, this point marks a change from an open coast environment to an estuarine/enclosed bay environment.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Earnse Point, Walney Island</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is not practical to divide Walney Island into two SMPs. However a key problem is selecting appropriate boundaries as Walney Island has interactions with both north and south coasts. It is proposed that Morecambe Bay should be considered as a single SMP area, with a boundary at Roa Island.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
As an alternative, Walney Island could be included entirely in this cell with a boundary at Sandscale Haws (southern border of the Duddon estuary). No further divisions are recommended because of the complex wave pattern and sediment interactions within Morecambe Bay.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Wherever the northern boundary is set there needs to be close links with the adjacent SMP and also with the SMP to the south. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary at Walney Island needs to be changed to either include Walney Island within this cell, or, more preferably, include Walney Island in sub-cell 11d. A minor change is also proposed for the boundary at Rossall Point.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Wyre, Kent, Leven and Lune estuaries. There needs to be inclusion of any estuary initiatives.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>Earnse Point, Walney Island to St Bee's Head (11d)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: Earnse Point, Walney Island</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
It is not practical to divide Walney Island into two SMPs. However a key problem is selecting appropriate boundaries as Walney Island has interactions with both north and south coasts. It is proposed that Morecambe Bay should be considered as a single SMP area, with a boundary at Roa Island.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
See above.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: St Bee's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
St. Bee's Head is a sandstone outcrop, which forms the only prominent cliffs of solid rock along this coastline, and as such is a key headland feature that has a control on the shoreline orientation to north and south. It is also a natural drift boundary; the shorelines to the north and south have distinctly different wave aspects.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
St Bee's Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
No further divisions of the coast are proposed due to the sediment interactions along this coastline.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
There needs to be consideration of the Morecambe Bay SMP (11c) because of the key controls on and by Walney Island. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
The boundary at Walney Island needs to be changed to either include Walney Island within sub-cell, 11c or, more preferably, in this SMP. St Bee's Head should remain as the northern boundary to this SMP.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Duddon and Ravenglass Estuaries.	

<b>SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN</b>	
<b>St Bee's Head to Solway Firth (11e)</b>	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 1: St Bee's Head</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
St. Bee's Head is a sandstone outcrop, which forms the only prominent cliffs of solid rock along this coastline, and as such is a key headland feature that has a control on the shoreline orientation to north and south. It is also a natural drift boundary; the shorelines to the north and south have distinctly different wave aspects.	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
St Bee's Head is an appropriate boundary.	
<b><i>BOUNDARY 2: Solway Firth</i></b>	
<b><i>Does the boundary <u>NEED</u> to change?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
As long as the interactions of the Solway Firth are explicitly considered, this boundary is appropriate (see note below).	
<b><i>Should a boundary change be considered?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
A major control upon this shoreline is the Solway Firth and this should be fully understood in order to assess management of the shoreline. So a possible boundary change could be to move the boundary to the northern (Scottish) side of the Solway Firth.	
<b><i>SMP AREA</i></b>	
<b><i>Are there other boundaries to consider?</i></b>	<b><i>: No</i></b>
Although the embayed nature of the coastline and the harbours interrupt the longshore drift, no further division of the coast is recommended.	
<b><i>Are there major inter-SMP considerations?</i></b>	<b><i>: Yes</i></b>
Links should be made with Scottish shoreline planning initiatives and Solway Firth initiatives to ensure full consideration of the Solway Firth. Assessment of coastal processes and physical interactions should not be constrained by the SMP management boundaries.	
<b><i>Should the SMP area be altered?</i></b>	<b><i>: No, but wider areas must be considered</i></b>
The current boundaries are acceptable as long as there is full consideration of the Solway Firth; the process assessment should include the whole of the Solway Firth and when considering management policies this should be done in conjunction with Scottish planning initiatives.	
<b><i>ESTUARIES</i></b>	
See separate Appendix F on the Integration of Estuaries for details relating to Moricambe Bay and the Solway Firth.	

## Annex E2: SMPs and Futurecoast boundaries

### Introduction

Futurecoast adopted a “behavioural systems” approach, which involved the identification of the different elements that make up the coastal structure and developing an understanding of how these elements interact on a range of both temporal and spatial scales; three levels were considered: Coastal Behaviour Systems, Shoreline Behaviour Units and Geomorphic Units. At the highest level, the Coastal Behavioural Systems (CBS) identify those areas that have similar characteristics or strong interactions, which provide either some commonality or inter-dependence in terms of behaviour and future evolution. Shoreline Behaviour Units (SBU) are sections of shoreline that exhibit coherent behavioural tendencies, with different elements (Geomorphic Units) combining to produce a particular response.

Sub-division of the coast for SMP purposes is not based on the same criteria as used for Futurecoast; therefore the units defined by Futurecoast are not expected to be strictly adhered to in the SMPs.

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas				
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast		
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS
1	1a	Northern North Sea (St. Abb's Head to Flamborough Head)	St. Abb's Head to Saltpan Rocks	St. Abb's Head to Saltpan Rocks (excl. Berwick Harbour) Berwick Harbour
			Saltpan Rocks to Bamburgh	Cheswick
				Holy Island
				Fenham Flats
				Ross Links
				Budle Bay
			Bamburgh to Longhoughton	Bamburgh to Seahouses
				Seahouses
				Seahouses to Embleton Embleton to Longhoughton
			Alnmouth and Druridge Bays (Longhoughton to Lynemouth)	Alnmouth Bay
	Amble			
	Druridge Bay			
	Lynemouth to Seaton Sluice	Lynemouth Bay		
		Newbiggin by the Sea		
Cambois Bay Blyth to Seaton Sluice				
Seaton Sluice to Hartlepool	Seaton Sluice to River Tyne (Tynemouth)			
	River Tyne to Trow Point			
	South Shields to Crimdon			
1b				Crimdon to Hartlepool
1c				Hartlepool Headland (the Heugh)
				West Hartlepool seafront

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas					
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast			
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS	
	1d			South Hartlepool to Seaton Carew	
				Seaton Carew to Coatham	
				Coatham to Marske-by-the-Sea	
				Marske-by-the-Sea to Saltburn-by-the-Sea	
				Saltburn to Ravenscar	Saltburn to Robin Hood's Bay (excl. Runswick Bay + Whitby)
					Runswick Bay
					Sandsend to Whitby West Pier
					Robin Hood's Bay
				Ravenscar to Scalby Ness	Peak Steel to Scalby Ness
				Scalby Ness to Filey Brigg	Scarborough North Bay to Osgodby (Knipe) Point
					Cayton Bay
					Filey Brigg
Filey Brigg to Flamborough Head	Filey Town to Dulcey Dock				
	Dulcey Dock to Flamborough Head				
2	2a & b	Southern North Sea: North (Flamborough Head to Weybourne)	Flamborough Head to Spurn Head	Flamborough Head to Sewerby	
				Sewerby to Kilnsea	
				Spurn Head	
	2c		Cleethorpes to Gibraltar Point	Cleethorpes to Donna Nook	
				Donna Nook to Skegness	
	2d		Gibraltar Point to Hunstanton (The Wash)	Gibraltar Point to Wolferton Creek	
Wolferton Creek to Hunstanton					
3	3a	Southern North Sea: South (Weybourne to Felixstowe)	Hunstanton to Weybourne	Old Hunstanton to Brancaster Staithe	
				Scolt Head Island	
				Burnham Overy Staithe to Stiffkey Marshes	
				Blakeney Spit	
				Weybourne to Happisburgh	
	3b		Happisburgh to Winterton	Cromer to Happisburgh	
				Happisburgh to Winterton	
				Winterton Dunes and Ness	
				Winterton to Benacre Ness	Scratby to California
					Caister-on -sea
	Caister Ness and Great Yarmouth Spit				
	Gorleston to Lowestoft North Denes				
	Lowestoft North Denes and Ness				
	3c		Benacre Ness to Blyth Estuary	Lowestoft South Beach	
				Pakefield and Kessingland cliffs	
Benacre Ness					
Kessingland to Easton Marshes					
Easton Marshes					
Blyth Estuary to Thorpe Ness	Blyth Estuary to Thorpe Ness	Southwold			
		Southwold Denes			
		Walberswick to Dunwich Marshes			
		Dunwich and Minsmere cliffs			
		Minsmere Levels			
				Sizewell to Thorpe Ness	

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas				
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast		
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS
4	3d	Outer Thames Estuary (Harwich to North Foreland)	Thorpe Ness to Shingle Street	Thorpe Ness
				Thorpeness Village to Aldeburgh (Fort Green)
				Aldeburgh
			Shingle Street to Landguard Point	Orford Ness
				Shingle Street to East Lane, Bawdsey
				Bawdsey to Bawdsey Manor
				Bawdsey Manor to River Deben
				Felixstowe Ferry to North Felixstowe
				North Felixstowe to Felixstowe Pier
				Felixstowe Pier to Landguard Point
	Harwich to The Naze	Dovercourt Bay		
		Pennyhole Bay		
		The Naze to Clacton-on-Sea		
	The Naze to River Colne	Jaywick and Seawick		
		St. Osyth to St. Osyth Stone Point		
		Mersea Island		
	River Colne to Leigh-on-Sea	Dengie and Foulness		
		Shoebury Ness to Leigh-on-Sea		
		Allhallows-on-Sea to Minster		
	Allhallows to Whitstable	Minster to Leysdown-on-sea		
Leysdown-on-sea to Shell Ness				
Cleve Marshes to Whitstable				
Whitstable to Reculver				
Whitstable to North Foreland	Reculver to Minnis Bay			
	Minnis Bay to North Foreland			
	North Foreland to Cliffs End			
North Foreland to South Foreland	Cliffs End to Walmer			
	Walmer to South Foreland			
	South Foreland to Abbot's Cliff			
South Foreland to Sandgate	East Wear Bay (Folkestone Warren)			
	Copt Point to Sandgate			
	Sandgate to Hythe			
Sandgate to Cliff End	Hythe Ranges			
	Dymchurch			
	Dungeness			
	Camber Sands			
	River Rother to Winchelsea			
	Pett Level			
	Cliff End to Fairlight			
	Fairlight Cove to Hastings			
Combe Haven				
Cliff End to Beachy Head	Bexhill			
	Hoe Levels and Pevensey			
	The Crumbles			
	Eastbourne			
	Beachy Head			
	Seven Sisters			
	Cuckmere Haven			
Cuckmere to Hawks Brow				
4d	Inner English Channel (Beachy Head to Selsey Bill)	Beachy Head to Brighton	Ouse Valley (Tide Mills)	

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas							
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast					
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS			
			Brighton to Selsey Bill	Newhaven to Brighton Marina Brighton Marina to East Hove East Hove to Portslade Portslade to East Worthing East Worthing to River Arun (Littlehampton) River Arun to Climping Climping to Pagham Pagham Harbour entrance Selsey Bill			
5	5a & b	English Channel and Solent (Selsey Bill to Durlston, inc IOW)	Selsey Bill to Gilkicker Point	Selsey Bill to Chichester Entrance West Wittering to Gilkicker Point			
			Gilkicker Point to Hamble	Gilkicker Point to Browdown Lee-on-the-Solent to River Hamble			
	5c		Calshot Spit to Hurst Castle Spit	Calshot Spit to Beaulieu River Beaulieu River to Hurst Spit			
			The Needles to Cliff End (IoW)	The Needles to Alum Bay Alum Bay and Headon Warren Totland and Colwell Bays			
	Cliff End to Old Castle Point (IoW)			Fort Albert to Yarmouth Bouldner to Gurnard Gurnard to Old Castle Point			
				Old Castle Point to Culver Cliff (IoW)	Old Castle Point to Ryde Ryde to Nettlestone Point (Ryde Sands) Nettlestone Point to St Helen's Duver St Helen's Duver to Bembridge Point Bembridge Point to Foreland Fields Foreland Fields to Culver Cliff		
			Culver Cliff to Dunnose (IoW)		Culver Cliff Culver Cliff to Yaverland Yaverland to Sandown Sandown to Shanklin Chine Shanklin Chine to Dunnose		
	Dunnose to Rocken End (IoW)				Dunnose to Rocken End (The Undercliff)		
	Rocken End to The Needles (IoW)				Rocken End to Chale Chale to Compton Down Compton Down to The Needles		
				Hurst Castle Spit to Hengistbury Head	Hurst Castle Spit Central Christchurch Bay Christchurch harbour mouth		
			Hengistbury Head to Handfast Point		Hengistbury Head Double Dykes Central Poole Bay Sandbanks Studland Bay		
	Handfast Point to Durlston Head				Handfast Point to Ballard Point Ballard Point to Peveril Point Peveril Point to Durlston Head		
				5g	Outer English	Durlston Head to White Nothe	Durlston Head to St. Alban's Head

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas				
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast		
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS
6	6a, b & c	Channel (Durlston Head to Start Point)	White Nothe to Portland Bill	St. Alban's Head to Worbarrow Tout
				Worbarrow Tout to White Nothe
				White Nothe to Furzy Cliff
				Weymouth Bay
				Weymouth Bay to Portland Harbour
				Portland Harbour / The Fleet
				Isle of Portland
		Portland Bill to Eype	Chesil Beach and The Fleet	
			Abbotsbury to Cogden Beach	
			Cogden Beach to West Bay	
			West Bay	
		Eype to Beer Head	West Bay to Axmouth	
			Axmouth	
	Axmouth to Beer Head			
	Beer Head to Otterton Ledge	Beer Head to Otterton Ledge		
	Otterton Ledge to Straight Point	River Otter		
		Budleigh Salterton to Straight Point		
		Straight Point to Hope's Nose	Straight Point to Maer Rocks	
			River Exe	
			Dawlish Warren to Teignmouth	
	Tor Bay	River Teign		
		River Teign to Hope's Nose		
		Hope's Nose to Livermead Head		
	Berry Head to Start Point	Livermead Head to Goodrington Sands		
		Goodrington Sands to Berry Head		
		Berry Head to Strete		
		Slapton Sands		
Beesands				
6d	South West Peninsula: South (Start Point to Lizard Point)	Start Point to Gribbin Head	Start Point to Bigbury-on-Sea	
			Bigbury-on-Sea	
			Bigbury-on-Sea to Whitsand Bay	
			Whitsand Bay	
			Whitsand Bay to Looe Point	
			Looe Point to Gribben Head	
	Gribbin Head to Dodman Point	Gribbin Head to Black Head		
		Black Head to Dodman Point		
	Dodman Point to Lizard Point	Dodman Point to Zone Point		
		Pendennis to Helford Estuary		
		Helford Estuary to Lizard Point		
6e	Mounts Bay (Lizard Point to Penlee Point)	Lizard Point to Penlee Point	Lizard Point to Gunwalloe Fishing Cove	
			Gunwalloe Fishing Cove to Porthleven	
			Porthleven to Marazion	
			Longrock	
			Longrock to Penlee Point	
7a & b	South West Peninsula: North (Penlee Point to Hartland Point)	Penlee Point to St Ives Head	Penlee Point to Whitesand Bay (Land's End)	
			Whitesand Bay	
			Whitesand Bay to St Ives Head	
			St Ives Bay (St Ives Head to	
			St Ives	

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas				
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast		
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS
			Godrevy Point)	Carbis Bay to Godrevy
			Godrevy Point to Pentire Point	Godrevy Point to Perranporth
				Perranporth to Towan Head
				Towan Head to Trevose Head
				Trevose Head to Pentire Point
			Pentire Point to Hartland Point	Pentire Point to Widemouth Bay
				Widemouth Bay to Crooklets
				Crooklets to Hartland Point
			7c & d	Bideford Bay (Hartland Point to Morte Point)
	Westward Ho! to Saunton Down	Westward Ho! to River Taw/Torridge		
	Saunton Down to Morte Point	River Taw/Torridge to Saunton Down		
	Bristol Channel: South (Morte Point to Brean Down)	Morte Point to Minehead		Morte Point to Foreland Point
				Foreland Point to Gore Point
				Porlock Bay
		Minehead to Hinkley Point		Hurlstone Point to Minehead
				Minehead to Blue Anchor
				Blue Anchor to St Audrie's Bay
	Hinkley Point to Brean Down	St Audrie's Bay to Hinkley Point		
		Hinkley Point to River Parrett		
		River Parrett to Brean Down		
	7e & 8a	Outer Severn Estuary (Brean Down to Penarth)	Brean Down to Clevedon	Brean Down to Worlebury Hill (Weston Bay)
				Worlebury Hill to Sand Point (Sand Bay)
				Sand Point to St Thomas's Head (Middle Hope)
				St Thomas's Head to Blind Yeo
			Clevedon to Portishead Dock	Clevedon to Portishead Dock
				Portishead Dock to Old Severn Bridge
				Old Severn Bridge to Black Rock
Old Severn Bridge to Penarth			Black Rock to Sudbrook Point	
			Sudbrook Point to Penarth Head	
			Penarth Head to Lavernock Point	
8	8b	Bristol Channel: North (Penarth to Worms Head)	Penarth to Nash Point	Lavernock Point to Barry
				Barry Island and Docks
				Cold Knap Point to Watch House Point
				Aberthaw (Breaksea Point)
				Summerhouse Point to Nash Point
				Nash Point to Ogmore River
			Nash Point to Porthcawl	Ogmore River to Porthcawl Point
				Porthcawl
				Porthcawl to Mumbles Head
		Margam and Kenfig Burrows		
		Margam to River Afan (Port Talbot)		
		River Afan (Port Talbot) to Crymlyn Burrows		

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas				
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast		
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS
9	8c	Carmarthen Bay	Mumbles Head to Worms Head	Swansea Docks
				River Tawe to River Clyne (Lower Sketty)
				River Clyne (Lower Sketty) to Mumbles Head
				Mumbles Head to Southgate
				Oxwich Bay
				Oxwich Point
		Carmarthen Bay	Worms Head to Burry Holms	Port-Eynon Bay
				Port-Eynon Point to Worms Head
				Worms Head to Rhossili Down
				Hillend Burrows
				Llangennith Burrows and Llangennith Moors
				Burry Holms to Broughton Burrows
	Carmarthen Bay	Burry Holms to Pendine	Broughton Bay to Cwm Ivy	
			Cwm Ivy to Whiteford Point	
			Whiteford Point to Salthouse Point	
			Penrhyn Gwyn to Burry Port	
			Pembrey Spit to Gwendraeth	
			Ginst Point to Pendine	
	Carmarthen Bay	Pendine to Giltar Point	Pendine to south Tenby	
			South Beach Tenby (south Tenby to Giltar Point)	
Caldey Island (incl. St Margaret's Island)				
Giltar Point to Linney Head				
Frainslake Sands and Freshwater West				
Studdock Point				
8d (part)	South Wales Peninsula (Giltar Point to St David's Head)	Giltar Point to Studdock Point	Studdock Point	
8d & 9a (part)	South Wales Peninsula (Giltar Point to St David's Head)	St Anne's Head to St David's Head	St Anne's Head to Little Haven	
			Little Haven to Broad Haven	
			Broad Haven to Newgale Sands	
			Newgale	
9a (part)	Cardigan Bay (St David's Head to Bardsey Sound)	St David's Head to Upper Borth	Newgale to St David's Head	
			St David's Head to Newport Bay	
			Newport Sands	
			The Nyfer Estuary to the Teifi Estuary	
			Poppit Sands	
			Gwbert to Aberaeron	
	Cardigan Bay (St David's Head to Bardsey Sound)	Upper Borth To Aber Dysynni	Aberaeron to Llanrhystud	
			Llanrhystud to Allt Wen	
			Afon Ystwyth to Afon Clarach	
			Upper Borth to Ynyslas	
9b	Cardigan Bay (St David's Head to Bardsey Sound)	AberDysynni to Mawddach Estuary	Twyni Bach Spit	
			Aberdyfi to Aber Dysynni	
			Aber Dysynni to Fairbourne	
			Fairbourne to Mawddach Estuary (Ro Wen)	
9b	Cardigan Bay (St David's Head to Bardsey Sound)	Barmouth to Llanfair	Barmouth to Llanaber	
			Morfa Dyffryn (Llanaber to Mochras Point)	

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas					
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast			
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS	
10	10a			Mochras Point (Shell Island) to Llanfair	
			Llanfair to Graig Ddu	Morfa Harlech (Llanfair to Afon Glaslyn) Morfa Bychan (Afon Glaslyn to Graig Ddu)	
			Graig Ddu To Bardsey Sound	Graig Ddu to Rhiw-for-fawr	
				Rhiw-for-fawr to Pen-ychain	
				Pen-ychain to Carreg y Defaid	
				Carreg y Defaid to Trwyn Llanbedrog	
				Trwyn Llanbedrog to Penrhyn Du	
	Penrhyn Du to Bardsey Sound				
	10b	North Wales Peninsula (Bardsey Sound to Great Orme's Head)	Bardsey Sound to Trefor	Bardsey Sound to Carreg Ddu Carreg Ddu to Penrhyn Glas Penrhyn Glas to Trefor	
			Trefor to Malltraeth Bay	Trefor to Pontllyfni	
	Pontllyfni to Morfa Dinlle				
	Morfa Dinlle to Foryd Bay				
	Newborough Warren (Abermenai Point to Malltraeth Bay)				
	Llanddwyn Island				
	Malltraeth Bay				
	10c			Aberffraw Bay to Holyhead Bay	Cwningar Bowden
					Aberffraw
					Aberffraw Bay to Rhosneigar
					Rhosneigar
					Holy Island
					Holyhead
					Penrhos
					Valley
Traeth y Gribin					
Penrhyn (Penial Downyn to Creigiau Cliperau)					
Holyhead to Dulas Bay	Penrhyn (Penrhyn to Creigiau Cliperau)				
	Porth Tywyn-mawr				
	Porth Tywyn-mawr to Cemlyn Bay				
	Cemlyn Bay				
	Cemlyn Bay to Wylfa Head				
Cemaes Bay to Dulas Bay					
Dulas Bay to Puffin Island	Dulas Bay				
	Lligwy Bay				
	Moelfre				
	Cerig Birth to Benllech				
	Redwharf Bay				
	Llanddona to Puffin Island				
Conwy Bay	Puffin Island to Beaumaris				
	Beaumaris				
	Penrhyn Castle				
	Penrhyn Castle to Llanfairfechan				
	Penmaenmawr to Penmaen Bach Point				
	Conwy Estuary				
	Great Ormes Head (South Llandudno to Hornby Cave)				

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas							
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast					
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS			
			Menai Strait	Newborough Warren (Llanddwyn Island to Abermenai Point) Brynsiencyn Moel-y-don to South Beaumaris Morfa Dinlle to Foryd Bay Caernarfon (West) Caernarfon to East Bangor			
11	11a	Liverpool Bay (Great Orme's Head to Fylde)	Great Orme to Rhos-on-Sea	Great Ormes Head (Hornby Cave to North Llandudno)			
				Ormes Bay			
				Little Ormes Head			
				Penrhyn Bay			
			Rhos-on-Sea to Point of Ayr	Rhos Point			
				Colwyn Bay			
				Kinmel Bay			
				Clwyd Estuary (Rhyl)			
			11b			Dee Estuary	Prestatyn
							Point of Ayr
							South of the Point of Ayr to Mostyn Quay
							Mostyn Quay to Flint
	North Wirral Coast	Burton Point to Gayton					
		Gayton to Heswall					
		Heswall to Caldy					
		Caldy to Hilbre Point					
	11c	Morecambe Bay		Sefton Coast (Seaforth to Southport)	North Wirral		
					Sefton sand dunes		
				Ribble Estuary	Marshside to River Douglas (Longton Sands)		
					Freckleton to Lytham		
Fylde Coast				Lytham to Blackpool Tower			
				Blackpool North (Blackpool Tower to Norbreck)			
			River Wyre to Heysham	Norbreck to Rossall Scar			
				Rossall Scar to River Wyre			
				Knott End-on-Sea to Piling			
				Cockerham Sands			
			Heysham to Roa Island	Sunderland Point to Pott's Corner			
				Pott's Corner to Heysham			
				Heysham			
				Morecambe frontage (Throbshaw Point to Hest Bank)			
				Hest Bank to Arnside			
				Kent Viaduct to Blawith Point			
Grange-over-Sands and Humphrey Head							
Cartmel Peninsula							
Plumpton Hall to Bardsea							

Existing SMP boundaries compared to Futurecoast areas					
SMP1 Boundaries		Futurecoast			
Cell	Sub-cell	CBS	SBS	LSRS	
	11d	North East Irish Sea (Walney Island to Solway Firth)	Walney Island	Bardsea to Newbiggin	
				Newbiggin to Roa Island	
				Southern section	
				Central section	
				Northern section	
				Sandscale Haws	
			Duddon Estuary	Sandscale Haws to Marsh Farm	
				Borwick Rails to Haverigg	
				Haverigg Dunes	
				Haverigg to St Bees Head	Kirksanton to Eskmeals
					Eskmeals Dunes
					Drigg Dunes
	Seascale to St Bees				
	11e	Saltom Bay to Solway Firth	St Bees Head		
			Saltom Bay to Workington		
			Flimby		
			Maryport		
			Allonby		
			Dubmill Point to Silloth		
			Silloth Bay		
The Grune					
Moricambe Bay					
Bowness Common					

-	-	Isles of Scilly	Isles of Scilly	St Mary's, Isles of Scilly
				St Martin's, Isles of Scilly
				Tresco, Isles of Scilly
				Bryher, Isles of Scilly
				St Agnes, Isles of Scilly