

Appendix F

Water Framework Directive Assessment

Appendix F

Water Framework Directive Assessment

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| F1 | Introduction..... | 3 |
| F2 | Water Framework Directive considerations in preparing SMP2..... | 4 |
| F3 | Water Framework Directive SMP2 Checklists | 11 |

F1 Introduction

This Appendix provides some background about the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), and sets out the requirements of the Water Framework Directive with regard to SMP2.

A checklist of WFD considerations has been completed for each Management Area to identify specific WFD issues. These checklists are included in section F3.

F2 Water Framework Directive considerations in preparing SMP2

Discussion paper prepared by Jan Brooke, February 2005; updated December 2005

1. Background

The EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) was transposed into law in England and Wales by the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2003. Many of the aims of the WFD are relevant to the preparation of the NECAG SMP2. Specifically, these include the objectives to:

- prevent deterioration in status¹
- aim to achieve *good ecological status* (GES) and *good chemical status* (GCS) or,
- for heavily modified or artificial water bodies (HMWB or AWB), aim to achieve *good ecological potential* (GEP) and good chemical status (GCS)
- contribute to mitigating the effects of floods and droughts
- achieve the objectives for EU protected sites

A series of new statutory *river basin management plans* (RBMP), required under the WFD, will summarise the *programmes of measures* (actions) required to meet these objectives. The WFD programmes of measures are required to be cost-effective and, as such, it seems likely that there will be focus on identifying measures which contribute to meeting more than one objective. For example, a coastal defence solution might mitigate the effects of flooding whilst also contributing to meeting good ecological status (or improving ecological status) and to the objectives for a SPA or SAC.

RBMPs need to be prepared in draft by 2008. Whilst there remain uncertainties about some of the details of the WFD, the broad principles are clear and it is therefore appropriate to endeavour to produce a 'WFD-compliant' SMP. The following sections discuss areas of potential overlap between the SMP and RBMP objectives - ie. issues which are clearly of relevance to both SMP preparation and to achieving the relevant WFD objectives.

¹ *In seeking to prevent deterioration in the status (ie. the chemical and ecological quality of a water body), it is assumed for the purpose of this discussion paper that the WFD is concerned only with significant, medium to long term deterioration between status classes rather than with temporary, short term effects and/or deterioration within a status class.*

2. Preventing deterioration and achieving good chemical status

Where there is a risk of significant contamination at the coast, for example due to mining residues (eg. colliery waste, discharges) or to the erosion of old landfill sites, there may be an existing (or future) risk of failing to meet good chemical status. In such instances, measures (which could include erosion control measures) are likely to be required to prevent deterioration in status. The possible role of (dual function) shoreline structures would need to be considered in the WFD RBMP and is therefore relevant to the SMP.

Action:

- *The SMP should identify locations or units where deterioration in chemical status could occur*
- *if possible, SMP policies which help to prevent deterioration in status should be identified*

3. Exemptions when deterioration in status is associated with new development

Where new defences may be required (eg. in Unit 7), the criteria set out in Article 4(7) of the WFD will apply if a proposal to construct new defences could have an effect on water status. Such an effect could be due to contamination or, more likely in the case of coastal defence works, to hydromorphological modifications.

In order to comply with the requirements of Article 4(7), for any such proposed new works, it will be necessary (at some stage) to:

- ensure the reasons for the works are described in the relevant RBMP, and
- consider mitigation requirements, and
- show that there are no technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative options, and
- demonstrate overriding public interest.

Action:

- *where new defences may be required, the SMP should describe the reasons for any proposed modification, facilitating the summary of these reasons in the RBMP*
- *the SMP should highlight the likely application of WFD Article 4(7) criteria as and when any proposals are progressed (see below)*

4. Preventing deterioration and achieving good ecological status or good ecological potential: WFD targets

The process of identifying and designating HMWBs and AWBs will be important to those involved in shoreline management. This is because such designations will determine the ecological targets for the relevant water body(ies) and could, in turn, have implications for coastal defence decision making.

However, it is also important to be aware that the RBC1 risk assessment outputs (including the hydromorphological parameters used to identify provisional HMWBs) may be sensitive to the size of the water body. For example:

- where an existing coastal defence affects a relatively high proportion of the coastline of the water body, it would be anticipated that the water body in question would be designated as a HMWB. HMWB designation might be expected either where there is an extensive length of defended frontage, or where a proportionately small structure acts as a control point, artificially stabilising a significant length of frontage. This latter scenario is the case along significant stretches of the NECAG frontage. In cases where a HMWB designation is confirmed, the ecological target would be GEP assuming that the water body also meets the criteria set out in Article 4(3) of the WFD, thus:
 - (i) the water body is not already at GES
 - (ii) the measures necessary to restore the water body to GES would have a significant adverse effect on the coastal defence function of the structure or other 'specified uses' (for example wider environmental interests), and
 - (iii) there is no technically feasible, environmentally better option which is not disproportionately costly, particularly where an existing coastal defence affects a relatively small proportion of the coastline of the water body, the presence of the structure may not in itself be sufficient for the water body to be designated as a HMWB. If there are no other significant physical modifications, the ecological target for that water body would be GES.

Other examples of the possible implications of HMWB or AWB designation for coastal defence decision-making include the following:

- in cases where there is neither an existing coastal defence structure nor any other significant physical modification, it is assumed that the ecological target for the coastline in question will be GES
- in cases where there has been significant historic or recent reclamation, and irrespective of whether or not that frontage has coastal defences in place, it is assumed that a HMWB will be designated and that the ecological target will be GEP
- in cases where an existing coastal defence structure is the only significant physical modification but where there is no longer the necessary economic justification to maintain that structure (and the structure does not support other uses), Article 4(3) of the WFD suggests that the water body in question should not be designated a HMWB. The ecological target for that water body would therefore be expected to be GES. However, it remains to be seen whether it will be possible to achieve GES if the (redundant) coastal defence structure remains in place
- where a site which is water-dependent in some way is protected via designation under another EU Directive (eg. Birds or Habitats Directive, Shellfish Waters Directive) and the GES or GEP targets set under the

WFD would be insufficient to meet the objectives of the relevant environmental Directive, the more stringent targets would apply.

5. Preventing deterioration and achieving good ecological status or good ecological potential: what this may mean in practice

It is interesting to note from the Environment Agency river basin characterisation exercise that the NECAG frontage is made up of two water bodies. Whilst the stretch of coastline from Hartlepool to Flamborough corresponds entirely to the 'North Yorkshire' coastal water body, the Tyne to Hartlepool frontage forms just a part of the larger Tyne and Wear coastal water body (which extends to north of Blyth). Thus the SMP boundary does not coincide with the boundaries to be used for the RBMPs.

The risk assessment undertaken by the Environment Agency as part of the initial WFD characterisation exercise (RBC1) covers a wide range of 'pressures, ranging from point and non-point source pollution to physical modifications to water bodies. The following paragraphs, however, deal only with the key pressures of relevance to coastal defence/risk management.

The two coastal water bodies covered by the NECAG were identified by RBC1 as being 'not at risk' and 'probably not at risk' from shoreline reinforcement for the Tyne to Hartlepool and Hartlepool to Flamborough frontages respectively. This is somewhat surprising given the extent to which significant lengths of the shoreline are stabilised by artificial control points, and it may be that the effect of these control points was not taken into account in the risk assessment. If this is the case, the situation will need to be clarified before the RBMP is prepared and the programmes of measures agreed for these coastal water bodies.

It should also be noted that the risk assessment identifies the Tyne to Hartlepool coastline and the Hartlepool to Flamborough coastline as being 'at risk' and 'probably at risk' respectively of failing to meet good status due to land claim. At first glance, these conclusions appear surprising because most of the historic reclamation in the area has been within the estuaries (where most of the claimed land is typically fronted by coastal defences). However, one possibility is that this conclusion was reached due to previous tipping of colliery waste on the beaches. As much of this waste has subsequently been removed or dispersed, with significant quantities remaining only in the bays, the risk assessment conclusions appear to be worthy of further investigation. If substantiated, these risk assessment outputs would suggest that the WFD targets for these frontages should be good ecological potential rather than good ecological status.

Action:

- *confirmation is required on whether or not the effect of the artificial control points has been taken into account in the EA risk assessment (or whether the 'not at risk' and 'probably not at risk' conclusions are a function of the defences affecting a small proportion of a large water body). Further, consideration also needs to be given to the questions relating to land*

claim. Resolving these outstanding issues will be important because the SMP policies will, ultimately, need to contribute towards achieving GES or GEP

- *the SMP should identify locations or units where deterioration in ecological

 - *status as a result of SMP policy is a possibility**
- *wherever possible, the SMP should identify policy options that assist in

 - *achieving GES or GEP**
- *in locations where new defences involving shoreline reinforcement or land claim may be required, the SMP needs to make provision for the application of the requirements of Article 4(7) of the Directive (see above)*

6. Contributing to mitigating the effects of floods and drought

Where there is a risk of flooding, the WFD emphasises that consideration should be given to the causes of flooding in order to identify options which contribute to mitigating the effects of floods (and droughts).

Action:

- *the SMP must demonstrate understanding of the cause(s) of any flooding

 - *affecting the shoreline**
- *any opportunities to contribute to mitigating the effects of flooding should be identified and explicitly incorporated into the SMP policies (or the reasons for failing to do should be explained)*
- *those preparing the SMP should ensure that the proposed policies will not

 - *will exacerbate the effects of flooding**

7. Achieving objectives for EU protected sites

Where there are sites protected under EU legislation (Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, protected shellfish waters, bathing waters, etc.), the WFD aims for compliance with any relevant standards or objectives for these sites. Whilst the SMP should have a broadly similar aim, the statutory nature of the WFD requirement lends weight to this requirement.

Action:

- *ensure that protected areas relevant to the WFD are properly identified in the

 - *SMP**
- *ensure that any relationship(s) between the protected site, the 'water-relevant' (or water-dependent) objectives for the site, and shoreline management policies are identified in the SMP*
- *ensure that the proposed SMP policies will not cause deterioration or failure to meet the site-specific objectives*
- *identify any opportunities for the SMP policies to contribute to meeting the protected area objectives (ie. win-win coastal management options) and incorporate them into the SMP policies (or explain the reasons for failing to do)*

8. Economic considerations

The WFD does not intend that GES, GEP and GCS should be achieved 'at any cost'. As part of the WFD implementation process, methodologies are being developed to assess the cost-effectiveness of (programmes of) measures, and to ensure that these (programmes of) measures are not 'disproportionately costly'.

As it is likely that the SMP policies will inform the programmes of measures in the RBMP, and given that these programmes of measures will have to be shown to be cost-effective, it will therefore be prudent to ensure that due consideration is given to the following.

Action:

- *ensure that the recommended SMP policies are both cost-effective and not disproportionately costly (this may require some reconciliation between the standard coastal defence appraisal mechanisms and the economic methodologies being developed as part of WFD implementation)*
- *the SMP should demonstrate that there are no technically viable, environmentally better options which are not disproportionately costly. This should include consideration of whether the same coastal defence objectives might be achieved more cost-effectively as part of a wider programmes of measures designed with multiple objectives in mind*

9. Prevention of accidental pollution caused by flooding

Article 11 (3(l)) of the WFD requires Member States to take 'any measures required ... to prevent and/or reduce the impact of accidental pollution incidents for example as a result of floods, including through systems to detect or give warning of such events ...'.

Action:

- *any installations which may cause pollution if flooded should be properly
 - identified in the SMP*
- *measures and/or warning systems should be incorporated in to the SMP
 - such that the impact of any accidental pollution arising as a result of future
 - flooding is adequately reduced*

10. Integration of RBMPs and SMP policies

Finally, it is important to be aware that RBMPs must summarise the 'programmes of measures' required to achieve the objectives of the WFD. It would therefore be helpful if the final SMP document could present the policy recommendations in a compatible format.

Action:

- *insofar as the process of developing RBMPs allows, it will be important to ensure that SMP-recommended policies are appropriate for inclusion (in summary form) in the relevant RBMP*

F3 Water Framework Directive SMP2 Checklists

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA01 |
| Location | Littlehaven |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes. Major structures to control entrance to the Tyne for port operation |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Management Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes Description of relevant issue(s). Structures are designated SPA. South Pier allows development of beach associated with bathing waters. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | No Description of relevant issue(s). <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | Yes Structures maintain semi-natural protection against flooding |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Maintenance of structures maintains acceptable control of geomorphology. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Consideration as HMWB |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA02 |
| Location | Herd Sands |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No Policies allow natural development of the bay. |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA03 |
| Location | Trow Quarry |
| The Area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | No (exposed in fill to quarry.) |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | NA |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | Yes Potential for excavation material. |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | No (Potentially, due to possible need to protect contaminated in fill.) <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA, Bathing waters <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Hazardous material identified in in-fill <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | No |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | To address issues of contamination |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the management area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | i) Policy could help to improve water status ³ iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | Yes either excavation of material or allowing material to erode could cause deterioration..... |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Detailed study on-going |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Potential to remove or contain contamination. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No substantial change. |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 04 |
| Location | Lizard Point North |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA05 |
| Location | Lizard Point South |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | No A continuation of defences would impact on hydromorphology. |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | NA |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | NA |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes Potential pollution could affect SPA, bathing waters and Fisheries. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Landfill site in filled with mining waste. <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | No |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Removal or controlled diffusion of waste. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | Yes Excavation or protection. |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Study to examine impact of diffusion |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Natural exposure of cliffs. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 06 |
| Location | Whitburn Bay |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes/No |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes - Much of area protected by seawalls |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | Yes in part Parson's Rock, potential for re-alignment. |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | Yes But only in limited area. |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | Yes Potentially <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA with hard defence behind stopping development of cliff. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? | Yes |

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Retreat in area of cliffs. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Policy recommends retreat in area of Parson's Rock. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, but at a local scale. Recommended offshore structures to retain beach. If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 07 |
| Location | Sunderland harbour |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes/No |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes major harbour Piers influencing the development of the Wear Estuary. - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Potential impact of harbour <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | Yes |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | No |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 08 |
| Location | Ryhope Bay |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Extensive seawalls. Outfalls |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | Yes |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes The cliff to the south of Sunderland is SPA. Loss due to erosion and landuse squeeze. |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Land fill site, likely to be exposed by erosion. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | to minimise impact on SPA. This is difficult given that Spa covers both cliff face and cliff crest |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Early discussion of policy following further monitoring |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Defended section of coast is considered for regeneration providing scope for waste management to the area. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, at a local scale If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 09 |
| Location | Seaham |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Seawalls Harbour Structures |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2*} | Yes |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA around Seaham Harbour. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Potential contamination from land fill south of Seaham. extensive coal mining waste to south of Seaham. |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? | Yes . |

| | |
|---|--|
| - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | To manage specific pollution issue. To allow natural diffuse of mining waste. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Identification of potential contamination |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No Not significantly |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 10 |
| Location | Durham South |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Mining waste to exposed coast |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | Yes But impractical to remove waste. |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | Yes or possible need for exemption. |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA. SAC Heritage Coast <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes Mining waste to beaches being allowed to erode. <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | No flood or erosion issues |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | No objectives |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | NA |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | No Potentially requires exemption rather than designation as HMWB |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Maintains intent of Heritage Coast |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA11 |
| Location | Hartlepool North |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | Tyne and Wear <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Major seawall - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2*} | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA/SAC potentially affected by maintenance of seawall. <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | no <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | Yes Strategy in place. |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Minimise impact on designated habitats |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Discussion as to minimising impacts |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Opportunity to modify coastal behaviour to reduce impact of coastal squeeze. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, at a local scale If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Location | | |
| SMP Management Area | | MA 12 |
| Location | | Hartlepool Bay |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | | Yes Sea walls and harbour structures - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | | Yes Heugh Breakwater potential redundant. But main structures still in place. |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | | Yes Impacts on SPA <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods | | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | Causes of flooding examined in strategy. |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Minimise impact on SPA |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Detailed impact assessment.... |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, removal of Heugh breakwater will impact on the water body at a local scale. If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA13 |
| Location | Teesmouth |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Major modification to Teesmouth. - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2*} | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA / SAC <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | Yes/ Flooding to Nuclear Power Station <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Minimise impact on designated areas. Allow natural development fo coastline within control imposed by structures. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 14 |
| Location | Redcar |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Sea walls.... - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2*} | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA Bathing Waters <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods | Yes |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | identified in strategy.... |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | To minimise impact on SPA and bathing waters |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | No |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, minor change proposed. If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 15 |
| Location | Marske and Saltburn |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 16 |
| Location | Hunt Cliff |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 17 |
| Location | Skinningrove |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 18 |
| Location | Boulby Cliffs |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA19 |
| Location | Staithes |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.) ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 20 |
| Location | Port Mulgrave |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA 21 |
| Location | Runswick Bay |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA22 |
| Location | Sandsend |
| The area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Existing seawalls |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Area meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ^{2 *} | Yes Possibly given the potential scale of possible works |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes Bathing waters <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood? | No |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| - Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause? | |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | To minimise impact of defence works |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Possible re-alignment of road to allow natural development of coast. |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Location | | |
| SMP Management Area | | MA23 |
| Location | | Whitby |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | | Yes Seawalls Harbour structures |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | | No |
| Does Policy Development Zone meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. | - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | No Description of relevant issue(s). <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | Yes Harbour structures provide flood protection.... |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | To maintain Harbour structures |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Strategy to be carried out |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes Potentially but at a local scale. If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA24 |
| Location | The Stray |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes/No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iv) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 25 |
| Location | Robin Hoods Bay |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | MA26 |
| Location | Burniston |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 27 |
| Location | Scarborough North Beach |
| The Area is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Major coastal defences - |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Policy Development Zone meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation - SPA/SAC (describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes SPA Bathing Waters <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | no <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | Yes Overtopping a significant threat.... |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Minimise impact on designated areas. Reduce risk. |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the Area compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Could cause deterioration or failure to meet good status by 2015 |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | No Subject to appropriate defence approach. |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Revised strategy |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes Potentially but at a local scale If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Location | Scarborough South Beach |
| SMP Management Area | 28 |
| Location | |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | Yes/No |
| 3. Heavily modified water body (HMWB)? | |
| Are there existing structures, etc. which modify the natural coastal hydromorphology ¹ | Yes Major coastal defence structures. Harbour works |
| Are some/all of these structures 'redundant' (ie. there would be no significant effect if they were removed)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Is there a technically viable, environmentally better and not disproportionately costly alternative which would provide the same benefits as the existing structure(s)?* <i>If yes, may not be appropriate to designate as HMWB.</i> | No |
| Does Policy Development Zone meet criteria for a Heavily Modified Water Body (HMWB)? ² * | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Potentially significant WFD issues | |
| When assessing the following, consider both the existing situation and whether the SMP policies, etc. could lead to deterioration in water status and/or a failure to improve (ie. to meet 'good status') by 2015 | Are any of these issues likely to be significant at water body scale? |
| Sites protected under EU legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPA/SAC (<i>describe dependence on ecological, chemical and/or physical water status</i>) - Bathing Waters - Shellfish Waters - Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive?? - Other?? | Yes/ Impact on SPA <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sites/activities potentially affecting chemical status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Landfill site - Mining waste - Other infilled quarry, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long sea outfall - Other significant point source discharge - Presence of installation, etc. likely to cause pollution if flooded | no <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Contribution to mitigating the effects of floods - <i>Are the wider causes of flooding adequately understood?</i> - <i>Could opportunities exist to contribute to mitigating the effects of floods by tackling their cause?</i> | Yes Significant risk of flooding. |
| 5. SMP objectives required for WFD purpose | |
| For the potentially significant issues indicated above (only), suggest possible SMP objectives designed to deliver WFD requirements | Minimise impact on designated area reduce risk |
| Are these above objective(s) compatible with those already identified for the Management Area? | Yes |
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | ii) neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | Yes Review strategy |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No If yes, briefly discuss |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | Yes, potentially at a local scale. If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 29 |
| Location | Cayton Bay |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Allowing natural processes. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 30 |
| Location | Filey North Cliffs |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | iv) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Allowing natural processes. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 31 |
| Location | Filey |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | v) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | No . |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 32 |
| Location | Hunmanby Sands |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | vi) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Allowing natural processes. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications

NECAG WFD *Draft* Checklist

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Location | |
| SMP Management Area | 33 |
| Location | Flamborough |
| The PDZ is part of which coastal WFD water body? | North Yorkshire <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any potential WFD issues in this area? (if yes, continue checklist) | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Compatibility of preferred SMP policies with WFD objectives | |
| To what extent is the preferred SMP policy for the PDZ compatible with overall WFD objectives (see WFD Note)? | vii) Neutral in its effect |
| If iii) ie. could cause deterioration, etc., can revised or alternative, cost-effective ⁴ policies be identified which would meet both SMP and WFD objectives. NB If policy <i>would</i> cause deterioration, be aware there is no 'disproportionate cost' exemption under the WFD other than via Article 4(7) (see below) | NA If yes, briefly describe and amend policy If no, see below |
| The WFD allows for exemptions (lower targets or extended deadlines) where good ecological and chemical status cannot be achieved by 2015. Is further work likely to be required on such options? | NA If yes, briefly discuss |
| Does the preferred policy option (or could an alternative policy option) provide an opportunity to achieve other WFD objectives (ie. in addition to SMP objectives) for example, habitat improvement; wetland creation; pollution clean up? | Yes Allowing natural processes. |
| 7. New modifications associated with SMP policies | |
| Will the preferred SMP policy involve changes to morphology (eg. new structures, physical modifications and/or changes to flow characteristics, sediment transport, etc.)? ⁵ | No If yes, WFD Article 4(7) may apply as part of consenting process for proposed modifications |

Notes

- ¹ Include consideration of 'control' structures impacting proportionally longer lengths of coastline, man-made features affecting flow/sediment transport, etc. Also reclamation ('intentional' or via disposal of materials on beaches)
- ² Consideration of outcomes of all PDUs within the water body boundary will indicate any differences with EA's RBC1 conclusion for the two WFD water bodies
- ³ Consider chemical, physical and ecological parameters
- ⁴ Note that the WFD states that policies/measures should not be disproportionately costly
- ⁵ Consider changes due to removal or re-alignment as well as any new structure or modifications