



Solent European Marine Sites

Annual Survey Report, 2020

Solent Forum
June 2020



Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Survey Respondents.....	3
Table 1. Relevant Authorities who responded to the 2020 monitoring survey	4
Table 2. The types of Relevant Authority who responded to the 2020 survey	5
3. Activity Summary	5
3.1 Jurisdiction of Activities in the Solent.....	5
Table 3. The number of RAs who reported that an activity was within their jurisdiction.....	6
3.2 Summary of Changes Recorded in Activity Levels	7
Table 4. Summary of reported changes in activity levels from 2019 to 2020	7
Table 5. Trend data for activity change in 2019 and 2020	8
3.3 Summary of Identified Impacts.....	8
Table 6. Summary of activity impact.....	9
4. Individual Activity Responses.....	10
4.1 Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up	10
4.2 Boat repair and maintenance	12
4.3 Fishing (including shellfisheries)	14
4.4 Fishing (shore based activities)	17
4.5 General beach recreation	20
4.6 Grazing and Foraging	22
4.7 Land recreation – Dog walking.....	23
4.8 Land recreation – Walking (other than dog walking)	26
4.9 Littering and removal of litter.....	28
4.10 Mooring and anchoring.....	31
4.11 Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes	33
4.12 Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure).....	35
4.13 Recreation – light aircraft	37
4.14 Recreation – non-motorised watercraft	39
4.15 Recreation – powerboating or sailing with an engine	42
4.16 Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance	44
4.17 Wildfowling.....	46
4.18 Additional Comments on Activities.....	47
5. Activities Resulting from Plans and Projects.....	49

Table 7. Activity change or impacts arising from plans and projects	49
6. Monitoring	51
Table 8. Relevant Authority monitoring within SEMS	51
Table 9. Authorities considering additional monitoring within SEMS	52
7. Marine Conservation Zones	53
Table 10. Relevant Authorities with a MCZ within their jurisdiction.....	53
Table 11. Relevant Authorities concerns regarding activities within MCZs and monitoring of activities	53
8. Other issues	54
Table 12. Other issues raised in the survey	54

1. Introduction

This document is the SEMS Annual Survey Report, (ASR) which presents the findings from the SEMS annual online survey that took place in Spring 2020. It is prepared by the Solent Forum in its role as the SEMS Secretariat. The purpose of this annual survey is to:

- Monitor changes in coastal activities that take place within SEMS sites.
- Identify those activities that are having an impact on the features of the sites.
- Provide the background evidence for the SEMS Annual Management Report.

The responses recorded in this report were made by the Solent's Relevant Authorities (RAs) and have been set out verbatim. Analysis of the responses takes place in the SEMS Annual Management Report; this report also sets out subsequent management measures and actions for discussion at the SEMS Annual Management Group meeting.

The activities surveyed reflect the activity categories found in Natural England's Conservation Advice packages for Marine Protected Areas. This enables us to directly cross refer the survey results to the impacts of activities as published in this Advice. The Conservation Advice packages can be accessed at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/conservation-advice-packages-for-marine-protected-areas>.

Locations and details on the Solent European Marine Sites can be found on Natural England's Designated Sites System at: <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/>. The sites can be viewed spatially on Defra's MAGIC map at: <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/magicmap.aspx>.

Past survey results and copies of the SEMS Annual Management Report can be accessed at <http://www.solentems.org.uk/publications/>.

2. Survey Respondents

Of the 32 RAs who were invited to respond to the 2020 SEMS monitoring survey, 29 responded. Table 1 shows a list of respondents. Table 2 identifies the types of RAs which responded. None of the RAs which responded notified any change to their coastal and marine management responsibilities since the last survey in 2019.

Table 1. Relevant Authorities who responded to the 2020 monitoring survey

Organisations who completed the Survey, 2020	
Associated British Ports (ABP)	Natural England (NE)
Beaulieu River Management (BRM)	New Forest District Council (NFDC)
Chichester District Council (CDC)	New Forest National Park Authority (NFNPA)
Cowes Harbour Commissioners (CoHC)	Portsmouth City Council (PCC)
Chichester Harbour Conservancy (ChHC)	Queen's Harbour Master (Portsmouth) (QHM)
Environment Agency (EA)	River Hamble Harbour Authority (RHHA)
Eastleigh Borough Council (EBC)	Portsmouth International Port (PIP)
Fareham Borough Council (FBC)	Southampton City Council (SCC)
Gosport Borough Council (GBC)	Southern IFCA (SoIFCA)
Hampshire County Council	Southern Water (SW)
Havant Borough Council (HBC)	Sussex IFCA (SxIFCA)
Isle of Wight Council (IoWC)	Test Valley Borough Council (TVBC)
Langstone Harbour Board (LHB)	West Sussex County Council (WSCC)
Lymington Harbour Commissioners (LHC)	Yarmouth Harbour Commissioners (YHC)
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	
Organisations Who Did Not Respond	
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	
Wightlink Ferries (staff furloughed)	
Winchester City Council	

Table 2. The types of Relevant Authority who responded to the 2020 survey

(some authorities are of more than one type)

Authority Type	Number
*Government Authority	5
Harbour Authority	9
IFCA	2
Local Authority	11
Other	1
Private Company	1
*New Forest National Park Authority is Defra grant funded but not a government body itself.	

3. Activity Summary

Section 3 summarises the response data on activities from the 2020 survey. Respondents were questioned on seventeen different types of activity.

1. Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up
2. Boat repair and maintenance
3. Fishing (including shellfisheries)
4. Fishing (shore-based activities)
5. General beach recreation
6. Grazing and foraging
7. Land recreation - Dog walking
8. Land recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)
9. Littering and removal of litter
10. Mooring and anchoring
11. Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes
12. Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)
13. Recreation - light aircraft
14. Recreation - non-motorised watercraft
15. Recreation - powerboating or sailing with an engine
16. Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance
17. Wildfowling

3.1 Jurisdiction of Activities in the Solent

Table 3 illustrates how many relevant authorities (RA) recorded that an activity takes place within their jurisdiction.

Table 3. The number of RAs who reported that an activity was within their jurisdiction

Activity	Percentage of RAs with jurisdiction for each activity	Total Responses
Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up	59%	17
Boat repair and maintenance	48%	14
Fishing (including shellfisheries)	52%	15
Fishing (shore-based activities)	62%	18
Grazing and foraging	21%	6
General beach recreation	52%	15
Land recreation - Dog walking	55%	16
Land recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)	55%	16
Littering and removal of litter	66%	19
Mooring and anchoring	48%	14
Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes	59%	17
Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)	52%	15
Recreation - light aircraft	34%	10
Recreation - non-motorised watercraft	66%	19
Recreation - powerboating or sailing with an engine	55%	16
Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance	52%	15
Wildfowling	17%	5
Source: SEMS Annual Survey, 2020		

3.2 Summary of Changes Recorded in Activity Levels

Respondents were asked whether, since the last survey, an activity had increased, decreased, had no change or they had no data. Table 4 summarises the data. The mode value of the responses has been highlighted in green.

Table 4. Summary of reported changes in activity levels from 2019 to 2020

Activity	Increased	Decreased	No change	Don't know	Total Responses
Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up	0	0	13	4	17
Boat repair and maintenance	0	2	8	5	15
Fishing (including shellfisheries)	0	3	10	4	17
Fishing (shore-based activities)	4	0	7	7	18
General beach recreation	0	1	8	7	16
Grazing and foraging	0	0	3	3	6
Land recreation - Dog walking	2	1	5	8	16
Land recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)	1	1	7	8	17
Littering and removal of litter	3	0	13	3	19
Mooring and anchoring	0	2	12	1	15
Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes	1	0	12	4	17
Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)	3	0	10	2	15
Recreation - light aircraft	4	0	3	4	11
Recreation - non-motorised watercraft	2	1	8	8	19
Recreation - powerboating or sailing with an engine	0	0	12	4	16
Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance	1	0	10	5	16
Wildfowling	0	0	3	4	7

Source: SEMS Annual Survey, 2020

Table 5. Trend data for activity change in 2019 and 2020

Table 5 shows the mode response for activity change for a time series; currently we have data for two years.

Activity	Mode response 2020	Mode response 2019
Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up	No change	No change
Boat repair and maintenance	No change	No change
Fishing (including shellfisheries)	No change	Decreased/no change
Fishing (shore-based activities)	No change	No change
Grazing and foraging	No change	No activity recorded
General beach recreation	No change	No change
Land recreation - Dog walking	No change	No change
Land recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)	No change	No change
Littering and removal of litter	No change	No change
Mooring and anchoring	No change	No change
Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes	No change	No change
Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)	No change	No change
Recreation - light aircraft	Increase	No change
Recreation - non-motorised watercraft	No change	Increase/no change
Recreation - powerboating or sailing with an engine	No change	No change
Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance	No change	No change
Wildfowling	No change	No change
Source: SEMS Annual Surveys, 2020 and 2019		

3.3 Summary of Identified Impacts

Respondents were asked whether they thought an activity has an impact on the Solent European Marine Sites. Table 6 summarises the data. The mode value has been highlighted in green. The final column identifies those relevant authorities who answered that they thought the activity was having an impact; the organisation abbreviations are set out in full in Table 1.

Table 6. Summary of activity impact

Activity	Yes	No	Total	Organisations who responded yes to an impact
Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up	3	14	17	ChHC, PIP, BRM
Boat repair and maintenance	1	13	14	ChHC
Fishing (including shellfisheries)	2	13	15	ChHC, PIP
Fishing (shore-based activities)	6	12	18	LHB, EA, ChHC, SxIFCA, EBC, SCC
General beach recreation	3	12	15	ChHC, EBC, HCC
Grazing and foraging	2	4	6	ChHC, HCC
Land recreation - Dog walking	9	7	16	LHB, WSCC, ChHC, CDC, FBC, EBC, HCC, BRM, GBC
Land recreation - Walking (other than dog walking)	7	10	17	LHB, ChHC, CDC, FBC, EBC, HCC, GBC
Littering and removal of litter	8	11	19	EA, LHC, ChHC, IOWC, EBC, SCC, SW, GBC
Mooring and anchoring	3	11	14	ChHC, NE, BRM
Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes	3	14	17	EA, ChHC, EBC
Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)	2	13	15	ChHC, PIP
Recreation - light aircraft	2	8	10	ChHC, EBC
Recreation - non-motorised watercraft	4	15	19	ChHC, IOWC, PIP, EBC
Recreation - powerboating or sailing with an engine	4	12	16	ChHC, PIP, EBC, BRM
Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance	1	14	15	ChHC
Wildfowling	1	5	6	ChHC
Source: SEMS Annual Survey, 2020				

4. Individual Activity Responses

Section 4 presents the individual relevant authority comments for each activity; the comments are presented verbatim. The comments where people have responded that they think an activity is having an impact have been placed at the top.

4.1 Accidental vessel discharges/emissions including oil spill and clean-up

Activity includes accidental discharges and/or emissions from all types of vessels, including exhaust fumes, waste water, sewerage, oils, lubricants and chemicals, including oil spill and clean-up.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey				
Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	0	13	4	17

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?		
Yes	No	Total Responses
3	14	17

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: PiP
Infrequent, small oil spills or pollutants, which have been discharged accidentally at Portsmouth International Port, or Town Camber. Cause could be leaks, machinery failures and emergencies. Port has counter pollution plan in conjunction with QHM Portsmouth. Ships hold SOPEP. Activities are risk assessed and control measures checked before activities commence. Oil spill response plan in place. Reporting system for harbour and to HMCG.

Respondent: BRM
Installed a pump out facility.

Respondent: ChHC
Waste water and fuel leaks, spills etc. negatively impact on water quality.

Respondent: EA
We are not aware of any significant spills or discharges of unregulated substances to the marine environment - the Harbour Authorities or large industries may notify the EA if this was the case, and the MCA and relevant authorities would lead a clean-up operation for pollution arising from the sea.

Respondent: LHC
One small diesel discharge reported. Source unknown - presumed electronic bilge pumped contaminated water. Spill fully dispersed within 24 hours.

Respondent: NFDC

There have been no incidents of accidental discharge of oils, lubricants or chemicals over the past 12 months. There are exhaust fumes from powered vessels and the majority of petrol engines are 4 stroke which helps to reduce environmental damage. The NFDC launch had a new diesel engine fitted in the last few years resulting in a more environmentally friendly vessel used for maintenance/patrolling. Any effect of accidental discharge/emissions in Keyhaven is minimal aided by the fact that it is not a very busy harbour.

Respondent: IOWC

Impacts have not been reported or highlighted.

Respondent: CDC

We have a role in emergency planning response for large oil spills only. ChHC may have information on smaller spills.

Respondent: GBC

The Council responds to emergency oil spills on the Borough's beaches. I'm afraid we currently have insufficient information to comment on this activity.

Respondent: ABP

No commercial shipping releases reported in 2019 that required the deployment of ABP's marine spill response plan or equipment. Southampton patrol boat called to assist with a sinking yacht at Eling Sailing Club (Feb 2020) and a slight sheen on the water. Further investigation concluded this was likely bilge water (and so small quantities of oil) and not fuel/engine oil. Anecdotal improvement in vessel engine emissions due to increased calls from LNG powered ships.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.2 Boat repair and maintenance

Activity includes vessel maintenance and repair on land or afloat, including hull cleaning. Please also consider the vessels, machinery and vehicles associated with this activity.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	2	8	5	15

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
1	13	14

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Disturbance to shoreline habitats, and pollution through fragments of plastics/fibre glass found in harbour and TBT paints/treatments; throughout the Harbour.

Respondent: YHC

Anecdotally YHC believe there to be fewer people carrying out maintenance on vessels. This may be because of financial constraints or because the size and type of vessels has gradually been changing to newer, lower maintenance boats.

Respondent: PCC

PCC has no responsibilities for this as far as I am aware.

Respondent: LHC

Operations are conducted at responsibly managed private boatyards outside of designated sites.

Respondent: NFDC

There are three areas where boat cleaning takes place from, one is commercially on the quay when vessels recovered by West Solent Boat Builders pressure wash the hulls prior to transporting boats to their yard resulting in a discharge of chemicals into the river. The number of boat movements is unknown however is likely to have been around the same as the previous year. Secondly, use of the scrubbing grid on the western side of the quay by leisure craft. This gets very little use and subsequently very little impact. Thirdly, vessels at anchor on the inside of Hurst Spit scrubbing hulls. This is an infrequent activity and any impact cannot be reported on.

Respondent: RHAA

A Filtabund filtration system has been installed at Marina Developments Limited (MDL) Mercury Yacht Harbour. This is thought to be the first of its type to be installed in the Solent Region, with more planned for other MDL sites. The filtration system collects all water and associated solids produced during the washdown of a vessel. The waste water is pumped through an automated 7-stage filtration system that removes solids (including paint particulates and non-native species),

fine sediments, hydrocarbons, dissolved copper and zinc. Whilst other sites in the river have systems that remove solids, sediment and oils, albeit to a lesser degree, this system further enables additional pollutants to be removed, thus resulting in significantly cleaner water being drained back into the estuary.

Respondent: CoHC

Possibly a slight decrease. Anecdotally there is a reduction in the number of smaller boats (on the smaller or drying moorings) and fewer older boats that generally require more maintenance.

Respondent: NE

Consideration may need to be given for increased risk of spread of invasive non-native species from this activity.

Respondent: PiP

Basic yacht and fishing boat maintenance on Council slipway within the Town Camber, minimal impact from pollution from washing or maintaining vessels on slip.

Respondent: GBC

Gosport Borough has a relatively strong boat repair sector. This activity is anecdotally seen to be the same and not increased in its intensity compared to previous years.

Respondent: ABP

Any commercial hull cleaning that has the potential to release debris (e.g. biofouling, paint flakes) into the marine environment is prohibited within ABP's SHA jurisdiction.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.3 Fishing (including shellfisheries)

Activity includes anchored nets or lines, electrofishing, traps, pelagic fishing (or fishing activities that do not interact with sea bed), hydraulic dredges, dredges, demersal trawl, demersal seines, diving and sea angling.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	3	10	4	17

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
2	13	15

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Dredges likely to negatively impact invert and fish habitat on seafloor, netting activities are removing juvenile fish from harbour at various locations. Little information on whether various fishing activities are increasing or decreasing, and little information on recreational fishing impact on fish populations.

Respondent: PiP

Concerns about reduced fish stocks. Harbour Master does not have any authority in fishing areas but is the harbour master of the Camber in Portsmouth, where the fishing fleet moor and land catches, so very little control over activities.

Respondent: LHB

The number of commercial fishing vessels seen operating in the harbour was 50% less than the previous year (just 4 vessels were recorded this year). The number of fishing days also declined from 51 last year to 27 this year. The decrease in commercial fishing activity can be attributed to sIFCA byelaws which have closed grounds in the harbour spatially, as well as placing seasonal restrictions on certain fishing activity. LHB does not record recreational fishing activity.

Respondent: EA

The only fishery which the EA regulate in this area is the Beaulieu Seine net - now regulated under byelaw rather than net limitation order. In 2019 we saw a slight reduction in effort with one less day fished than usual. The other relevant activity is the fyke net fishery for European Eel which operates within designated sites. This also saw slightly reduced effort in 2019. Until the revised byelaws are in place to manage the Solent shellfisheries (pending sign off by Secretary of State), there is an outstanding risk in this regard. There are also on-going concerns in relation to migratory salmonids and netting (though this links strongly to the freshwater designations, the activity occurs within these areas). All other aspects of fishing are regulated by Southern IFCA, of which we have a member on their committee.

Respondent: SolFCA

Overall activity within the Solent European Marine Sites has decreased over the past 12 months in

most fisheries. Broken down into the following categories:

Shellfish Dredging. The level of shellfish dredging within the Solent has decreased from the previous year. The number of vessels targeting clams has reduced with less vessels engaged in the fishery on the first day of the season down on the previous year (approximately 5), and with this reducing further throughout the season. Most of the effort was focused in Southampton Water.

Native Oyster dredging was prohibited in the Solent. The reduction in activity of this type was likely due to a reduced fleet size, other fishing opportunities in the Solent becoming available (outside of the SEMs area) and poor winter weather.

Trawling. Trawling activity remained on a similar level to previous years through the summer months, however into late Autumn and Winter there was a reduction due to vessels targeting other fisheries (outside of SEMs area) and significant winter storms. The majority of trawling within the Solent does not overlap with the European Marine Sites.

There is no indication that levels of the remaining activities e.g. netting, lining or sea angling (from a vessel) has changed from previous years, although due to poor winter weather a decrease has been reported anecdotally.

Fishing activities have been excluded from a number of areas in the Solent at certain times due to the IFA2 cable route into the Solent, particularly where the cable makes landfall at Lee-on-the-Solent or around Chilling.

Shellfish dredging in the Solent is managed through various mechanisms. The Solent Dredge Fishing Byelaw was brought in place to ensure that the conservation objectives of the site were not being impacted by shellfish dredging. Further to those measures, the Temporary Closure of Shellfish Beds byelaw was implemented in the Solent for the 19/20 season to close the oyster fishery due to low stock levels removing the vessels targeting oysters within the Solent. The Bottom Towed Fishing Gear Byelaw 2016 prohibits towed gear over the more sensitive areas of the Solent European Marine Site. All fishing activities have been assessed through the revised approach process, and either led to the development of management or concluded no adverse effect. The assessments for the activities requiring a full, detailed HRA can be found at (<http://www.southern-ifca.gov.uk/management-of-mpas>).

Respondent: QHM

QHM work/liases with SolFCA who regularly conduct patrols in the DPP. If static gear is laid in areas where prohibited or has an impact of the safety of navigation QHM and SolFCA often come together to address.

Respondent: NFDC

None of the above activities take place in Keyhaven River.

Respondent: CDC

Our jurisdiction is limited to food safety inspections of shellfish beds.

Respondent: SxIFCA

Sussex IFCA made a byelaw on 25 January 2020, which is with Defra for sign off, which will prohibit netting and trawling within Chichester Harbour to protect fish nursery and spawning areas.

Respondent: EBC

Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline -easternmost stretch).

Respondent: GBC

Fishing is a low key activity in the Borough so we would consider it to be unlikely to have an impact on SEMS sites.

Respondent: ABP

ABP's marine department reported a suspected illegal fishing boat to the MMO in this SEMs survey period. However, generally only activities that pose a risk to navigational safety are recorded for monitoring by ABP.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.4 Fishing (shore based activities)

Activity includes crab tiling, bait digging, shellfish collection (including seed mussel) e.g. by hand (with or without digging apparatus), rake or through the use of 'tiles'. Also includes rod and line angling, the setting of pots and nets from the shore and the use of vehicles or vessels to access the shoreline.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
4	0	7	7	18

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
6	12	18

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: LHB

Visual inspection to the mudflats at Southmoor showed large amounts of very obvious damage to the intertidal zone caused by bait digging and associated trampling. The presence of multiple diggers on the mud also inevitably causes disturbance to wildlife such as wildfowl and waders. This takes place year-round, daily, at low water. High levels of bait digging have occurred in this area for several years. The area has easy access to the foreshore close to a free car park, just off the major road network. Bait is seemingly being collected in commercial quantities. Any management measures put into place need to be VERY CAREFULLY considered. While this activity is clearly causing damage and disturbance south of Southmoor, prohibition may cause the participants to be displaced to other areas of the harbour (or wider Solent) where greater disturbance to wintering birds assemblages as well as disturbance to breeding seabirds might occur. Displacing participants at greater environmental cost to the SEMS should be avoided at all costs. Nonetheless, intensively gathering bait in commercial quantities on a daily basis from a highly designated MPA is an undeniably damaging activity which continues to need to be addressed.

Respondent: SxIFCA

Potential disturbance to birds and removal of food source. Impact on intertidal sediments by shellfish pickers walking and digging within them. Largely focused around Nutbourne & Printhead Channels which feed into Thorney channel; Emsworth channel; Thorney Island; Pilsey island which is accessed either by sea or by land; Chichester Marina and Chidham, all accessible from several locations by land or boat. Other known hand gathering locations are Dell quay, Northney marina, Copperas Point, Westlands, Birdham pool, and Longmere point. The impacts of digging are removal of prey for protected bird species, potential bird disturbance by the activity.

Sussex IFCA has undertaken an HRA of the activity and is proposing to bring in management of bait and shellfish collection within the near future.

Respondent: EA

EA are concerned that this activity is having a year round impact at a wide range of locations, causing disturbance, plastic pollution and removal of species. Of these activities only rod and line angling falls within the EA's jurisdiction - and this is only partially with EA responsibility for

salmonids. Sea angling for marine species falls within Southern IFCA's jurisdiction as do the other activities listed. It is unlikely that rod and line angling has a significant impact on the SEMS sites, though there are potential concerns of a low level of impact in relation to accidentally discarded fishing gear in terms of plastic pollution, and disturbance from anglers visiting coastal locations.

Respondent: ChHC

Removal of fish, disturbance to shoreline habitats (bird roosts, bird feeding areas) at various locations. Much shore based angling takes place around sandy point, also the head of the Fishbourne channel, and Nutbourne marshes. Little information on impact of shore based angling on fish populations.

Respondent: EBC

Intensity and activity type unknown. Potentially along the whole coast. Disturbance and removal of food resource for the ecosystem. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch).

Respondent: SCC

Damage to the inter-tidal area as a consequence of potentially commercial collection of shellfish at Weston Shore. Timing is variable, can be several times a month. Turning over of mud to find shellfish - oysters. Reported incidents to the Police, IFCA and Port Health. This has been going on for several years and no action has been taken against the people collecting the shellfish as far as I am aware.

Respondent: SolFCA

Levels of intertidal hand gathering for shellfish appear to have increased in areas of the SEMs. Particularly Weston Shore, Hill Head, Hamble point and Lee-on-the-Solent. A level of activity remains in Portsmouth and Langstone Harbours. It is understood that these include commercial and recreational gatherers. The increase in activity could be as a result of the increased presence of Pacific oysters along the shorefront. Southern IFCA do not have evidence to suggest that the levels of bait digging have increased or decreased. Southern IFCA has byelaws in place to protect the most sensitive features of the European Marine Site from Hand Gathering and Bit Digging in both the SPAs and SACs details of this byelaw can be found at: <http://www.southern-ifca.gov.uk/byelaws#>. Prohibition of gathering (seafisheries resources) in Seagrass Beds. Depending on the area or on the species harvested, gathering of shellfish may not be permitted due to food hygiene regulations ((EC) No 854/2004).

Respondent: CDC

We lack evidence to show if any increases are having an impact on the SPA/SAC.

Respondent: PCC

Whilst the activity would fall partially within our jurisdiction (our planning powers encompass the intertidal zone extending to low water), we do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view. As far as I am aware, no planning permissions were granted during the monitoring period relating to fishing or dredging facilities or infrastructure.

Respondent: LHC

Limited rod and line angling due to access restrictions. No bait digging.

Respondent: NFDC

There is no commercial fishing in the Keyhaven river. Leisure fishing is not allowed from the quay however there will be leisure fishing taking place in the river and surrounding area as the entire

river cannot be policed 24/7 therefore cannot be reported on. Shellfish collection does not take place at Keyhaven. Crabbing is a tradition on the quay by local and visiting families and the crabs are returned to the river. This activity would have been less in 2019 due to the poor weather during the summer of 2019. This fall is estimated to be around 20%.

Respondent: RHAA

Impact of bait digging on SEMS unknown so cannot conclude 'yes'. Bait digging still remains elevated on the Hamble and RHHA continues its provision of information and liaison with SIFCA and police.

Respondent: IOWC

Impacts have not been reported or highlighted.

Respondent: CDC

Anecdotal increases reported in rod and line fishing around Fishbourne creek area. We lack evidence to show if any increases are having an impact on the SPA/SAC.

Respondent: CoHC

Access for angling across sensitive saltmarsh would impact the site if it is occurring at increased levels but we have no way to monitor or restrict that as access is across private land beside the cycle path. There have not been any reports of increased levels of angling, but we will continue to raise awareness of the most sensitive areas of the estuary.

Respondent: YHC

There was a slight increase in fishing from Yarmouth Pier during 2019 as in 2018 it was closed for repair (Feb - August).

Respondent: NE

Due to the extent and complexity of bait digging in the Solent a pilot is suggested, initially in one area of SEMS, using the Poole Harbour model (i.e. establishing a working group to develop a bait digging Memorandum of Agreement). NE remains committed to exploring the idea of piloting the Poole Harbour model with Southern IFCA.

Respondent: GBC

Fishing is a low key activity in the Borough so we would consider it to be unlikely to have an impact on SEMS sites.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.5 General beach recreation

Activity includes other coastal land recreation and leisure activities such as educational or scientific studies, horse riding on the beach, fireworks displays, swimming, rock pooling, surfing and non-motorised land craft (e.g. sand yachting, kite buggying).

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	1	8	7	16

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
3	12	15

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: HCC

As with other walking, where there is reduced access due to lockdown, hence a decrease.

Respondent: ChHC

Disturbance to wildlife, littering, trampling. Various locations, East Head and Thorney Island are the most impacted locations. Primarily summer months (May-Sept).

Respondent: EBC

Intensity of these "static" activities vary at different locations presumably dependent on visitor facilities available. Impacts include disturbance, litter and erosion. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline -easternmost stretch) or where planning permission or other EBC consents are required.

Respondent: PCC

We do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view.

Respondent: NFDC

This activity is again weather dependent.

Respondent: IOWC

Unknown, but as recreational pressures increase it is likely that these activities are increasing too. However, data on the levels and frequency is not collected. Anecdotally it is known that local organisations implement codes of conduct at the coast.

Respondent: CDC

Due to the nature of Chichester Harbour, beach activities take place largely outside the SPA (e.g. Bracklesham Bay) or on parts of the SPA where bird numbers are low (West Wittering beach).

Respondent: FBC

The Council maintain in parts along the coastline within the Borough the carparks (including public toilets), street furniture and empty the waste bins provided. As far as I am aware there are no other beach restrictions in place other than no dogs on beaches at set times of the year for some beaches only. Bird Aware Solent will be the best placed Organisation to give information on any changes to the amount of this activity taking place and the level of impact that it is having on the SEMS.

Respondent: GBC

Anecdotal evidence that this has not really changed from the previous year. We consider this to have little impact on SEMS sites in the Borough.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.6 Grazing and Foraging

Activity includes grazing on saltmarsh or intertidal areas.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	0	3	3	6

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
2	4	6

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Hand gathering of clams, cockles is widespread and having negative impact on bird feeding areas and invert populations, takes place at intertidal habitats at various locations. Much of this hand gathering is of a commercial nature.

Respondent: PCC

There is no grazing on coastal habitat within Portsmouth. Foraging for personal use on public land doesn't require permission and is therefore not monitored.

Respondent: YHC

No grazing and no information on foraging. If foraging is occurring it is at a very low level.

Respondent: EBC

Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline -easternmost stretch) but this is not applicable on land in our ownership.

Respondent: NFNPA

Land Advice Team may provide advice on farmer and landowners on grazing management and habitat management. To the best of my knowledge no intertidal areas or SEMS sites have been covered by such advice this year.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.7 Land recreation – Dog walking

Activity includes recreational participation with dogs, including the use of dogs in wildfowling.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
2	1	5	8	16

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
9	7	16

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: LHB

LHB does not actively monitor this activity, but dog walkers are frequently observed on the intertidal zone. This activity could cause disturbance to wildlife, in particular SPA bird species. This happens daily, site-wide and is due to increasing human population in the region (approximately 1 in 4 households have a dog in the UK). LHB do not manage this activity, however the Bird Aware project was created to minimise disturbance to SPA birds caused by this and other activities.

Respondent: WSCC

Dogs disturbing feeding and roosting waders and wildfowl. Intensity not known and impacts likely to depend on other factors such as weather conditions with greater impact during severe weather at West Wittering and Fishbourne Creek.

Respondent: ChHC

Disturbance to wildlife, primarily birds especially at sites such as East Head at feeding areas, high tide roosts and breeding sites. Takes place at various locations all year, East Head is particularly impacted.

Respondent: CDC

Levels of recreational disturbance remain high due to historical (pre Bird Aware Solent (BAS)) levels of development near the coastal SPAs (Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA). The impact on SPA species is over the winter period. Recreational disturbance leading to decreased feeding time and increased energy expenditure in bird species. Bird Aware Solent education and wardening together with access improvements are designed to mitigate the impact of new development, but these broad ranging activities will also mitigate pre-existing impacts to some extent. CDC does not have data ourselves, but monitoring data commissioned through BAS will be highly relevant here.

Respondent: FBC

Recreational Disturbance of over wintering bird populations in particular is experienced to some degree at all coastal paths around the borough. There are increased concentrations for walker in areas such as around Portchester coastline (castle and Cams/Wicor) and Hill Head (all along this coastal stretch) and Warsash (the footpath along bunny meadows in the Hamble is well used). Year long recreation, disturbance is likely significant effect over winter. Predominantly dogs causing species to stop feeding and fly - this is not a new impact and is being mitigated through

the Bird Aware Solent work. New residential development within 5.6km of the Solent SPAs developers pay a contribution towards the Bird Aware Solent Project which aims to tackling the threat of species disturbance from recreation. Bird Aware Solent will be the best placed organisation to give information on any changes to the amount recreational activity taking place and the level of impact that it is having on the SEMS.

Respondent: EBC

Walkers and dogs off leads causing disturbance, erosion and fouling. Other causes not identified. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) or where planning permission or other EBC consents are required.

Respondent: HCC

As with other walking, where there is reduced access due to lockdown so a decrease in activity.

Respondent: BRM

Dogs off leads and running over marshes on the Beaulieu River Walk, Solent Way. To manage there is signage and educational articles in the River handbook.

Respondent: GBC

Coastline of Solent and Southampton Water popular with dog walkers given the urbanised nature of the Borough. Lee-on-the-Solent is a popular destination at a sub-regional level attracting visitors from further afield. Less pressure on Portsmouth Harbour coastline given lack of access due to large areas of land in Ministry of Defence ownership. Takes place all year round. Improvement of the Alver Valley Country Park which acts as a SANG to deflect pressure from dog walking away from the coast. Renewal of Public Spaces Protection Dog Control Order in 2020. The order has been extended and varied and in force for a period of 3 years. Part of Bird Aware Solent, which collects money from all new residential development.

Respondent: IOWC

We did attempt to introduce additional dog prohibitions on beaches in the new Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). Unfortunately, we have been asked to revert to the existing regulations contained within the current Dog Regulations. However, once the PSPOs are approved we shall be collating evidence of problem areas so that a PSPO can be amended whereby additional restrictions can be included in future years. A public consultation on the PSPOs is ongoing, closing June 2020. Impacts associated with planned housing growth is evidenced to be having an impact but is being mitigated. Evidence through the SRMP work showed that recreational pressure on the SPA is causing disturbance to birds. The Isle of Wight Council, in collaboration with Solent Bird Aware (formerly known as the SRMP), is working to mitigate increased pressure through new housing development. This does not address existing pressures.

Respondent: PCC

We do not directly record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view. However, data for planning permissions granted that were subject to SPA recreation disturbance mitigation (monitored by Bird Aware), indicates a significant drop in the monitoring period for financial year 2019-2020 from 227 dwellings to 40. This is likely to be because of the stall in permissions granted due to the nitrates issue. I would imagine neighbouring authorities may have similar reports. This could be taken as a proxy indicator for this activity and it might tentatively be concluded to suggest a decrease from last year? Bird Aware may be able to advise better and provide some thoughts.

Respondent: NFDC

Generally, dog walking stays at the same level.

Respondent: NE

Level of activity overall has probably stayed roughly the same, however, an increase in activity has been noted in the New Forest, particularly on North Solent NNR.

Respondent: NFNPA

Strictly speaking we have not 'jurisdiction' directly as we are not the Highway Authority. We are however an Access Authority and once coastal access goes through, have been identified as the managing body for the local area. We are involved in projects that relate to walking access such as large development schemes and associated access management. Also producing a Recreation Management strategy for the Park area, particularly concentrating on core Crownland areas currently but with strategic objectives relevant to the SEMS sites. We also engage with the New Forest Dog Owners Group (NFDOG) and operate a project officer on behalf of NFDC that seeks to engage with dog owners to provide advice on best practice dog ownership and walking that respects wildlife sensitivities on terrestrial habitats - and who also liaises with Bird Aware rangers.

Respondent: SCC

It's difficult to know whether dog walking is having an effect on bird numbers at Weston Shore. There are reports of dogs being encouraged to chase birds on the inter-tidal area and the numbers of over-wintering birds has declined, however, there are a number of other factors, such as an increase in carrion crows and poor water quality, that could be the underlying reasons.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.8 Land recreation – Walking (other than dog walking)

Activity includes walking on upper shore or intertidal zone (other than dog walking).

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
1	1	7	8	17

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
7	10	17

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: LHB

LHB does not actively monitor this activity, but walkers are frequently observed on the intertidal zone. This activity could cause damage to fragile habitats through trampling, as well as disturbance to wildlife including SPA bird species. This happens daily, site-wide and is due to increasing human population in the region. LHB do not manage this activity, however the Bird Aware project was created to minimise disturbance to SPA birds caused by this and other activities.

Respondent: ChHC

General walking around the harbour leads to trampling saltmarsh vegetation and disturbance to wildlife particularly birds (high tide roosts, feeding areas and breeding birds). This takes place at various locations.

Respondent: CDC

Levels of recreational disturbance remain high due to historical (pre Bird Aware Solent) levels of development near the coastal SPAs. Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA. The impact on SPA species is over the winter period. Recreational disturbance leading to decreased feeding time and increased energy expenditure in bird species. Bird Aware Solent education and wardening together with access improvements are designed to mitigate the impact of new development, but these broad ranging activities will also mitigate pre-existing impacts to some extent. CDC does not have data ourselves, but monitoring data commissioned through BAS will be highly relevant here.

Respondent: FBC

Recreational Disturbance of over wintering bird populations in particular. Experienced to some degree at all coastal paths around the borough.
There are increased concentrations for walker in areas such as around Portchester coastline (castle and Cams/Wicor) and Hill Head (all along this coastal stretch) and Warsash (the footpath along bunny meadows in the Hamble is well used). Year long recreation, disturbance likely significant effect over winter. Predominantly walker (often with dogs) disturb the birds causing species to stop feeding and fly - this is not a new impact and is being mitigated through the Bird Aware Solent work. New residential development within 5.6km of the Solent SPAs pay a contribution towards the Bird Aware Solent Project which aims to tackling the threat of species disturbance from recreation. Bird Aware Solent will be the best placed organisation to give

information on any changes to the amount recreational activity taking place and the level of impact that it is having on the SEMS.

Respondent: EBC

There is public access (car parks and foot access) along the foreshore so there will be an impact although intensity is unknown. Access along possibly the whole (certainly majority) of the coast within Eastleigh Borough. Impacts include disturbance and erosion from walkers. Unaware of other causes. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline – easternmost stretch) or where planning permission or other EBC consents are required.

Respondent: HCC

With the closure of the parking at sites like Lepe CP and Royal Victoria due to COVID 19, reduced disturbance to birds is likely with lockdown restrictions or areas where access would normally be by car. We are considering what messages we will need to consider for people "released" from lockdown to avoid disturbance to birds (particularly where nesting is taking place).

Respondent: GBC

Potentially increased disturbance although GBC is unable to directly quantify the impact. Complete Gosport Borough coastline. All year round but likely more activity in the summer months. Use of the coast for recreation. Borough is highly urbanised, this places increase pressure on the coastline for exercise and recreation. Part of Bird Aware Solent - GBC has not implemented other measures at this time.

Respondent: IOWC

Evidence through the SRMP work showed that recreational pressure on the SPA is causing disturbance to birds. The Isle of Wight Council, in collaboration with Solent Bird Aware (formerly known as the SRMP), is working to mitigate increased pressure through new housing development. This does not address existing pressures.

Respondent: PCC

As planning authority do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence-based view.

Respondent: NFDC

This is generally a weather dependent activity, with summer 2018 being an exceptional time for tourism including walking.

Respondent: NE

Level of activity overall has probably stayed roughly the same, however, an increase in activity has been noted in the New Forest, particularly on North Solent NNR.

Respondent: NFNPA

Strictly speaking we have not 'jurisdiction' directly as we are not the Highway Authority. We are however an Access Authority and once coastal access goes through, have been identified as the managing body for the local area. We are involved in projects that relate to walking access such as large development schemes and associated access management. Also producing a Recreation Management Strategy for the Park area, particularly concentrating on core Crownland areas currently but with strategic objectives relevant to the SEMS sites.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.9 Littering and removal of litter

This activity includes discharges from land, water or air, from all types of vessels, of particulate or solid wastes e.g. plastics, microplastics and other flotsam and jetsam (accidental vessel discharges are a separate category). The toxicity and damage caused by littering materials should be considered as should the cleanup of toxic debris. Please includes information on any strandline clearance and beach clean up.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
3	0	13	3	19

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
8	11	19

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: EA

The EA are concerned that this activity is having an impact on the SEMS sites from nurdle pollution, (microplastic pollution on a significant scale in this location) nurdle hunts are showing more than 1000 nurdles in this area. Impact on SEMS or underlying SSSIs of this concern is currently not assessed by Natural England. This is happening year round with a particular concern at Chessel Bay, the source is plastic manufacture. Investigations are ongoing.

Respondent: LHC

Litter (plastics) entering the harbour from land or sea must be having some adverse impact albeit we are not qualified to quantify. Occasional litter picks organised.

Respondent: ChHC

Micro plastic pollution now well known to be extremely widespread throughout harbour, impacts still unclear. Regular beach cleans organised around the harbour and general raising awareness of plastic pollution by micro-plastic symposium in 2019.

Respondent: IOWC

Nationally it is recognised that marine litter, and particularly plastics entering the system, is a huge issue. Therefore, this response is based on the assumption that littering within SEMS remains elevated. Without data and monitoring the confidence level is low.

Respondent: EBC

Litter from visitors to the coast is brought in via wind, watercourses and sea. Intensity unknown. May be some hot spots - from visitor numbers or physical factors (tides, prevailing wind etc). Presumably all year round. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch).

Respondent: SCC

The strandline and higher shore are covered in plastic nurdles, bottles and other waste materials on the River Itchen shoreline. All year round. Poor storage of raw materials by plastics companies based along the river. Waste from ships, boatyards and other river side businesses. Litter discarded by members of the public. Regular litter picks to remove the rubbish. This is a

persistent problem with various sources. It will require a variety of actions, including legal action, to secure better standards of waste management by local businesses and residents.

Respondent: SW

I do not have actual site specific data, but I am aware marine litter is an issue across the whole of the Solent.

Respondent: GBC

Litter being dropped at the Borough's beaches and harbor frontage. Litter travelling from inland locations to the beach by air. All coastal locations. It is considered that littering is worse in locations such as Lee-on-the-Solent and Stokes Bay. Higher prevalence in the summer months when the Borough's beaches are much busier. People not disposing of litter appropriately and/or litter blowing from bins inland. Additional emptying of litter bins during busy times and a strict street cleaning regime, particularly in high traffic locations. In addition to the Council's statutory responsibilities in the disposal of waste and cleansing of the Borough's streets, the Council is aware of community organisations undertaking litter picks on the Borough's beaches.

Respondent: NFDC

There was a paddle board litter pick in 2018 (on 31 December 2018) at Hurst Spit, there was no water-based litter pick in 2019. There are however other voluntary organisations in addition to private individuals that litter pick however the NFDC River Warden cannot report on this.

Respondent: LHB

Litter including cotton bud sticks and nurdles (derived from storm water discharges), fishing litter, food wrappings, plastic bottles and many other types are encountered in large quantities harbour-wide.

Respondent: PCC

We do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view. Potential evidence sources you could investigate however would be reported incidents or fines for littering, fly tipping or dog fouling in coastal areas. Organised beach cleans also record how much litter is collected?

Respondent: RHHA

Regular litter picks take place along accessible foreshores by established volunteer groups who typically collect food wrappings, plastic bottles, drink cans and fishing litter. Small nurdles are commonly found on the shoreline. RHHA patrols do not routinely collect litter from foreshore areas but do collect items hazardous to vessels within the navigable areas and will attend River Hamble Country Park Jetty when litter is observed.

Respondent: CoHC

Not specifically in our area although generally it is a problem. Marine litter tends to collect in certain areas within the harbour and marinas and is cleared as required where practically possible.

Respondent: YHC

There was an increase in the number of volunteer litter picks last year by groups such as Yarmouth Sailing Club.

Respondent: NE

Further work is needed to assimilate impacts from inert waste and litter on features, sub features and supporting features into its conservation advice due to the variety of waste occurring and lack of data on implications. However, NE agrees that litter and waste present in SEMS will in all likelihood be impacting species and habitats to a currently unknown degree.

Respondent: NFNPA

No legal controls but our Rangers do undertake community liaison and events around the issues and our Education team that go into schools also have been providing litter assemblies.

Respondent: ABP

Increase in awareness around marine plastics and campaigns across the Port user community to reduce single-use plastics and increase litter picking operations. ABP targeted campaign in 2019 to reduce and remove HGV generated litter across key port roads. Potential small positive impact associated with increased litter picking activities and the removal of litter at source before it enters the marine environment as well as collection from strandlines. This is providing the litter picking activities are carefully managed so as not to introduce a further/different impact pathways for sensitive receptors. ABP coordinated a beach clean event in 2019 and was turned down by one beach landowner due to regular community litter picks and the additional resource not being required at the time.

Respondent: QHM

If floating objects which could cause damage to the safety of Navigation are reported then the MOD's agent is then tasked/required to remove /recover.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.10 Mooring and anchoring

Activity includes the operational use of berths, moorings and anchorages including the presence of these structures and the vessels using them. Includes consideration of impacts from vessels when berthing/berthed, mooring/moored, anchoring/anchored. Also includes impacts from anchors and impacts of boat when at anchor or mooring. There is a particular risk of damage from anchoring in seagrass beds.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	2	12	1	15

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
3	11	14

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Concerned about the impacts of erosion and scouring of mudflats and seabed at various locations. Anchoring during summer months a particular problem to the north and east of East Head where dozens of boats anchor temporarily. Moorings year round, anchoring mainly during summer months. There is a particular issue with recreational vessels anchoring off East Head during summer months. No surveys conducted on sub-tidal habitats, but impacts could be significant.

Respondent: BRM

The use of anchors has decreased due to a condition placed on us as part of an MMO Licence for the reconfiguration of the marina. Concerned about damage to seagrass at Below Needs on the Ore. Management measures include no anchoring during the winter months while the works at the marina are taking place. No anchoring in future unless advance permission received from Harbour Authority or an emergency.

Respondent: NE

Mooring and anchoring within or near sensitive habitats, most notably seagrass beds and supporting habitats. Various places across SEMS, year round. LIFE Recreation REMEDIES project hopes to reduce the impact of this activity.

Respondent: LHB

The number of moorings occupied in Langstone Harbour declined by 3.4% in 2019 compared with 2018.

Respondent: LHC

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, from March 2019 to time of survey very low participation rates - principally confined to essential safeguarding inspection on moored vessels.

Respondent: NFDC

Anchoring takes place outside the entrance of the Keyhaven River on the Eastern side of Hurst Spit and just inside the entrance of Hurst Spit. The structure of the seabed in both locations is mud and sand. Neither area have been surveyed in the last 12 months to identify what effect this activity has on the river/seabed. Discharging of tanks (Heads) in these areas is likely however the tidal flow helps to maintain the quality of the water. Most vessels on moorings are residential and not normally occupied by crew and therefore have little or no impact.

Respondent: IOWC

Following recent case law and changes in our approach to Habitat Regulations Assessment, any proposals within the footprint of a designation needs Appropriate Assessment and use of evidence to support it. This means that there can be further certainty that new proposals for structures, replacement or extensions to existing ones will not be having a significant impact on the marine sites.

Respondent: PiP

No new moorings in past 12 months.

Respondent: ABP

Commercial shipping lines are generally allocating larger vessels to serve the key deep sea trade routes. This means that larger ships are calling at the Port and, as they can accommodate higher volumes, the number of calls required to maintain volumes is reducing. In 2019 the inaugural Sail GP event was held in Cowes. Whilst data on recreational mooring/anchoring activities has not been specifically collected, anecdotally this event is likely to have attracted increased recreational boaters to the area.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.11 Operation of coastal flood and erosion risk management schemes

Activity includes maintenance and operation of all port/harbour infrastructure including quay walls, jetties, slipways, navigation markers, coastal defence structures etc. Includes consideration of vessels/machinery/vehicles associated with activity. Also include the day-to-day operational use of these structures, lights, buoys, posts, towers, transit marks, supply of fuel/bunkering operations onshore /offshore, etc.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
1	0	12	4	17

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
3	14	17

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: EA

The EA are concerned about the impact of Coastal Squeeze in places where policy is 'Hold The Line' (HTL). Increase in local wave reflection. This is happening in front of defences where existing policy is HTL, in the past this was through historic squeeze and in the future it will be with sea level rise. For management we have the Regional Habitat Compensation Programme. At Manor Farm we have creation of 69Ha of compensatory habitat (grazing marsh). Other projects considering options to current SMP policy which could potentially lead to further compensatory habitat. Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management De-commissioning of Assets Programme may identify sites to change the asset management. Adaptation to future challenges e.g. Sea Level Rise and Climate Change, and Carbon off-setting, and Net Gain are the key focus of all schemes going forward.

Respondent: ChHC

Long term, large scale loss of saltmarsh within harbour is attributed in part to coastal defence walls (coastal squeeze).

Respondent: EBC

Gradual erosion which, although will not require repair in the near future, will require works to be carried out at some stage. Extent unknown. Definitely within EBC owned land. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) - no change this year on this land.

Respondent: PCC

I suspect not, as no new schemes have commenced (though planning permission has been granted for several new phases of the north Portsea Island scheme to commence this year). ESCP manage and maintain this for us and would be the contacts for any of this data. We would not keep any data to assess this ourselves.

Respondent: NFDC

A small scheme to stabilise Hurst castle was undertaken in addition to other planned maintenance schemes.

Respondent: CDC

CDC owned coastal defences lie outside of the SEMS area.

Respondent: NE

Further consideration should be given as to the potential impact of such schemes related to rising sea levels and coastal squeeze. This is currently not considered in NE condition assessment, however this may need to be considered in the near future.

Respondent: FBC

Yes however, the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership deal with matters associated with Coastal Flood Risk and Management.

Respondent: GBC

The Council works with the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership to deliver flood and erosion risk management schemes in the Borough. There are a number of schemes due to be delivered in the Borough in the coming years and the impact of these will be monitored by the ESCP.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.12 Operation of ports and harbours (maintenance of infrastructure)

Activity includes maintenance and operation of all port/harbour infrastructure including quay walls, jetties, slipways, navigation markers, coastal defence structures etc. Includes consideration of vessels/machinery/vehicles associated with activity. Also include the day-to-day operational use of these structures, lights, buoys, posts, towers, transit marks, supply of fuel/bunkering operations onshore /offshore, etc.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
3	0	10	2	15

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
2	13	15

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: PIP

Marine Piling, dredging, construction works at PIP berths during construction works Oct 2019 - Jun 2020. Impacts include sediment in water and penetration of the seabed. Management measures include a MMO License, full RAMS and project management.

Respondent: ChiHC

disturbance to sub-tidal and shoreline habitats. various locations

Respondent: NE

Consideration may need to be given for increased risk of spread of invasive non-native species from this activity.

Respondent: PCC

We as the planning department do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view, however PCC do own the Portsmouth International Port. The other wharves, marinas and ferry ports in the city are privately owned.

Respondent: NFDC

Keyhaven River is managed on a day to day basis by a River Warden and the role is shore and water based. The focus of the workload during peak times is shore based in order to ensure the safety of the use of the quay and the adjacent areas by different users e.g.

- Slipway and beach use - launch and recovery of vessels and associated vehicle access.
- Yacht club dinghies launching and recovery.
- Families with young children crabbing on the quay.
- Paddle boarders.
- Canoe/Kayak users.
- Making the areas clear as and when required for the commercial use of the quay by West Solent Boat Builders launching and recovering vessels.
- Commercial fishing boat use of quay.

When the opportunity arises, the river is patrolled and fees collected as required.

Respondent: BRM

Reconfiguration of the marina.

Respondent: GBC

The Council is responsible for a number of slipways, it is not known whether these have seen increased use although it is suspected that there has been little change. The operation of Portsmouth Harbour and the Borough's other harbour infrastructure is managed by other organisations.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.13 Recreation – light aircraft

Activity includes all types of craft used for recreation in the air e.g. small planes and helicopters, microlights, paramotors, hang gliding, parascending (on beach), parasailing (by boat), drones and model aircraft.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
4	0	3	4	11

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
2	8	10

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Light aircraft, micro lights regularly disturb birdlife in the harbour, little information on impacts of drones. Takes place at various locations mainly in the summer months.

Respondent: EBC

Drones etc - intensity unknown, could be anywhere along coastline resulting in noise and visual disturbance. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch).

Respondent: NE

Increase in activity from various forms of light aircraft causing disturbance to SPA features. Further study is likely required to assess the impacts of this increase.

Respondent: LHC

Limited drone use - all with prior consent.

Respondent: NFDC

Use of drones are popular at the moment.

Respondent: RHAA

Whilst true 'jurisdiction' over this issue is not clear as RHHA jurisdiction is below mean high water level, RHHA occasionally receives third party requests for commercial drone flights in relation to flights over our lease holding of river bed and some foreshore areas, or in relation to navigational safety. RHHA is using the NE guidance document, and liaising with NE on individual cases when necessary regarding any specific conditions required in relation to flight height, duration, distance from SPA birds.

Respondent: YHC

Slight increase in drone use last year. Some surveying and only with permission of YHC to ensure appropriate use.

Respondent: GBC

Significant helicopter movements in the Borough related to the Standard Aero helicopter maintenance plant. There are also helicopter movements associated with Ministry of Defence sites. As the Council we are unable to comment on the impacts these aircraft movements have on the SEMS site.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.14 Recreation – non-motorised watercraft

Activity includes windsurfing, kite surfing, kayaks, canoes, row boats, punts, paddle boards, dinghies and sailing boats. Includes all related participation such as launching and recovery (shore access and trailers) and any land based practice. Please include information on events and competitions.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
2	1	8	8	19

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
4	15	19

Relevant Authority Comments

Respondent: ChHC

Potential disturbance to wildlife, feeding areas, roosting sites, breeding bird sites, seal haul outs at various locations around the harbour . Kite surfing impacts waders roosts and feeding areas on Thorney island. kayaking and paddle boarding during the summer months primarily, kite surfing can be in autumn and winter. Paddle boarders, kayakers getting close to shoreline bird feeding areas, breeding sites and high tide roosts, seal haul outs, Difficult to assess change, but probably increasing.

Respondent: IOWC

Unknown, but as recreational pressures increase it is likely that these activities are increasing too. However, data on the levels and frequency is not collected. Anecdotally it is known that local organisations implement codes of conduct at the coast.

Respondent: PiP

Minimal wash damage from this activity, along the shoreline in daylight hours, more in the summer, caused by wash from craft, activity managed by speed limits and police presence in the harbour.

Respondent: EBC

Sailing club at the mouth of the Hamble. Smaller boats/ boards can be launched from anywhere along the coastal stretch. Intensity known. Presumably higher levels where there are visitor facilities. Disturbance, possibly erosion. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) or where planning permission or other EBC consents are required.

Respondent: NFDC

Vessels under this section are leisure based and the weather has a significant influence on their use on the Keyhaven River.

Comparing the rainfall from April to September inclusive in 2018 and 2019 there was 250mm of total rainfall in 2018 compared to 375mm in 2019. The difference in weather conditions had a negative effect on the popularity of leisure water-based activity in 2019 compared to the previous year.

Windsurfers are not issued with launching permits however they do get launched from the shoreline by private users. There is no identified increase year on year. Slight increase in kitesurfers who are not issued with launching permits however they do get launched from the shoreline by private users and are also taken out of the river to the area adjacent to Hurst Spit by small tender. There is possibly a slight increase year on year due to this activity being dependent on strong winds.

Canoes / Kayaks - decrease and likely to be less than in 2018 due to poor weather. Paddle boards increased in 2019 by about 10% compared to the previous year. Some activities are outside the hours when the River Warden is not in attendance and cannot be reported on. The activity is becoming more popular with the establishment of the New Forest Paddle Sport Company, based in West Solent Boat Builders at Keyhaven, in addition to their shop in Milford. If the weather had been better in the summer of 2019 this increase is likely to have been greater.

Tenders / Rowing Boats / Dinghies - slight movement to battery power. The use of tenders remains constant due to the number of moorings year on year being around the same. A small number of boat owners have changed from using an outboard engine to battery powered. The numbers are small probably 5 maximum but this figure has probably increased from 2 in the last 12 months. Sailing Dinghies - decrease There are two clubs in Keyhaven namely Keyhaven Yacht Club and Hurst Castle Sailing Club. A total of 303 licences are issued to both clubs and this figure has remained constant over the two years. Actual dinghy sailing was less in 2019 due to poor weather estimated at around 15% > 20%. Both clubs are presently closed due to COVID-19 restrictions, it is not possible to drill down into these figures in any more detail at this time. Sailing Boats – decrease. The number of moored sailing yachts and motorboats remained about the same year on year. Due to the poor weather during the summer of 2019 use of both was less.

Respondent: NE

Further study is likely required to assess the impacts of this increase.

Respondent: LHB

Whilst many of the craft listed above are not liable to harbour dues and therefore LHB does not hold data on their numbers, no perceivable increase has been noted. A number of sailing clubs around the harbour hold regular regattas, and there are also annual races around Hayling Island for windsurfers and kayaks.

Respondent: PCC

Whilst the activity would fall partially within our jurisdiction (our planning powers encompass the intertidal zone extending to low water), we do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view. We've not granted any new recreational permissions in the coastal areas in the last year as far as we are aware. There are existing private facilities along the Eastern Road in Portsmouth (e.g. sailing clubs, watersport centre).

Respondent: CDC

This is managed by ChHC as Harbour Master. All CDC boat ramps are on the open coast outside the SPA.

Respondent: CoHC

Not permitted within the harbour and access/tidal restrictions upstream probably keep the levels fairly low. There may be a slight increase in the summer months but we will keep an eye on it this

year to see whether any further management is required.

Respondent: YHC

It has been anecdotally noted that there were more kayakers and paddleboarders around last year. This did not cause a problem but YHC will keep an eye on it as increasing numbers may cause disturbance and require management in future.

Respondent: NE

Increase in activity of various forms of non-motorised watercraft, including canoeing and stand-up paddle boarding, have been noted across the Solent. Further study is likely required to assess the impacts of this increase.

Respondent: NFNPA

No jurisdiction. Role in planning system for any new facilities to support activity e.g. slipways/jetties. Activity does take place in the National Park.

Respondent: GBC

From our observations, this activity is not significant enough to be causing much concern. There may be a higher prevalence of this activity in Portsmouth Harbour however we don't have the information to comment on this.

Respondent: ABP

ABP does not collect specific data on the use of non-motorised watercraft. However, anecdotally, there has not been a specific increase in the level of activity undertaken within the SHA area.

Respondent: LHC

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, from March 2019 to time of survey very low participation rates - principally confined to essential safeguarding inspection on moored vessels.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.15 Recreation – powerboating or sailing with an engine

Activity includes any motorised boat activity, such as Personal Watercraft (PWC), hovercraft, powerboating and water-skiing. Includes launching and recovery of craft e.g. slipway or beach/shore launching and participation i.e. when activity is underway or making way. Please consider other novel uses of power boats such as flyboarding. The impacts of different craft will vary and should be considered on a case by case basis e.g. sailing boats with low power engines moving at slow speeds are less likely to have an impact.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	0	12	4	16

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
4	12	16

Relevant Authority Comments

Respondent: PIP

Wash effects from this activity, along the shoreline in daylight hours, more in the summer, caused by vessels, activity managed by speed limits and Marine police presence in the harbour.

Respondent: BRM

Wash created by motorboats especially if speeding. Signage & Notice to River users and river rules.

Respondent: EBC

Intensity unknown takes place where there is vehicular access to enable launch. Erosion at launch site, pollution from engines, noise/ visual disturbance. Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) or where planning permission or other EBC consents are required.

Respondent: ChHC

Disturbance to feeding birds, seal haul outs, and probably increasing erosion of saltmarsh through wave action.

Respondent: LHB

A slight decrease in the number of harbour dues (required by all vessels), jet ski permits and waterski licenses were purchased in 2019 compared with the previous year.

Respondent: PCC

Whilst the activity would fall partially within our jurisdiction (our planning powers encompass the intertidal zone extending to low water), we do not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view.

Respondent: LHC

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, from March 2019 to time of survey very low participation rates -

principally confined to essential safeguarding inspection on moored vessels.

Respondent: NFDC

Ferries Hurst Castle is located at the mouth of the Keyhaven River and is owned by English Heritage, the day to day management is undertaken by Hurst Castle Marine. There is a small fleet of commercial passenger ferries that take visitors back and forth to the castle. As these ferries operate at all states of the tide their usage will have an impact on the riverbed when operated at low water. In addition, Hurst Marine have some larger vessels that are used when the tide permits and as required. Powerboating - Keyhaven is very tidal and vessels use the river at various states of tide, this is more acute on a low water spring. A powerboat making way in low water is likely to dislodge the riverbed and dislodge sediment. A powerboat underway is unlikely to disturb the riverbed unless it goes aground. Sailing with an engine - a yacht due to draft requirement is unlikely to have any effect or at worst minimal effect when making way. Any effect on the riverbed when underway would only occur should the vessel ground. Hovercraft use water skiing and jet skiing are not permitted. Slipway/Beach Launch and Recover - although users are discouraged from doing so the seabed is disturbed when motorboats are recovered at low water when owners are tempted to use the power of the engine to position the vessel on the trailer.

Respondent: CDC

This is managed by CHC as Harbour Master. All CDC boat ramps are on the open coast outside the SPA.

Respondent: CoHC

Speed restrictions throughout the harbour and estuary are adhered to by the majority of visitors.

Respondent: YHC

The Harbour's General Directions, including speed restrictions, effectively manage this within the harbour and estuary.

Respondent: NFNPA

No jurisdiction. Role in planning system for any new facilities to support activity e.g. slipways/jetties. does take place in the National Park.

Respondent: GBC

We do not have enough information to offer comment on this. Gosport Borough does have a number of marina's with a significant number of recreational boats ,however the impact on SEMS sites is not known.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.16 Slipway and jetty cleaning and maintenance

Activity includes the ongoing maintenance, such as washing down, clearing of mud or sediment, algal growth or similar of a slipway or jetty.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
1	0	10	5	16

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
1	14	15

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Small scale impacts to intertidal areas local to the jetties/slipways at various locations.

Respondent: IOWC

Applications for new and improved jetties and slipways have been received, this creates additional points of access to marine environment. Refer to details on Marine License Applications.

Respondent: PCC

PCC has no responsibilities for this.

Respondent: LHC

Use power washer to clean algae using river water.

Respondent: NFDC

Slipway Cleaning, no chemicals used just pressure washed. No real difference in algae growth between 2018 and 2019 was noted.

Respondent: RHHA

RHHA continues to remove algal mats that build up and obstruct a slipway.

Respondent: CoHC

Activity kept to a minimum.

Respondent: YHC

This activity is kept to a minimum due to cost and potential impact.

Respondent: NE

Consideration may need to be given for increased risk of spread of invasive non-native species from this activity.

Respondent: EBC

Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) and I do not believe we have any slipways or jetties in our ownership.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.17 Wildfowling

Activity includes the use of firearms to shoot wild fowl. This category does not take into account the use of dogs during these activities, please use 'Land recreation - dog walking' for any dog related activity.

Change in Activity Level reported in 2020 Survey

Increase	Decrease	No Change	Don't Know	Total Responses
0	0	3	4	7

Do you think the Activity is having an impact on the SEMS Site?

Yes	No	Total Responses
1	5	6

Relevant Authority Comments:

Respondent: ChHC

Disturbance to feeding and roosting birds at various locations takes place September to February. Difficult to quantify impact, but disturbance is evident when shooting is heard/seen.

Respondent: LHB

Due to the corona virus I have not been able to obtain wildfowling figures for last year yet, but anecdotal evidence indicates there has not been an increase in this activity. While I have no evidence that this activity is impacting the SEMS it is difficult to imagine how the direct mortality of bird species listed within our SPA designation coupled with the disturbance that this activity causes is of no consequence. Allowing the features of conservation interest within a designated site to be shot dead does not seem compatible with conservation.

Respondent: PCC

Whilst I would suspect this has neither increased nor decreased (I've not heard of it happening within our area), again we would not record data of this type of activity occurring thus could not give an evidence based view.

Respondent: NFDC

The area is under four designations so wildfowling is not permitted.

Respondent: YHC

The local landowner has shoots on land beside and away from the estuary but not in the estuary itself.

Respondent: EBC

Jurisdiction where we are the landowner (we own a small stretch of the coastline - easternmost stretch) and we do not carry out or permit this activity.

Source: SEMS Annual Survey Report, 2020

4.18 Additional Comments on Activities

Respondent: PCC

Because of the nature of our role as planning department for the Portsmouth City Council area, our jurisdiction would capture the majority of these activities to some degree. However, our role in terrestrial planning means we do not record specific data on any of these activities (if we ever needed to draw upon it we would refer to other organisations/authorities e.g. Bird Aware, Hampshire County Council, Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership, all of whom I suspect will also be answering this survey in their own capacities). Hence, I have unfortunately had to answer 'don't know' to most of these questions as to give any other response would not be based on any specific data or solid evidence. I have however tried to point you to some potential data sources that may assist you in finding relevant information external to the council.

Respondent: NFDC

On 21 May 2019, a tern raft was moored in the locality of a location called Half Way Spreaders. The raft is a recycled concrete pontoon about 2m wide and about 7m long with a layer of shingle and clam shells complemented by some nesting boxes in the form of marine plywood. The aim being to encourage Tern breeding in Keyhaven. Keyhaven Fisherman's Association is best placed to provide an update on the success of this installation.

Coronavirus and the Government lockdown requirement has resulted in no leisure boating activities in the Keyhaven River for the last 3 weeks. With the likelihood of the water clarity no doubt benefiting this may have been an influencing factor for marine life as illustrated by a seal basking on the beach at Hurst Spit and Hordle Cliff in the middle of April during a spell of warm calm sunny weather. Marshes, I am not aware of any activity to measure nutrient levels or the height of the various marshes in 2018 or 2019. I am aware that this takes place in Lymington and a similar activity in Keyhaven would provide a useful reference and means of measuring marsh erosion. Marshes do not suffer from being walked on/trampled.

There has been erosion to the spit during the winter months due to the number of winter storms and has resulted in parts of Hurst Castle being closed due to underpinning erosion. The storms in late 2019 / early 2020 were much worse than they have been for a couple of years.

There have been discussions to allow the reed beds on the north shore to be irrigated in a controlled manner using sea water with the aim of changing the natural habitat. No decision has been made as yet to the best of my knowledge. The river has not been surveyed during the last 12 months and is likely to have changed over the last 12 months. This will be due to the storms over the winter that were worse than most years. In addition due to the extended periods of wet weather over the winter, fresh water flowing into the Keyhaven River will have had an effect on the river bed.

Respondent: IOWC

Natural England's coastal path project is now being publicly consulted on for the Isle of Wight section. This omits any path on the north eastern part from East Cowes to Fishbourne.

Respondent: NFNPA

Anecdotal information suggests some dog walkers preferring coast at times when Forest is wet and when there has been publicity around 'Alabham Rot' affecting dogs. No evidence that this is particular to this year.

Respondent: GBC

Due to the current Covid-19 crisis and the reassignment of staff to frontline critical services the Council is not in a position to offer the most detailed answers from the colleagues responsible for each activity monitored in the survey. Considered answers have been given where possible. The responses are based largely on the perceptions of officers in the Planning Policy team.

5. Activities Resulting from Plans and Projects

Respondents were asked whether plans or project within SEMS may lead to any changes to activity levels, or impacts over the last 12 months. Table 7 presents the findings.

Table 7. Activity change or impacts arising from plans and projects

Respondent	Details
PCC	Couple of points to raise potentially for wider context. Outputs of nitrogen from residential development (wastewater) into the SEMS: While deterioration of the water environment from condition assessments of the SPAs / SACs has been a noted concern previously, this become an immediate issue for Local Planning Authorities following a legal ruling from the Court of European Justice in November 2018. Following advice from Natural England, PCC ceased granting permissions for all residential / overnight stay / tourism development between April and November 2019 while an interim solution was being developed to enable development to be 'nitrate neutral' and ensure no net gain in wastewater output from the PCC area. An Interim Strategy was put in place by the Council on 29th November 2019. While the impact of this on the actual nitrogen levels / water quality in the Solent (particularly Langstone Harbour for Portsmouth) within the monitoring year is currently unknown, the Council will continue to work together with the other South Hampshire planning authorities, statutory agencies and water companies to solutions to the eutrophication issue in the Solent. Second, permission has now been granted for the defences at Southsea, and work on these will be progressing in the coming years which I suspect could have potential impacts and should be on your radar, but these have not yet started. Application reference number if you want more information is: 19/01097/FUL.
SoIFCA	Work around the IFA2 interconnector cable has contributed to a reduction in fishing in the Solent, particularly around Lee on the Solent and Chilling where, at times, fishing activities have been excluded while works are undertaken.
CDC	Impacts of new development on nutrient levels in the Harbours is now a critical issue in determining planning applications
CoHC	Not aware of changes in activity levels resulting from plans and projects in 2019.
YHC	Not aware of any changes to activity levels as a result of any plan or project within the SEMS.
FBC	The emerging Fareham Local Plan proposes an increase in housing and employment development within the Borough. However, the impact of this development growth on SEMS is being considered within the Habitats Regulations Assessment accompanying the Local Plan.
NFNPA	Local Plans in the Forest have been through Public Examination and been approved by Government. In the New Forest area this includes allocations for significant growth across the whole planning area, and in particular major allocation adjacent SEMS sites. Project yet to be approved. Elsewhere cumulative impact of housing growth is reliant on Bird Aware and nutrient neutrality issues are being addressed by condition to achieve nutrient neutrality. To date applicants seeking to achieve this by techniques such as water efficiency, wetlands, suds - some of these relate to ongoing projects that are still to be approved. Although projects have not been approved or

	have been subject to enforcement, increasingly it is supporting habitat to SEMS (e.g. brent and wader high tide roost/feeding) that is potentially being impacted. This could be something for SEMS to watch.
MMO	No information received to indicate a change from previous years in the number of plans and projects taking place within the SEMS
GBC	Not at this time - The Council is currently working on a revised Gosport Borough Local Plan which will set out the Council's development strategy to 2036. This will have implications on activity levels in the Borough which will be assessed as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
ABP	As noted in the comments, the inaugural Sail GP event was held in 2019 which may have increased the levels of recreational sailing traffic in the area.

6. Monitoring

Tables 8 and 9 record the monitoring being undertaken by respondents in the SEMS sites on activities and/or their impacts.

Table 8. Relevant Authority monitoring within SEMS

Respondent	Details
LHB	LHB monitors numerous water and shore based activities in the SEMS. In addition, LHB monitors a variety of wildlife interests. All this monitoring work is ongoing and further details are available upon request. Coordinate work with sIFCA, RSPB, UoP, CHC.
EA	Ongoing monitoring of bathing waters and shellfish waters. Ongoing environmental monitoring of chemical and biological elements in transitional and coastal waters for EU Water Framework Directive; biological elements include saltmarsh, seagrass, opportunistic macroalgae, phytoplankton, benthic invertebrates and estuarine fish (excluding coastal fish). Monitoring includes recording for invasive non-native species. Data held by Marine Team, Analysis & Reporting teams, Fisheries and Biodiversity teams. Records for invasive non-native species are held on an external national website. Coordinating with Natural England, Harbour Authorities, Local Authorities, Cefas, IFCA and Wildlife Trusts.
LHC	Periodic monitoring of effects of ongoing beneficial use of dredged sediment. Consultant reports produced in accordance with MMO licence conditions. Coordinating with others for monitoring of BUDS project.
SoIFCA	Southern IFCA undertakes fishing sightings from shore and vessel during enforcement patrols, identifying the position and type of fishing. The data is a useful tool for assessing fishing activity and is used internally when assessing interactions with Marine Protected Areas and fishing effort levels, as well as contributing to national fishing effort datasets. Data is collected on a nationally standardised form for collecting sightings. Data is held internally, but sensitised forms of the data may be available. Data is collected in a manner that is consistent with other IFCA and the MMO.
RHHA	1. Ongoing monitoring of bait digging activities in the Hamble estuary, as previous years, comprising patrol officer sightings and reports from members of the public. Not all incidents are captured, but all data held is supplied to SIFCA. Data held by RHHA and SIFCA. 2. RHHA is supporting the Hamble-based monitoring of research into the reintroduction of native oyster. Data is held by Blue Marine Foundation and Portsmouth University. Coordinating with SoIFCA, Blue Marine Foundation and Portsmouth University.
CoHC	Sediment monitoring is continuing. Saltmarsh monitoring ongoing. All reports on sediment monitoring are on: www.cowesharbourcommission.co.uk/environment . Saltmarsh monitoring information held by Isle of Wight Estuaries Project.
YHC	Annual photographic saltmarsh monitoring ongoing. Takes place from a boat so no access onto the saltmarsh required. Data held by YHC and IW

	Estuaries Project.
NE	LIFE Recreation REMEDIES project – ongoing. Data held by NE and project partners. Coordinate monitoring with harbour authorities and HIWWT.
SxIFCA	Sussex IFCA regularly carries out sea and boat patrols in Chichester Harbour to collect information on fishing activity, including bait collection and hand gathering of shellfish. Coordinate monitoring with FSA, Chichester Harbour Conservancy, NE and Southern IFCA - on activity levels in the Harbour.
HCC	HCC Countryside Service is reviewing its monitoring programme for land management within its holding. Combination of rapid assessment and other monitoring with outcome recording within CMSi management plans. Working together with established recording; WeBS, HBIC, etc.
BRM	Impact of dredging around the marina. Data held by Harbour Authority and MMO.
MMO	MPA Site reporting, monitors the level of fishing activities and perceived impacts through questionnaires and intelligence reports received from MMO Coastal officers.
EBC	Access Management Assessments at Hamble Common / Westfield Common - Footprint Ecology, part of Bird Aware.

Table 9. Authorities considering additional monitoring within SEMS

Respondent	Details
EA	Yes, as above but subject to restrictions around Covid 19 pandemic.
CoHC	Yes, as part of the ReMEDIES project with Natural England.
NE	Yes.
PIP	Other than reactive work on incidents, and the wider monitoring by the Statutory Harbour Authority (QHM) we only hold statutory responsibility for a small area of water.
FBC	Bird Aware Solent conduct monitoring with regards to recreational disturbance from walking and water sports users. The ESCP will monitor impacts of coastal flood risk and management initiatives.
NFNPA	No specific SEMS driven work, however research is underway looking at recreation behaviour on core Park area and this may have relevance to the SEMS sites as a side-benefit.

7. Marine Conservation Zones

For the first time we asked respondents whether they had a Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) within their jurisdiction and whether they had any concerns about activities taking place within these sites. Tables 10 and 11 give the responses.

Table 10. Relevant Authorities with a MCZ within their jurisdiction

Response	Number
No	15
Yes	13

Table 11. Relevant Authorities concerns regarding activities within MCZs and monitoring of activities

Respondent	MCZ Related Concerns
SoIFCA	Southern IFCA is currently reviewing fishing activities against the features of MCZs. This process is a phased risk based approach, starting with Bottom Towed Fishing Gear Assessments, working through other gear types to determine whether management is required. When complete, these assessments will be available on the Southern IFCA website.
CDC	Pagham Harbour MCZ, which is outside the SEMs area, but has many of the same issues impacting on it as Chichester Harbour does.
YHC	No concerns about current activities (Yarmouth to Cowes MCZ).
NE	Yes, mooring and anchoring.
MMO	No current concerns, the MMO monitor and review each activity in order to best identify areas that require management.
ABP	The Bembridge MCZ was designated in May 2019. This falls just outside of ABP's SHA. The supporting designation documents consider activities and there is nothing of specific concern that requires monitoring by ABP.

8. Other issues

Respondents were asked whether there were any further issues they would like to raise. Their responses are recorded in Table 12.

Table 12. Other issues raised in the survey

Respondent	Any other information?
SoIFCA	Other surveys are undertaken in the SEMs, including annual oyster stock assessments, clam stock assessments and seine net surveys at sites within the Solent.
NFDC	Egging will take place on the Lymington to Keyhaven marshes again this year. The tern raft on the marshes at Keyhaven is also in use again this year.
RHHA	Water Quality and Boating Workshop held in 2019, led by EA & NE, and focusing on black water discharge from recreational vessels. Actions underway for partners (e.g. harbour authorities, Southern Water, marina groups, RYA, EA) to seek improvements to pump out facilities and ways to encourage behavioural change of recreational sailors.
YHC	After successful monitoring as part of The Pier's Tale project we are keen to develop research activities with Bournemouth University on a project to enable monitoring of different aspects of the Solent from the Pier.
NFNPA	Coastal erosion at Hurst castle has become a major issue for archaeologists this year. Work and studies ongoing. Similarly work ongoing with EA and NFDCC coastal unit on defence options between Keyhaven and Lymington - stakeholder engagement to start summer 2020.

-end-