




Port of London Authority: Baseline Document for Maintenance Dredging

Port of London Authority

June 2007
Final Report
9R6602



A COMPANY OF



ROYAL HASKONING

HASKONING UK LTD
ENVIRONMENT

Burns House
Harlands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 1PG
United Kingdom
+44 (0)1444 458551 Telephone
Fax
info@haywards-heath.royalhaskoning.com E-mail
www.royalhaskoning.com Internet

Document title Port of London Authority: Baseline Document
for Maintenance Dredging

Status Final Report
Date June 2007
Project name Baseline Document for Maintenance
Dredging
Project number 9R6602
Client Port of London Authority
Reference 9R6602/R//Hayw

Drafted by Angela Nicholson and Dr Nicola Meakins
Checked by Nicola White
Date/initials check
Approved by Daniel Leggett
Date/initials approval

CONTENTS

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Context and Scope of the Baseline Document	2
1.3 Objectives	5
1.4 Methodology	6
1.5 Report structure	6
2 EXISTING DREDGING REGIME	7
2.1 Overview of Activity	7
2.2 Summary of Dredging Operations	7
2.3 Water Injection Maintenance Dredging Operations	9
2.4 Trailer or TSHD Maintenance Dredging Operations	14
2.5 Historic dredging	17
2.6 Other dredging activities	18
3 BENFLEET AND SOUTHEND MARSHES SPA AND RAMSAR SITE	20
3.1 Overview	20
3.2 Conservation objectives	20
3.3 Current conservation status	21
4 THAMES ESTUARY AND MARSHES SPA AND RAMSAR SITE	26
4.1 Overview	26
4.2 Conservation objectives	27
4.3 Current conservation status	28
5 HOLEHAVEN CREEK SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST	35
5.1 Overview	35
5.2 Current Conservation Status	35
6 DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE CONDITIONS	36
6.1 Coastal and estuarine processes and morphology	36
6.2 Water quality	56
6.3 Sediment Quality	66
6.4 Intertidal ecology	70
6.5 Ornithology	73
6.6 Noise	83
7 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
7.1 The influence of historic dredging activity on the SPA and Ramsar sites	85
7.2 Data availability	88
7.3 Recommendations	88
7.4 Other Research	90
8 REFERENCES	90
APPENDIX A	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Summary of WID dredging undertaken for the Port of Tilbury London Limited	12
Table 2.2	Summary of WID activity undertaken at Robins Wharf for Foster Yeoman	13
Table 2.3	Summary of WID activities undertaken at Customs House Jetty for HM Customs	14
Table 2.4	Summary of WID activities undertaken at Divers Shoal for the PLA	14
Table 2.5	Summary of WID activities undertaken at Shell Bravo for Shell	15
Table 2.6	Summary of WID activities undertaken at BP Coryton Berths for BK	16
Table 2.7	Summary of WID activities undertaken at the Oikos Terminal for Oikos	17
Table 2.8	Summary of WID activities undertaken at Tilburyness Shoal for PLA	17
Table 2.9	Summary of Trailer activities undertaken at Tilbury Power Station for RWEM Power	18
Table 2.10	Summary of Trailer activities undertaken at Tilburyness Shoal for PLA	19
Table 2.11	Summary of Trailer activities undertaken at Coalhouse Shoal for PLA	19
Table 2.12	Summary of Trailer activities undertaken at Tilburyness Shoal for PLA	20
Table 1.1	Numbers of Bird Species using habitats within the Benfleet and Southend Marshes site	25
Box 1.1	Definition of SSSI condition assessment terms (from www.english-nature.org.uk)	26
Table 1.2	Favourable condition table for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes European Marine Site	27
Table 1.3	Benfleet and Southend Marshes SSSI condition summary (1 November 2005)	29
Table 1.1	Numbers of bird species using habitats within the Thames Estuary Site	31
Table 1.2	Favourable condition table for the Thames Estuary European Marine Site	33
Table 1.3	South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI condition summary (1 November 2005)	37
Table 1.4	Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI condition summary	37
Table 1.5	Rate of increase of mean high water (MHW) and mean low water (MLW) or Southend-on-Sea and Tower Bridge between 1934 and 1966/69.	45
Table 1.6	A proposed sediment budget for the Thames Estuary using data from 1940 to 1988 (figures in m ³ per year) (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993).	52
Table 1.7	Areas of intertidal flat in the Thames Estuary downstream of Gravesend in 1820, 1940 and 1988 (from Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993)	55
Table 6.4	Bathing water quality at the designated bathing waters located in or close to the boundary of the study area.	61
Table 6.5	Selected imperative standards for shellfish waters	63
Table 6.6	Summary of shellfish waters quality (mean concentrations of physicochemical parameters) for 1999 to 2001. (Source Environment Agency)	63
Table 6.7	Designated bivalve mollusc production areas in the Thames estuary from 1 September 2004. (Source: Food Standards Agency, 2005)	64
Table 6.8	Selected List I dangerous substances*	66

Table 6.9	Selected List II dangerous substances*	67
Table 6.10	Summary of Dangerous substances provided by the Environment Agency for the period 1990 to 2000.	67
Table 6.11	CEFAS guideline action levels for dredged material (CEFAS, 2005)	70
Table 6.12	Interim marine sediment quality guidelines (ISQGs)/threshold effect levels (TELs), probable effect levels (PELs) (dry weights) and incidence (%) of adverse biological effects in concentrations ranges defined by these values	71
Table 1.13	Data sources used to produce this section	73
Table 1.14	WeBS High Tide Counts, 1998/99-2002/3 for Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	77
Table 1.15	Percentage change and Alerts for cited waterbirds at the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA over the short- (5-year), medium- (10-year), long-term (25-year or maximum available if less) and since notification. Symbols: - Medium-Alert, -- High-Alert, + Medium-Increase, ++ High-Increase, o No substantial Change. Symbols in brackets are flagged as precautionary Alerts or Increases due to the application of the 'Biological-Filter' (see methods). Stage: Selection Stage (Stroud et al. 2001).	81
Table 1.16	Percentage change and Alerts for cited waterbirds at the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA over the short- (5-year), medium- (10-year), long-term (25-year or maximum available if less) and since notification. Symbols: - Medium-Alert, -- High-Alert, + Medium-Increase, ++ High-Increase, o No substantial Change. Symbols in brackets are flagged as precautionary Alerts or Increases due to the application of the 'Biological-Filter' (see methods). Stage: Selection Stage (Stroud et al. 2001).	83

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Study area and dredge locations	9
Figure 6.1	Changes in Bed Elevation between 1965 and 1967 at West Thurrock Oil Jetty	44
Figure 6.2	Changes in Bed Elevation between 1972 and 1982 at Rainham Creek	45
Figure 6.3	Change in Bed Elevation between 1970 and 1998 from Gravesend to Southend-on-Sea	46
Figure 6.4	Suspended Sediment Concentrations between London Bridge and Southend-on-Sea	47
Figure 6.5	Locations and quality of Environment Agency bathing waters within the study area	60
Figure 6.6	The surface waters (shellfish) (Classification) Regulations 1997 map showing the designated shellfish waters	62

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The UK Government considers that where maintenance dredging has the potential to affect a *Natura 2000* site (such as a Special Protection Area (SPA) or Special Area of Conservation (SAC)), maintenance dredging should be considered as a 'plan or project' for the purposes of the EC Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC). Based on this interpretation, maintenance dredging operations would need to be assessed in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Directive. Whilst not endorsing this interpretation, the ports industry has agreed to co-operate with the Government to seek to devise arrangements which allow the effects of maintenance dredging on *Natura 2000* sites to be reviewed in a way which does not impose a disproportionate burden on industry, Government, or its agencies.


In order to inform this process, a *Draft Conservation Assessment Protocol on Maintenance Dredging and the Habitats Regulations 1994* (hereafter referred to as the 'Draft Protocol') has been developed to assist port authorities in fulfilling their statutory obligations through the co-operation of the:

- British Ports Association;
- British Marine Federation;
- Cabinet Office;
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs;
- Department for Transport;
- English Nature; and
- UK Major Ports Group.

The Draft Protocol was produced in December 2003. Since this date it has been trialled at a number of ports, but has not yet been adopted. The draft protocol recommends that a 'Baseline Document' is prepared that draws on existing and readily available information to describe current and historic patterns of dredging in relation to the conservation objectives of adjacent European marine sites. The report represents the 'Baseline Document' for the Port of London Authority (PLA). This document therefore contains information relevant to the integrity of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA, Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA and the Holehaven Creek SSSI.

Over a period commencing in 2000/2001 and culminating in the issue of the summary documentation in 2003, PLA established a Maintenance Dredging Framework for the Thames in partnership with members of the Dredging Liaison Group (a Thames Estuary Partnership group). This framework provides for the co-ordinated assessment and management of dredging operations on the tidal Thames and includes the consideration of any likely impacts on designated conservation sites. Much of the information and data required to inform this Baseline Document has been sourced through the PLA's Maintenance Dredging Framework, and the document therefore represents a summary of existing environmental management practice in the Thames.

The Framework structure:




The presumption on which the protocol is based is that maintenance dredging will continue in line with established practice. This baseline document has been prepared on the premise that existing practice is part of the functioning of the existing system (i.e. part of the baseline environment).

1.2 Context and Scope of the Baseline Document

The PLA and berth operators regularly carry out maintenance dredging works within the River Thames. A proportion of these operations take place on berths or areas of the navigation channel that are in “close proximity” to areas designated under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994. This document has therefore been commissioned by the PLA to help establish a baseline position for the Thames in respect of these specific dredging operations and European sites. For this baseline close proximity has been defined, with the agreement of English Nature, as being a zone of 5 km radius around the identified dredging operations. The study area for the document is therefore defined by the sites and corresponding buffer areas illustrated in Figure 1.1, extending from Coldharbour Point and the Inner Thames Marshes SSSI at Rainham to the eastern limits of Canvey Island. Other maintenance dredging activities located upstream of the Dartford Crossing have been discounted as having no potential to impact on the designated sites, being in excess of 5 km from the nearest boundary. Furthermore, maintenance dredging activity within the Medway River, under the administration of the Medway Ports Authority has been excluded, despite recognition that impact may arise. This does not prevent such dredging taking place, but places the responsibility of meeting the criteria of the EC Habitats Directive on a case by case basis, or as part of the maintenance dredging baseline prepared to address the Medway specifically. The preparation of this baseline has involved limited external consultation to date and hence the document is considered to be a draft, suitable for discussion with statutory consultees and stakeholders.

In deviation from the protocol, consideration has also been given to the potential impacts on one specific SSSI area, namely Holehaven Creek, in recognition that this may, in future, also be incorporated into the SPA under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994.

Figure 1.1 Study areas and dredge locations



1.3 Objectives

The objectives of this Baseline Document are as follows:

- to synthesize relevant existing information about the environmental status of the study area and, in particular, what is known about the potential extent of impacts of previous capital and maintenance dredging undertaken by PLA and others;
- to provide the data necessary to allow any maintenance dredging proposals for the River Thames to be assessed in accordance with Article 6(3) of the Habitat Directive and in line with the Draft Conservation Assessment Protocol on Maintenance Dredging and the Habitats Regulations 1994; and
- to assist competent authorities in identifying 'likely significant effect' in respect of future maintenance dredging applications or proposals.

It should be noted that this document will require regular updating as further information becomes available, if circumstances and requirements change and, potentially, as a result of any wider consultation.

According to the Draft Protocol, baseline documents are to be based on existing and readily available information (e.g. from previous applications and/or EIAs, dredge disposal returns and condition monitoring). Where possible, they are intended to identify:

- the existing need for maintenance dredging in individual areas;
- the existing volumes, frequencies and duration of dredging operations – where this should be based on actual dredge returns rather than volumes applied for in consents;
- the precise locations of dredging and disposal;
- the methods of dredging, transport and disposal, including any restrictions imposed as licence conditions or by physical constraints (e.g. depth, tidal flow, wave or weather conditions);
- material type and chemical status (existing and historical);
- the history of dredging and disposal at particular locations, as well as the variability in material type and volumes due to natural changes;
- any monitoring requirements previously imposed through licences, and the outcomes of such monitoring;
- any beneficial use and sediment cell maintenance schemes, or mitigation and compensation schemes entered into; and
- any other relevant information from past studies or previous applications that have possible direct or indirect links to the maintenance dredging.

They should also include information supplied by English Nature and others (e.g. Defra, CEFAS, Environment Agency) on the condition and characteristics of the *Natura 2000* site, in particular:

- the interest features of the site and their conservation objectives, which could be affected by maintenance dredging; and
- the extent to which the ecological requirements of the site have been achieved, maintained or restored since the requirements of the Birds or Habitats Directive were applied to the site.

The Draft Protocol recommends that a structured and evidence-based approach is adopted to facilitate the consideration of future dredging proposals. This Baseline Document has therefore been prepared with this need in mind.

1.4 Methodology

In preparing this baseline report a data gathering exercise was carried out and the following data sources were examined:

- published literature;
- unpublished 'grey' literature;
- data held by consultees such as English Nature; and
- internet resources, such as the ThamesWeb website (<http://www.thamesweb.com>) and *MarLIN* (www.marlin.ac.uk).

Much data had already been collated by PLA as part of the PLA's Maintenance Dredging Framework that has been set up for the Thames Estuary.

It should be emphasised that the report is based on a desk study of existing and readily available data only (as specified in the draft protocol) and no original survey work has been carried out as part of this exercise, however, through the PLA's Maintenance Dredging Framework, considerable amounts of survey and monitoring data associated with the dredging operations are available.

In addition, the data gathering exercise has deliberately focussed on those environmental parameters that potentially could be affected by maintenance dredging and are of relevance to the integrity of the SPA. These include the following:

- coastal processes and morphology;
- sediment quality;
- water quality;
- intertidal ecology;
- ornithology; and
- noise (where this is limited to potential disturbance of feeding or roosting birds).

The study area for the document is illustrated in Figure 1.1.

1.5 Report structure

Following this introductory section, Section 2 details the history of dredging within the Thames Estuary. An overview of the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site is presented in Section 3, the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Site in Section 4, and the Holehaven Creek SSSI presented in Section 5. The baseline conditions of the estuary relevant to the integrity of the SPA and Ramsar are then considered in Section 6. Section 7 concludes this exercise with discussion and recommendations.

2 EXISTING DREDGING REGIME

2.1 Overview of Activity

Maintenance dredging within the outer reaches of the Thames, between Dartford and Southend-on-Sea, is carried out under the management and direction of the PLA, who have a responsibility to maintain depths within the navigation channels. A Maintenance Dredging Framework has been established by PLA in partnership with members of the Dredging Liaison Group (a Thames Estuary Partnership group). This framework provides for the co-ordinated management of dredging operations on the tidal Thames. Berth operators are responsible for the maintenance of their berths and approaches under the regulation of the PLA and in accordance with the Maintenance Dredging Framework and these have been addressed as part of Section 2.6. Data on dredging operations in the Thames were obtained through consultation with the PLA, document review and from data received from CEFAS. CEFAS maintain a database of licensed dredging around the UK as part of their Food and Environment Protection Act 1985 (FEPA) disposal licensing responsibilities although they hold only limited information within the Port of London due to the PLA's regulatory regime. Data were obtained from CEFAS for 1989 to 2003 (the most up-to-date available). Data on historical dredging has been collated from the HR Wallingford Report EX4936, dated November 2004, titled An Overview of the Tidal Thames Estuary - A Historical Review of the Bathymetric and Sedimentary Regimes, together with consultation with PLA and Van Oord UK Limited.

2.2 Summary of Dredging Operations

2.2.1 Water Injection Dredging

The majority of dredged sites within the inner estuary of the Thames, by volume and frequency, are undertaken using water injection dredging (WID), rather than more conventional excavation processes. The technique involves the injection of high volumes of water into the recently deposited seabed sediments. This re-fluidises the silts and fine sands, which then flow by gravity or current from the dredge site. The water is injected at low pressures, ensuring the sediment material is re-energised as a density current at the bed, rather than being re-suspended into the full water column. To be effective, the technique requires a flow gradient away from the dredge site, so material is transported to locations from which it is subsequently re-distributed by natural currents. The technique therefore promotes relocation of material based on local dispersion rather than removal to licensed marine or terrestrial disposal grounds. Retention of sediments within the natural estuarine system is widely considered to be a potentially significant environmental benefit of the technique. In order to minimise the environmental effects, dredging is already required to be undertaken on an ebb tide to provide maximum dispersion and minimise sedimentation on the designated conservation sites. Where adjacent facilities are dredged (Coryton for example), the sequence in which berths are dredged is managed, when possible, to work downstream, thereby avoiding deposition within recently maintained areas.

Re-deposition rates vary depending on the grading of the dredged materials. Sand material will be re-deposited within close proximity of the dredge site whereas fine silts may remain in suspension for a period of days following dredging.

2.2.2 Trailer Suction Hopper Dredging

Water injection dredging is not suitable for all locations and bed materials. Consequently, some areas are maintained using conventional trailer suction hopper dredging (TSHD) equipment. Material is taken from the seabed and transported to disposal sites in hoppers. There is a one established marine disposal site licensed for material arising from the Thames, namely South Falls. This is located 110km east of Gravesend, within a polygon defined by:

CEFAS Site Code	Name	Degrees & Decimal Mins	
		Latitude	Longitude
TH070	SOUTH FALLS	51 35.000 N	01 58.000 E
		51 35.000 N	02 00.000 E
		51 30.000 N	02 00.000 E
		51 30.000 N	01 57.000 E
		51 35.000 N	01 58.000 E

A further sand placement site has recently been characterised in the North Edinburgh Channel but this is yet to be used and is subject to a monitoring regime to validate the environmental assessment. As a consequence of the costs associated with transporting dredged materials over this distance, it is relatively unusual for sediment dredged from the Thames for maintenance to be taken to sea disposal. In preference, arisings from TSHD operations are typically taken to land-based site for disposal. Currently, the main land placement sites on the Thames Estuary are as follows:

- Rainham Marshes, where the site is owned by Defence Estates and leased by RSPB, licensed to PLA and operated by Westminster Dredging. The site is to be managed under procedures agreed jointly by RSPB (Inner Thames Marshes SSSI) and PLA (Rainham Silt Lagoons)
- Cliffe Pools, where the site is owned by RSPB and managed by Westminster Dredging.

2.2.3 Plough Dredging

Some plough dredging is undertaken, generally in tandem with other maintenance dredging techniques but also as a stand alone technique.

Ploughing utilises a tug vessel equipped with a plough unit (a steel box suspended on cables/chains). The plough is lowered to predetermined levels and is used to drag sediment along the seabed. Because the vessels are small and manoeuvrable in comparison to, particularly, trailer dredgers, ploughing is utilised to move material from areas inaccessible to the main dredging plant. As with water injection dredging, ploughing should not lead to significant re-suspension of sediment but if the sediment ploughed is soft it may be sufficiently disturbed to rise in to suspension. Ploughing equipment has also been deployed in the Thames to level sand waves in the channel bed, but without significant success. Upstream of the study boundary at least two sites are licensed to use plough dredging on a frequent basis thus remobilising sediment on a little and often principle.

2.3 Water Injection Maintenance Dredging Operations

The following subsections identify the locations of water injection dredging operations within the study area. The locations of these areas are shown in Figure 1.1. Information is provided on the dredging frequency, estimated quantities, dredge material (where identified) and distances to the SPAs and SSSI. For WID, quantities are estimated based on pre and post dredge survey data undertaken for each campaign.

2.3.1 Port of Tilbury Bellmouth

The Bellmouth is located at the entrance to the main lock barrel leading to the Port of Tilbury. Dredging activity for the port is detailed in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Summary of WID dredging undertaken for the Port of Tilbury London Limited

Client Organisation	Port of Tilbury London Limited
Contractor	Van Oord UK Limited
Maintained Depth	-8.5 m CD (with restriction to -7.2 m CD)
Dredging frequency	3 months – 20,500m ³ in last campaign
Average annual dredge quantity	85,000 m ³
Material type	soft silt
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	To maintain access to the Port of Tilbury through the lock for all vessels at all states of the tide.
Historical context	While the adjacent berths are largely self maintaining, the lock entrance is a natural silt trap. Consequently, dredging has been necessary throughout the operational life of the dock system. Injection dredging on the ebb has been implemented over the past decade, with no obvious impact on the adjacent river berths (Northfleet Hope Container Terminal for example). WID commenced in early 1990s.
Contamination testing	Sediments are tested on a two yearly cycle, with the 7 samples tested for TBT in October 2003, and 2 tested for a full suite of metal and organic compounds. TBT has been identified in deeper sediments in an area adjacent to the East Lead-in Jetty (test results dated October 2003). In consequence, and following extensive monitoring and review, the PLA dredging licence is now issued conditional on POTLL/ Van Oord ACZ demonstrating that a buffer layer is maintained with the dredge surface in excess of 500mm above the contaminated strata at all stages of the dredge process. The sampling regime has identified no other

	contamination that precludes dredging and TBT has not been found at elevated levels in subsequent analysis cycles.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	6.4 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	20.4 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	14.6 km

2.3.2 Robbins Wharf

Table 2.2 Summary of WID activity undertaken at Robbins Wharf for Foster Yeoman

Client Organisation	Foster Yeoman
Contractor	Van Oord UK Limited
Maintained Depth	-3.0 m CD
Dredging frequency	1 year
Average annual dredge quantity	1,000 m ³
Material type	Silt
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	Maintenance of the berth pocket to allow receipt and unloading of aggregate vessels at the jetty.
Historical context	Maintenance dredging operations have historically taken place using trailer equipment. However, WID techniques were introduced in early 1990s.
Contamination testing	2 samples tested for full suite of metal and organic compounds in October 2003.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	7.0 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	21.0 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	15.2 km

2.3.3 Customs House Jetty

Table 2.3 Summary of WID activities undertaken at Customs House Jetty for HM Customs

Client Organisation	HM Customs
Contractor	Van Oord UK Limited
Maintained Depth	-4.0 m CD
Dredging frequency	6 months
Average annual dredge quantity	5,000 m ³
Material type	soft silt
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	Maintenance of the berth pocket to permit all tide operations for the Customs vessels
Historical context	The jetty has been dredged regularly since construction, with the implementation of WID techniques in early 1990's. Testing is

	undertaken on a 2 year cycle, with the most recent testing dated January 2006.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	3.8 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	18.4 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	12.8 km

2.3.4 Divers Shoal

Table 2.4 Summary of WID activities undertaken at Divers Shoal for the PLA

Client Organisation	Port of London Authority
Contractor	Van Oord ACZ Limited & Westminster Dredging Limited
Ruling Depth	-9.1 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 months
Average annual dredge quantity	6,000 m ³ for all dredging at the location (see also trailer dredging)
Material type	Fine sand and silt, rare gravel – some debris
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The shoal impinges on the deepwater channel, reducing the all tide ruling depth for the docks and jetties to the west. Maintenance of depth is undertaken by WID, but the PLA undertakes less frequent trailer campaigns to remove coarser materials and debris.
Historical context	Located upstream of Coalhouse Point, Divers Shoal has historically provided the limiting depth for the river. Training works implemented on the northern side of the channel in 1995 successfully generated higher currents in the channel itself, while allowing accretion on the northern foreshore. This has considerably reduced, although not eliminated, the shoal's maintenance dredging requirements. The material was tested for metals and organic compounds in August 2005 with no abnormalities
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1.0 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	15.6 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	10.2 km

2.3.5 Shell Bravo

Table 2.5 Summary of WID activities undertaken at Shell Bravo for Shell

Client Organisation	Shell
Contractor	Van Oord UK Limited
Maintained Depth	-14.6 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 months
Campaign Duration	15 to 20 hours
Average annual dredge quantity	60,000 m ³
Material type	soft silt/ fine sand
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	Maintenance of the berth pocket to permit all tide operations. The berth is the deepest of the jetties on this portion of the coast.
Historical context	The Shell jetty has been dredged regularly since construction. Frequent dredging is now a necessity to provide appropriate levels of access to the berths. Testing of sediments is undertaken on a 2 yearly cycle. Maintenance of depth is undertaken by WID, but Shell undertakes infrequent trailer campaigns to remove coarser materials and debris.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	9.8 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	3.6 km

2.3.6 BP Coryton Berths

Table 2.6 Summary of WID activities undertaken at BP Coryton Berths for BP UK

Client Organisation	BP UK
Contractor	Van Oord ACZ Limited
Maintained Depth	Varies: 1 -10.6 m CD 2 -5.1 and -7.0 m CD 3 -13.4 m CD 4 -14.0 m CD 5 -13.1 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 months
Campaign Duration	Up to 50 hours
Average annual dredge quantity	105,000 m ³
Material type	Silt and fine/medium sand
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The Coryton facility is of national significance and, without regular dredging, would become unable to accommodate the delivery fleet.
Historical context	The site comprises a range of jetty structures serving differing vessel profiles. All have been dredged regularly since construction. However, analysis of survey data from 1970 to 1999 indicates that the deposition patterns in

	<p>the area have been changing over the past 25 years. The grading of the sediments at Coryton is understood to be tending to coarser sand fractions.</p> <p>Maintenance of depth is undertaken by WID, but BP undertakes infrequent trailer campaigns to remove coarser materials and debris. The last such campaign took place in January 2003, during which 42,850 m³ was removed and taken to South Falls (marine disposal).</p> <p>Sediment testing is undertaken on a 2 year cycle, with the most recent results dated July 2005.</p>
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1.4 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	5.8 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	400 m

2.3.7 Oikos Terminal (Holehaven Wharf)

Table 2.7 Summary of WID activities undertaken at the Oikos Terminal for Oikos

Client Organisation	Oikos
Contractor	Van Oord UK Limited
Maintained Depth	-10.5 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 months
Campaign Duration	Approx 15 hours
Average annual dredge quantity	60,000 m ³
Material type	Silt and fine sand
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	Maintenance of the berth pocket to permit all tide operations. The rate of accretion at the jetty appears to be accelerating, reflecting changing sedimentation patterns in the area.
Historical context	<p>The Oikos jetty has been dredged regularly since construction.</p> <p>Sediment testing is undertaken on a 2 yearly cycle, with the most recent set dated June 2004 and June 2005. No abnormalities have been recorded.</p>
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1.5 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	5.0 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	200 m

2.4 Trailer or TSHD Maintenance Dredging Operations

2.4.1 Tilburyness Shoal

Tilburyness is located approximately 400 metres seaward of Tilbury Lock entrance.

Table 2.8 Summary of Trailer Dredging activities undertaken at Tilburyness Shoal for PLA

Client Organisation	Port of London Authority
Contractor	Westminster Dredging
Ruling Depth	-9.1 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 years
Average annual dredge quantity	700 m ³
Disposal Site	Rainham or Cliffe Pools
Material type	Sand
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The shoal impinges on the deepwater channel, reducing the all tide ruling depth for the docks and jetties to the west.
Historical context	Dredging quantities are variable, and are influenced by the presence of sand waves. Ploughing and WID has been tested in the area, but the coarseness of the sediment is such that mechanical excavation remains the most practical dredging method. The sand sediment was tested for TBT, metals and organic compounds in October 2003. No abnormalities were found
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	5.6 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	19.6 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	13.8 km

2.4.2 Tilbury Power Station

Table 2.9 Summary of Trailer Dredging activities undertaken at Tilbury Power Station for RWE NPower

Client Organisation	RWE NPower
Contractor	Westminster Dredging
Maintained Depth	-14.0 m CD
Dredging frequency	6 months
Average annual dredge quantity	40,000 m ³
Disposal Site	Cliffe Pools
Material type	soft silt
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	Maintenance of the berth pocket to permit all tide operations for the importation of coal for the power station
Historical context	Previously maintenance dredging was

	<p>carried out on the older B Jetty. However since construction of a new berth (approximately 2 years ago), maintenance dredging has only been carried out on the new jetty and the older jetty has not been dredged.</p> <p>Sediment testing is undertaken on a 2 yearly cycle, with the most recent set dated June 2004 and June 2005. No abnormalities have been recorded.</p>
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	3.0 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	18.4 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	11.4 km

2.4.3 Divers Shoal

Table 2.10 Summary of Trailer Dredging activities undertaken at Divers Shoal for PLA

Client Organisation	Port of London Authority
Contractor	Westminster Dredging
Ruling Depth	-9.1 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 years, for trailer campaign
Average annual dredge quantity	6,000 m ³ for all dredging at the location (see also WID).
Disposal Site	Rainham or Cliffe Pools
Material type	Fine sand and silt
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The shoal impinges on the deepwater channel, reducing the all tide ruling depth for the docks and jetties to the west.
Historical context	<p>Located upstream of Coalhouse Point, Divers Shoal has historically provided the limiting depth for the river. Training works implemented on the northern side of the channel in 1995 successfully generated higher currents in the channel itself, while allowing accretion on the northern foreshore. This has reduced, although not eliminated, the shoal's maintenance dredging requirements. The shoal is regularly dredged by water injection dredging. However, it is found that debris accumulates in the bed and this is removed by mechanical plant. The excavated material comprises gravels, but with additional waste materials (tyres and steel debris). Testing undertaken on a 2 year cycle, with the last report dated August 2002.</p>

Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1.0 km
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	15.6 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	10.2 km

2.4.4 Coalhouse Shoal

Table 2.11 Summary of Trailer Dredging activities undertaken at Coalhouse Shoal for PLA

Client Organisation	PLA
Contractor	Westminster Dredging
Ruling Depth	-9.0 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 years
Average annual dredge quantity	1,000 m ³
Disposal Site	Cliffe Pools
Material type	Sand and gravel
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The shoal impinges on the deepwater channel, reducing the all tide ruling depth for the docks and jetties to the west.
Historical context	Minor accretion of coarse sediments and debris has required infrequent maintenance, in tandem with works upstream at Divers Shoal.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	26.0 m
Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	14.6 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	9.2 km

2.4.5 Sea Reach

Table 2.12 Summary of Trailer Dredging activities undertaken at Sea Reach for PLA

Client Organisation	Port of London Authority
Contractor	Westminster Dredging
Ruling Depth	-10.2 m CD
Dredging frequency	3 months
Average annual dredge quantity	4,000 m ³
Material type	Sand
Need for Maintenance Dredging activity	The shoal impinges on the deepwater channel, reducing the all tide ruling depth for the docks and jetties to the west.
Historical context	Dredging takes place on the northern side of the main navigation channel. Dredging quantities are variable.
Distance to Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA	1.0 km

Distance to Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA	6.0 km
Distance to Holehaven Creek SSSI	600 m

2.5 Historic dredging

The Thames River and estuary has provided a national gateway port since the Roman Period. Encroachment through reclamation and construction of wharfage ensured access was maintained, although by the early C19th some dredging works had commenced principally to lower shoals on the main channels and to provide a source of ballast. From 1857, when the Thames Conservators were reconstituted, dredging activity in the Thames increased to maintain and improve the main navigation, ensuring passage of new classes of commercial shipping, which were both wider and deeper draughted. Significant dredging works were undertaken between 1895 and 1900. Further works were undertaken during a second capital dredging campaign concluded by 1928, during which some 37 million cu yards were excavated.

Since 1928, dredging in the Thames has been primarily associated with maintaining depths. The main navigation channel created by 1928 was largely self maintaining, but annual dredging returns for the River and docks for the periods 1928 to 1956 are fairly consistent, averaging 2,660,000 hopper tonnes per annum [1,860,000 m³] (extracted from An Overview of tidal Thames Estuary, HR Wallingford Report EX 4936, Rev 2.0, Table 4.1, and corroborated in The Thames Estuary Coastal Processes and Conservation, Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, October 1993 – Section 6.1). Much of this material was disposed of in the outer estuary (Black Deep and Barrow Deep) located in the outer Estuary. Approximately 50% of this dredging originated in the Mud, Gravesend and other Reaches.

Following a review of the dredging requirements of the River in the 1950s, the PLA implemented a significant change of policy for the dredging objectives and disposal practice. This resulted, from 1967, in a considerable annual reduction in the dredging commitment particularly within the Mud Reaches (HR Wallingford EX 4936, Table 4.2). This included a significant reduction in maintenance dredging from Gravesend Reach/Divers Shoal from 1965 and does not appear to have impacted significantly on the navigable depth in the River. It should also be noted that in the preceding years (1962 to 1966), significant capital dredging had been undertaken including the relocation of the navigation channel in Lower Gravesend Reach (relocated 500 feet south - 1964/1965) and Knock John Channel (Deterioration of North Edinburgh Channel, new channel through Black Deep - 1966) in response to recommendations by the then Hydraulics Research Station. .

Historically, arisings have been disposed at sea at sites seaward of Southend. However, two onshore disposal sites have operated at Rainham and Cliffe. Rainham was operational pre-1949 but was further developed following the Inglis and Allen dredging review of 1957. Initially comprising two large lagoons, the site was extended with the addition of 7 new lagoons, commencing operations in January 1968. The original two lagoons have since been incorporated into the household waste landfill operations facility.

Rainham now comprises a series of 9 linked lagoons, and currently has a capacity of approximately 1.3 million m³. The site is owned by the MOD, and managed jointly by RSPB (Inner Thames Marshes SSSI) and by the PLA (disposal lagoons).

Cliffe was originally licensed to receive dredge materials (having formerly operated as clay pits) in 1960. With Rainham originally anticipated to be full by 1982, Westminster Dredging expanded their interest in the Cliffe disposal site in 1972 to provide capacity for 20 years of maintenance operations. The site received its Waste Management Licence in 1977, and this has been maintained. The site was acquired by RSPB in 2001, to provide a habitat for overwintering waders. Nevertheless, it continues to receive dredge material.

The deployment of WID equipment has alleviated much of the routine requirement for on-shore disposal capacity. The original Jetsed dredger was built in 1987, and the "Maasmond" now operates in the Thames for approximately nine berth operators, undertaking campaigns on a 3 monthly cycle (although not at all berths).

2.6 Other dredging activities

There are a small number of other operators and facilities undertaking or proposing to undertake maintenance dredging within the study area, including Denton Wharf and Gravesend Canal Basin, but such new projects will be assessed separately and are presently excluded from this issue of the baseline document.

In addition, and in recognition of potential secondary impacts arising from maintenance dredging operations, consideration has been given to, particularly, the potential impacts arising from discharge from the two disposal lagoon facilities within the study area, namely Rainham and Cliffe Pools.

2.6.1 Rainham Pump Ashore Facility

Dredging is not undertaken at the site itself. However, the site is a receptor for material arising from maintenance dredging operations, as well as providing a resource within the Inner Thames Marshes SSSI. A management plan for the site is in preparation (January 2006) which will support the ongoing operation of the site to maintain the conservation status of the surrounding grassland and saltmarsh habitats.

The Waste Management Licence is currently under review, with an anticipated maximum annual reception capacity of 75,000 tonnes of deposited material (solids), excluding the water used to carry the material to the lagoons. The dredged material deposited at Rainham is used beneficially to create and maintain the habitats within the SSSI.

The ongoing operation of the site is an intrinsic element of the maintenance dredging strategy for the Thames, as well as continuing the management regime of the SSSI itself. The operations do not directly impact on the European sites and the discharge from the lagoons occurs outside the study area. No further examination of direct environmental impact has therefore been undertaken.

2.6.2 Cliffe Pools Pump Ashore Facility

The Cliffe site has operated as a dredging disposal site since 1960. It is located to the east of Gravesend, in Kent, and forms the western end of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA. Since 2001, the site has been owned by RSPB. In 2002, RSPB entered into a management contract for the lagoons with Westminster Dredging, and this arrangement is ongoing.

Dredging is not undertaken at the site itself. However, the site is a receptor for selected material arising from maintenance dredging operations in the Thames. The deposited materials are being used to manage and enhance the existing saline lagoon areas to reduce depths, provide beaches, and create island breeding and roost sites.

In 2004, Westminster applied (successfully) for a PPC Licence for the site (although Government has since removed the requirement for PPC at such sites). As part of that process, the applicant undertook a habitats risk assessment for the lagoons carried out under the Habitats Regulations. The evaluation considered:

- Toxic Contamination
- Nutrient Enrichment
- Habitat Loss
- Siltation
- Smothering
- Disturbance
- Predation

The assessment concluded that the ongoing operation of the lagoons, undertaken in accordance with the lagoon dredging plan established by RSPB and Westminster Dredging, with agreement of English Nature, as appended to the site management plan, does not adversely affect the integrity of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA.

The site has a potential capacity of 850,000 m³, with an annual ceiling of 150,000 m³. The site operates in support of dredging activity in the Thames, equating to quarterly periods of approximately 3 weeks duration. During these periods, the site is operational for up to 24 hours each day, with a daily ceiling of 10,000 m³ excluding the water used to flush material into the site from the discharging vessel. Water, from dredging and precipitation, is discharged from the site via a series of sluices leading to Cliffe Creek. These are operated by Westminster Dredging during operational periods and by RSPB during non-operational phases. The PLA are not aware of any water quality issues associated with this activity.

The RSPB, as landowner, is working in partnership with Westminster Dredging Plc to create at Cliffe Pools a flagship nature reserve and the focus for visitors to the RSPB's North Kent Marshes reserves.

3 BENFLEET AND SOUTHEND MARSHES SPA AND RAMSAR SITE

3.1 Overview

The Benfleet and Southend Marshes site was classified on the 14th February 1994 as an SPA. It comprises a series of saltmarsh, mudflat and grassland habitats located on the north bank of the Thames Estuary.

The Benfleet and Southend Marshes site qualifies under Article 4.2 of the EU Birds Directive as a designated SPA as it supports internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species. This includes Dark-bellied brent geese (*Branta bernicla bernicla*), knot (*Calidris cantu*), and grey plover (*Pluvialis squatarola*). This area also supports internationally important assemblages of waterfowl also covered under Article 4.2 of the Directive.

The Benfleet and Southend Marshes site qualified as a Ramsar site under Ramsar Criterion 5 as it supports assemblages of internationally important waterfowl. It is also notified under Criterion 6 as species occurring at internationally important levels are recorded within the area.

3.2 Conservation objectives

The conservation objectives for the site are detailed in the Regulation 33 advice for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes Marine Site (English Nature, 2001). The conservation objectives for the nationally and internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species are:

Subject to natural change, maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species, under the Birds Directive, in particular:

- *Shell banks;*
- *Saltmarsh;*
- *Intertidal Sandflat and Mudflat communities; and*
- *Eelgrass beds.*

And;

Subject to natural change, maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblages of waterfowl, under the Birds Directive, in particular:

- *Shell banks;*
- *Saltmarsh;*
- *Intertidal Sandflat and Mudflat communities; and*
- *Eelgrass beds.*

Numbers of bird species using these habitats within the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA are given in Table 3.1 (average peak counts for the five year period 1986/87 to 1990/91).

It should be noted that the SPA conservation objectives focus on habitat condition (rather than bird numbers) in recognition of the fact that bird populations may change as a reflection of national or international trends or events. However, annual counts for qualifying species will be used by English Nature, in the context of five year peak means, together with available information on UK population and distribution trends, to assess whether the SPA is continuing to make an appropriate contribution to the favourable conservation status of the SPAs across Europe.

Table 3.1 Numbers of Bird Species using habitats within the Benfleet and Southend Marshes site

Internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species	
Species	Population (5yr Peak mean)
Dark-bellied brent goose	7,200I birds (4 % of World population)
Knot	8,400 birds (2% of East Atlantic flyway)
Grey Plover	2,500,birds (1% of East flyway)
Nationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species	
Importance	Population (5yr Peak mean)
Benfleet and Southend Marshes supports large populations of wintering waterfowl	30,400 individual birds.
Nationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species within the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl	
Ringed Plover	430 birds (2% of British Population)
Dunlin	11,100 birds (31 % of British population)

The Regulation 33 advice provides favourable condition tables for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes European Marine Sites. The relevant favourable condition targets for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA are presented in Table 3.2.

3.3 Current conservation status

The UK Government has a duty to report to the European Union at 6 yearly intervals on the condition of SPAs in the UK. As part of this reporting, the Government is required to carry out monitoring of the features listed in the favourable conditions tables (see Table 3.2)

At the time of writing, no condition assessment was available for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA or Ramsar site. However, a condition assessment for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) has recently been carried out by English Nature (1st November 2005). Although this is for the SSSI and not the SPA, it is considered to be relevant as the boundaries of both sites are very similar, and they share some of the same interest features as noted for in both designations. For example, the SSSI is also designated for the habitats which support the nationally and internationally important numbers of wildfowl and waders.

The Benfleet and Southend Marshes SSSI is made up of five management units. For each of these units English Nature has assessed their condition according to a number of criteria, and assigned the terms presented in Box 3.1 to the area. The full results of the condition assessments for the units of the SSSI are presented in Appendix A, and a summary of the site as a whole is presented in Table 3.3. In general, this area is in an unfavourable condition and not recovering (94.74%), and an area of only 5.2% is reaching the required management targets (Table 3.3). The main issues potentially

affecting the condition of the site were coastal squeeze against the sea defences, public access/disturbance, water pollution and discharge. For example, management area 1 within this site was confirmed as having eroding saltmarsh and a foreshore subject to coastal squeeze, though this is being addressed strategically through CHAMPs/SMPs and other national policy interventions.

Box 3.1 Definition of SSSI condition assessment terms (from www.english-nature.org.uk)

Favourable	SSSI is being adequately conserved and is meeting its 'conservation objectives', however there is scope for enhancement of these sites.
Unfavourable recovering	SSSI unites are not yet fully conserved but all the necessary management measures are in place. Provided that the recovery work is sustained, the SSSI will reach favourable condition in time.
Unfavourable no change	SSSI unit is not being conserved and will not reach favourable condition unless there are changes to the site management or external pressures. The longer the SSSI unit remains in this poor condition, the more difficult it will be, in general, to achieve recovery.
Unfavourable declining	SSSI unit is not being conserved and will not reach favourable condition unless there are changes to the site management or external pressures. The site condition is becoming progressively worse.
Part destroyed	Part destroyed means that lasting damage has occurred to part of the special conservation interest of a SSSI unit such that it has been irretrievably lost and will never recover. Conservation work may needed on the residual interest of the land
Destroyed	Lasting damage has occurred to all the special conservation interest of the SSSI unit such that it has been irretrievably lost. This land will never recover.

Table 3.2 Favourable condition table for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes European Marine Site

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important assemblages of waterfowl and internationally and nationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species.	All sub-features	Disturbance	Reduction or displacement of wintering birds	No significant reduction in numbers or displacement of wintering birds attributed to disturbance from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Significant disturbance attributable to human activities can result in reduced food intake and/or increased energy expenditure. Five year peak mean information on populations will be used as the basis for assessing whether disturbance is damaging
		Absence of obstruction to view lines.	Openness of terrain unrestricted by obstructions	No increase in obstructions to existing views lines, subject to natural change.	Waders require over >200 m and dark-bellied brent geese require unrestricted views over >500 m to allow early detection of predators when feeding and roosting.
	Shell Banks	Extent	Area (ha), measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Shell banks are important roosting areas.
	Intertidal mudflat and sandflat communities	Extent	Area (ha), measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent of intertidal sediment from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Intertidal sediments and their communities provide important feeding areas for the migratory species of birds

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important assemblage of waterfowl and internationally and nationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species	Intertidal mudflat and sandflat communities	Food availability	Presence and abundance of invertebrates measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	Presence and abundance of prey species should not deviate from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	These species are important food supply for birds. This food source is also important for a nationally important breeding population of ringed plover. For specialist feeders it may be necessary to record to species level for important prey items. Food availability will be affected by freezing conditions.
			Presence and abundance of green algae	Presence and abundance of prey species should not deviate from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	<i>Enteromorpha</i> is important for dark-bellied brent geese.
	Saltmarsh	Extent	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle.	No decrease in extent of Atlantic salt meadows from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Important roosting and feeding areas.
		Food availability	Presence and abundance of soft-leaved and seed-bearing plants.	Presence and abundance of food species should not deviate from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Important for feeding dark-bellied brent geese

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important assemblage of waterfowl and internationally and nationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species	Saltmarsh	Vegetation characteristics	Short vegetation predominating (roosting)	Vegetation height throughout areas used for roosting should not deviate significantly from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Vegetation of <10 cm is required throughout area used by roosting waders
	Eel grass bed communities	Extent	Area (ha) ,measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent and distribution of <i>Zostera</i> from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Eelgrass beds are an important feeding area for dark-bellied brent geese.
		Food availability	Presence and abundance of eelgrass.	Presence and abundance of food species should not deviate from an established baseline, subject to natural change.	Eelgrass beds are an important food source for dark-bellied brent geese.

Table 3.3 Benfleet and Southend Marshes SSSI condition summary (1 November 2005)

% area meeting PSA target	5 area favourable	% area unfavourable recovering	% area unfavourable no change	% area unfavourable declining	% area destroyed/ part destroyed
5.26%	0.00%	5.26%	0.00%	94.74%	0.00%

4 THAMES ESTUARY AND MARSHES SPA AND RAMSAR SITE

4.1 Overview

The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA is shown in Figure 4.1. It includes both marine and terrestrial habitats, and the marine area is also termed a European Marine Site. The marshes extend for around 15 km along the south side of the estuary, and also include some intertidal areas found on the north bank¹. It encompasses brackish, floodplain grazing marsh ditches and saline lagoons as well as intertidal saltmarsh and mudflat. This site was classified as both an SPA and a Ramsar Site (which covers approximately 5500 hectares) on the 31 March 2000.

The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA qualifies under Article 4.1 of the EU Birds Directive as it supports internationally important populations of the following regularly occurring Annex 1 species;

- the avocet *Recurvirostra avocetta*, and;
- the hen harrier *Circus cyaneus*.

This Site also qualifies as an SPA under Article 4.2 of the EU Birds Directive as it supports internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species including;

- ringed plover *Charadrius hiaticula*.
- grey plover *Pluvialis quatarola*.
- dunlin *Calidris alpina alpina*.
- knot *Calidris canutus islandica*.
- black-tailed godwit *Limosa limosa*, and;
- redshank *Tringa tetanus tetanus*.

This SPA site also supports an internationally important assemblage of waterfowl as stated in Section 4.2 of the Directive, which include the following species;

- gadwall *Anus strepera*;
- shoveler *Anus clypeata*;
- tufted duck *Aythya fuligula*; and
- pochard *Aythya farina*.

The Thames Estuary and Marshes Ramsar site qualifies under Criterion 2 as it supports 1 nationally rare and 14 nationally scarce plant species, as well as 1 endangered, 10 vulnerable and 12 rare invertebrate species. It also qualifies under Criterion 5 for its internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, and Criterion 6 for its internationally important numbers of over-wintering waterfowl.

¹ <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=2042>

4.2 Conservation objectives

The conservation objectives for the site are detailed in the Regulation 33 advice for the Thames Estuary and Marshes Marine Site (English Nature, 2001). The conservation objectives for the nationally and internationally important populations of the regularly occurring migratory species are:

Subject to natural change, maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important population of the regularly occurring Annex 1 bird species, under the Birds Directive, in particular:

- *Saltmarsh;*
- *Intertidal Mudflats; and*
- *Intertidal shingle.*

And;

Subject to natural change, maintain in favourable condition the habitats for the internationally important assemblage of waterfowl, under the Birds Directive, in particular:

- *Saltmarsh;*
- *Intertidal Mudflats; and*
- *Intertidal shingle.*

Numbers of bird species using these habitats within the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA are given in Table 4.1 (average peak counts for the five year period 1986/87 to 1990/91).

Table 4.1 Numbers of bird species using habitats within the Thames Estuary Site

Internationally important populations of regularly occurring Annex 1 species	
Species	Population (5yr Peak mean)
Avocet	283 birds (28.3% Great Britain)
Internationally important populations of regularly occurring migratory species	
Species	Population (5yr Peak mean)
Ringed Plover	1,324 birds (2.6% Europe/North Africa)
Grey Plover	2,593 birds (1.7% Eastern Atlantic)
Dunlin	29,646 birds (2.1% Northern Siberia;/Europe/West Africa)
Knot	4,848 birds (1.4% North West Europe)
Black-tailed Godwit	1,699 birds (2.4% Iceland)
Redshank	3,251 birds (2.2% Eastern Atlantic)
An internationally important assemblage of waterfowl	
Importance	Population (5yr Peak mean)
Thames Estuary supports large populations of wintering waterfowl	75,019 individual birds
Nationally important bird populations within internationally important assemblages of waterfowl	
Species	Shelduck (<i>Tadorna tadorna</i>), Teal (<i>Anas crecca</i>) and Pintail (<i>Anas acuta</i>).

The Regulation 33 advice provides favourable condition tables for the Thames Estuary and Marshes European Marine Sites. The relevant favourable condition targets for the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA are presented in Table 4.2.

4.3 Current conservation status

As was the case for Benfleet and Southend Marshes (Section 2.3), a condition assessment for the Thames Estuary SPA and Ramsar site was not available at the time of writing. However, assessments for the corresponding SSSI sites found within the SPA were available (compiled in 1st November 2005 but carried out up to 4 years before). The SSSI sites that correspond with this SPA and Ramsar site and lie within the study area are the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI for the area south of the river, and Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI for the area north of the river. Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI comprises an extensive stretch on the left bank of Thames mudflats and saltmarsh, together with sea wall grassland. The South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI stretches from Gravesend to the eastern end of the Isle of Grain on the right bank and supports a wide range of habitats including saltmarsh, mudflat, grazing marsh and shingle.

These SSSIs were assessed using the same conditions as shown previously in Box 2.1. South Thames Estuary and Marshes is composed of 58 management units, while Mucking Flats and Marshes has only 4 units. The full condition assessments of these areas can be found in Appendix A, while a summary of the findings for both sites are presented in Table 4.3 and 4.4. In general, the area north of the river within the Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI fell within the 'area favourable' assessment, while the area south of the river within the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI is mostly in

favourable condition (87%). Only 3.6% of the site is now in unfavourable condition (unfavourable declining and unfavourable no change).

The main issues affecting the site north of the river (Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI) were inappropriate weed control and public access/disturbance. Such issues were only seen in Unit one, where tall herb ruderals dominated creating a less than ideal high tide roost, coupled with the disturbance from a nearby footpath. South of the river, in the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI, the two major units in unfavourable condition are units 100 and 101, which are both experiencing saltmarsh erosion as a result of coastal squeeze.

Table 4.2 Favourable condition table for the Thames Estuary European Marine Site

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important populations of regularly occurring Annex 1 bird species (Avocet)	All sub-features	Disturbance in feeding and roosting areas	Reduction or displacement of wintering birds, measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	No significant reduction in numbers or displacement of wintering birds attributable to disturbance, subject to natural change.	Significant disturbance attributable to human activities can result in reduced food intake and/or increased energy expenditure. Five year peak mean information on populations will be used as the basis for assessing whether disturbance is damaging.
		Absence of obstructions to view lines	Openness of terrain unrestricted by obstructions, measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	No increase in obstructions to existing bird view lines, subject to natural change.	Avocet ideally require unrestricted views >200 m to allow early detection of predators when feeding and roosting.
	Intertidal mudflats	Extent and distribution of habitat	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle.	No decrease in extent form an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Intertidal sediment and their communities provide both habitat and feeding area for the Annex 1 bird populations.
		Food availability	Diversity and abundance of fish and intertidal invertebrates including e.g. <i>Gammarus</i> , <i>Corophium</i> , flies, beetles, <i>Nereis</i> , <i>Hydrobia</i> , <i>Cardium</i> , gobies. Measured periodically. Frequency to be determined	Diversity and abundance of prey species should not deviate significantly from the established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Marine insects, crustaceans, mollusc

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important populations of regularly occurring Annex 1 bird species (Avocet)	Saltmarsh	Extent and distribution of habitat	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle.	No decrease in extent from an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Saltmarsh provides roosting areas, and shallow water within saltings may be used for feeding.
		Vegetation characters	Open, short vegetation or bare ground predominating (roosting), measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	Vegetation height throughout areas used for roosting should not deviate significantly from an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Vegetation of <10 cm is required throughout areas used y roosting avocet.
Internationally important assemblage including internationally and nationally important populations of migratory species	All sub-features	Disturbance in feeding and roosting areas	Reduction or displacement of wintering birds, measure periodically (frequency to be determined)	No significant reduction in numbers or displacement of wintering birds attributable to disturbance, subject to natural change.	Significant disturbance attributable to human activities can result in reduced food intake and/or increased energy expenditure. Five year peak mean information on populations will be used as the basis for assessing whether disturbance is damaging.
		Absence of obstructions to view lines	Openness of terrain unrestricted by obstructions, measured periodically (frequency to be determined)	No increase in obstructions to existing bird view lines, subject to natural change	Some waders require unrestricted views >200 m to allow early detection of predators when feeding and roosting.

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important assemblage including internationally important populations of migratory species	Intertidal mudflats	Extent and distribution of habitat	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent form an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Intertidal mudflats and their communities provide both roosting and feeding areas for the migratory species of birds.
		Food availability	Diversity and abundance of intertidal invertebrates. Measured periodically (frequency to be determined)	Diversity and abundance of prey species should not deviate significantly from the established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Marine insects, crustaceans, molluscs and worms are important food sources for the migratory species of birds: <i>Gammarus</i> and <i>Posidium</i> for ringed plover. <i>Nereis</i> , <i>Aricicola</i> and <i>Notomastus</i> for grey plover. <i>Nereis</i> , <i>Macoma</i> , <i>Hydrobia</i> , <i>Crangon</i> and <i>Carcinus</i> for dunlin. <i>Macoma</i> , <i>Mytilus/Cerastoderma</i> spat and <i>Hydrobia</i> for knot. <i>Macoma</i> , <i>Cardium</i> and <i>Nereis</i> for black-tailed godwit. <i>Hydrobia</i> , <i>Macoma</i> , <i>Corophium</i> and <i>Hydrobia</i> for shelduck. <i>Hydrobia</i> for teal and pintail.
	Saltmarsh	Extent and distribution of habitat	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent form an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Water fowl feed and roost within the saltmarsh areas of the Thames Estuary European marine site.

Feature	Sub-Feature	Attribute	Measure	Target	Comments
Internationally important assemblage including internationally important populations of migratory species	Saltmarsh	Food availability	Presence and abundance of soft leaved and seed bearing plants. Measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	Presence and abundance of food species should not deviate from an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	<i>Salicornia</i> and <i>Atriplex</i> are important for teal.
		Vegetation characteristics	Open, short vegetation or bare ground predominating (roosting), measured periodically (frequency to be determined).	Vegetation height throughout areas used for roosting should not deviate significantly from an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Vegetation of <10 cm is required throughout areas used by roosting waders.
	Intertidal shingle/cobble beach	Extent and distribution of habitat	Area (ha) measured once per reporting cycle	No decrease in extent form an established baseline (established during first reporting cycle), subject to natural change.	Areas of intertidal shingle/cobble beach provide high tide roots for the migratory species of waterfowl which use the Thames Estuary European marine site.

Table 4.3 South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI condition summary (1 November 2005)

% area meeting PSA target	% area favourable	% area unfavourable recovering	% area unfavourable no change	% area unfavourable declining	% area destroyed/ part destroyed
96.35%	86.9%	9.48%	1.84%	1.76%	0.00%

Table 4.4 Mucking Flats and Marshes SSSI condition summary

% area meeting PSA target	% area favourable	% area unfavourable recovering	% area unfavourable no change	% area unfavourable declining	% area destroyed/ part destroyed
94.13%	94.13%	0.0%	5.87%	0.00%	0.00%

5 HOLEHAVEN CREEK SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST

5.1 Overview

Although Holehaven Creek is not designated as a SPA or SAC under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994, it has been included within this assessment due to its status as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and that it may also be included within the boundaries for one of the SPA sites in the near future. Other SSSIs within the study area, such as West Thurrock Lagoons and Marshes, have not been considered within this baseline document. Although they lie within the study area, they do not lie within the boundaries of a Natura 2000 site, and are not currently being considered for notification. As such, they are not mentioned further within this document.

Holehaven Creek regularly supports nationally important numbers of wintering Black-tailed Godwit (*Limosa limosa islandica*). It is also noted for its assemblage of over 8,000 waterfowl during the winter, with dunlin (*Caldris alpina*) and curlew (*Numenius arqueta*) occasionally occurring in nationally important numbers.

5.2 Current Conservation Status

A condition survey of this area was carried out on the 1st November 2005. There are nine management units within this designated site, and each was surveyed and allocated a status as shown previously in Box 3.1. This site was recorded as having an area of 100% falling within the 'favourable' assessment.

6 DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE CONDITIONS

6.1 Coastal and estuarine processes and morphology

6.1.1 Methodology

Work has been previously undertaken to identify past and existing morphological processes and likely future change to inform dredging, coastal erosion, flood risk and habitat management studies for the Thames Estuary. In particular, the following key information sources have been used for this baseline review:

- Thames Barrier Studies (1960s and 1970s).
- London Gateway Port studies (2002/2003).
- Scoping studies for the Thames Estuary 2100 project (2003).
- Monitoring of dredging undertaken by PLA
- Studies forming part of the Thames Estuary 2100 project (2004).

This section of the report summarises the baseline morphological conditions; coastal evolution and historical change; sediment budget (source, transport and storage, of sediment), and likely future change.

6.1.2 Coastal Evolution

Geological Evolution

The Thames Estuary lies towards the southern edge of the London Basin bounded by upland areas to the south (North Downs) and north (Chiltern Hills) composed of Cretaceous Chalk. It was not until the Late Cretaceous (around 65 million years ago) that a major rise in sea level across Europe led to a significant deepening of the sea and without the influence of sediments brought in from nearby landmasses a very pure marine limestone was deposited in the warm sea: This is the Chalk, which may constitute up to 98% calcium carbonate. The Chalk forms the sub-crop of sections of the middle part of the Inner Thames (Erith downstream to Tilbury and parts of Woolwich and Gallions Reaches) (Sumbler, 1996). Elsewhere the Chalk is covered by Tertiary muds and sands (Balson and D'Olier, 1989; British Geological Survey, 1997).

A fall in sea level allowed the emergence of large areas of land and a considerable thickness of Chalk was eroded away. However, around 60 million years ago, sea level rose again and a shallow sea invaded the area depositing a series of Tertiary muds and sands reflecting changes in sea level and the transgression and regression of this sea (Sumbler, 1996). The oldest Tertiary sediments beneath the Thames Estuary belong to the Thanet Sand Formation and Lambeth Group. The bulk of the Thanet Sand consists of shallow marine silty sand with the main outcrops in south-east London (e.g. Howland, 1991) and north Kent. The Lambeth Group comprises sands (the Upnor Formation) deposited in a shallow sea and the overlying Woolwich Formation, comprising a varied assortment of sediments including clays and sands deposited in brackish, estuarine or coastal lagoon environments.

Following a rise in sea level, shallow marine conditions were again established in the Thames area, and the Harwich Formation was deposited, made up of several distinct

units of mud and sand. Sea level continued to rise during the Eocene (55-35 million years ago) leading to the deposition of the thick bluish-brown London Clay which is the most widespread and best known of the Tertiary deposits of the London Basin and underlies much of Greater London and the Thames.

The Tertiary units are overlain by a complex suite of sediments deposited during the glacial and interglacial phases of the Quaternary, including those of the Holocene (last 10,000 years). Between the Anglian glaciation and the Devensian glaciation (the last Ice Age) the River Thames and its tributaries became established in their modern valleys and formed wide expanses of river terrace sands and gravels (Bridgland, 1994). These are mainly remnants of floodplains, representing phases in the gradual downcutting of the river during the Pleistocene; the highest terrace being the oldest and the lowest the youngest. This gently terraced landform is now almost completely obscured by urban development. The last major phase of terrace formation was during the Devensian glaciation when the River Thames was graded to a level at least 25 m below present sea level. The Late Devensian River Thames appears to have followed a braided course, crossing a wide floodplain until the early Holocene when it gradually developed into a single channel river (Wilkinson and Sidell, 2000). The deposits are now covered by estuarine alluvium, deposited as sea level rose during the Holocene interglacial (10,000 years ago to present).

Following the melting of the ice sheet at the end of the Devensian glaciation there has been a significant rise in sea level. The Thames Estuary was flooded around 8000 years ago and complex sequences of marine/brackish sediments intercalated with freshwater peats were deposited on the youngest terrace sands and gravels (Devoy, 1977, 1979, 2000; Marsland, 1986). The Holocene sediments cover the floodplain approximating to the area that has been flooded by high water spring tides, including that presently protected by flood defences; they occur on both sides of the estuary and occupy an overall width of 3-10 km (Royal Haskoning, 2004).

The width of the Thames Estuary floodplain deposits is partially controlled by the position and strength of the Cretaceous and Tertiary sub-crops. The most significant change occurs at Tilbury where relatively soft Tertiary deposits downstream are replaced by relatively hard Chalk upstream, resulting in greater confinement of the river upstream. As a consequence the width of the floodplain deposits narrows rapidly from 10 km in the Coryton area to 3 km at Tilbury-Gravesend. The thickness of the deposits increases downstream, reaching a maximum of about 35 m at the eastern end of Canvey Island (Marsland, 1986).

Holocene Evolution

Devoy (1977, 1979) proposed two Holocene relative sea-level curves from the estuary, one for Tilbury and one from sites to the west of Tilbury. Although the curves from both areas followed the same trend, the Tilbury curve plotted c. 1.5 to 3 m below the west of Tilbury curve. Various reasons have been put forward for this anomaly, including the possibility of differential subsidence on an east-west axis (Devoy, 1979). However, a re-interpretation of the data (Haggart, 1995; Long, 1995), removed the need for eastward trending subsidence.

The most recent model proposed for the Holocene evolution of the Thames Estuary (Long, 2000; Long et al., 2000) describes sedimentation within a three-stage sequence based on estuarine development:

- **Stage 1** - The early Holocene rapid rise in relative sea level and flooding of the estuary between 8000 and c. 6000 years ago (Wilkinson and Sidell, 2000) leading to the widespread deposition of the silt and clay.
- **Stage 2** – A major expansion of peat-forming communities between c. 6000 and 3500 years ago: Beginning in the lower estuary, the initial formation replaced estuarine mudflat and saltmarsh sedimentation. Further west in London the rising water table allowed peats to form on top of Devensian terrace sands and gravels. Peat accumulation had a significant impact on the geometry of the estuary, reducing the spatial extent of intertidal environments. At Cross Ness, the intertidal area narrowed by 4 km. It is likely that the reason for initiation of peat formation at this time is a reduction in the rate of relative sea-level rise between c. 6000 and 4000 years ago. In the Thames Estuary the slow down in sea level rise would have encouraged the expansion of saltmarsh and then freshwater communities across areas of former intertidal mudflat.
- **Stage 3** - Between 4000 and 3000 years ago the peats of the lower estuary were inundated with later inundation of middle and upper estuary areas (2500 years ago at Silvertown, Wilkinson et al., 2000). By c. 2500 to 2000 years ago almost all of the once extensive peat forming communities throughout the estuary downstream of Woolwich had been replaced by intertidal conditions. Hence, the tidal Thames expanded and was once again flanked by extensive mudflats and saltmarshes that continued to develop, with only occasional still-stand phases until c. 150 years ago when much of the previously intertidal area was land-claimed for docks and associated installations.

Historic Relative Sea-Level Change and Ground Motion

The most recent relative sea-level curve (Wilkinson and Sidell, 2000) shows that there is a general rise of sea level through time, with an initial rapid rise of 3.5 mm per year, slowing down around c. 6000 years ago to 0.7 mm per year. This is supported by a wider analysis of land-level and sea-level change around Britain (Shennan and Horton, 2002), which calculated a late Holocene (last 4000 years) relative sea-level rise of 0.74 mm per year for the Thames, 0.85 mm per year for Essex and 0.67 mm per year for Kent. This can be compared with those for 20th century sea-level changes published by Woodworth et al. (1999) using tide gauges. They showed relative sea-level rises of 1.22 \pm 0.24 mm per year at Southend-on-Sea, 1.58 \pm 0.91 mm per year at Tilbury and 2.14 \pm 0.15 mm per year at Sheerness. Overall, these figures suggest an additional rate of relative sea level change in the 20th century of around 1 mm per year, as compared to the Late Holocene. This is in general agreement with the view that global sea levels have increased by 100-200 mm over the last century.

Shennan and Horton (2002) suggest, however, that some deficiencies may be inherent in the 20th century dataset. These include the unequal distribution of measurements and the considerable amount of interannual (typically decadal) variability present in all tide gauge records. Littlewood and Crossman (2003) also questioned the degree of accuracy of the tide gauge data based on concerns that they may not have remained at the same level relative to Ordnance Datum throughout their period of deployment. They

indicated that the gauges were levelled to Ordnance Datum over 40 years ago, and since that time differential ground subsidence may have caused their perceived level to be different to their actual level. Monitoring using GPS at the tide gauge locations at Richmond, Tower Pier, Silvertown, Erith, Tilbury and Southend-on-Sea has shown that between March 1997 and July 1999, the movement of ground levels at these locations was statistically insignificant.

6.1.3 Anthropogenic Influences

The human race has placed considerable demands on the Thames Estuary. Little control and poor recording of these activities have meant that it is difficult to relate changes in the morphology of the estuary to any particular impact (Royal Haskoning, 2004). Since the 1960s/1970s the large capital or maintenance dredging programmes, the discharge of pollutants and the construction of riverside developments have been subject to increasing legislation to ensure their impact on the hydrodynamic and morphological regimes of the estuary are acceptable.

Land-Claim and Industrial Development

The area covered by the floodplain deposits of the Thames Estuary has been progressively protected and developed since the 12th century. The Industrial Revolution led to the construction of major docks and a rapid expansion of industrial development. The closure of the London docks since the late 1950s and the transfer of these facilities downstream to Tilbury led to further extension of industrial developments on saltmarshes previously used for agriculture. A large proportion of the saltmarshes have been land-claimed behind embankments which stretch along most of the estuary shore.

The progressive land-claim of saltmarsh has meant that most of the enclosed areas now lie below the level of high water. This is due to the consolidation of the saltmarsh sediments after they were drained. The enclosed marshes cannot accrete as their supply of sediment has been cut off.

Land-claim and development have had significant impacts on the coastal processes and morphodynamics of the Thames Estuary by changing the geographical distribution of sediment sources and sinks. New source areas may be activated and existing areas starved due to lack of replenishment. A few examples of how previous developments have impacted on the process regime are described below (Kendrick, 1984; HR Wallingford, 2002f).

Construction of West Thurrock Oil Jetty

Kendrick (1984) examined the impact on the estuary of the construction of West Thurrock oil jetty. A first jetty in place in 1873 caused a local 80 m seaward movement of the low water mark. A second jetty built in 1966 further downstream caused further deposition and the low tide mark at the new jetty advanced around 50 m due to reduced tidal current velocities near the bank (Figure 6.1). Prior to construction, sediment brought into the area on the flood tide was deposited around high water slack, but then re-entrained into the flow on the ebb tide, maintaining a balance. Once jetty construction was completed the reduction in current velocities provided a longer period for deposition, and the ebb current was less efficient in re-entraining sediment.

Construction of Woolwich Ferry Terminals

Kendrick (1984) found that cofferdams used in the construction of the Woolwich ferry terminals (starting 1964) created eddies in the current flow, particularly on the north bank, reducing current velocities leading to increased sediment deposition. Bed levels during construction were raised by over 3 m in places. Former bed levels were not re-established following the removal of the cofferdams because during construction, the silt had become compacted and post-construction the large number of piles supporting the terminals continued to impede flow. The zone of deposition extended beyond the terminals along the adjacent banks. This was attributed by Kendrick to a secular increase in tidal penetration causing the gradual upstream movement of the zone of main deposition (the Mud Reaches), which increased the quantity of suspended sediment in the area as a whole. There is a possibility that the process may have been enhanced by the cessation of dredging in the downstream Barking Reach between 1963 and 1966, allowing more suspended sediment to arrive in Woolwich Reach on the flood tide.

Construction of Rainham Creek Dam

To prevent tidal surges flooding the low lying Hornchurch and Rainham Marshes flanking Rainham Creek, a sheet pile dam was constructed in 1978/79 spanning the mouth of the creek (about 100 m wide) (Kendrick, 1984). An alternative outlet for the creek (Ingrebourne River) was provided by sluices further up-river. The result was extensive siltation in to the previous location of the low water channel in front of the dam (Figure 6.2)

Diver Shoal Groynes

HR Wallingford (2002a, f) compared 1970 and 1998 bathymetric charts and found large amounts of accretion (of the order of $1 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) in the area now occupied by the Diver Shoal groynes along the northern shore of Gravesend Reach (Figure 6.3). They concluded that, as anticipated, the accumulation was almost completely due to this scheme which took place in 1995 and occurred over a 3-year period (1995-1998).

Dredging and Disposal

The Port of London Authority has a statutory duty to provide and maintain designated depths of water in the navigable channels, jetties and berths of the Thames Estuary. As a result of sedimentation it is therefore necessary to periodically undertake maintenance dredging. The importance of London as a port has resulted in a history of dredging, although, as elsewhere, few accurate records of dates of dredging and quantities removed exist. The records that do exist are difficult to use in a quantitative fashion because the units are not always compatible. They may also be approximations such as nominal values (provided as hopper tonnes, in situ volumes, paid volumes etc) assigned to barge loads.

Dredging can potentially have two effects on the processes of sediment exchange in the estuary. First, deepening may increase the proportion of total tidal discharge which takes place through the main channel reducing velocities adjacent to the channel. Second, dredging may create an artificial sink for sediment which may modify the fine sediment regime reducing supply to other nearby areas (Royal Haskoning, 2004). Inglis and Allen (1957) described dredging activities in the estuary between 1928 and 1956. The average annual dredged volume taken from the estuary as a whole during this

period was $1.86 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). Most of this sediment along with sewage sludge from London's main sewage works at Barking and Cross Ness was disposed of in Black Deep in the Outer Estuary. Some was disposed of in Lower Hope Reach in front of north Mucking Flats. HR Wallingford (2002f) reported that a total around $0.58 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ per year of material is estimated to have been disposed of in Lower Hope Reach between 1941 and 1967.

Inglis and Allen (1957) suggested that the disposed sediment at Black Deep was re-entrained and transported back into the estuary, adding to the rate of deposition in primary sources (Thorn and Burt, 1978). Following these results the disposal site was changed in 1961 (and still ongoing) to Rainham Marshes mid-way between London Docklands and Tilbury. This had the effect of removing the dredged sediment from the system. The route of transport of sediment back into the estuary from Black Deep may not be as direct a path as suggested by Inglis and Allen; it may be a more indirect contribution to the general sediment pool in the outer Thames Estuary.

In addition to the change of disposal site, the practice of regular maintenance dredging in the Mud Reaches and at Diver Shoal in Gravesend Reach was discontinued in the 1960s. Since this time dredging of the subtidal channel has been limited to local activities related to new jetties or deepening of existing riverside facilities (Kendrick, 1984) and the annual volume of sediment dredged appears to have fallen dramatically. The Port of London Authority estimates that the present annual requirement for maintenance dredging in the Thames Estuary, removed by conventional dredging methods, is $50,000\text{-}150,000 \text{ m}^3$ (HR Wallingford, 2002e) with this material being placed at Rainham Marshes and Cliffe Pooles. Most of the dredging on the Thames Estuary is now undertaken using water injection dredging techniques. This agitation technique, which retains fine sediment in the estuary, is used to remove about $225,000 \text{ m}^3$ per year at the berths at Shell Bravo, Coryton and Oikos, together with approximately $85,000 \text{ m}^3$ per year from the Port of Tilbury Bellmouth.

Operation of the Thames Barrier

The operation of the Thames Barrier can influence hydrodynamics and sediment transport along the length of the estuary, although the type and magnitude of the influence is presently unclear. For example, Prandle (1975) simulated deployment of the Thames Barrier during the 1953 storm surge, and found that the amplitude of the reflected wave at Southend-on-Sea was negligible. However, Littlewood and Crossman (2003) showed that closure of the Thames Barrier for prevention of fluvial flooding (without a surge component) could result in a reflected wave that may raise high water levels downstream of the barrier by around 0.5 m, depending upon the time of closure. A small negative wave (depression of water level) is generally recorded propagating upriver. It is likely that barrier operations will increase in the future in response to climate change, and thus the influence on morphology will increase (Royal Haskoning, 2004). Due to a lack of data, the impacts of the Barrier on the Greater Thames Estuary (e.g. the Medway), are not currently fully understood.

6.1.4 Salinity, Mixing and the Turbidity Maximum

The relationship between tidal range and river discharge enables all estuaries to be classified between highly stratified estuaries at one end and well mixed estuaries at the other. The Thames Estuary is generally a well mixed estuary; this means that river flow

is small compared with the volume of the tide, and the whole water mass migrates up and down the estuary with the flood and ebb tides. A longitudinal salinity gradient also exists and mixing takes place at the interface between the river water and sea water; saline water is mixed upwards (being denser and thus freshwater moves above the saline water) and freshwater is mixed downwards. This mixing causes a weak density current to flow (in addition to the tidal currents), which is a natural mechanism for maintaining a balance of fresh and saline water. This current flows upstream and is an important agent for the transportation of suspended sediment into the Thames Estuary. The near bed residual flows result in the formation of a null point where there is no net movement of water at the bed in either direction. During summer freshwater discharges, the null point is generally located along the Gallions, Barking and Halfway Reaches but variations such as freshwater input will cause the location of the null point to move up- or down- estuary (Royal Haskoning, 2004).

6.1.5 Tides and Tidal Range

The Thames Estuary is macrotidal with a mean spring tide range of 5.2 m at Sheerness gradually increasing upstream to 5.9 m at Tilbury and 6.6 m at London Bridge (United Kingdom Hydrographic Office, 2003). The increasing tidal range upstream is due to the funnelling effect of the estuary, which has gradually been magnified by the formation and subsequent land-claim of extensive areas of saltmarsh.

The Thames Estuary has historically experienced an increase in the elevation of high water levels. Rossiter (1969) showed that between 1934 and 1966 there were increases in mean high water (MHW) and mean low water (MLW) at both Southend-on-Sea and Tower Bridge. He found that superimposed on the 18.6 year (lunar) oscillation were other water level increases (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 Rate of increase of mean high water (MHW) and mean low water (MLW) or Southend-on-Sea and Tower Bridge between 1934 and 1966/69.

Source	Water level	Southend-on-Sea mm/yr	Tower Bridge mm/yr
<i>Rossiter, 1969</i>	MHW	3.63	7.75
	MLW	2.49	0.92
<i>Bowen, 1972</i>	MHW	3.51	6.80
	MLW	2.50	0.43

Overall, the data shows that an increase in tidal range has taken place, which itself increased steadily with distance upstream from Southend-on-Sea. An increase in tidal range of around 1-1.1 mm per year is described for Southend-on-Sea and 6.4-6.8 mm per year for Tower Bridge, between 1934 and 1969. The increase in tidal range is probably due to a combination of anthropogenic and natural causes (Royal Haskoning, 2004). Bowen (1972) considered that a large part of the observed increase in tidal range is likely to be due to the effects of embanking the estuary. Before construction of flood defences much of the water entering the Thames spread laterally to cover mudflats and saltmarshes. Flood defences have caused a loss of this water storage volume at

high tide levels, thus increasing the height of high water contained within the banks through morphological effects. Other contributory artificial causes may include the historic dredging of deeper shipping channels, the damming of tidal creeks and changes to estuary morphology caused by waterside developments. Natural causes also have an influence on tidal range, but the main drivers are difficult to ascertain. The predominant causes of the observed increase in tidal range appear to be (although not definitively) anthropogenic in nature; for this reason a simple extrapolation of the observed rates into the future would not be appropriate (Littlewood and Crossman, 2003) and further analytical work is required to (Littlewood et al., 2003):

- Determine the causes of the rise in water levels at Tower Bridge and their relative importance.
- Examine whether a rise at Tower Bridge will continue into the future and if so whether it will continue to be greater than the rise at Southend-on-Sea.

6.1.6 Storm Surges

The primary driver of flood risk along most of the Thames Estuary is tidal water level enhanced by a storm surge component. The incidence and magnitude of these surges depend on the air pressure and the severity of winds in the North Sea. Positive storm surges in the North Sea are generated by low air pressure combined with strong northerly winds. If the surge component peaks at the same time as high water (particularly spring tides) there will be a high risk of flooding unless the flood defences are able to cope with the increased elevation. Rossiter (1961) compiled surge data for Southend-on-Sea between 1928 and 1938 and showed a tendency for surges to be amplified by around 25% on the rising tide (over those at any other state), irrespective of whether the surges were negative or positive. Rossiter (1961) suggested that the propagation of the tide up the Thames Estuary is retarded (shifted back in time) by the presence of a negative surge and advanced (shifted forward in time) by a positive surge as a result of:

- The rate of progression is reduced by a reduction in water depth during a negative surge but increased by an increase in water depth during a positive surge.
- Bottom friction has the effect of retarding a wave, and as bottom friction is proportional to water depth a negative surge will increase frictional effects and a positive surge will decrease frictional effects.

Predicted tide levels in the Thames Estuary have been raised by as much as 2.5 m at high water, and up to 4 m on the rising tide by storm surges (Trafford, 1981; Horner, 1984). On the 1st February 1953, the storm surge increased the rising tide by 2.9 m and the high tide level at Tower Bridge by 1.9 m (Trafford, 1981).

6.1.7 Tidal Currents and Residual Currents

Tidal currents in the Thames Estuary show an increasing degree of asymmetry in an upstream direction. With the exception of Sheerness and Southend-on-Sea, the tidal wave becomes increasingly flood-dominated in an upstream direction. Between Sheerness and Gravesend, maximum ebb current velocities are in excess of the flood, whereas upstream of Gravesend the flood current velocities are in excess of the ebb

(Thorn and Burt, 1978). The switch of tidal dominance coincides with the narrowing of the channel into Long Reach; The Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993) suggested that the ebb dominance at Sheerness was due to the exit of the large tidal prism held in the Medway Estuary, confluent with the Thames Estuary through a constricted mouth at Sheerness.

Thorn and Burt (1978), using historical measured current velocity variation with depth in Halfway Reach (1968 and 1969), found that the velocities at all depths rose sharply after low water slack after which they decreased steadily to a smaller peak just before high water. During both the flood and the ebb tides, velocities generally increased with height above the bed.

The tidal current ebb- or flood-dominance has important implications for sediment transport in the Thames Estuary. Other things being equal, flood-dominance will tend to favour net movement of sediment into the estuary, whereas ebb-dominance will favour net export of sediment. However, this general scenario is complicated by the presence of upstream-directed density currents (see Section 6.1.4) which enhance the flood tidal currents, and if increased river flows occur, they will enhance the ebb tidal currents (especially in the upper reaches). In addition, it has been shown by HR Wallingford (2002e) that the flow regime of the Thames Estuary downstream of Gravesend Reach has three-dimensionality. 3D modelling demonstrates that, although secondary currents are weak in comparison to the main tidal current flows, the flow field has a complex vertical structure in both lateral and longitudinal directions (HR Wallingford, 2002d). Greater detail is now available from ADCP measurements carried out in parts of the estuary by the Port of London Authority to support the investigation of various developments in the Thames Estuary. These datasets provide full river-width current velocity distributions at intervals through the tidal cycle and support this view of a complex flow field (Littlewood and Crossman, 2003).

6.1.8 Waves

HR Wallingford (2002b) modelled the wave regime of the Thames Estuary in Lower Gravesend Reach, Lower Hope Reach and Sea Reach. They found that wind action is the main wave generation process in this part of the Thames Estuary as waves generated offshore were dissipated over the Outer Estuary banks and wide intertidal flats. They modelled waves generated by winds from the east and those from 205° representing waves generated locally from the south across Lower Hope Reach. They found relatively short wave periods and since the fetch is longest for winds from the south-east and east, these winds generally result in the highest wave conditions in this part of the Thames Estuary. However, a lot of energy is dissipated by the extensive offshore bank and channel system before the waves reach Sea Reach leading to relatively small overall wave heights (HR Wallingford, 2004). Significant wave heights were predicted to be slightly greater than 1.5 m at Coryton for 1 in 50 year winds from all directions and under 0.7 m for 10 times a year winds (at all water levels). Another method of wave generation in the estuary is that created by the passage of vessels. Although individually of less energy than wind-generated waves, they may be the largest waves in areas that are protected from wind waves and the passage of large vessels may also influence flow direction and turbulence and hence sediment mobilisation and net direction of transport.

6.1.9 Freshwater Input to the Estuary

The main freshwater input to the Thames Estuary is at Teddington; this has an average flow rate of $90 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). A long record of flow exists with the highest flow estimated at $1059 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ in 1894. Other major fluvial events occurred in 1947 ($714 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$) and 2003 ($461 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$) (Littlewood and Crossman, 2003). Tributary inputs are relatively small (10-15% of the total flow) compared to the main input at Teddington. Average freshwater inputs are very small compared to tidal discharge in the estuary (Inglis and Allen, 1957). Using ADCP measurements in July 2001, HR Wallingford (2002d) reported tidal discharges of up to $15,000 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ on both flood and ebb tides (in Lower Hope Reach).

Freshwater input also partly influences morphology through the salinity regime in terms of the position of the null point for sedimentation. Crooks (1994) analysed water level records over the last 100 years for locks upstream of Teddington, and found that there was a greater number of above average peaks before 1940 than after 1940. This work concluded that channel dredging in the upper parts of the Thames and flood prevention schemes have resulted in localised decline in peak flood levels and event duration (particularly since dredging of the main fresh watercourses took place in the 1930s and 1940s); this may have influenced sediment supply to the estuarine parts of the system.

6.1.10 Sediment Sources

Sediment Provenance

It is likely that the sediment is derived from multiple sources (Royal Haskoning, 2004). During the Holocene the estuary has partially filled with marine, estuarine and freshwater sediments derived from 'natural' sources such as the underlying bedrock and reworking of the Holocene sediments themselves. The modern sources of sediment include these sources together with other anthropogenic (industrial) sources not available to the system prior to human influence (HR Wallingford, 2004). Prentice (1972) suggested that the dominant source of muddy sediment during the Holocene was the London Clay under the lower reaches of the estuary. Other sources may include the London Clay cliffs of the Isle of Sheppey (Nicholls et al., 2000) and sediment transported down the East Anglian coast and from the Essex cliffs (Marsland, 1986). It may be that far-field sources supply suspended sediment into the western North Sea where it accumulates in the 'Thames Embayment' immediately offshore of the estuary (east of a line between Walton-on-the-Naze and North Foreland). This sediment slowly enters the estuary where it becomes trapped in the tidal oscillations. The origin of bedload (fine to medium-grained sand) is believed to be mainly from reworking of earlier Thames/Medway Pleistocene fluvial sediments, from cliff erosion in Kent, Essex and Suffolk and from Tertiary sea bed exposures.

Nature of Bed Sediments

The characteristics of the bed sediments of the Inner Thames Estuary vary across and along the estuary. British Geological Survey (1997) and HR Wallingford, 2002d, e, 2004) showed that between Erith and Canvey Island the main subtidal channel generally comprises sand and gravel. To the east of Canvey Island, these sediments are replaced by mainly sand. The Outer Thames Estuary intertidal flats are characterised by sediment with high sand content due to the winnowing action of waves generated locally and those that propagate into the estuary from the North Sea. Mean sediment

particle size becomes markedly smaller up-river into the Inner Thames Estuary. Mucking Flats are typified by mud whereas Blyth Sands/Yantlet Flats are muddy towards the high water mark becoming sandy towards the low water mark with a transition zone between the two (British Geological Survey, 1997; HR Wallingford, 2002d, e). A thin strip of coarser sediment (gravel and conglomerates) is generally found at the base of the flood defences backing the intertidal flats. Information on bed characteristics upstream of Erith is limited.

6.1.11 Sediment Transport

Influence of Turbidity Maximum

Littlewood and Crossman (2003) divided the Inner Thames Estuary into four suspended sediment zones on spring tides (they suggested that little sediment is in suspension on neap tides). From Teddington to Lower Pool the suspended load is low, there is little deposition on the bed and banks of the river, and much of the sediment passes through downstream. The second zone, downstream to Erith Reach, includes the turbidity maximum which forms around the null point in Gallions, Barking and Halfway Reaches. This is a zone where large concentrations of suspended sediment accumulate (collectively known as the 'Mud Reaches') which coincides with the limit of saline water intrusion (Inglis and Allen, 1957). Turbulence and the high concentrations of sediment in this zone encourage flocculation, and deposition occurs. The exact position of the turbidity maximum is sensitive to tidal range, changes of sea level, and the seasonal variability of the freshwater flow and saline tidal flow (Kendrick, 1972; Littlewood and Crossman, 2003). During periods of higher river discharge (winter flows), the saline water is pushed seawards and sediments are flushed out of the Mud Reaches and stored downriver in the Gravesend Reach area. During periods of lower river discharge (summer flows), there is a gradual upriver migration of the saline water, modifying residual flows and sediments gather and settle back in the Mud Reaches. Littlewood and Crossman (2003) suggested that the upriver migration of sediment is a slow process (months) because the forces are weak. However, the first freshwater flow of sufficient strength will rapidly move the 'summer' load back to the position it occupied before. They suggested that the downriver movement takes the form of a high suspended sediment concentration close to the bed and in the deeper parts of the channel, with only a small percentage at higher levels in the water column. Inglis and Allen (1957) observed that a sustained increase in river flow of around 1-2 weeks caused the Barking Reaches channel to deepen by over 0.5 m in the shoal areas. They suggested three reasons for the change:

- The silt-laden water in the Mud Reaches is pushed downstream and replaced by relatively clear water which encourages re-suspension of the bed and hence scour.
- The high river flow appreciably increases the ebb discharge and thus physically scour the bed.
- The almost fresh upland water acts as a dispersing or deflocculating agent on the uppermost layers of consolidated mud thus reducing the effective particle size and bonding of particles and making them more readily transportable.

Suspended Sediment Transport

Once the suspended sediment enters the Inner Estuary system, material movement and accumulation is complex. Using measurements taken in 1953, Inglis and Allen (1957)

showed a striking drop in suspended sediment concentration upstream of the Mud Reaches (Figure 6.4) with concentrations in Upper Pool and Bugsby's Reach consistently below 200 ppm. The concentrations rise to a peak near the upper end of the Mud Reaches and gradually decrease seawards. They also described higher concentrations of suspended sediment on the ebb than on the flood. This may be a result of the differential re-suspension of sediment after low water slack and high water slack. On low water slack sediment settles out to form a high concentration (100,000-150,000 ppm) fluid mud layer close to the bed. Some of the sediment at the base of this mud layer consolidates under its own weight raising the bed level, effectively removing it from re-suspension. At high water slack some suspended sediment again settles out but it is brought back into suspension by the ebb current. More thorough mixing takes place during the ebb, with consequently higher concentrations in the middle to surface layers.

As a result of suspended sediment monitoring, Thorn and Burt (1978) were able to propose several longitudinal areas of the estuary which act as temporary sediment stores releasing and accumulating sediment on a semi-diurnal and spring tide cycle. On the flood tide, sediment deposited on the previous low slack water is re-entrained and moved upstream in a series of 'jumps' corresponding to the 16 km tidal excursion and is then re-deposited at high slack water. On the following ebb tide almost all of this sediment is re-entrained and moved downstream once more where it is deposited close to the original source area at low slack water. Thus the temporary storage areas in the lower estuary supply sediment only on the flood and receive it again only on the ebb, whereas storage areas in the middle estuary, between Gravesend Reach and Blackwall Reach, both receive and supply during flood and ebb. In contrast, the most landward temporary store, in the Syon Reach, receives only on the flood and supplies only on the ebb.

A programme of water sampling at discrete points in the estuary downstream of Gravesend Reach was undertaken in July 2001 by HR Wallingford (2002e). They found a marked concentration gradient with spring tide near-bed levels up to 2000 mg/l in Lower Hope Reach decreasing to 1000 mg/l at Coryton to less than 100 mg/l at Southend-on-Sea. A similar pattern emerged from the neap tide measurements with highs of up to 500 mg/l in Lower Hope Reach and lows of less than 100 mg/l at Southend-on-Sea. They also showed vertical layers on both spring and neap tides; at high water bed concentrations were an order of magnitude greater than mid-depth concentrations and at other states of the tide were several times higher.

HR Wallingford (2002c) modelled fine sand transport (median diameter 0.1 mm) transport in the estuary downstream of Gravesend and found a net spring and neap tide sediment flux out of the estuary (i.e. export of sediment). Tidal currents transported a majority of the sediment with negligible wave influence. These results support the general conclusions that the estuary is ebb-dominated downstream of Gravesend and wave heights are relatively small and have less influence on the sediment movements.

More recently, it has been recognised that single point measurements in the estuary may not provide information on the full complexity of suspended sediment distribution. For example, the presence of wide meanders influences suspended sediment transport. The interaction of these meanders (and the secondary currents set up by them) with the

adjacent intertidal mudflats gives rise to a complex suspended sediment regime with large fluxes of sediment moving on and off the mudflats, with subsequent morphological change (HR Wallingford, 2004, Royal Haskoning, 2004). Bed sediments can also change across the section from the outer to inner part of the meander: For example, the meander separating Gravesend Reach and Lower Hope Reach results in secondary currents that move near-bed sediment towards the inside of the meander increasing suspended sediment concentrations relative to the outside of the meander (HR Wallingford, 2002e).

Sediment Transport as Bedload

On the south shore of the Outer Thames Estuary, longshore sediment transport is inclined to the west under the action of north-easterly waves although this is largely interrupted at the Isle of Sheppey by the River Swale and at the Isle of Grain by the outflow of the River Medway (Welsby and Motyka, 1987). The net transport of sediment decreases in magnitude upstream in the estuary and is generally less than 5000 m³ per year (Scott Wilson, 1998). Scott Wilson (1998) argued that Kentish Flats and Whitstable Flats (intertidal areas) attenuate the wave energy that would otherwise reach the Isle of Sheppey, and they may therefore influence the relatively low rates of sediment transport along this shoreline.

These results indicate that movement of sediment as bedload is very small in comparison to the loads of suspended sediment that are carried into and out of the estuary.

6.1.12 Response of Intertidal Areas to Historic Sea-Level Rise

The data suggest that vertical accretion on the intertidal areas of Blyth Sands/Yantlet Flats and Mucking Flats and the saltmarshes downstream of Gravesend has exceeded sea level rise over the past 30 years (Royal Haskoning, 2004). However, some areas of intertidal flat along the northern shore (e.g. Southend Flat) appear to have eroded over this time period. Overall, Blyth Sands/Yantlet Flats have vertically accreted at a rate of 4-5 mm per year between 1970 and 1998 (HR Wallingford, 2002a). Similarly, Mucking Flats has accreted by around 11 mm per year during the same time period (HR Wallingford, 2002e). Vertical accretion rates on saltmarsh surfaces have been measured up to 3.9 mm per year at Higham and 3.4 mm per year at Benfleet. Historic relative sea-level rise has varied between 1.22 and 2.14 mm per year (Woodworth et al., 1999) and as such, sediment availability to the estuary downstream of Gravesend is adequate to meet demand under current environmental conditions.

6.1.13 Sediment Budget

The definition of sediment budgets for estuaries are challenging, particularly for large estuaries such as the Thames, with many (and generally difficult to quantify) anthropogenic (particularly historic dredging and disposal) forcing factors. Only one sediment budget has been published for the Thames Estuary (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). This budget suggests that the estuary exists in a balance between sediment deposition and erosion over a number of tidal cycles or seasons, and there is neither loss nor gain of sediment from the estuary. This assertion, if proven, suggests the system is in dynamic equilibrium and this would include the influence of dredging activities. It should be recognised that such equilibrium may be disrupted by

new anthropogenic factors, or by accelerated sea-level rise, or by change in components of the budget such as discharge of sewage effluent (HR Wallingford, 2004, Royal Haskoning, 2004).

One of the main difficulties in being definitive about the sediment budget is the small amount of net sediment movement during a tidal cycle compared to the very large volumes of water and sediment moved (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993): For example, at Southend-on-Sea, the instantaneous discharge on a spring tide is around $42,500 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ and the background suspended sediment concentration is around 50 ppm (Thorn and Burt, 1978). Therefore, around 2 tonnes of sediment are transported across a given section of the estuary every second, which equates to 46,000 tonnes on a typical spring tide. Of this amount, it is estimated (using the budget in Table 6.2) that less than 300 tonnes (less than 0.7%) is retained in the estuary on the flood tide, the rest is returned to the sea on the ebb tide.

Table 6.2 A proposed sediment budget for the Thames Estuary using data from 1940 to 1988 (figures in m^3 per year) (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993).

Location	Source	Sink
Saltmarsh	65,000	
Mudflat	50,000	98,600
Subtidal (dredged)		250,000
Fluvial	27,000	
Marine Source	206,100	
Total	348,600	348,600

Subtidal Channel

The average annual volume of sediment dredged from the estuary channel since 1961 is around $225,000 \text{ m}^3$. Assuming a dry density for this sediment in the hoppers and barges is around 500 kgm^{-3} (bulk density of 1300 kgm^{-3}) then the approximate mass of sediment presently extracted from the estuary (sink) is 113,000 tonnes per year and hence this is re-supplied to the system from the various sediment sources.

Blyth Sands and Yantlet Flats

HR Wallingford (2002a) showed that the volume of sediment on the intertidal flats of Blyth Sands and Yantlet Flats increased by $2.39 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ between 1970 and 1998. Using a dry density of 1000 kgm^{-3} for soft silts, this equates to an annual mass increase (sink) of 86,000 tonnes per year.

Mucking Flats

HR Wallingford (2002a) showed that the volume of sediment on the intertidal flats of Mucking Flats increased by $8.55 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^3$ between 1970 and 1998. This equates to an annual volume increase (sink) of $31,000 \text{ m}^3$ or approximately 31,000 tonnes per year.

Saltmarsh

Burd (1992) calculated that between 1973 and 1988, $0.98 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ of saltmarsh were eroded in the Inner Thames Estuary (between Higham Marshes and Shoebury Ness). Assuming that the surface of the saltmarsh is elevated 1 m above the level of the

mudflat, and the erosion rate has continued to the present day then 65,000 m³ (65,000 tonnes) of eroded saltmarsh is yielded every year. In terms of a sediment sink, if it is assumed that accretion of sediment on the saltmarsh surface averages around 3.0 mm per year (1.9-3.9 mm per year at Higham and 3.4 mm per year at Benfleet) then using the 1988 area of saltmarsh of 3.2 x 10⁶ m² equates to a maximum sink of 9600 m³ per year or approximately 9600 tonnes per year.

Fluvial

Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993) estimated an annual fluvial input of suspended solids of 28,000 m³. Using a dry density of 1000 kgm⁻³ for the sediment, this equates to a mass of 28,000 tonnes per year.

The Environment Agency and its predecessors have dredged the River Thames upstream of the tidal limit at Teddington for many years with records going back to the 1930s. These schemes now present the Agency with an ongoing liability to maintain the design channel profiles and this means that over the last 10 years, on average, about 40,000 tonnes are dredged annually (Kirby, 2000). Dredgings are currently disposed of at a licensed waste site known as Penton Hook Pit, a former gravel pit adjacent to the Thames and thus are removed from being available to the system.

Response of Estuary to Accelerated Sea-Level Rise

An important question with respect to the future morphological development of the Thames Estuary is whether accretion on the intertidal areas will be able to keep pace with potential accelerated sea-level rise. This is presently a difficult question to answer in the absence of a definitive sediment budget, although several attempts, using different methods, have been made to look at the estuary response based on the available data.

The Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993) suggested that under an accelerated rate of sea-level rise, a net loss of intertidal surface area would be likely, although vertical accretion may continue on some intertidal surfaces. They envisaged that this net loss would result in a narrowing of the foreshore, leading to reduced attenuation of wave and tidal energy. It was also suggested that the response of the Thames Estuary to sea-level rise over the next 100 years would be to roll-over in a landward direction. This means that the entire estuary sediment system would transgress landward with sea-level rise causing the pattern of sediment entrainment, transport and deposition to also migrate upstream. To achieve this transgressive movement the estuary must redistribute sediment landward but must also receive sediment inputs from marine sources equivalent to the rate of sea-level rise as the system elevates with the tidal frame. Posford Haskoning (2002a) predicted that for the Thames Estuary this landward migration rate would be around 12.5 m per year assuming an accelerated sea-level rise of 6 mm per year (medium-high scenario).

A combination of process based modelling and historical trend analysis (HR Wallingford, 2002a-f) showed that long term changes observed between 1970 and 1998 could be accounted for by the intertidal processes of accretion at high water and erosion under wave and tidal action as predicted by the sediment transport models. They found that on average Mucking Flats increased in volume by about 30,000 m³ per year but slightly reduced in area (less than 1000 m² per year) (HR Wallingford, 2002a). Mucking Flats

was observed to be rising at average rates of between 7 mm and 26 mm per year. They also found that (western) Blyth Sands reduced in volume by about 40,000 m³ per year but increased in area by about 9,000 m² per year. The upper parts of the intertidal area were lowering by about 12 mm per year. Overall, in the period 1970-1998 these intertidal areas underwent net accretion of about 400,000 m³ and the elevations adjacent to the mudflats accreted or eroded at rates substantially greater than observed rates of sea level rise (around 2 mm per year).

If in the medium term, the intertidal areas downstream of Gravesend continued to respond in the same way they have been observed to change between 1970 and 1998, then in ten years time Mucking Flats would be expected to rise in level by between 70 and 260 mm but reduce in area by about 10,000 m². The upper parts of Blyth Sands would reduce in level by 120 mm and the lower parts would accrete by 80 mm because of an increase in area due to a lower intertidal accretion of about 90,000 m³. HR Wallingford (2002a-f) did not propose extrapolation of these rates of change beyond a ten year period and they found no evidence of net erosion of the intertidal areas of the estuary between Gravesend and Canvey Island (which is implied in the Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993 and Haskoning, 2002a predictive studies).

The HR Wallingford results may simply reflect the change in the system from one where (historically) dynamic equilibrium has been reached to one of transition in relation to rising sea levels where the roll-over of the estuary inland to be commencing. However, the roll-over method operates on the basis of potential sediment movement allowing the estuary to adjust to the new tidal frame. The difficulty with applying roll-over to the Thames Estuary is the likelihood that sediment movement will be laterally constrained by flood defences and other developments and the transgression may have 'nowhere to go' upstream because this boundary of the estuary is constrained by Teddington Weir and development.

The findings of HR Wallingford (2002a) are based upon historical trend analysis and are in broad agreement with process model predictions. Their predictions do not apply to the entire estuary and there is limited historical data on the changes in the downstream intertidal areas. Collectively these studies provide a basis for prediction that needs to be proven or disproven once better information on sediment and historical trend analysis data becomes available.

6.1.14 Summary of Morphological Characteristics

Historic morphological change in the Thames Estuary can be divided into two periods. The first, from the middle of the 19th century until around 1970, was a period when many natural morphological changes were masked by extensive anthropogenic activity, such as flood defences, dredging programmes, waterside schemes and developments. The second period, from 1970 to the present day, corresponds with the implementation of legislation to control waterside activities enabling the estuary to (commence a process to) establish a more natural regime (HR Wallingford, 2003, 2004, Royal Haskoning, 2004). Morphological change in the estuary post-1970 is therefore more representative as a baseline to future development than the long term development (pre- and post-1970s combined), which must be set within the context of large artificial changes to the estuary.

Subtidal Channel

Estuarine channels experience natural periodic shifts in position, due to gradual meander migration or more sudden changes during periods of high river flow, extreme tides or strong winds. A lateral shift in the position of the subtidal channel may over time produce a change in the slope of the intertidal profile and may alter the wave and tidal energy impinging on the shoreline. Historic changes in the position and depth of the Thames Estuary subtidal channel are difficult to ascertain because of the influence of dredging and disposal activities. This is exemplified by two examples:

- A major programme of capital dredging took place between 1909 and 1928 to improve navigation in the Yantlet Dredged Channel. It was further deepened in 1965 and much of the dredged sediment was deposited in Leigh Channel to the north to encourage flow in the Yantlet Channel (HR Wallingford, 2002a).
- The navigation channel in Lower Gravesend Reach migrated to the south after dredging was undertaken in 1963/64. The dredged sediment may have been used to close the previous (more northerly) alignment of the navigation channel.

However, in broad terms, and from both natural and anthropogenic influences, between 1820 and 1988 the subtidal channel increased in width between Lower Hope Reach and the eastern tip of Canvey Island, and narrowed between Canvey Island and the Isle of Grain (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). These changes were due to advance or retreat of the adjacent intertidal areas. During a similar period (1834 to 1957/59), HR Wallingford (2003) found that in Lower Hope Reach and Upper Sea Reach, the deep water channel deepened. Between 1920 and 1957/59, this deepening was accompanied by a shallowing of the subtidal areas fronting Mucking Flats and Blyth Sands. These changes are also influenced by the large-scale historic ballast winning and disposal activities in Lower Hope Reach. A more complex pattern of change occurred between 1957/59 and 1970/71, related to realignment of the navigation channel in Lower Gravesend Reach in the 1960s. Overall, between 1920 and 2002, the deep water channel has deepened significantly in Lower Hope Reach and Upper Sea Reach and the subtidal areas adjacent to the intertidal flats have shallowed (HR Wallingford, 2003, 2004).

Intertidal Flats

Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993) showed that between 1820 and 1940 (using a comparison of the low water mark on Ordnance Survey maps) the area of intertidal flat downstream of Gravesend increased by $4.86 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$, but decreased by $1.26 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ between 1940 and 1988 (Table 6.3). The decrease occurred mainly because a decrease on the north side of the Thames was greater than a continued increase on the south side. The increase mainly occurred at the low water mark (the low tide boundary of the mudflats encroaching into the subtidal channel) rather than at the boundary with the adjacent saltmarshes. The decrease on the north bank may be due to the increased land-claim and industrialisation that took place here during the mid 20th century.

Table 6.3 Areas of intertidal flat in the Thames Estuary downstream of Gravesend in 1820, 1940 and 1988 (from Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993)

Location	Area (10 ⁶ m ²) in 1820	Area (10 ⁶ m ²) in 1940	Area(10 ⁶ m ²) in 1988
North Bank	23.14	24.94	22.43
South Bank	20.36	23.40	24.65
Total	43.48	48.34	47.08

The extensive intertidal flats downstream of Gravesend can be divided into shorter sections for a more detailed appraisal of change. It should be recognised that these areas exhibit dynamic change on a short term basis but also some assessments have been made of longer term processes. The areas are: on the south bank,

- Blyth Sands.
- Yantlet Flats/Grain Spit

and on the north bank,

- Mucking Flats
- Canvey Island (Chapman Sands, Marsh End Sand, Leigh Sand)
- Southend Flat.

Blyth Sands – According to Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993) the northern edge of Blyth Sands fronting Cliffe and Halstow Marshes generally retreated between 1820 and 1940. Between 1940 and 1988 the edge generally advanced seaward, possibly responding to loss of mudflat at Coryton on the opposite bank (dredging of the channel close inshore, deepening the berths at the oil refinery jetties), allowing the main channel to maintain a constant width. This scenario is supported by the results of HR Wallingford (2002a) who showed more deep water adjacent to Coryton in 1970 compared to 1834. HR Wallingford (2002a, c) also showed that the surface of Blyth Sands lowered by up to 1 m over the period 1970-1998 (an average vertical erosion of 12 mm per year), even though accretion (up to 4 m, an average of around 100 mm per year) had taken place around the low water mark (Figure 6.3). These changes equate to an increase in area of around 4% ($5.93 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ to $6.19 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$) but a volume decrease of more than 11% ($9.5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ to $8.4 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$). HR Wallingford (2002f) showed a continuation of general lowering of the Blyth Sands surface between 1998 and 2002, but at a higher rate. They also found a lower rate of general accretion around the lower water mark during this 4-year period compared to 1970-1998.

Yantlet Flats/Grain Spit - There has been significant general accretion along the low water mark of Yantlet Flats fronting St Mary's and Allhallows Marshes between 1820 and 1988 (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993; HR Wallingford, 2002a). HR Wallingford (2002a) also demonstrated that the main body of the flats has accreted vertically by around 0.5 m between 1970 and 1998, and the flats around the low water mark by up to 8 m. These changes equate to an increase in area of around 16% (11.22

$\times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ to $12.98 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$) and a volume increase of around 15% ($22.9 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ to $26.4 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$).

Mucking Flats – Between 1820 and 1988, the southern part of the mudflats at Mucking (opposite East Tilbury) generally advanced into the subtidal channel whilst the northern portion (Mucking) generally retreated, with most of the movement taking place between 1940 and 1988 (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). HR Wallingford (2002a) showed a similar trend around the low water mark between 1959 and 1998 and a general vertical accretion (0.5-2 m) of the main body of the flats over the same period. They found that the change had been fairly continuous over the period and was not influenced significantly by the anthropogenic activities that took place in the area in the 1960s. HR Wallingford (2002e) described an average vertical accretion rate of 11 mm per year for the entire intertidal area, between 1970 and 1998, although rates of 20-40 mm per year occurred at the northern end (HR Wallingford, 2002f) and some erosion took place at the southern end (towards low water mark). Area and volume comparisons of Mucking Flats between 1970 and 1998 revealed an overall decrease in area above Chart Datum of less than 1% ($2.74 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ to $2.72 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$) but a general volume increase of 12% ($7.2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ to $8.1 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) (HR Wallingford, 2002a). However, HR Wallingford (2002e, d) demonstrated that between 1998 and 2002, Mucking Flats generally lost volume. They postulated two reasons for this change, and the concurrent changes occurring on Blyth Sands (see above):

- Increased wind speeds (and hence increased wave activity) in the 1998-2002 period relative to those experienced 1970-1998.
- Unusually high freshwater flow experienced in winter 2000/2001 causing a change in salinity, tidal flows and hence suspended sediment concentrations.

The 1998-2002 bed level changes could be a short-term perturbation, and hence they may demonstrate the natural variation of change that can occur, within the longer-term trend described by the 1970-1998 data (HR Wallingford, 2002f). Alternatively this could be a more significant change in the processes that future measurement may be able to confirm.

Canvey Island – The intertidal flats in front of Canvey Island have generally retreated between 1820 and 1988 (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). Prior to 1909, Chapman Sands and Marsh End Sand to the east of Canvey Island were receding westwards, but since 1909 they have generally extended eastwards. The movement of Marsh End Sand has resulted in a northward shift of Ray Gut and erosion of the mudflats (Leigh Sand) to its north-east.

Southend Flat – Southend Flat has suffered erosion to the west of Southend-on-Sea Pier (due to the northward movement of Ray Gut), while the creek systems draining the flats have enlarged and migrated (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). HR Wallingford (2002a) also showed a general loss of intertidal flat volume at Canvey Island and Southend-on-Sea between 1970 and 1998.

Saltmarsh

Maps of 1820 show that large areas of saltmarsh had already been enclosed (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993). It is likely that early (14th-16th century) land-

claims were piecemeal with construction of walls by landowners to protect their property. However, out of this piecemeal approach a fairly uniform sea wall fronting the Thames Estuary developed. Burd (1992) showed that between 1973 and 1988, $4.44 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ of saltmarsh identified between Higham Marshes and Shoebury Ness in 1973 had been reduced to $3.21 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ by 1988, a loss of 28%. Of the $1.23 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ lost (1.06 on the north bank and 0.17 on the south bank), $0.98 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ were lost through erosion and $0.25 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^2$ through land-claim.

The main mechanism of saltmarsh erosion over the last 30 years is considered to be increased wave energy at the seaward edge (Pye, 2000; Van der Wal and Pye, 2004). The periods 1970-73, 1976-79 and 1985-88 in particular, are characterised by stormy conditions with sustained periods of strong winds and waves from the south-east and east. The erosion is concentrated along the seaward edge of the saltmarshes which are exposed to wave action (e.g. Leigh Marsh and Canvey Point, Cooper *et al.*, 2000), whereas the more sheltered saltmarshes, in Benfleet and Holehaven Creeks, have not experienced a retreat of their seaward edges.

6.2 Water quality

6.2.1 Methodology

The following section describes the water quality of study area of the Thames Estuary. Water quality is important benthic infauna and hence the feeding resource for waterfowl can be impacted as a consequence of poor water quality.

Water quality data is predominantly collected by the Environment Agency in response to legislative requirements. Data is then compared against environmental quality standards (EQS), which are designed to protect the environment and human health. In the Thames estuary study area there are a number of applicable EC Directives which trigger a requirement for monitoring. Applicable legislation is listed below:

- EC Bathing Waters Directive;
- EC Shellfish Waters Directive;
- EC Shellfish Hygiene Directive; and
- EC Dangerous Substances Directive.

The water quality data for the Thames Estuary has therefore been largely derived from monitoring carried out by the Environment Agency. The exception is the information provided by the Food Standards Agency for data collected under the Shellfish Hygiene Directive.

6.2.2 Bathing water quality

There are nine designated bathing waters located in the outer estuary, some of which are located directly on the boundary of the study area and some outside. These bathing waters are shown as individual locations on Figure 6.5 and reflect the Environment Agency's monitoring points.

Bathing water quality is assessed by standards listed in the EC Bathing Waters Directive. The Directive was adopted by the Council of the European Communities in 1975 and transposed into law for England and Wales to form the Bathing Waters (Classification) Regulations 1991. The Directive is concerned with the quality of bathing waters for the purpose of protecting public health and requires monitoring of microbiological parameters and a small number of physical parameters e.g. visible oil.




Figure 6.5 Locations and quality of Environment Agency bathing waters within the study area

There are two types of microbiological standards set out in the Directive, namely the mandatory standards and the more stringent guideline standards.

The mandatory standards are:

- 10,000 total coliforms per 100 ml of water; and
- 2,000 faecal coliforms per 100 ml of water.

For a bathing water to comply with the Directive, 95% of samples collected within a bathing season (15th May to 30th September) must meet these and the other physical criteria.

The guideline standards should be achieved where possible and are:

- 500 total coliforms per 100 ml of water (in 80% samples);
- 100 faecal coliforms per 100 ml of water (in 80% samples); and
- 100 faecal streptococci per 100 ml of water (in 90% samples).

Bathing water quality at each of the bathing waters for the period 2000 to 2005 is illustrated in Table 6.4. Water quality is classified as 'excellent', 'good' or 'poor'. 'Excellent' relates to the achievement of the more stringent guideline standards and 'good' relates to the achievement of the mandatory standards. Bathing waters classified as 'poor', fail to meet the Directive's minimum mandatory standard. The majority of the bathing waters in the area have exhibited either good or excellent quality for at least the last five years. Where designation of the bathing water has occurred within the five years, bathing waters have exhibited either good or excellent quality for at least the last three years.

Table 6.4 Bathing water quality at the designated bathing waters located in or close to the boundary of the study area.

Bathing Water	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Sheerness	E	E	E	E	G	E
Leysdown	G	G	G	E	G	E
Shoebury East	E	E	E	E	E	E
Southend Thorpe Bay	G	G	E	G	G	G
Southend Jubilee ¹	-	-	-	G	E	E
Southend Three Shells ²	-	E	E	G	G	E
Southend Westcliff Bay	G	G	E	G	E	E
Southend Chalkwell ¹	-	-	-	G	G	G
Leigh Bell Wharf ¹	-	-	-	E	G	E

Bathing Waters Classifications: E = Excellent, G = Good, P = Poor

¹ Bathing waters were newly designated in 2002/03.

² Bathing water was newly designated in 2000.


The European Commission put forward a proposal to revise the EC Bathing Waters Directive in December 2000. Although the publication of the revision was expected in June 2002, it is still in discussion. If the Directive revision is accepted, there will be significant changes in the parameters, standards and classification systems.

6.2.3 Shellfish Water Quality

There are six designated shellfish waters located in or close to the study area. The location of these shellfish waters can be seen in Figure 6.6.

Foulness, Southend, Outer Thames, Sheppey, Swalecliffe and Margate

Scale - 1:400000



NB: Any land above the Mean High Water Mark is excluded from the designation e.g., islands that fall within these areas .

Figure 6.6 The surface waters (shellfish) (Classification) Regulations 1997 map showing the designated shellfish waters.

The Shellfish Waters Directive (79/923/EEC) is designed to protect the aquatic habitat of the bivalve and gastropod molluscan species of shellfish. Species covered include oysters, mussels, cockles, scallops and clams but not shellfish crustaceans such as crabs, crayfish and lobsters. The Shellfish Waters Directive is implemented in the UK under the Shellfish Waters (Shellfish) (Classifications) Regulations 1997.

Shellfish waters are monitored for various parameters based on water quality standards established by the Directive. These parameters include suspended solids, salinity, dissolved oxygen (DO), organo-halogenated substances (e.g. PCBs, organochlorine pesticides), metals and guideline values for coliforms in shellfish flesh. For each substance, the Directive specifies the minimum number of samples to be taken, the water quality standards to be met and the percentage of samples that must meet these standards. The standards are either a numeric limit or a descriptive standard (see Table 6.5). The water quality standards have been met if the following percentage of the samples analysed do not exceed the limit values:

- 100% for metals and organo-halogen compounds;
- 95% for salinity and dissolved oxygen (DO);

- 75% for other substances; and
- No evidence of harm to the shellfish from organo-halogenated compounds.

Table 6.5 Selected imperative standards for shellfish waters

Parameter	Units	Standard
Suspended solids	mg/l	A discharge affecting shellfish waters must not cause the suspended solid content of the waters to exceed by more than 30% the content of waters not affected.
Salinity	Parts per thousand (i.e. g/l)	≤40 parts per thousand A discharge affecting shellfish waters must not cause the salinity to exceed by more than 10% the salinity of the waters not affected.
Dissolved oxygen	% saturation	Average of individual values >70% and an individual measurement may not indicate a value lower than 60% unless there are no harmful consequences for the development of shellfish colonies.
Organo-halogenated substances	-	The concentration of each substance in the shellfish waters or in the shellfish flesh must not reach or exceed a level, which has harmful effects on the shellfish and their larvae.
Metals (Ag, As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Hg, Ni, Pb, Zn)	mg/l	The concentration of each substance in the shellfish waters or in the shellfish flesh must not reach or exceed a level, which has harmful effects on the shellfish and their larvae. The synergic effects of these metals must be taken into consideration.

Table 6.6 summarises the Environment Agency's shellfish water quality monitoring data for the designated shellfish waters for the period 1999 to 2001. Samples are taken at designated points within each of the shellfish water selected to be representative of the quality of the whole area of shellfish water.

Table 6.6 Summary of shellfish waters quality (mean concentrations of physicochemical parameters) for 1999 to 2001. (Source Environment Agency)

Parameter	Units	Southend	Outer Thames	Foulness	Sheppey
Suspended solids	mg.l ⁻¹	31	27	No data	33
Salinity	g.l ⁻¹	28	31	No data	31
Dissolved oxygen	% saturation	94	103	103	100
Organo-halogenated substances	µg.l ⁻¹	All reported as "<" values. All values <0.005 µg.l ⁻¹ (or less)	All reported as "<" values. All values <0.005 µg.l ⁻¹ (or less)	All reported as "<" values. All values <0.005 µg.l ⁻¹ (or less)	Many reported as "<" values. All values <10 µg.l ⁻¹ (or less). Variations include total values of DDT, HCH and 'drins, for which no data has been recorded since December 2000
Metals (dissolved)	µg.l ⁻¹				
As		1.92	1.48	1.41	1.7
Cd		0.06	0.12	0.18	<0.25
Cr		0.26	0.52	0.70	0.55
Cu		4.17	3.20	1.55	2.23
Hg		0.03	0.02	0.02	<0.01
Ni		1.63	1.11	0.93	<3
Pb		0.33	0.19	1.2	<2.5
Zn		9.78	5.12	9.87	7.90

6.2.4 Shellfish quality

The Shellfish Hygiene Directive, although not a Directive directly protecting water quality, stipulates the level of treatment required depending on numbers of bacteria in the shellfish flesh. This Directive is designed to protect human health. Since shellfish are grown in the natural environment, it is a commonly held view that the concentration of bacteria in the flesh directly relates to the quality of the surrounding water in which they grow. The monitoring undertaken as a consequence of this Directive can therefore be used as an indicator of water quality.

Under the Shellfish Hygiene Directive, standards are set in terms of concentrations of coliform bacteria and salmonella. Shellfish are classed in categories 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'P' where 'A' is the highest quality and can be collected direct for human consumption. 'P' is the poorest quality and shellfish are prohibited from collection. Monitoring for the Shellfish Hygiene Directive is carried out by the local authorities and the data is collated by the Food Standards Agency. Table 6.7 lists the designated bivalve mollusc production areas in the study area and their individual classifications.

Table 6.7 Designated bivalve mollusc production areas in the Thames estuary from 1 September 2004. (Source: Food Standards Agency, 2005)

Bed Name	Species	Common Name	Class
Thames Estuary			
Nid and NE Maplin Sands	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	A
Foulness Sands	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	A
Leigh Foreshore	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	C
Leigh Foreshore	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	C
Chapman Sands	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	C
Chapman Sands	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	C
Southend Flats	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	C
Southend Flats	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
West of Southend Pier	<i>C.gigas</i>	Pacific Oyster	B
Phoenix	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
East Shoebury Beacon	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
Scrapsgate	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
Yantlet Flats	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Grain	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Sheppey	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
North Kent Coast			
The South Oaze	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Whitstable	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Whitstable Bay	<i>C.gigas</i>	Pacific oyster	B
Hern Hampton	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Beltinge Bay	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Herne	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Reculver	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Swalecliffe	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Pollard	<i>C.gigas</i>	Pacific oyster	B
Pollard	<i>T.philippinaru</i>	Manila Clam	B
Pollard	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
East Last Bank	<i>Ostrea edulis</i>	Native or flat oyster	B
East Last Bank	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Clite Hole	<i>Ostrea edulis</i>	Native or flat oyster	B
Clite Hole	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
The Street	<i>Ostrea edulis</i>	Native or flat oyster	B
The Street	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Kentish Flats	<i>Ostrea edulis</i>	Native or flat oyster	A
Kentish Flats	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B

Bed Name	Species	Common Name	Class
North of Hook	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
South of Hook	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
Margate Sands	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B
Minnis Bay	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Blue Mussel	B
Minnis Bay	<i>Cardium edule</i>	Common edible cockle	B

6.2.5 Dangerous Substances

The Environment Agency monitors for dangerous substances at a variety of sites within the study area for the purposes of ensuring that the Thames Estuary is compliant with the EC Dangerous Substances Directive.

The EC Dangerous Substances Directive was adopted in 1976 to control pollution caused by certain dangerous substances on the aquatic environment. The Directive established List I substances, which are regarded as particularly dangerous because of their toxicity, persistence and bioaccumulation. Pollution by these substances must be eliminated. Pollution by List II substances regarded as less dangerous but which have a deleterious effect on the aquatic environment must be reduced.

The Dangerous Substances Directive stipulates uniform emission standards (UESs, also known as limit values) and environmental quality standards (EQSs) as approaches for the control of List I substances. For List II substances, all member states are required to establish EQSs on a national level. EQSs for List II substances have been implemented in the UK by the Surface Waters (Dangerous Substances) (Classification) Regulations 1997 and 1998.

The EQSs for selected List I substances are shown in Table 6.8. The table is based on the information presented in "Guidelines for managing water quality impacts within UK European marine sites" (Cole *et al.*, 1999).

Table 6.8 Selected List I dangerous substances*

Substance**	EQS Type	Marine EQS (annual average, $\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Estuarine EQS*** (annual average, $\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)
Mercury (dissolved)	Annual average	0.3	0.5
Cadmium (dissolved)	Annual average	2.5	5
HCH (Lindane) ****	Annual average	0.02	0.02
Total DDT	Annual average	0.025	0.025
ppDDT	Annual average	0.01	0.01
Pentachorophenol	Annual average	2	2
Aldrin	Annual average	0.01	0.01
Dieldrin	Annual average	0.01	0.01
Endrin	Annual average	0.005	0.005
Isodrin	Annual average	0.005	0.005
Total 'Drins'	Annual average	0.03	0.03
Hexachlorobenzene	Annual average	0.03	0.03

Substance**	EQS Type	Marine EQS (annual average, $\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Estuarine EQS*** (annual average, $\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)
Hexachlorobutadiene	Annual average	0.1	0.1
Carbon tetrachloride	Annual average	12	12
Chloroform	Annual average	12	12
1,2-dichloroethane	Annual average	10	10
Trichloroethylene	Annual average	10	10
Perchloroethylene	Annual average	10	10
Trichlorobenzene	Annual average	0.4	0.4

*EQS List I taken from www.environment-agency.gov.uk

**total concentration (i.e. without filtration) unless specified

*** in the UK, standards for estuaries are the same as for marine EQSs, as established under the Surface Waters (Dangerous Substances) (Classification) Regulations 1989

**** all HCH isomers, including Lindane

EQSs for List II substances have been implemented in the UK by the Surface Waters (Dangerous Substances) (Classification) Regulations 1997 and 1998. The EQSs for selected List II substances are shown in Table 6.9.

Table 6.9 Selected List II dangerous substances*

Substance	EQS Type	Marine and Estuarine EQS (annual average, $\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)
Arsenic (dissolved)	Annual average	25
Chromium (dissolved)	Annual average	15
Copper (dissolved)	Annual average	5
Lead (dissolved)	Annual average	25
Nickel (dissolved)	Annual average	30
Tributyl tin	Maximum concentration	0.002
Zinc (total)	Annual average	40

*The full EQS List II is available on www.environment-agency.gov.uk

Water quality monitoring data for the years 1990 to 2000 was provided by the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency undertakes routine monitoring of water quality for dangerous substances at a number of sites along the length of the Thames Estuary (Richmond to North Oaze). These sites are sampled 12 times per annum. Table 6.10 summarises the water quality conditions of all List I substances and selected List II substances. Comments are also provided concerning compliance with the environmental quality standards.

Table 6.10 Summary of Dangerous substances provided by the Environment Agency for the period 1990 to 2000.

Substance	Mucking ($\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Chapman ($\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Southend ($\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Sea Reach ($\mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)	Comments
Mercury (dissolved)	0.018	0.184	0.041	0.04	All data well below EQS, except one 1991 datum at Chapman ($3 \mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)
Cadmium (dissolved)	0.159	0.111	0.078	0.124	All data below EQS and concentrations generally decreasing
HCH (Lindane)	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.006	All data at or below EQS, except one 1990 datum at Sea Reach ($0.1 \mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$)
Total DDT	0.021	0.021	0.019	0.021	All data below EQS since early 1990s
PpDDT	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	<0.005	All data below EQS since early 1990s, all concentrations at or < $0.005 \mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$
Pentachlorophenol	0.106	0.109	No data	0.113	All data below EQS and concentrations generally decreasing since early 1990s and stabilising around $0.1 \mu\text{g.l}^{-1}$ by mid 1990s
Aldrin	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	Virtually all data below EQS in early 1990s and all data below EQS since mid 1990s
Dieldrin	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	Virtually all data below EQS in early 1990s and all data below EQS since mid 1990s
Endrin	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	All data below EQS since mid 1990s
Total 'Drins'	0.02	0.02	0.018	0.019	All data below EQS since early 1990s; sampling at Southend started in 1999
Hexachlorobenzene	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	All data well below EQS
Hexachlorobutadiene	0.014	0.015	0.005	0.015	All data well below EQS
Tetrachloromethane	0.264	0.27	No data	0.261	All data well below EQS
Trichloromethane	0.441	0.386	No data	0.386	All data well below EQS
Dichloroethene	1.056	1.019	No data	1.025	All data well below EQS
Trichloroethane	0.29	0.306	No data	0.297	All data well below EQS
Tetrachloroethene	0.259	0.257	No data	0.249	All data well below EQS
Trichlorobenzene	0.045	0.046	No data	0.046	All data well below EQS since early 1990s
Arsenic (dissolved)	2.448	2.159	2.027	1.86	All data well below EQS
Chromium	0.88	0.662	0.285	0.85	All data below EQS with all

(dissolved)					concentrations <2 µg.l ⁻¹ since early 1990s
Copper (dissolved)	Although in 2000, all concentrations of copper at all sites fell below the EQS level of 5 µg.l ⁻¹ , concentrations of dissolved copper at all sites have on average, exceeded the EQS levels. Concentrations dropped in the early 1990s, but a trend toward increasing concentrations occurred from the mid 1990s to the late 1990s, with a reverse in this trend after 1998.				
Lead (dissolved)	0.807	0.697	0.342	0.567	All data below EQS, with concentrations falling in early 1990s
Nickel (dissolved)	4.074	2.984	1.775	2.061	Virtually all data below EQS, with concentrations falling in early 1990s
Tributyl tin	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.001	Most data above EQS except for 1999 and 2000, which may reflect sensitivity of analytical equipment since most data for 1999 and 2000 are recorded as "less than" concentrations.
Zinc (total)	Although in 2000, all concentrations of zinc at all sites fell below the EQS level of 40 µg.l ⁻¹ , concentrations of total zinc at Mucking, Chapman and Southern have been recorded around the EQS level, whilst at Sea Reach they have mostly fallen below the level. In the last 4 years there is an apparent trend of declining concentrations.				

6.3 Sediment Quality

6.3.1 Methodology

This section describes the chemical and physical characteristics of sediments within the study area. Data on sediment quality within the estuary have been obtained from the Port of London Authority and CEFAS. The PLA require sediment at dredging areas to be analysed on a two to three year cycle as part of the dredging licensing process. CEFAS also undertake analysis of sediments within the estuary as part of the FEPA licensing process, albeit only when disposal of sediments be required offshore. When a FEPA application is received by DEFRA, CEFAS carry out analysis of the sediments in order to assess the nature and degree of any chemical contamination present.

The chemical characteristics of the sediments are described in terms of a range of chemical parameters that can be associated with sediment due to their low solubilities in water. The following lists the chemical parameters:

- Heavy metals (arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel and zinc) and other metals (aluminium, boron, iron, manganese, selenium, silver and vanadium);
- Organotins (Tributyl tin (TBT) and dibutyl tin (DBT));
- Total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH);
- Polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) (USEPA 16);

- Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) including 25 congeners;
- Ammonia; and
- Sulphide.

Unlike water quality, there are no quantified UK environmental quality standards (EQSs) for *in situ* sediment quality. The only guidance for sediment quality is defined as “standstill (no deterioration)” and is required for most of the EC Dangerous Substances List 1 parameters.

In the absence of any quantified UK standards, the sediment quality data has been compared against other guidelines to provide a basic indication about the degree of contamination and its potential suitability for disposal. The two sets of standards are:

- CEFAS guideline action levels for the disposal of dredged material; and
- Canadian Sediment Quality Guidelines for the protection of aquatic life.

CEFAS’s guideline action levels for the disposal of dredged material are not statutory contaminant concentrations for dredged material but as used as part of a weight of evidence approach to decision-making on the disposal of dredged material to sea. The action levels are presented in Table 6.11.

Table 6.11 CEFAS guideline action levels for dredged material (CEFAS, 2005)

Contaminant / Compound	Action Level 1	Action Level 2
	mg/kg Dry Weight (ppm)	mg/kg Dry Weight (ppm)
Arsenic	20	100
Mercury	0.3	3
Cadmium	0.4	5
Chromium	40	400
Copper	40	400
Nickel	20	200
Lead	50	500
Zinc	130	800
Organotins; TBT DBT MBT	0.1	1
PCB's, sum of ICES 7	0.01	none
PCB's, sum of 25 congeners	0.02	0.2
*DDT	*0.001	
*Dieldrin	*0.005	

*these levels were set in 1994

These values are used in conjunction with a range of other assessment methods, for example, bioassays, as well as historical data and knowledge regarding the dredging site, the material's physical characteristics, the disposal site characteristics and other relevant data, to make management decisions regarding the fate of dredged material. The action levels are therefore not ‘pass/fail’ criteria but triggers for further assessment. In general, contaminant levels in dredged material below action level 1 are of no concern and are unlikely to influence the licensing decision. However, dredged material

with contaminant levels above action level 2 is generally considered unsuitable for sea disposal. Dredged material with contaminant levels between action levels 1 and 2 requires further consideration and testing before a decision can be made.

The Canadian Sediment quality guidelines were developed by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment as broadly protective tools to support the functioning of healthy aquatic ecosystems (CCME, 2001). They are based on field research programmes that have demonstrated associations between chemicals and biological effects by establishing cause and effect relationships in particular organisms.

Comparison of measured concentrations of various contaminants within the sediments with these guideline values will, therefore, provide a basic indication on the degree of contamination and likely impact on ecology.

The guidelines consist of threshold effect levels (TELs) and probable effect levels (PELs). The TELs and PELs are used to identify the following three ranges of chemical concentrations with regard to biological effects. It is likely that the TELs will be adopted as the ISQGs (CCME, 2001):

- Below the TEL; the minimal effect range within which adverse effects rarely occur.
- Between the TEL and PEL; the possible effect range within which adverse effects occasionally occur
- Above the PEL; the probable effect range within which adverse effects frequently occur.

Table 6.12 lists the existing sediment quality guidelines for some of the parameters that have been monitored.

Table 6.12 Interim marine sediment quality guidelines (ISQGs)/threshold effect levels (TELs), probable effect levels (PELs) (dry weights) and incidence (%) of adverse biological effects in concentrations ranges defined by these values

Substance	Units	ISQG/TEL	PEL	Incidence (%≤ISQG)	Incidence (ISQG<%<PEL)	Incidence (%≥PEL)
Metals						
Arsenic	mg.kg-1	7.24	41.6	3	13	47
Cadmium	mg.kg-1	0.7	4.2	6	20	71
Chromium	mg.kg-1	52.3	160	4	15	53
Copper	mg.kg-1	18.7	108	9	22	56
Lead	mg.kg-1	30.2	112	6	26	58
Mercury	mg.kg-1	0.13	0.7	8	24	37
Zinc	mg.kg-1	124	271	4	27	65
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)						
PCBs: total PCBs	µg.kg-1	21.5	189	16	37	55
Polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAH)						
Acenaphthene	µg.kg-1	6.71	88.9	8	29	57
Acenaphthylene	µg.kg-1	5.87	128	7	14	51
Anthracene	µg.kg-1	46.9	245	9	20	75
Benz(a)anthracene	µg.kg-1	74.8	693	9	16	78
Benzo(a)pyrene	µg.kg-1	88.8	763	8	22	71
Chrysene	µg.kg-1	108	846	9	19	72
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	µg.kg-1	6.22	135	16	12	65
Fluoranthene	µg.kg-1	113	1494	10	20	80
Fluorene	µg.kg-1	21.2	144	12	20	70
2-Methylnaphthalene	µg.kg-1	20.2	201	0	23	82
Naphthalene	µg.kg-1	34.6	391	3	19	71
Phenanthrene	µg.kg-1	86.7	544	8	23	78
Pyrene	µg.kg-1	153	1398	7	19	83

6.3.2 Overview of sediment quality within the study area

Sediment quality data for a number of locations within the study are presented in tables 1 to 3 of Appendix B and a summary of sediment quality in the estuary is provided below.

Metals and organotins

The data collated indicates that the concentrations of metals within the study area all fall below the CEFAS action level 2. There is only one exception in the Tilbury area which recorded TBT concentrations above the CEFAS action level 2.

For the Shellhaven and Tilbury areas, a number of samples exceed the CEFAS action level 1. These are mainly concentrations of TBT, chromium, copper, mercury, nickel, lead and zinc.

Concerning the sediment quality guidelines, the majority of samples either fall below the lower interim sediment quality guideline or record values in between the TEL and PEL values. There are only three samples which exceed the higher probable effect level (PEL) value and these are for lead and mercury in the Denton and Shellhaven areas.

Polychlorinated Biphenols (PCBs)

The majority of samples did not detect PCB contamination. Where PCB concentrations were recorded, in two of the three samples at Custom Quarry Gravesend, levels marginally exceeded the higher PEL value.

Poly Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs)

CEFAS action levels do not contain values for individual PAHs. The action levels are therefore based on total PAHs. All samples, where analysis was undertaken for total PAHs, did not detect PAH contamination.

Canadian sediment guidelines however contain individual values for specific substances. Where values were recorded, the majority indicated substance concentrations between the interim sediment quality guideline and the higher PEL.

Summary

The sediment quality throughout the study area exhibits a varied degree of contamination from a variety of substances. Contamination levels however remain predominantly below the higher CEFAS action levels and the higher sediment quality guideline levels.

6.4 Intertidal ecology

6.4.1 Methodology

A large amount of marine biological data is available for the Thames Estuary. The main data sources used for the study were marine ecological surveys carried out to inform the London Gateway Environmental Impact Assessment (Table 6.13). These provide a comprehensive coverage of the study area. A number of other data sources on the estuary also exist such as the Environment Agency Thames Benthic Monitoring Programme, established in 1989.

Table 6.13 Data sources used to produce this section

Publication Date	Reference
2001	Newell R.C., Seiderer L.J., Robinson J.E. & Simpson N.M (2001) London Gateway Port Project benthic biological resource survey of the lower Thames Estuary, July-September 2001. Marine Ecological Surveys Limited, Cornwall.
2002	Newell R.C., Seiderer L.J., Robinson J.E. & Simpson N.M (2002) London Gateway Port Project benthic intertidal biology of the lower Thames Estuary, July 2002. Marine Ecological Surveys Limited, Cornwall.
2002	The (London Gateway Port) Harbour Empowerment Order 2002 Environmental Statement, Chapter 19. Royal Haskoning.
2005	Royal Haskoning (2005). Frost <i>et al.</i> , East Tilbury Jetty Environmental

	Statement.
--	------------

6.4.2 Overview of the intertidal ecology of the Thames Estuary

The intertidal areas of the Thames Estuary are characterised by large expanses of mud and sandflats backed by seawalls with some small areas of saltmarsh. There are two main areas on the northern shore of the Thames within the study area: Mucking Flats and Holehaven Creek. Mucking Flats comprises a large area of intertidal mudflats backed by seawall with occasional patches of saltmarsh. The mudflats are largely uniform and homogeneous in terms of sediment composition and stretch from Tilbury to Stanford-le-Hope covering approximately 312 hectares, and extend approximately 0.5km offshore. Holehaven Creek is a sheltered inlet containing many sandbanks that dry at low tide. The west bank of Holehaven Creek comprises a seawall with a rubble foreshore, and at the mouth of the creek is an island. Lower Horse Island is an area of saltmarsh which is surrounded by intertidal sandy mud with cockle beds on the western edge.

On the southern shore of the Thames is a large area of intertidal called Blyth Sands extending up to 1km offshore. Western Blyth Sands, from Egypt Bay to Cliffe Creek, comprises a large expanse of sandflat backed by a seawall fronted by a strip of rocks. Occasional strips of saltmarsh occur which are generally between 10 to 15 m wide. Patches of cobbles are also occasionally present. Eastern Blyth Sands is similar to the western half in that it is backed by seawall with a narrow strip of stones at its base. However, at the eastern end of Blyth Sands, off Allhallows-on-sea, localised patches of other communities, such as seagrass beds and mussels are present. Occasional patches of sandy substrate are also present within Egypt and St Mary's Bays.

Data on the intertidal communities of the study area are available from an intertidal biotope survey carried out by Royal Haskoning in 2001 and from grab surveys carried out by Newell *et al* in 2001 and 2002. These surveys have found that the mud and sandflats are dominated by large populations of *Corophium volutator*, *Macoma balthica* and a variety of polychaetes, forming two main biotopes: '*Hediste diversicolor* and *Macoma balthica* in sandy mud shores' and '*H.diversicolor* and *Scrobicularia plana* in reduced salinity mud shores' (Royal Haskoning, 2002). The seawalls backing these intertidal flats are colonised by the algae *Fucus vesiculosus* and *Ascophyllum nodosum* along their base. Newell *et al* (2001) found that the infaunal community intertidal mudflats within the inner Thames Estuary is dominated by *Tubificoides benedii*, *Aphelochaeta marioni*, *Corophium volutator* and *Streblospio shrubsolii*. Large population densities of *T. benedii* were recorded mainly on the higher shore at the western end of Blyth Sands, on Mucking Flats and at Holehaven. Significant populations of *Hediste diversicolor* are also located in these areas.

Relatively high biomass values for Molluscs were also recorded along the upper intertidal mudflats of Blyth Sands and Mucking Flats reflecting the presence of a number of bivalves including *Macoma balthica*, *Scrobicularia plana* and the snail *Hydrobia ulvae* (MES, 2002). Much of the muddy intertidal flats in these areas and Holehaven are therefore of potential importance as feeding areas for birds capable of exploiting *Macoma balthica* and other species as a food resource.

Benthic algae within the Thames Estuary are mainly restricted to river walls, mussel, shingle and shell banks, saltmarsh and floating structures. Furoid seaweeds are common as are *Ectocarpus silliculosus* and *Chaetomorpha capillaria*. The upstream limit of some algal species has moved in recent years. This is a reflection of decreasing water quality and reduced salinity associated with decreased freshwater flow (Newell *et al.*, 2001). The increasing prevalence of hard defences around the estuary has led to an increase in furoid seaweeds which rapidly colonise hard substrates to the exclusion of soft-sediment species.

Saltmarsh within the Thames Estuary is dominated by *Spartina maritima* at the pioneer level and *Puccinellia maritima* and *Salicornia* on the lower marsh. The rare golden samphire *Inula crithmoides* is also common within the Thames (Newell *et al.*, 2001).

Overall the benthic infauna in the estuary is diverse although no nationally rare species have been recorded by the various surveys. It is noted that the mixed sands and muds of Blyth Sands, Mucking Flats and the sheltered creeks of the inner estuary support much higher population densities and species diversity of benthic macrofauna than the subtidal deposits. The intertidal areas of the inner estuary also support a much higher biomass of benthic invertebrates than those of the outer estuary. The communities of shallower water areas and mudflats demonstrate increased dominance by few species which is a reflection of a natural reduction in habitat complexity in the more uniform sediments within these locations (rather than human-induced stress). Generally surveys have underlined the importance of the intertidal mixed sands and muds in supporting a high species diversity, population density and biomass of benthic invertebrates. Some of these are of economic significance whilst others form an important potential food resource for wading birds.

6.4.3 Overview of the subtidal ecology of the Thames Estuary

The subtidal regions of the study area consist of the main shipping channel that runs down the centre of the tidal Thames and the shallower areas either side of the dredged channel. The infaunal communities within the subtidal are dominated by two main community types. Deposits in the central channel support a community including *Balanus crenatus*, juvenile Mytilidae, *Polydora caeca*, *Tubificoides benedii*, *Hediste diversicolor*, *Lanice conchilega* and *Streblospio shrubsolii*. The sediment either side of the channel, along the shallow subtidal areas of Blyth Sands and off Holehaven, support a different range of species including *Nephtys hombergii*, *Tubificoides benedii* and *Aphelochaeta marioni*. Another community is also present in the subtidal, albeit only in isolated patches. This assemblage comprises juvenile Mytilidae, the polychaete *Aphelochaeta marioni* and barnacles *Balanus crenatus*.

Macroinvertebrates in the outer estuary are dominated by the brown shrimp *Crangon crangon*, the swimming crab (*Liocarcinus holsatus*) and the prawn (*Pandalus montagui*). Prevalent fish species include the goby (*Pomatoschistus* spp.), whiting, dab and poor cod. The inner estuary is dominated by large numbers of fewer species. *C. crangon* and *P. montagui* are still prevalent, as are goby and whiting. Swimming crabs are replaced by shore crabs (*Carcinus maenus*) in the upper estuary, a reflection of reduced salinity.

The Thames Estuary supports a number of commercially important species, and particular parts of the estuary are important for different fauna. The central part of the

inner estuary supports a high biomass of the brown shrimp *Crangon crangon*. This area is also an important nursery area for juvenile and post juvenile fish. The whole estuary is important for Dover Sole *Solea solea* with highest abundances being present in the areas of high *C. crangon* biomass. Gut content analysis showed that the brown shrimp formed the major food source for *S. solea* (Newell *et al.*, 2001).

Another community is present within the southern part of the outer estuary in areas dominated by the colonial bryozoan *Alcyonidium diaphanum*, which provides shelter and habitat for a dense community of fish and invertebrates with higher diversity and abundance than elsewhere in the estuary. Dominant species include *Gammarus* spp., *P. montagui*, *C. crangon*, *L. holsatus*, starfish (*Asterias rubens*) and gobies.

In the Chapman Buoy area of the main shipping channel to the south of Canvey, the substratum is highly heterogeneous and comprises muddy sand, clay, stones, shells and sodden wood. This combined with a good water quality results in the invertebrate community here being the most species rich and diverse in the whole estuary. The site also consistently records high biomass due to the presence of many large species, the most important being the sea anemone *Sagartia troglodytes*, the fan worm *Sabella pavonia* and the shore crab *Carcinus maenus*. The clay walls of the channel contain a large number of boring piddocks (*Petricola pholadiformis* and *Barnea candida*). The community in the shipping channel was characterised by a wide range of species, some of which were only recorded from this site. This high diversity has been attributed to the high stability of the sediment and good water quality surrounding the site.

In the Chapman Buoy area, the shallow subtidal area to the south of the channel has a very different community from that of the north. The substratum is fairly mobile muddy sand, and the fauna associated with this area (e.g. Blyth Sands, Grain Flats) is lacking in diversity and biomass in comparison to other intertidal and subtidal areas of the outer estuary. The fauna seawards of Blyth and Grain Flats is very similar, and characterised by a low biomass and a variable community structure. This low faunal diversity may be due to large amounts of decaying plant material, such as seagrass, that accumulate on the southern side of the outer estuary.

Overall, whilst not as diverse as the intertidal areas within the Thames Estuary, the subtidal supports communities containing some species that are important potential food resources for commercial fish e.g. *Solea solea* feeds upon *C. crangon*.

6.5 Ornithology

6.5.1 Methodology

Bird count data have been collected for the Thames Estuary for a number of years as part of the Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS). WeBS is a joint scheme of the British Trust for Ornithology, the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee. The scheme aims to provide a scientific basis for the conservation of waterbird populations. The counts form two types: core counts which are undertaken once a month on pre-selected dates around the winter period (normally) at high tide. Low tide counts are conducted at low tide on most estuaries around once every six years, with up to four counts being made.

Core count data is available for the entire study area for the period 1999/00 - 2003/04, and low tide data is available for the period 2002/2003. A very good coverage of bird data is available for the study area from these sources. For the purposes of this study, core count data has been obtained for the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA for the period 1998/99 – 2002/03 (East Tilbury Jetty ES, 2005) and for the period 1995/96 – 1999/00 (HEO Thames Gateway ES, 2001). Low water count data was available from counts carried out in specific areas, such as the counts in the vicinity of BP Refinery at Coryton (Shaw, 2005) and a series of counts were carried out as part of the London Gateway Environmental Statement. Information on bird usage of the study area has also been collated from other sources such as the “*Thames Estuary Partnership: Tidal Thames Habitat and Species Audit*”. The focus of this section is on the intertidal areas of the study area rather than the inland habitats, as it is the intertidal which has the most potential to be affected by maintenance dredging.

6.5.2 Overview of ornithological interest of the study area

The biological richness and productivity of the Thames Estuary is reflected in the number of waterbirds, particularly waders and wildfowl, which it supports. The estuary contains a variety of habitats, which increase the diversity of species that can use it. For example, waders and ducks are dependent on feeding on the benthic invertebrates of mudflats and shallow waters; dark-bellied brent geese feed on eelgrass and algae; and an array of diving birds depend on small fish, crustaceans and molluscs sought in the channels at low water and over the mudflats at high water.

The Thames Estuary is of national importance for the populations of twelve species of waterfowl (dunlin, oystercatcher, redshank, black-tailed godwit, lapwing, shoveler, pintail, gadwall, shelduck, European white-fronted goose and little grebe). It is of international importance for the numbers of wintering and passage ringed plover, and wintering dark-bellied brent geese, knot, grey plover and avocet². The total numbers of waders and wildfowl present has at times exceeded 20,000. The importance of the Estuary for waterbirds is reflected in its SPA designations under the Birds Directive (see Sections 3 and 4). In addition to the SPA designations, the Thames Estuary has been recognised as an internationally important wetland by being designated as Ramsar sites. The ornithological reasons for these designations are similar to the SPA citations.

Other Annex 1 species that regularly occur on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA in non-qualifying numbers are breeding common tern, and passage and wintering Bewick's swan, golden plover, ruff, hen harrier, short-eared owl and kingfisher.

Analysis of overall waterbird assemblage

Table 6.14 summarises the overall waterbird assemblage of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA for the period 1998/99 - 2002/03 and shows the 5 year mean peak for these years. The data presented is only representative of the SPA itself and not the wider area that this review covers, furthermore the data are core counts undertaken at high water and, therefore, do not indicate the use of areas for feeding at low water.

² Afforded protection under Annex 1 of the EC Birds Directive (79/409/EEC).

Table 6.14 WeBS High Tide Counts, 1998/99-2002/3 for Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA

Species	1% thresholds for national and international importance		Thames Estuary & Marshes SPA (5-year mean peak 1998/9-2002/3)	Mucking Flats SSSI (5-year mean peak 1998/9-2002/3)
	Great Britain	International		
Shelduck	750	3000	1207.2	298.4
Black-tailed Godwit	70	700	1513	206.2
Redshank	1100	1500	1059.2	332.2
Avocet	10	700	634.4	579
Ringed Plover	290	500	534	102.6
Grey Plover	430	1500	1308	449.8
Knot	2900	3500	4695.4	24.8
Dunlin	5300	14000	12951	5875
Lapwing	20,000 (5,000) ¹	20,000	3699	747.8
Total Waterfowl Assemblage	n/a	n/a	34634.4	6479.4

Data provided by the BTO, 2004

The BTO monitor changes in waterbird numbers through a system of alerts based on WeBS data. The alerts system provides a standardised method of identifying the direction and magnitude of changes in numbers at a variety of spatial and temporal scales for a range of waterbird species for which sufficient WeBS data are available. Species that have undergone major changes in numbers can then be flagged by issuing an alert. Alerts are intended to be advisory and, subject to interpretation, should be used as a basis on which to direct research and subsequent conservation efforts if required (Maclean *et al*, 2005).

Table 6.15 and Table 6.16 present the alerts for the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA respectively. The summaries of the alerts include the following key points:

Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA

Of the 14 species evaluated, four species have had alerts triggered, including one that occurs in internationally important numbers. Some of these species have not undergone either national or regional declines of the same magnitude and there is thus some cause for concern, such as European white-fronted goose. More details on these alerts are presented in the following species accounts.

Maclean (*et al*, 2005) identified that threats to the SPA include considerable infrastructure development, sea-level rise that may result in erosion and flooding, dredging proposals, a lack of management, and water shortages for wetland enhancements.

Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA

This SPA lies at the eastern end of the study area, east of Canvey Island. Alerts have been triggered for all six species evaluated. This gives some cause for concern, particularly as some of the species for which alerts have triggered have not declined in either Great Britain or England as a whole.

Maclean (*et al*, 2005) identified that threats to the SPA include erosion, reclamation, dredging, shell-fisheries, intensive recreational activities and development proposals.

Key Species on the Thames Estuary

For the purposes of this assessment, key species are defined as those species that are either specifically cited as being internationally important regularly occurring Annex 1 species or migratory species, or which are present in nationally important populations. These are avocet, black-tailed godwit, dark-bellied brent goose, dunlin, European white-fronted goose, gadwall, grey plover, knot, lapwing, little grebe, oystercatcher, pintail, redshank, ringed plover, shelduck and shoveler.

Avocet

Avocet is the only Annex 1 waterfowl species for which the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA is designated and is present in internationally important numbers, so it can arguably be considered to be its single most important component. Within the Thames Estuary, avocet are largely restricted to the lower marine reaches of the river; the mudflats at Higham Bight and Mucking Flats are particularly important for this species and small numbers also breed amongst the saline lagoons at Cliffe (Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan, 2002). During the five winters between 1995/6 and 1999/00, the Thames was ranked as the third most important estuary for wintering avocets within the UK (Musgrove *et al*. 2001). In winter 2001/2002, avocets were recorded in nationally important numbers on two occasions and internationally important numbers twice. In March 2002, a record number of 1395 birds were seen (Shaw, 2002). Avocets feed on insects, crustaceans and occasionally small fish and the most recent high water WeBS counts show that over 90% of the SPA population overwinters on Mucking Flats (Table 6.15). No WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species.

Black-tailed godwit

Black-tailed godwits prefer muddy estuaries where they feed chiefly on intertidal invertebrates, with food located by sight and touch. A wide range of invertebrates are taken, including molluscs, ragworms, crustaceans and earthworms. Within the Thames Estuary breeding sites are restricted to the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Holehaven Creek, Essex (Tidal Thames Habitat and Species Audit, 2004). A peak of 629 was recorded by Shaw (2002) in November 2001 and WeBS high water counts indicate that around 14% of the SPA population use Mucking Flats (Table 6.5). Internationally important numbers of black-tailed godwit also occur within Holehaven Creek, Essex (Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan, 2002). High increases in the WeBS data have been observed over the short-term (5 year) and long-term (25 years) within the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA.

Dark-bellied brent goose

The dark-bellied brent goose winters in Britain in internationally important numbers. It breeds in western Siberia and winters in Western Europe, with about half the population in Britain. The species feeds on eelgrass and green algae (especially *Enteromorpha* and *Ulva*) which grow on mudflats. Once these food sources are depleted, the birds

move inland to feed on coastal arable farmland and pasture. The birds roost on sheltered coastal and estuarine waters (Batten *et al.*, 1990). Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA is designated for holding 3,819 birds (5 year peak mean 1991/92 – 1995/96) and nationally important numbers overwinter on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA. On Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA high increase in the WeBS counts have been recorded over the medium term (10 years) but medium level decreases have been recorded over the long term (25 years).

Dunlin

Dunlin feed principally in extensive muddy areas of estuaries on a wide range of invertebrate prey, including polychaete worms, gastropod snails, bivalves, crustaceans and occasionally small fish. They are the second most widespread wintering estuarine species in the UK, occurring throughout Britain and Ireland. They are also by far the most numerous species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA, comprising between 37% of the total assemblage. Both this site and Benfleet and Southend Marshes regularly support over 11,000 wintering dunlin (Tidal Thames Habitat and Species Audit, 2004). WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species on both SPAs but they are of no immediate concern as this species is prone to fluctuations (Maclean *et al.* 2005).

European white-fronted goose

The European white-fronted goose winters in Britain in nationally important numbers. It breeds in western Siberia and winters in Western Europe, with about half the population in Britain. They overwinter in nationally important numbers on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA (Table 6.15). White-fronted geese forage on farmland for grass, clover, grain and winter wheat. The number of European White-fronted Geese over-wintering on the Thames Estuary SPA has decreased sufficiently to trigger a long-term Medium-alert. The magnitude of the decline, is however influenced by uncharacteristically high counts in the late 1960s, since when, numbers have decreased, but not as rapidly as suggested by the alert. The trend contrasts with that of the region, which has fluctuated, but generally increased, but is inline with the national trend, with little evidence of a decrease in the proportion of the national WeBS total hosted by this site. Combinations of factors are thus responsible for triggering this alert (Maclean *et al.* 2005).

Gadwall

The gadwall winters in Britain in internationally and nationally important numbers, predominantly on inshore waters (Batten *et al.*, 1990). The Greater Thames Estuary Natural Area supports at least 5% of the wintering British population (English Nature, 1997). The Lee Valley and Southwest London Waterbodies SPAs, (approximately 20kms upstream from the current study site) are designated for their high numbers of wintering gadwall. Within the study area the species occurs in nationally important numbers at Cliffe Pools (RSPB website). No WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species.

Table 6.15 Percentage change and Alerts for cited waterbirds at the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA over the short- (5-year), medium- (10-year), long-term (25-year or maximum available if less) and since notification. Symbols: - Medium-Alert, -- High-Alert, + Medium-Increase, ++ High-Increase, o No substantial Change. Symbols in brackets are flagged as precautionary Alerts or Increases due to the application of the 'Biological-Filter' (see methods). Stage: Selection Stage (Stroud et al. 2001).

Species	Selection Stage	First Winter	Last Winter	Short-term percentage change	Medium-term percentage change	Long-term percentage change	percentage change since notification	Short-term alert-status	Medium-term alert-status	Long-term alert-status	Alert-status since notification (1999)
Little Grebe (LG)	1.3	88/89	02/03	16	62	114	6	o	+	++	(o)
European White-fronted Goose (EW)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-11	-1	-31	16	o	o	-	(o)
Shelduck (SU)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-27	-48	-17	-19	(-)	-	o	(o)
Gadwall (GA)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-15	26	506	-18	o	o	++	(o)
Pintail (PT)	1.3	77/78	02/03	19	-22	164	17	o	o	++	(o)
Shoveler (SV)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-13	-4	43	-8	o	o	+	(o)
Avocet (AV)	1.1	77/78	02/03	27	141		0	o	++		(o)
Ringed Plover (RP)	1.2	77/78	02/03	-13	-59	10	-10	o	--	o	(o)

Species	Selection Stage	First Winter	Last Winter	Short-term percentage change	Medium-term percentage change	Long-term percentage change	percentage change since notification	Short-term alert-status	Medium-term alert-status	Long-term alert-status	Alert-status since notification (1999)
Grey Plover (GV)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-12	-24	209	-22	0	0	++	(o)
Lapwing (L ₋)	1.3	77/78	02/03	1	2	390	-6	0	0	++	(o)
Knot (KN)	1.2	77/78	02/03	-51	58	75	-46	(-)	+	+	(-)
Dunlin (DN)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-44	-44	-17	-33	(-)	-	0	(-)
Black-tailed Godwit (BW)	1.3	77/78	02/03	115	0	296	57	++	0	++	(+)
Redshank (RK)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-10	2	42	-11	0	0	+	(o)

Table 6.16 Percentage change and Alerts for cited waterbirds at the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA over the short- (5-year), medium- (10-year), long-term (25-year or maximum available if less) and since notification. Symbols: - Medium-Alert, -- High-Alert, + Medium-Increase, ++ High-Increase, o No substantial Change. Symbols in brackets are flagged as precautionary Alerts or Increases due to the application of the 'Biological-Filter' (see methods). Stage: Selection Stage (Stroud et al. 2001).

Species	Selection Stage	First Winter	Last Winter	Short-term percentage change	Medium-term percentage change	Long-term percentage change	percentage change since notification	Short-term alert-status	Medium-term alert-status	Long-term alert-status	alert-status since notification (1993)
Dark-bellied Brent Goose (DB)	1.2	77/78	02/03	-11	127	-28	90	0	++	-	+
Oystercatcher (OC)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-34	-36	47	-36	-	-	+	-
Ringed Plover (RP)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-17	-23	-56	-21	0	0	--	0
Grey Plover (GV)	1.2	77/78	02/03	0	-30	614	-33	0	-	++	-
Knot (KN)	1.2	77/78	02/03	-21	-24	175	-40	0	0	++	-
Dunlin (DN)	1.3	77/78	02/03	-45	-30	-24	-40	(-)	-	0	-

Grey Plover

This is another widespread species within the Thames Estuary and around 34% of the SPA population overwinter on Mucking Flats. Their diet comprises chiefly polychaete worms, molluscs and crustaceans. Nationally important numbers were recorded within the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA in November 2001, March 2002 and November 2002 (Shaw, 2002). A positive WeBS alert has been triggered for this species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA due to high increases in numbers over the long-term (25 years). However, decreases have been recorded on the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA.

Knot

This is the third most numerous estuarine British wader with an average population of 220,000. The mudflats of the Thames estuary are important wintering sites for this species (Batten *et al*, 1990). Knots are specialist feeders on marine bivalves, particularly *Macoma balthica*, *Mytilus edulis* and *Cerastoderma* sp in the length range 3 – 15 mm. WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species but they are of no immediate concern as this species is prone to fluctuations in numbers (Maclean *et al*, 2005).

Lapwing

Lapwing are the most numerous estuarine British wader, they forage on saltmarsh for a variety of invertebrates. The highest known winter concentrations of lapwings are found at the Somerset Levels, Humber and Ribble estuaries, Breydon Water/Berney Marshes, the Wash, and Morecambe Bay. Within the Thames Estuary there is widespread suitable habitat for lapwing in the lower Thames Estuary (UK BAP website), this species occurs in significant numbers throughout the Greater Thames Natural Area (English Nature, 1997). A positive WeBS alert has been triggered for this species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA due to high increases in numbers over the long-term (Maclean *et al*, 2005)..

Little Grebe

Little grebe chiefly overwinters on island freshwater sites (Davidson *et al* 1991), approximately 10% over winter on estuaries and coastal habitats, the Thames estuary is an important wintering site (RSPB website). A positive WeBS alert has been triggered for this species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA due to high increases in numbers over the long-term.(Maclean *et al*, 2005).

Oystercatcher

Wintering oystercatchers are associated with sandy estuaries and beds of cockles and mussels. They are widespread throughout Britain with large numbers present on the Thames Estuary. The Greater Thames Estuary Natural Area supports at least 5% of the wintering British population (English Nature, 1997). Medium-level WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species over the short (5 year) and medium-term (10 year) on the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA.

Pintail

The Icelandic population of pintail spend the winter in Britain, favouring coastal marshes and estuaries, flooded grassland, lakes and reservoirs. They eat a variety of plants and invertebrates. The Greater Thames Estuary Natural Area supports at least 5% of the

wintering British population (English Nature, 1997). Within the study site Cliffe Pools support nationally important numbers of pintail (RSPB website). A positive WeBS alert has been triggered for this species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA due to high increases in numbers over the long-term.(Maclean *et al*, 2005).

Redshank

Redshank overwinters in nationally important numbers on the saltmarsh within the Thames Estuary on both of the SPA sites. Additionally, small numbers also breed on the wetter grazing marsh areas adjacent to the Thames in the lower reaches of the estuary (Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan, 2002). They are known to feed on a variety of invertebrates but typically feed on crustaceans, molluscs and polychaete worms on estuaries. Redshank is mainly a winter and passage-migrant within the Thames Estuary because suitable habitat conditions are limited. A positive WeBS alert has been triggered for this species on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA due to high increases in numbers over the long-term.(Maclean *et al*, 2005).

Ringed Plover

Ringed plover are widely distributed along the lower reaches of the river in numbers of international importance. The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA represent nearly 3% of the UK's passage population of ringed plover (Tidal Thames Habitat and Species Audit, 2004). They feed on invertebrates in a variety of intertidal habitats and roost communally, close to feeding sites along the shoreline, on sandbanks or bare arable fields and in low vegetation. Due to uncharacteristically high numbers recorded on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA during two winters in the early-1990s, ringed plover have declined sufficiently to trigger a medium-term High-alert. However, apart from these two winters, numbers have remained relatively stable despite regional and national declines (Maclean *et al*. 2005).

Shelduck

Shelduck has a coastal distribution in Britain, with intertidal sands and mudflats forming the main foraging areas. Their diet includes a variety of invertebrates but predominantly the snail *Hydrobia*. Breeding shelduck are widely distributed within the tidal Thames where suitable habitat occurs. The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA supports significant numbers of wintering shelduck (Table 6.15).

Since the early-1990s, shelduck numbers on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA have decreased sufficiently to trigger short and medium term Medium-alerts. In the later is of less concern as not only is it lesser in magnitude, but it lies within the range considered normal for this species and cannot be assessed with certainty due to incomplete data. The regional and national WeBS totals have undergone similar declines, with little evidence of consistent decreases in the proportions of the regional and national WeBS totals hosted by this site. This would suggest that large-scale processes are responsible for the downturn in numbers on this SPA (Maclean *et al*. 2005).

Shoveler

This species winters in Britain on shallow freshwater areas with plentiful marginal reeds or emergent vegetation (Batten *et al*, 1990). The Thames Estuary is an important area

for this species with an average of 300 birds wintering annually, particularly on Cliffe Pools (RSPB Website). No negative WeBS alerts have been triggered for this species.

Overall waterfowl assemblage

Broadly speaking, the extensive mudflats and saltmarsh present within the study area provide some of the most important feeding grounds within the Thames Estuary as a whole. It is likely that the distribution of waterfowl is linked to the presence of productive mudflats in these areas which provide key prey items for waterfowl. In particular, the distribution of dark-bellied brent geese is probably governed by the distribution of eelgrass and green algae. Relatively few alerts have been triggered for the key waterfowl species within the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA indicating that the site is overall likely to be in good condition. However, a greater number of alerts have been triggered for the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA.

6.6 Noise

6.6.1 Methodology

Noise may cause disturbance to SPA species and needs to be considered to establish the baseline against which to compare dredging operations. Limited information was retrieved on current noise levels experienced by the waterfowl populations of the Thames Estuary, and no regular noise monitoring programmes were identified for this area. It has not, therefore, been possible to provide an in depth baseline description of noise levels along this stretch of the Thames. As a result, this assessment examines the likely noise levels that would be generated by the maintenance dredging regime, and therefore the levels likely to be experienced by the waterfowl assemblages of the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA, Benfleet and Southend Marshes SPA, and Holehaven SSSI.

6.6.2 Baseline Conditions

Background noise is likely to be derived from a variety of sources which include:

- Traffic noise (e.g. A2, A13, A1014 and A1089 which run near by to the designated sites);
- Trains;
- Industry and dockyards (e.g. Port of Tilbury, Shell Bravo, etc);
- Temporary construction noise (i.e. proposal for new container and ro-ro facilities at the Shellhaven site); and
- Water-borne noise from vessels and people.

One of the main sources of noise for the birds of the SPA will be a result of the passage of boat traffic. The Port of London is one of the busiest ports within England; with more than 80 terminals, it is a gateway to London and the south-east of England. The PLA has various by-laws in place regarding the control of noise levels within this area. This includes by-law 47(1):

No person shall use or knowingly cause or permit to be used a vessel with an internal combustion engine unless the engine is fitted with a silencer, expansion chamber or other contrivance suitable and sufficient for reducing so far as may be

reasonable the noise caused by the escape of exhaust gasses from the engine; Provided that the engine may be fitted with a device for cutting out the silencer expansion chamber or other contrivance so long as the device is used only to enable the engine to be started and for no other purpose.

Such by-laws limit the disturbing effect of noise for both the users and residents of this waterway, but will also reduce the possible impacts on the wildlife communities as well.

6.6.3 Noise from vessels and maintenance dredging

The main source of noise from a vessel originates from the engine, and may travel via the atmosphere or be transmitted through the structure of the craft. The volume of sound generated and transmitted into the air or water depends on the size, design and location of the engine, and the crafts size and construction. Vessel-based ornithological surveys have previously found that the birds are initially disturbed by the presence of a boat, however, dredgers are generally quieter than such survey vessels (PLA, Princes Channel Environmental Assessment Report, 2004).

Most birds are present within the designated areas of interest during low tide in the winter months. The dredging activities mostly occur around times of high water, and so these birds are not generally present during this time (PLA, 2004).

The dredging activities within this stretch of river are primarily undertaken by water injection dredgers anything up to 4 times a year. The areas being dredged are the jetties and the main navigation channels which are heavily used by many types of vessels, but mainly by the larger ships. These are short-term, infrequent events which will take place during the normal operation of the estuary, and so will be in addition to the noise produced by the passage of the vessel traffic. The birds of the SPA will already be accustomed to such background noise, and the noise levels from the dredging, particularly water injection methods, are comparable to, and often lower than, the ongoing noise from routine ship operations (PLA, 2004).

It is more likely that disturbance to the waterfowl will be caused by the movement and visual presence of such a vessel rather than the noise associated with it (Bureau Veritas-Acoustic Technology, 2003). However, given the slow-moving nature of dredgers (i.e. the lack of fast and sudden movements), it is likely that disturbance arising from their movement and presence would also be low. In light of the above, it is considered that maintenance dredging is unlikely to be causing significant disturbance to waterfowl given the background levels of disturbance and the relative infrequency of dredging activities.

7 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 The influence of historic dredging activity on the SPA and Ramsar sites

The aim of this document is to summarise the baseline conditions prevalent within the study area that are relevant to the conservation status of the European marine sites. The results of this document will then be used alongside the existing maintenance dredging framework procedures when licensing maintenance dredging to determine whether the maintenance dredging is likely to have a significant effect on the European sites. In order to aid these decisions, presented below is a brief discussion of the effects that maintenance dredging may currently be having on the European marine sites.

Theoretically, maintenance dredging has the potential to affect the SPA and Ramsar sites through the following routes:

Changes in the morphology of the estuary through the removal or redistribution of sediment within the system. Removal of sediment from the system can create an artificial sink for sediment which may modify the fine sediment regime reducing supply to other nearby areas (Royal Haskoning, 2004). In the Thames Estuary this has the potential to occur where material is disposed of onshore. However, over half of the maintenance dredging on the Thames Estuary is now undertaken using WID techniques. This agitation technique, which retains fine sediment in the estuary, is used to remove about 105,000 m³ per year at the berths at Coryton and approximately 85,000 m³ per year at Tilbury Docks. The quantity removed by conventional dredging methods, is up to 50,000m³ per year (HR Wallingford, 2002e) with this material being placed at Rainham Marshes and Cliffe Pools. It is worth noting that the sediment budget that has been published for the Thames Estuary (Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies, 1993) suggested that there was a net sediment shortfall in the budget of some 200,000m³ per annum, met through material entering the system from the sea. Since 1998, the volume of material taken out of the system to land (Cliffe and Rainham) has reduced, and there is currently some 200,000m³ per annum of dredging undertaken by WID. Based on the earlier assertion by IECS, the change in dredging practice over the past 15 years balances the budget and suggests the system is in dynamic equilibrium, including the influence of dredging activities. Therefore it is regarded that the annual removal of 50,000-150,000 m³ of sediment from the estuary is already accounted for in the sediment budget and hence morphology of the study area.

The North Kent Champ identifies that under various sea level rise scenarios (2mm and 6mm rises); sediment budgets within the estuaries of the embayment could become increasingly depleted over the next 50 years and go into deficit over the next 50-100 years. It is possible that additional fluvial sediment input may arise, but this is unlikely to amount to a significant additional contribution to make up for shortfalls. There is therefore a clear need to ensure that mudflat and saltmarsh health are monitored and an ongoing evaluation of sediment input is maintained. If the effects of shortfalls are identified, there will be a need to find additional ways of retaining sediment within the system through techniques such as Water Injection Dredging and sediment placement at suitable locations. It is anticipated that the Baseline Document will evolve over time to incorporate and respond to new information on sediment regimes as it becomes available (i.e. through key projects and initiatives such as TE2100 and CHaMPs), as described in Section 7.3.1.

There is some evidence for change in bathymetry within the entrance to Holehaven Creek and to Mucking Flats, indicating changing morphologic conditions. The redistribution of sediment within the system as a result of Water Injection Dredging, has been considered in studies by HR Wallingford EX2648, September 1992) and Environmental Tracing Systems (RE40981, November 2003). HR Wallingford concluded that the material arising from WID should not cause significant damaging changes to either the general estuary regime or the maintenance dredging commitments of local river users, and that the impact was no different to that arising from a cessation of dredging at the location of the WID exercise. HR Wallingford also concluded that WID should not be used in higher reaches of the estuary (above Tilbury). However, as noted above, the annual remobilised volume relative to the sediment budget in the outer estuary is not significant. The current trend for accretion has been identified from survey data predating the implementation of WID techniques. The current deposition pattern, while additionally influenced by particular climatic events in noted years, does not appear to have significantly accelerated or altered this underlying trend. The Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies analysis of Coastal Processes and Conservation in the Thames Estuary (October 1993) concluded that *the estuary has reached dynamic equilibrium and that dredging at the rate practiced over the 100 years does not appear to have any deleterious effect on the intertidal morphology of the estuary. Dredge spoil dumping within the estuary system until 1961 merely resulted in a rapid return of the sediment to the dredge sites. Mudflats within the estuary appear to have responded not only to sea level changes, but to have kept pace with the increase in the rate of such sea level rise which appears to have taken place over the past 40 years.*

- Increase in levels of suspended sediment during maintenance dredging operations. This could potentially affect the SPAs/Ramsar by remobilising and redistributing contaminated sediments within the estuary and by affecting populations of small fish which are a food source for a number of waterfowl. The provision of sediment samples is a requirement of all new dredging applications and samples must be provided once every two years for ongoing maintenance dredging operations. The PLA has developed guidelines on the number of samples required which is dependent upon the quantity of sediment to be dredged. This provides a mechanism for modifying or preventing dredging if the sediments are significantly contaminated. In some areas of the estuary, contaminants are present at deeper levels within the sediments, and a buffer layer is maintained to prevent dredging of the contaminated sediments. However, it is understood that in no locations has contamination been identified which precludes dredging. It is therefore considered unlikely that maintenance dredging has to date had an adverse effect on the integrity of the European Marine Sites through remobilisation of contaminated sediments. Furthermore, assuming the existing Maintenance Dredging Framework testing regime stays in place, it is unlikely that an impact would be allowed to occur in the future.
- Loss of benthic organisms within the footprint of the dredged area. Maintenance dredging is only carried out in the subtidal and, therefore, is unlikely to significantly affect the SPAs/Ramsar site (which is largely intertidal) in this way. Species within the over-wintering waterfowl assemblage do feed within the sub-tidal, however the core feeding areas for the principal waterfowl is within the intertidal habitats of the SPA and Ramsar site.

- Increasing disturbance. The visual presence of the dredging plant and increase in noise levels potentially could affect bird populations. However, as discussed in Section 6.6, dredging is only likely to cause low levels of disturbance over relatively short periods of time which are not predicted to adversely affect bird populations. It is recognised however that there are circumstances which can make the impacts more significant, e.g. sensitivity of location and weather conditions. Furthermore, other plans or projects, may increase the significance of the feeding areas, which needs to be borne in mind when considering 'in combination' effects.
- Operation of the disposal facilities at Cliffe Pools. Under the approved management procedures agreed by English Nature, the ongoing operation has, on balance, an ongoing beneficial impact on the condition of this area of saline habitat. The continued disposal of arisings to Cliffe Pools therefore should be continued for the foreseeable future.

To date, a condition assessment of the SPAs has not been produced by English Nature, it is therefore difficult to comment on whether maintenance dredging is likely to be causing a deterioration in its condition. In the absence of a condition assessment for the SPA, the SSSI condition assessments have been used. The vast majority of the Benfleet and Southend Marshes SSSI (which only covers a small proportion of the study area) is in unfavourable condition. Unit 3, which lies within the study area, is cited as being in unfavourable condition due to coastal squeeze, public access/disturbance, sea fisheries, water pollution discharge. The assessment comment notes, however, that Smallgains Creek is silting up rapidly and therefore area of mudflats is likely to be increasing. This process is regarded as being small with respect to the ongoing changes in the SPA and Ramsar site. Within the Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI, Mucking Flats is generally in favourable condition. For the area south of the river within the South Thames Estuary and Marshes SSSI some of the saltmarsh units are in unfavourable condition. The reasons cited for this are saltmarsh erosion due to coastal squeeze against the seawall. It is considered that this is likely to be due to sea level rise (and potential morphological roll-over of the estuary to the west) and hence maintenance dredging is not causing this coastal squeeze. This view is supported by the high availability of sediment within the system.

Overall it is considered that within the context of the estuarine system, the existing level of maintenance dredging activity is not having a significant effect of the SPAs or Ramsar sites, when the scale of the operations is compared to the high availability of sediment within the system, and when the management procedures already in place to monitor the activities are considered.

It should be noted that there are other activities currently impacting on the European sites under evaluation. In particular, the Mucking Flats SSSI area currently is influenced by the operation of the waste facilities within the site. It should be noted that the cessation of these operations might impact on the value of the site due to changes in nutrient levels derived from outfalls and discharges.

7.2 Data availability

A very large body of information exists for the Thames Estuary on the coastal and estuarine processes of the estuary, including an assessment of Sediment Budget undertaken by IECS in 1993.

Water quality monitoring comprises largely monitoring by the Environment Agency under the various relevant EC Directives, which in turn is limited to selected locations with varying frequencies. Some water quality sampling (suspended sediment, temperature and salinity) was undertaken in 2001 as part of studies for the London Gateway Environmental Statement. Although some data exists, comprehensive information is not, available for the estuary, particularly with respect to suspended sediment concentrations which have the most potential to be affected by maintenance dredging.

Similarly, sediment quality data have largely been collected as part of London Gateway Environmental Statement, PLA dredging license applications and, on occasion, FEPA disposal licence applications. Data is therefore available for both the subtidal and selected intertidal areas of the estuary.

There is a good coverage of data available for the Thames Estuary on marine ecology. Comprehensive surveys of the study area have been carried out within the last five years which have involved intensive grab surveys and large scale biotope mapping. It is therefore considered that the marine ecology can be well characterised from these sources.

With regard to ornithology, data collected as part of the WeBS scheme provides an excellent coverage of bird data for the intertidal areas of the estuaries. Counts are undertaken every year between September and April at high water and every 4-5 years at low water. These counts allow systematic monitoring of bird numbers in the estuary, and provide a scientific basis for analysing trends. The WeBS data is also analysed annually by the BTO to analyse trends and detect downwards movements in counts and pick-up alerts. This provides means of monitoring whether there is cause for concern to do with bird numbers within the study area. Data also exists from selected studies such as the London Gateway Environmental Statement. It is considered that the existing level of bird count data is at present sufficient for detecting any adverse effects of maintenance dredging on the SPA (if they occur). However, as WeBS survey information is largely undertaken by volunteers, coverage for some surveys is not always annual, leaving incomplete data sets. With this in mind, the adequacy of bird monitoring data should be monitored as part of the cross-cutting functions of the DLG, the adequacy reviewed as part of the ongoing update of the Baseline document and additional surveys should be undertaken where regarded appropriate

7.3 Recommendations

7.3.1 Use and Currency of Document

In accordance with the Draft Protocol, it is recommended that this baseline document is developed over time to incorporate new information as it becomes available (e.g. from condition monitoring of the SPA). It is also intended to be used in consultation with

other operators within the estuary who undertake, or plan to undertake, dredging activity.

It is anticipated that the document should not require substantial revision unless major changes are proposed (e.g. capital works or substantial change to existing maintenance dredging methods or quantities) or significant new information comes to light. It will be important to ensure that future proposals are assessed against the up-dated position and latest information.

7.3.2 London Gateway

In this context, a major capital dredge is proposed as part of the London Gateway port project. The London Gateway proposals involve amongst others, a 95ha land claim on the north bank of the Thames and dredging of approximately 30 million m³. A public inquiry into the proposals was completed in September 2003. Since then the Government has announced that it is minded to approve the proposals and therefore it is our understanding that the project will proceed. It is recommended that once the project is complete, this document is revised to take account of the new channel morphology and any changes to the maintenance dredging regime.

7.3.3 Incorporation of WeBS Data

It should also be noted that bird counts are undertaken every year between September and April as part of the WeBS scheme. New bird count data and WeBs alerts data should, therefore, be incorporated into this document as it becomes available. The document should also be reviewed once the six-yearly condition assessment of the SPA has been undertaken by English Nature; where this information will be critical to determining whether existing activities within the estuary are affecting the integrity of the European designated site.

7.3.4 Water Framework Directive

The implementation of the Water Framework Directive is anticipated to have implications on the management of the wider marine resource within the Estuary. While characterisation has now been completed, the implementation process has yet to commence. This document should be developed to address the requirements of the WFD as they become available, to provide a composite baseline for maintenance dredging within the lower Thames Estuary.

7.3.5 Further Evaluation of WID

It is recommended that further evaluation be undertaken to monitor bed level changes adjacent to selected water injection dredge sites themselves, including time-step surveys over a period commencing prior to and concluding a reasonable period after dredging campaign to identify any specific deposition trends arising from the technique and to supplement work previously undertaken by HR Wallingford and Environmental Tracing Systems.

7.4 Other Research

With regard to further work to investigate the estuarine system, an increase in tidal range has taken place which would be worthy of further study, albeit outside the scope of reference for PLA. The predominant causes of the observed increase in tidal range appear to be (although not definitively) anthropogenic in nature; for this reason a simple extrapolation of the observed rates into the future is not appropriate and hence further work is recommended (Littlewood et al., 2003) to:

- Determine the causes of the rise in water levels at Tower Bridge and their relative importance.
- Examine whether a rise at Tower Bridge will continue into the future and if so whether it will continue to be greater than the rise at Southend-on-Sea.

8 REFERENCES

Balson, P.S., and D'Olier, B. (1989). Thames Estuary Sheet 51oN-00o: Solid Geology. British Geological Survey, 1:250000 Series.

Batten, L.A., Bibby, C.J., Clement, P., Elliott, G.D. & Porter, R.F. (eds) (1990). *Red Data Birds in Britain*, The Nature Conservancy Council and RSPB. T and AD Poyser. London.

Bowen, A.J. (1972). The tidal regime of the River Thames; long-term trends and their possible causes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, A272, 187-199.

Bridgland, D.R. (1994). The Quaternary of the Thames. Geological Conservation Review Series. Joint Nature Conservation Committee/Chapman and Hall, London.

British Geological Survey (1997). Inner Thames Estuary. England and Wales. Part of Sheets 257, 258, 259, 271, 272, 273. Pre-Quaternary Geology and Quaternary Geology. 1:50000 (Keyworth, Nottingham: British Geological Survey).

Burd, F.H. (1992). Erosion and vegetation change on the saltmarshes of Essex and north Kent between 1973 and 1988. *Research and Survey in Nature Conservation*, 42. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough.

Bureau Veritas-Acoustic Technology (2003). Environmental Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment. Bathside Bay Planning Applications, Environmental Statement.

Cooper, N., Skrzypczak, T. and Burd, F. (2000). Erosion of the saltmarshes of Essex between 1988 and 1998. Report to the Environment Agency. Coastal Geomorphology Partnership, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Crooks, S.M. (1994). Changing flood peak levels on the River Thames. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers (Water, Maritime and Energy)*, 106, 267-279.

Davidson, N.C., d'A Laffoley, D., Doody, J.P., Way, L.S., Gordon, J., Key, R., Pienkowski, M.W., Mitchell, R. and Duff, K.L. (1991). *Nature Conservation and Estuaries in Great Britain*. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough.

Devoy, R.J.N. (1977). Flandrian sea level changes in the Thames Estuary and the implications for land subsidence in England and Wales. *Nature*, 270, 712-715.

Devoy, R.J.N. (1979). Flandrian sea-level changes and vegetational history of the lower Thames estuary. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, B285, 355-410.

Devoy, R. J. N. (2000). Tilbury, The World's End site (grid reference TQ 64667540: 51o27/14"N; 0o22/12"E). In Sidell, J. and Long, A. (eds) IGCP 437: Coastal Environmental Change During Sea-level Highstands: The Thames Estuary. Environmental Research Centre, University of Durham, Research Publication No 4. Durham, UK, 40-49.

Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (2001) Protocol for the derivation of Canadian Sediment Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life.

Cole, S., Coding, I.D., Parr, W. and Zabel, T. (1999) Guidelines for managing water quality impacts within UK European Marine Sites. WRc Swindon.

Corporation of London: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/>

English Nature: <http://www.natureonthemap.org.uk/>

English Nature (1997). *Greater Thames Estuary Coastal Natural Area Profile*, Essex, Hertfordshire and London Team October 1997.

English Nature (January 2001). Benfleet and Southend Marshes, European Marine Site. English Nature's Advice given under Regulation 33(2) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994.

English Nature (May 2001). Thames Estuary European Marine Site. English Nature's Advice given under Regulation 33(2) of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994.

Environment Agency: <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk>

Environmental Tracing Systems Ltd (November 2003). Hole Haven Creek Sediment Transport Study, Draft Report for PLA

Food Standards Agency: <http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/shellfish/shellharvestareas>

Haggart, B.A. (1995). A re-examination of some data relating to Holocene sea-level changes in the Thames estuary. In Bridgland, D.R., Allen, P. and Haggart, B.A. (editors) *The Quaternary of the Lower Reaches of the Thames*. Quaternary Research Association Field Guide, 329-335.

Halcrow Group Limited (2002). Proposed Channel Dredging, Shellhaven, Environmental Impact Assessment. Report to Shell UK Ltd, 17pp. and Appendices.

Halcrow Group Limited (2002). Proposed Channel Dredging, Shellhaven, Environmental Impact Assessment. Sediment Sampling Report. Report to Shell UK Ltd, 64 pp. and Appendices.

Horner, R.W. (1984). The Thames tidal flood risk - the need for the barrier: a review of its design and construction. Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology, 17, 199-206.

Howland, A.F. (1991). London's Docklands: engineering geology. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, 90, 1153-1178.

HR Wallingford (1992). Water Injection Dredging at Tilbury Bellmouth. A Study of the probable effects on the silt regime of the Thames Estuary. Report EX 2648.

HR Wallingford (2002a). London Gateway Development Studies. Review and assessment of morphological change. HR Wallingford Report EX4486.

HR Wallingford (2002b). London Gateway Development Studies. Wave studies. HR Wallingford Report EX4488.

HR Wallingford (2002c). London Gateway Development Studies. Impact of development on sediment transport and estuary morphology. HR Wallingford Report EX4490.

HR Wallingford (2002d). London Gateway Port Development. Technical Report: Results and implications of further flow, sediment transport and morphological studies. Appendix A – 3D hydrodynamic studies. HR Wallingford Report EX4631.

HR Wallingford (2002e). London Gateway Port Development. Technical Report: Results and implications of further flow, sediment transport and morphological studies. Appendix B – Sediment transport and morphological studies. HR Wallingford Report EX4632.

HR Wallingford (2002f). London Gateway Port Development. Technical Report: Results and implications of further flow, sediment transport and morphological studies. Appendix C – Review and assessment of morphological change. HR Wallingford Report EX4633.

HR Wallingford (2003). The London Gateway Port. Update to review and assessment of morphological change. HR Wallingford Report EX4751.

HR Wallingford (2004). An overview of the tidal Thames Estuary. HR Wallingford Report EX4936 for PLA.

Inglis, C.C. and Allen, F.H. (1957). The regimen of the Thames Estuary as affected by currents, salinities, and river flow. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, 7, 827-878.

Institute of Estuarine and Coastal Studies (1993). The Thames Estuary Coastal Processes and Conservation. Report to English Nature.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee: <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/>

Kendrick, M.P. (1972). Siltation problems in relation to the Thames barrier. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, A272, 233-243.

Kendrick, M.P. (1984). Impact of engineering structures on tidal flow and sediment distribution in the Thames. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology*, 17, 207-218.

Kirby, A. (2000). A dredging strategy for the Thames. An example of how strategic planning can be used to manage O&M expenditure. *Proceedings of the 35th MAFF Conference of River and Coastal Engineers*, Keele University, 03.2.1-03.2.9.

Land Use Consultants (2004.) *Tidal Thames Habitat and Species Audit*, Thames Estuary Partnership, March 2004.

Littlewood, M.A. (1999). The potential development of the Princes Channel for the east west navigation in the Outer Thames Estuary. Data review, collection and assessment of channel alignment. HR Wallingford Report EX 3974.

Littlewood, M.A. and Crossman, M. (2003). Planning for Flood Risk Management in the Thames Estuary Technical Scoping. Report to the Environment Agency, March 2003.

Littlewood, M.A., Malcolm, M. and Crossman, M. (2003). Review and Update of the 'Tidal Thames Strategy Review'. Report to the Environment Agency, March 2003.

Long, A. J. (1995). Sea-level and crustal movements in the Thames estuary, Essex and east Kent. In Bridgland, D.R., Allen, P. and Haggart, B.A. (editors) *The Quaternary of the Lower Reaches of the Thames*. Quaternary Research Association Field Guide, 99-105.

Long, A.J. (2000). The mid and late Holocene evolution of Romney Marsh and the Thames Estuary. *Archaeology in the Severn Estuary*, 11, 55-68.

Long, A.J., Scaife, R.G. and Edwards, R.J. (2000). Stratigraphic architecture, relative sea level, and models of estuary development in southern England: new data from Southampton Water. In Pye, K. and Allen, J.R.L. (editors) *Coastal and Estuarine Environments: Sedimentology, Geomorphology and Geoarchaeology*. Geological Society Special Publication 175, 253-279.

Maclean, I.M.D., Austin, G.E., Mellan, H.J. and Girling, T. (2005) *WeBS Alerts 2003/2004: Changes in numbers of wintering waterbirds in the United Kingdom, its Constituent Countries, Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)*. BTO Research Report No. 416 to the WeBS partnership. BTO, Thetford. Available: <http://blx1.bto.org/webs/alerts/index.htm>.

Marsland, A. (1986). The flood plain deposits of the Lower Thames. *Quarterly Journal of Engineering Geology*, London, 19, 223-247.

Motyka, J.M. and Welsby, J. (1987). A Macro-Review of the Coastline of England and Wales Volume 3; The Wash to the Thames. HR Wallingford Report SR135.

Musgrove, A.J., Pollitt, M.S., Hall, C., Hearn, R.D., Holloway, S.J., Marshall, P.E., Robinson, J.A. & Cranswick, P.A. (2001). *The Wetland Bird Survey 1999-2000: Wildfowl and Wader Counts*. BTO/WWT/RSPB/JNCC, Slimbridge.

Newell R.C., Seiderer L.J., Robinson J.E. & Simpson N.M (2001). London Gateway Port Project benthic biological resource survey of the lower Thames Estuary, July-September 2001. Marine Ecological Surveys Limited, Cornwall.

Newell R.C., Seiderer L.J., Robinson J.E. & Simpson N.M (2002). London Gateway Port Project benthic intertidal biology of the lower Thames Estuary, July 2002. Marine Ecological Surveys Limited, Cornwall.

Nicholls, R.J., Dredge, A. and Wilson, T. (2000). Shoreline change and fine-grained sediment input: Isle of Sheppey coast, Thames Estuary, UK. In. Pye, K. and Allen, J.R.L., (editors). *Coastal and estuarine environments: sedimentology, geomorphology and geoarchaeology*, 305-315. London: Geological Society.

PLA: <http://www.portoflondon.co.uk/>

PLA (2004). The potential effects of maintenance dredging in the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Holehaven Creek Site of Special Scientific Interest: initial overview. Nicola Clay, Environmental Scientist.

PLA (2004). Princess Channel Development: Phase II Environmental Assessment Report. PLA River Engineering and Environment, August 2004.

PLA (2004). Princess Channel Development: Placement of dredged sand in the North Edinburgh Channel- Environmental Characterisation Report.. PLA River Engineering and Environment, August 2004.

Posford Haskoning (2002a). Essex Estuaries Coastal Habitat Management Plan. Report to English Nature and the Environment Agency.

Posford Haskoning (2002b). North Kent Coastal Habitat Management Plan. Report to English Nature and the Environment Agency.

Prandle, D. (1975). Storm surges in the southern North Sea and the River Thames. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, A344, 509-539.

Prentice, J.E. (1972). Sedimentation in the inner estuary of the Thames, and its relation to the regional subsidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, A272, 115-119.

Pye, K. (2000). Saltmarsh erosion in southeast England: mechanisms, causes and implications. In Sherwood, B.R., Gardiner, T. and Harris, T. (editors). *British Saltmarshes*. Linnean Society of London, Forrest Text, Cardigan, 359-396.

- Rossiter, J.R. (1961). Interaction between tide and surge in the Thames. *Geophysical Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 6, 29-53.
- Rossiter, J.R. (1969). Tidal regime in the Thames. *Dock and Harbour Authority*, 49, 461.
- Royal Haskoning (2002). *HEO London Gateway Environmental Statement*. July 2002.
- Royal Haskoning (2002). The (London Gateway Port) Harbour Empowerment Order 2002 Environmental Statement, Chapter 19. Royal Haskoning.
- Royal Haskoning (2005). Frost *et al*, East Tilbury Jetty, Environmental Statement, July 2005.
- Royal Haskoning, (2004). Thames Estuary 2100 - Geomorphological Review and Conceptual Model, October 2004 Project Number: STCG/2003/81. Report to Environment Agency.
- RSPB website: <http://www.rspb.org.uk>
- Scott Wilson, (1998). Isle of Sheppey Strategy Plan, Strategy Report Volume 2. Report to the Environment Agency.
- Shaw, P (2002). *London Gateway Shorebird Survey for the Port of London Authority, October 2001 – March 2002*.
- Shaw, P. (2005) Wintering Shorebird Survey at BP Refinery, Coryton, January – March 2005. Study for BP Oil UK Ltd.
- Shennan, I. and Horton, B. (2002). Holocene land- and sea-level changes in Great Britain. *Journal of Quaternary Science*, 17, 511-526.
- Sumbler, M.G. (1996). *British Regional Geology: London and the Thames Valley* (4th edition). (London: HMSO for the British Geological Survey).
- Thames Estuary Partnership: <http://www.thamesweb.com/>
- Thames Estuary Partnership Biodiversity Action Group (2002). *Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan*.
- Thorn, M.F.C. and Burt, T.N. (1978). The silt regime of the Thames Estuary. Report No. IT175. Hydraulics Research Station, Wallingford.
- Thurrock Council: <http://www.thurrock.gov.uk/>
- Trafford, B.D. (1981). The background to the flood defences of London and the Thames Estuary. *Journal of the Institute of Water Engineers and Scientists*, 35, 383-397.

UK Biodiversity Action Plan Website: <http://www.ukbap.org.uk>

United Kingdom Hydrographic Office, (2003). Admiralty Tide Tables. Volume 1, 2004. United Kingdom and Ireland including European Channel Ports. UKHO.

Van der Wal, D. and Pye, K. (2004). Patterns, rates and possible causes of saltmarsh erosion in the Greater Thames area (UK). *Geomorphology*, 61, 373-391.

Welsby, J. and Motyka, J.M. (1987). A Macro-Review of the Coastline of England and Wales Volume 4; The Thames to Selsey Bill. HR Wallingford Report SR136.

Wilkinson, K. and Sidell, J. (2000). Late Glacial and Holocene development of the London Thames. In Sidell, J., Wilkinson, K., Scaife, R. and Cameron, N. *The Holocene Evolution of the London Thames. Archaeological Excavations (1991-1998) for the London Underground Limited Jubilee Line Extension Project*. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 5, 103-110.

Wilkinson, K.N., Scaife, R.G. and Sidell, E.J. (2000). Environmental and sea-level changes in London from 10 500 BP to the present: a case study from Silvertown. *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, 111, 41-54.

Woodworth, P.L., Tsimplis, M.N., Flather, R.A. and Shennan, I. (1999). A review of the trends observed in British Isles mean sea level data measured by tide gauges. *Geophysical Journal International*, 136, 651-670.

APPENDIX A

SSSI Condition Summaries

Condition of SSSI units

Compiled: 01 Nov 2005

See the [SSSI glossary](#) for an explanation of terms.

Team - Essex, Hertfordshire And London - **SSSI name** - Benfleet And Southend Marshes - **Staff member responsible for site** - Neil Fuller

Region	County	District	Main habitat	Staff member responsible for unit	Unit number	Unit ID	Unit area (ha)	Latest assessment date	Assessment description	Condition assessment comment	Reason for adverse condition
East Of England	Essex	Southend-On-Sea	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	1	1005108	1231.03	01 Feb 2002	Unfavourable declining	Assessed using EA's commissioned report 'Erosion of the saltmarshes of Essex between 1988 and 1998' (Jan 2000) - Confirmed by CO Intertidal foreshore subject to coastal squeeze being addressed strategically through CHAMPs/SMPs and other national policy interventions	Coastal squeeze,Public access/disturbance,Water pollution - discharge
East Of England	Essex	Southend-On-Sea	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	2	1005110	246.55	10 May 1999	Unfavourable declining	caused by sea level rise.	Coastal squeeze,Public access/disturbance,Sea fisheries,Water pollution - discharge
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	3	1005111	771.37	13 May 2002	Unfavourable declining	Visited area within Island Yacht Club's tenure with Ian Black. Area previously noted in 2000 as partially destroyed has had minimal recovery with very sparse vegetation cover. The tipped material has been almost entirely removed and there has been a natural deposition of sand/silt & shells, allowing a substrate for pioneering saline species to gain a foothold. Club member suggested that considerable areas of saltmarsh immediately west of the southernmost boardwalk have been recently blown-out during April due to the strong easterly currents. Inspection suggests that easterly currents are cutting a channel through this same area of saltmarsh. Discussions with Paul Ward Env Agency, Island Yacht Club members and observations on site suggest that Smallgains Creek is silting up rapidly and therefore area of mudflats is likely to be increasing.	Coastal squeeze,Public access/disturbance,Sea fisheries,Water pollution - discharge
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Neutral grassland - lowland	Neil Fuller	4	1005131	50.70	26 Apr 2002	Unfavourable recovering	Positive : The grassland is grazed between late April until end November by c. 30 cows & calves and the resultant mosaic of structure (tussocky, short etc.) is meeting objectives. Ditches clear water (water crowfoots etc.) and healthy levels. AW also confirmed GCN's in ponds last summer. Negative: Some localised ragwort & thistle problems - needs addressing. Speak to ESA administrator and possibly tenant wrt suitable spraying control. Ditch works as per WLMP not yet done, AW to undertake this summer. Excessive poaching at gateways is causing problems for movement - AW requires consent to improve surface of these areas. NF requested plans ASAP to consider. Discussed proposal of Sustrans route on top of coastal wall - some botanical interest & bird disturbance potential. (SSSI / SPA)	
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland	Neil Fuller	5	1005136	74.05	26 Apr 2002	Unfavourable recovering	Negative : Grassland slopes are undergrazed due to a history of practical difficulties - water supply & access. Improvements to both were discussed and resources available to address in the medium term. NF to work with AW towards these aims. Currently, a max. of 30 young male cows graze between late April and end November. Flailing is slowing down the rate of scrub development, but in areas up to 50 per cent has significant scrub regeneration and ranker grassland with thistles /ragwort in places. Advised AW to flail the newly regenerated scrub and encourage aftermath grazing. Keep in check and consult wrt chemicals if necessary. Positive : rides & glades works apparent to provide transition from short through longer grass to scrub. Also, WGS grant has allowed coppicing of scrub to open up areas, but to date ground flora is poor. Reptile numbers have benefitted from log piles & hay piles. Discussed long term management, wrt dense scrub areas - Need to establish ideal long term vision for this section of the site, in line with SSSI interest features & conservation objectives. It may require an experimental restoration approach, with coppice works providing some evidence of ground flora to inform process.	

Condition of SSSI units

Compiled: 01 Nov 2005

See the [SSSI glossary](#) for an explanation of terms.

Team - Essex, Hertfordshire And London - **SSSI name** - Holehaven Creek - **Staff member responsible for site** - Neil Fuller

Region	County	District	Main habitat	Staff member responsible for unit	Unit number	Unit ID	Unit area (ha)	Latest assessment date	Assessment description	Condition assessment comment	Reason for adverse condition
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	1	1028087	100.45	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	2	1028088	16.57	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	3	1028089	50.43	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	4	1028090	40.80	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Basildon	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	5	1028091	7.45	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Castle Point	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	6	1028092	8.09	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	7	1028093	33.46	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	8	1028094	13.28	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numnbers of black-tailed godwits.	
East Of England	Essex	Basildon	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	9	1028095	4.19	22 Nov 2002	Favourable	WeBS counts and site visits indicate that the mudflats and saltmarsh support good numbers of black-tailed godwits.	

Report completed.

Condition of SSSI units

Compiled: 01 Nov 2005

See the [SSSI glossary](#) for an explanation of terms.

Team - Essex, Hertfordshire And London - **SSSI name** - Mucking Flats And Marshes - **Staff member responsible for site** - Neil Fuller

Region	County	District	Main habitat	Staff member responsible for unit	Unit number	Unit ID	Unit area (ha)	Latest assessment date	Assessment description	Condition assessment comment	Reason for adverse condition
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Coastal lagoon	Neil Fuller	1	1016169	18.37	23 Dec 2002	Unfavourable no change	Rank grassland area and some tall herb ruderals dominate site. This is not ideal for a high tide roost, particularly accounting for the footpath disturbance. Area needs to have vegetation removed to an early pioneer successional stage.	Inappropriate weed control, Public access/disturbance
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	2	1005253	112.46	23 Dec 2002	Favourable	Good numbers of waterfowl seen feeding on the mudflats.	
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	3	1005254	87.85	23 Dec 2002	Favourable	Good number of birds seen feeding on mudflats. Some pioneer saltmarsh with Golden Samphire on old sea defences.	
East Of England	Essex	Thurrock	Littoral sediment	Neil Fuller	4	1005255	94.03	23 Dec 2002	Favourable	Good numbers of birds seen feeding on mudflats. Saltmarsh areas predominantly Spartina with higher areas dominated by Halimione & Sea Couch and rare clumps of Sea Aster. Some obvious erosion at south-side of mouth at Mucking Creek. Possible future issues of eroding towards land-fill.	

Report completed.

Condition of SSSI units

Compiled: 01 Nov 2005

See the [SSSI glossary](#) for an explanation of terms.

Team - Kent - **SSSI name** - South Thames Estuary And Marshes - **Staff member responsible for site** - Dave Rogers

Region	County	District	Main habitat	Staff member responsible for unit	Unit number	Unit ID	Unit area (ha)	Latest assessment date	Assessment description	Condition assessment comment	Reason for adverse condition
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	6	1016728	81.31	30 Nov 1999	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	7	1007016	84.34	01 Sep 2000	Favourable	Water levels in ditches very good for time of year. Grass swards generally taller than would be ideal, due to warm, wet growing season; thistles locally dominant in some fields, but management likely to achieve ESA objectives.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	8	1007017	27.76	04 Feb 2005	Unfavourable no change	The 2 eastern fields looked excellent with a very short sward. The ditches were also good. However the western and central fields were generally rank (the 2 central fields being very overgrown) and there was a significant thistle problem in all 4 western fields	Inappropriate weed control, Undergrazing
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	9	1007018	69.45	09 Nov 2004	Favourable	Good sward height, well managed ditches with a good range of vegetation successional stages. Flocks of wigeon and teal present during the visit along with a number of herons	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	10	1007019	86.11	30 Nov 1999	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	11	1007020	59.48	09 Nov 2004	Unfavourable recovering	Work continues to restore the ditch systems with recent scrub removal and desilting works visible. More work on the same lines is to follow this winter. Grassland was a mix of suitable sward height however some fields were on the rank side as well as the north western fields having a thistle problem. Both cattle and sheep were present during the visit.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	12	1007021	37.28	25 Feb 1999	Unfavourable recovering	brief visit by common wall, same as for unit 11	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	13	1007022	83.91	25 Jan 2001	Favourable	Good sward and recent ditch reprofiling	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	14	1007023	76.70	25 Jan 2001	Favourable	Good sward and ditch conditions	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	15	1007024	47.88	25 Jan 2001	Favourable	Good sward and ditch conditions	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	16	1007025	46.23	25 Jan 2001	Favourable	Good sward and ditch conditions	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	17	1016737	2.28	25 Jan 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	18	1016738	4.37	13 Dec 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland -	Dave Rogers	19	1007026	24.56	13 Dec 2001	Favourable	Visit with owners and ESA Officer (DEFRA). Dense reedbed covers most of Fleet - open channel very narrow in places. Discussed proposal to create more open	

			lowland								water at junction of watercourses at TQ782779. Agreed in principle that this would be acceptable.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	20	1007027	15.54	28 Sep 2001	Favourable		Grassland has not been grazed or cut this year and sward is therefore tall and thistly. Not in favourable condition for waterfowl, but does provide good habitat for short-eared owl and hen harrier. In context of surrounding area therefore judged to be in favourable condition.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	21	1007028	39.27	28 Sep 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	22	1007029	16.09	28 Sep 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	24	1007030	52.50	15 Aug 2000	Unfavourable recovering		Part of area recently acquired by RSPB. Scattered hawthorn scrub has been removed and several ditches reprofiled or slubbed out. Grassland rather rank and tussocky. Long term management goals are to maintain ditches, raise water levels and enhance for breeding waders.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	25	1007031	72.15	15 Aug 2000	Unfavourable recovering		Part of area recently acquired by RSPB. Scattered hawthorn scrub has been removed and several ditches reprofiled or slubbed out. Grassland rather rank and tussocky. Long term management goals are to maintain ditches, raise water levels and enhance for breeding waders.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	26	1007032	74.24	05 Feb 2002	Unfavourable recovering		RSPB have started work to remove hawthorn scrub and manage ditches. A substantial population of great crested newst occurs in mosaic of ponds (old shell craters), grassland and scrub. Management of this unit has to accommodate needs of GCN - hence proportion of scrub and tussocky grass sward will be retained.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	27	1007033	72.35	17 Jan 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	28	1016715	61.67	07 Dec 2000	Favourable		Viewed from footpath at eastern edge of unit. Generally short but tussocky sward grazed by cattle; some poaching on and next to sea wall but not excessive. Shallow standing water in fields (5 - 10% cover).
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	29	1016716	63.75	07 Dec 2000	Favourable		Viewed from footpath on eastern side of unit. Short (3-5cm) sward grazed by sheep; shallow standing water over 5-10% of field area.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	31	1007036	81.49	13 Dec 2001	Favourable		Area affected by FMD - livestock culled earlier in year. Now grazed by c.75 horses. Sward over most of unit tall tall and tussocky to be ideal for wintering waders and wildfowl. Very little water in internal ditches; no water in rills. Exception is south-western field behind counter wall - plenty of surface water with flock of roosting wigeon and some waders. Needs to be assessed in 2002/03 to see if longer-term management problem.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	32	1007037	86.54	24 Feb 2000	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	34	1007038	91.26	30 Sep 2000	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	35	1007039	49.97	30 Mar 2005	Favourable		Area affected by FMD pyre has revegetated but requires weed control; however, the affected area is less than 0.5ha so only a small part of the unit. Remainder of unit is well-grazed with appropriate sward structure & composition. Water level in ditches lower than would be ideal at this time of year due to lack of winter rainfall.
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	36	1007040	93.48	30 Sep 2000	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	37	1007041	75.24	24 Feb 2000	Favourable		

South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	38	1007042	29.48	06 Sep 2000	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	39	1007043	147.66	30 Mar 2005	Favourable	Sward height and structure are appropriate for the features of interest. Water levels in ditches and extent of surface flooding on fields are lower than would be ideal for the time of year, but this is due to low winter rainfall so no remedial action needed.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	40	1007044	17.39	01 Sep 2000	Favourable	Currently grazed by horses, giving short but tussocky sward. Water levels in ditches good for time of year.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	41	1016714	31.09	22 Aug 2001	Unfavourable no change	Visited to look at proposed modifications to N-S ditch. Ploughed land colonised by ruderals; horses on adjoining land have free access. Watercourses have been modified (banks scraped) and are mostly devoid of aquatic vegetation except duckweed.	Agriculture - other
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	42	1016718	35.67	27 Sep 2000	Favourable	Reasonably diverse ditches. see field notes in owner file.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	43	1016719	19.77	27 Sep 2000	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Boundary and linear features	Dave Rogers	44	1016723	14.44	04 Feb 2005	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	45	1016720	40.01	16 May 2002	Unfavourable no change	Unit visited on 11 May and 16 May. Part of unit is dominated by Juncus spp., with very different character to other grazing marsh in North Kent. Agreed that sward should be opened up slightly by mowing/grazing, but that conversion to short grass sward would be undesirable/unachievable. Land is more typical grazing marsh, but has not been managed for approx. 10 years. Requires cutting/grazing and restoration of ditches. Does not have any livestock or suitable machinery for managing the site. Discussed possibility of funding by EN to secure positive management in future.	Inappropriate scrub control, Undergrazing, Inappropriate ditch management
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	46	1016721	12.88	07 Dec 2000	Favourable	Viewed from footpaths. Clumps of Juncus sp. locally frequent in southern part of unit, but not excessive.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	47	1023743	55.87	03 Dec 2003	Unfavourable recovering	Work commenced to remove dense hawthorn scrub and clean worst section of ditch.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Standing open water and canals	Dave Rogers	48	1016711	23.42	04 Feb 2005	Favourable	Developing reed fringe. Variety of waterfowl present	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Standing open water and canals	Dave Rogers	49	1016712	71.81	04 Feb 2005	Favourable	Nice reed fringe along parts of the lake. 50+ tufted duck present along south east shoreline	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Standing open water and canals	Dave Rogers	50	1007070	23.73	14 Sep 1999	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Standing open water and canals	Dave Rogers	51	1007071	34.06	14 Jun 2002	Favourable	Water levels within the pit remain high - area of scrub below access track in NW corner of pit has been flooded (see previous assessment) and about half of this scrub is now dead. Large number (>50) of coot present, also great crested grebe (1), greylag geese (5-6) and tufted duck (6-10). Scrub habitat around margins and upper rim of quarry is dominated by hawthorn, willow, buddleja, elder, bramble and dogrose - good habitat for invertebrates and scrub-nesting birds.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Coastal lagoon	Dave Rogers	52	1007130	19.88	03 Dec 2003	Unfavourable recovering	Significant improvements to the disturbance and fly tipping problems. RSPB are progressing with their plans for the site and action on the ground has resulted in significant improvements	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Coastal lagoon	Dave Rogers	53	1007131	70.65	03 Dec 2003	Unfavourable recovering	Works by RSPB have significantly reduced the disturbance and flytipping problems on site. Good numbers of wintering birds present during the visit.	

South East	Kent	Gravesham	Coastal lagoon	Dave Rogers	54	1007132	69.04	03 Dec 2003	Favourable	RSPB have undertaken enhancement works to this part of the Cliffe Pools site including the creation of new islands within the lagoon. Good numbers of birds present during the visit - teal, shoveler, pochard, lapwing etc	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Coastal lagoon	Dave Rogers	56	1019619	64.63	03 Dec 2003	Unfavourable recovering	Creation of a perimeter ditch around the northern edge of this unit has eliminated the motorbike trespass problem and significantly reduced the flytipping. Good numbers of birds present during the visit including goldeneye	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	57	1007054	35.46	22 Feb 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	58	1007055	32.10	04 Feb 2005	Favourable	Good short sward across the site, mix of open and vegetated ditches with recent reprofiling works along 2 ditches	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	59	1007056	56.15	04 Feb 2005	Favourable	Good sward height generally across the site. A few thistles present in places	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	60	1007057	43.91	22 Feb 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	61	1007058	53.87	05 Dec 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	62	1007059	49.48	05 Dec 2001	Favourable	Area around old munitions buildings grazed by the tenant's horses. Sward is in good condition, no problems with poaching or stock feeding.	
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Neutral grassland - lowland	Dave Rogers	64	1007060	19.95	28 Sep 2001	Favourable		
South East	Kent	Gravesham	Littoral sediment	Dave Rogers	100	1023905	82.43	19 Dec 2002	Unfavourable declining	Saltmarsh erosion due to coastal squeeze against sea defences on this unit and within the other intertidal unit within the SSSI. More detail on assessment available on Kent Team files.	Coastal squeeze
South East	Kent	Medway Towns	Littoral sediment	Dave Rogers	101	1023906	2454.91	19 Dec 2002	Unfavourable declining	Saltmarsh erosion due to coastal squeeze against sea defences within this unit and the other intertidal unit on the SSSI. More information on assessment on file at Kent Team.	Coastal squeeze

Report completed.