

MCZs requiring further consideration

Using the DEFRA report.

Use the DEFRA link on the BORG website to access the DEFRA download page.

Identify from this list which Annex you need, and download it as a pdf.

The DEFRA report contains three tables and a chart for each MCZ area. The tables for each area are the pages BEFORE each chart, but I have used the chart as it is easy to flick through the report to find them. (Hint: you can easily search for keywords in these documents using a pdf reader: right-click on the document and select "find" in the drop-down menu, then type the word, eg bembridge: using the arrows, you can search the whole document).

Beneath each area heading is a list of references for further reading and information

Table 1 'General information...', lists The FOCI and habitats present in the MCZ, and its conservation objective - Maintain or Recovery

Table 2 Lists who will be affected and the estimated cost to them of creating an MCZ in this location.

Table 3 'Designation Status' is the important one for us: It summarises the conservation need of the area as 'Site advantages' The known socio-economic implications such as who is likely to be affected. Data Certainty - often the reasons why the site was not taken forward immediately, and DEFRA's all important conclusions.

DEFRA Doc Ref Annex A.2

Areas are listed alphabetically for each region

Irish Sea Sites

Ribble estuary Chart p26 Reason given: Inadequate data. Impact; Low

Solway Firth: Chart p38 Reason given: Data uncertainty. Impact: Low

Lune and Wyre Estuaries: Chart p 58 Impact Low

DEFRA Doc Ref Annex A.3

Balanced Seas Sites

Bembridge Chart p15 'High Risk' area (i.e identified as in need of immediate protection)

Reason given: significant unquantified costs arising from St Helens road commercial anchorage

Impact: No assessment possible, too many variables.

This site is heavily used by both commercial and leisure sector especially the popular anchorage in Priory Bay and extensive moorings in Seaview as well as the entrance to Bembridge harbour itself. Commercial ships anchor further offshore to await tide or a berth, etc. Conservationists regard this site as one of the most important in the Solent because of its wide biodiversity. It contains 15 identified FOCI, including eelgrass and Seahorses, and several other more rare and exotic species. Conservation Objectives identified will involve 'bottom protection' which implies restrictions on anchoring. Outside Studland it is one of the most disputed MCZ proposals.

Dover to Folkestone and Dover to Deal: Charts pp 20 and 25 Higher risk areas.

Reasons Given: No higher risk pressures identified, data uncertainty.

Impact Nil

Note: included here to clarify that the actual ports of Dover and Folkestone are NOT included in the MCZ proposal.

Fareham Creek Chart p33

Reason Given uncertain data.

Impact: Medium.

This is an area with many small boat moorings which would be affected if bottom protection measures are imposed. If this is avoided, then impact = low.

Norris to Ryde (Includes Osborne Bay and Wooton Creek)

Chart p49 'High Risk site'

Reason Given: Uncertainty whether the advantages of designation will outweigh the socio-economic implications.

Impact: If designated High: Mitigation of damage to eelgrass in the Osborne bay anchorage called for. Implications for moorings in Wooton Creek, Implications for Wightlink ferry terminals at Wooton and Ryde . Implications for Ryde marina.

Thames Estuary Chart p71

Reason Given: significant unquantified socio economic implications

This proposal covers the entire Port of London Authority area and tidal Thames up to Richmond lock. 'Reservations' were expressed during the consultation stage about even putting it forward.

The Needles (IoW) Chart p75 High risk site

Reasons Given: High uncertainty about the main FOCI species, the stalked jellyfish

Impact: Nil, unless bottom protection is required in Alum, Totland and Colwell Bay., Discussions suggest that the anchorages could be excluded from the zone without affecting it.

The Swale Estuary Chart p79 High risk site

Reasons Given: Uncertainty whether the advantages outweigh the socio-economic implications.

Impact: This site contains 7 FOCI requiring bottom protection. If designated mitigation measures would follow

Yarmouth to Cowes including Newtown River Chart p88

Reason Given: Uncertainty whether advantages outweigh the socio-economic implications

Impact: High within the popular Newtown River estuary which the conservationists would like to see closed to boats altogether. Strong local opposition from everyone involved has reduced this likelihood. Eelgrass is present off Yarmouth in the anchorage outside the harbour. If Newtown were closed, it is likely the less sheltered anchorage outside the entrance could remain open. A further option is the provision of more moorings within the harbour, with a ban on anchoring. Existing No anchor zones in the Oyster beds would be reinforced and are likely to become 'no go' zones, if designation takes place.

FINDING SANCTUARY

DEFRA Doc Ref Annex A.5

Axe Estuary Chart p5

Reason given: Uncertainty of data

Impact: Low. The MCZ includes the Harbour area, but as the FOCI are all regarded as being in good condition, no mitigation measures are likely. Mooring licence conditions may be more stringent so 'low' rather than 'nil'.

Bideford to Foreland point and Tav Torridge estuary Chart pp13 and 122

Reason Given: Data uncertainty

Impact: Low. FOCI all in good condition. Possible tightening of mooring licensing conditions in estuary

Camel Estuary Chart p 21

Reason given: potentially significant unquantified socio-economic implications for aquaculture sector.

Impact: low. FOCI in good condition.

Dart Estuary Chart p32.

Reason Given: potentially significant socio-economic implications

Impact: Low - nil. All FOCI in good condition.

Devon Avon Chart p36

Reason Given: strong indication of potentially high socio-economic implications.

Impact: Low Relevant FOCI in good condition. Possible mooring licence rules.

Erme estuary Chart p42

Reason given: Uncertain data.

Impact Low. Moorings licensing regulations?

Mounts Bay Chart p72

Reason given: Uncertainty of data.

Impact: Low: local landowners support depends on no restriction on ports and harbours.

Newquay and the Gannel Chart p77

Reason Given: Data uncertainty.

Impact Low

Otter Estuary Chart p93

Reason given: data uncertainty

Impact: Nil

Studland Bay Chart p118

Reason Given: Uncertainty whether advantages of designation will outweigh socio-economic implications and data uncertainty on some species.

Impact: Eelgrass present, potentially High if mitigation is required. for this highly popular anchorage.

DEFRA DOC REF ANNEX A.4

NET GAIN

Alde Ore Estuary Chart p8

Reason Given: Potentially significant socio-economic implications associated with renewable energy sector, and data uncertainty.

Impact: Low, possible tightening of mooring regulations.

Castle Ground Including Scarborough Bay Chart p13

Reasons Given: Cost implications for renewable energy sector.

Impact: Low. Scarborough harbour itself is not included in the MCZ zone

GENERAL NOTES;

As before the 'Impact' assessment is Jon Reed's opinion of the likely outcome, and has *NO OFFICIAL STANDING*

FOCI: = Features of Conservation Interest, i.e. the specific features the MCZ is designed to protect and support. In the Natural England Report each FOCI in each MCZ was awarded a conservation status of 'Maintain', or 'Recovery' This is listed in the DEFRA summaries. Where a feature is listed as 'Maintain' any existing activity such as anchoring or mooring will almost certainly be allowed to continue.

Mooring licensing regulations in an MCZ will almost certainly become more stringent so as to prevent any damage. In many places where impact is listed as 'low', this is likely to be the only effect on the local boating community.