3 Wembury Point to Devil's Point (policy units 6c27 to 6c30)

This stretch of coastline encompasses the large urban settlement of Plymouth, the protection of which is a key policy driver. An additional consideration in this section is the need to protect areas of active/former landfill and potentially contaminated land from increasing rates of erosion and flooding. As such, the policy for the majority of this section is to continue to 'Hold the Line'.

The cliffs along the eastern side of Plymouth Sound are of outstanding landscape and geological value and a policy of 'No Active Intervention' in this area would ensure that these features remain in the future.

2 Tamar Estuary (policy units 6c31 to 6c40)

The Tamar Estuary contains both a number of developed areas as well as large areas of natural, undefended estuary. Policies aim to hold the existing defences where they occur, and undertake no intervention in the undefended areas of the estuary.

In areas where there is potential for 'Managed Realignment', opportunities for the expansion of existing wetland areas can be explored through targeting environmental schemes such as stewardship. There are also opportunities for new areas of wetland habitat creation through the design of appropriate managed realignment schemes. Within these areas, the aim of managed realignment is to both create habitat and reduce flood risk in other parts of the estuary. As such, areas where there are existing defences would be maintained under this policy. However, it is not envisaged that new defences will be constructed in currently undefended areas under this policy.



I Mount Edgcumbe to Rame Head (policy units 6c41 to 6c45)

This coastline is mainly characterised by undefended, hard rock cliffs, which experience very slow retreat rates, although locally cliff falls can occur which cause a few metres of erosion. Sediment linkages are weak and therefore impacts of defences tend to be confined locally. For most of the frontage the selected policy is to continue to allow natural retreat of the shoreline, which, due to the low rate of retreat, is unlikely to result in significant loss of assets.

At Kingsand and Cawsand, the selected policy is to minimise the risk of flooding and erosion to the town assets, through maintaining and improving the existing defences. The cliffs that enclose these beaches are very resistant to erosion. Coastal squeeze would therefore be expected to occur whether these areas were defended or not.

South Devon & Dorset

Shoreline Management Plan Review



Our Changing Coastline

The coastline is undergoing constant change from the effects of waves and tidal currents and the changing climate. The amount of physical change depends upon the degree of exposure of each length of coast and the underlying geology. These changes usually take place over long historical periods and examples include the ongoing erosion of cliffs between Lyme Regis and Charmouth.

Another influence on the development of the coastline has been human intervention throughout the ages, particularly in attempts to stop the effect of erosion or flooding at particular locations. In many cases this has taken place without any acknowledgement of the consequences of carrying out these works on other locations up and down the coast.

Whilst these changes continue to take place, social, economic and environmental pressures are increasing in the coastal zone. People enjoy living by and visiting the coast and the pressure for more housing is ever present. As international trade increases, so does the demand for port space and associated coastal-based industry. Such development often places stress on natural coastal habitats that are unique and of national and international importance.

Durlston Head to Rame Head

The coastline covered by this plan has a rich diversity in its physical form, human usage and natural environment. This includes one of the largest active landslip areas in Europe between Lyme Regis and Charmouth, large urban centres such as Plymouth and Torbay, and many areas designated and protected for their heritage, landscape, geological and biological value. This combination of assets creates a coastline of great amenity value, and a tourism economy of regional importance.



What is the Shoreline Management Plan?

A Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) provides an objective, largescale assessment of the risks to people and the developed, historic and natural environment, resulting from the evolution of the coast. It goes on to present a policy framework that addresses these risks in a way that does not tie future generations to costly and unsustainable activities. In the setting of policy, it attempts to balance all of the (sometimes conflicting) interests at the coast in a sustainable manner.

The SMP is a non-statutory policy document for the planning and management of coastal defences. It takes account of other existing planning initiatives and legislative requirements, and is intended to inform wider strategic planning. It does not set policy for anything other than coastal defence management. As such, it does not set policies for the management of issues such as land drainage, though along parts of this coast this is a significant problem that is acknowledged within the plan.

16

Coastal Defence Planning

It is important to differentiate between the three tiers of coastal defence management in England and Wales, and their discrete roles to address flood and erosion risks:

SMP	Identifies general policies and general implementation requirements.
Coastal Defence Planning	Identifies nature and timing of works to be undertaken.
Scheme	Design and construction of capital wor

Design and construction of capital works and maintenance on a single frontage.



Sustainable Management

One of the main objectives in developing a Shoreline Management Plan is the identification of sustainable long term management policies for the coast. Defra's SMP guidance defines sustainable long term management policies as "those which take account of the relationships with other defences, developments and processes, and which avoid, as far as possible, committing future generations to inflexible and expensive options for defence" (Defra, 2006).

Given sea level rise predictions, this would generally best be achieved through the creation of a naturally functioning coast; allowing it to move landwards or seawards at rates dictated by the natural processes of waves and tides. Along this SMP frontage, there are large areas of natural, undefended coastline and the policy selection in these areas has been driven by sustaining this situation.

Many areas along the South Devon and Dorset coastline have a long history of coastal defence intervention to reduce the risk of flooding and erosion. This means that the shoreline today is, in places, in an 'unnatural' form and position, one that would not necessarily revert to 'naturally functioning' if simply allowed to develop unmanaged. It is likely that the removal of defences along parts of the SMP frontage would result in the breakdown of beaches, with little or no protection of the land behind from erosion and flooding.

The consequences of this, given the extent of development along parts of the coast, would be catastrophic, as thousands of homes and businesses lie within the potential risk areas.

As such, it is the social and economic sustainability of the SMP area which has driven policy selection for the majority of the developed areas of this frontage. However, policies leading to a more 'natural' shoreline in the long-term have been identified where feasible.

The SMP Review

Recognising the need for review of the original SMP policies, the South Devon and Dorset Coastal Advisory Group commissioned consulting engineers Halcrow Group Ltd (Halcrow) to review the two original SMPs, which for the purpose of this review have been combined into one single SMP. The review was commissioned to take account of:

- Latest coastal studies and monitoring information;
- Issues identified by most recent defence planning;
- Changes in legislation (e.g. European Union Habitats Directive);
- Changes in national flood and coastal defence planning policy requirements (e.g. the need to consider a timeframe of at least 100 years rather than the original 50 years).

This summary presents an overview of the policies that have been formally adopted. Full details of policies for individual sections of coast are provided in the main SMP document. It should be noted that, although these policies have been formally adopted, this does not guarantee funding will be provided to implement policies in the future.

The Policy Appraisal Process

The 100 year appraisal timeframe, identified above, is significant as it forces us to look beyond the anticipated life of all coastal defence structures and into a period when climate change will have a significant impact on coastal management. This is an important change from the original SMP.

The coastal process appraisal determines the way in which natural forces will shape the shoreline (taking account of climate change and sea level rise). It begins by looking at a 'no active intervention' scenario to identify what could happen to the coastline over the next 100 years if all defences were allowed to deteriorate and fail.

By considering this scenario, the assets potentially affected by coastal erosion and flooding can be identified and objectives associated with their future management defined, e.g. protection of properties and environmental enhancement. These objectives are, in part, defined through the involvement of those with an interest in the coast (the Stakeholders).

The achievement of objectives under different policy approaches is then used to determine the recommended policies for the next 100 years. In this way, policy is set with full acknowledgement of its potential impact on the environmental, financial and social assets along the coast.



An overview of the recommended policies for each section of coast (i.e. each Policy Scenario Area) is presented on the reverse of this leaflet, with full appraisals for the smaller Policy Units within each area presented in the main SMP document (on deposit with Coastal Advisory Group members (see page 6 for further information).

Policy Options

The 4 shoreline management policies considered are those defined by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra, formerly MAFF). Defra provides guidance and grant aid to local authorities for the preparation of SMPs. These policies are:

Hold the Line	maintain or upgrade the level of protection provided by existing coastal defences.
Advance the Line	build new defences seaward of the existing defence line.
Managed Realignment	allow retreat of the shoreline inland, with management to control or limit that movement.
No Active Intervention	a decision not to invest in providing or maintaining defences.



The South Devon and Dorset Coastal Advisory Group

The South Devon and Dorset Coastal Advisory Group (SDADCAG) includes the 11 local authorities that lie within the boundaries of the SMP, the Environment Agency and other key bodies. These include Natural England, Devon County Council, Dorset County Council, English Heritage, The National Trust and Network Rail. The local authorities and Environment Agency have responsibility for protecting the coastline and estuaries.

The local authorities mainly deal with defences that protect the coast from erosion by the sea. The Environment Agency deals with flood risk management and has a strategic overview for all aspects of flood and coastal erosion risk management.

Defra require production of SMPs for sustainable coastal defence management. The development of this Plan has been led by the SDADCAG, with guidance and funding provided by Defra.

Background to the South Devon and Dorset SMP

In 1998, the original Shoreline Management Plans for the coastline from Durlston Head to Portland Bill, and Portland Bill to Rame Head, were completed and adopted. These identified coastal defence management policies based upon original guidance from MAFF for a 50-year period.

Since completion of these SMPs, a number of studies and schemes have been developed based upon the policies it recommended. The outcomes of these studies have been used to inform the development of this SMP review.

Stakeholder Engagement

The greater involvement of Stakeholders in the appraisal process is one of the key changes from the first SMP. The main changes have been in the formation of a Client Steering Group (CSG) and consultation with Stakeholders and Elected officials at key stages of the development of the SMP to input information to the process, and review and comment on outputs as the study progressed. This involvement has therefore provided representation of the interests of landowners and residents such that the views of those whom SMP policies will affect have been taken into account during its development, ensuring that all relevant issues are considered, and all interests represented.

The CSG comprises representatives from some of the local authorities, the Environment Agency, Natural England, the National Trust, the World Heritage Site management team, and Devon County Council, with a remit to agree the various stages of the SMP as it progresses. This group has met throughout the Plan development, agreeing to the outputs once they have been discussed with stakeholders.



Further Information

SMP documents are available to view and download on the South Devon and Dorset Coastal Advisory Group's website: www.sdadcag.org.

Full copies of the Shoreline Management Plan and Supporting Appendices, as well as this summary, are also available at the following locations:

- Purbeck District Council, Westport House, Wareham.
- Weymouth & Portland Borough Council, North Quay, Weymouth.
- West Dorset District Council, Stratton House, Dorchester.
 Dorset County Council, County Hall, Dorchester.
- East Devon District Council, Council Offices, Sidmouth.
- Exeter City Council, Civic Centre, Exeter.
- Devon County Council, County Hall, Exeter.
- Teignbridge District Council, Forde House, Newton Abbot.
- Torbay Council, Town Hall, Torquay.
- South Hams District Council, Follaton House, Totnes.
- Plymouth City Council, Civic Centre, Plymouth.
- West Devon Borough Council, Kilworthy Park, Tavistock.
- Cornwall Council, County Hall, Truro.
- Dorset, Devon and Cornwall County Libraries.
- Universities of Bournemouth, Exeter & Plymouth Libraries.

Any new information and/or data will be uploaded onto the website as it becomes available. Should this affect the current policies, notification will be stipulated.

December 2010

The Shoreline Management Policies

The following text summarises the justification for and the impacts of the 100-year management recommendations defined for each policy scenario area in the SMP. It is essential that this is read in conjunction with the main SMP documents, which provide more detailed information for each individual policy unit.

17 Durlston Head to White Nothe (policy units 5g01 to 5g08)

This area is characterised by rocky cliffed shorelines, which are designated for their outstanding landscape and geological value, much of the coast is currently undefended and erosion risks are generally low due to the resistant nature of the cliffs. The policy is therefore to continue to minimise intervention along this coast. At Kimmeridge Bay and Lulworth Cove, existing defences could be retained, potentially in a realigned position and subject to private funding, in order to retain visitor access points and facilities.

16 White Nothe to Redcliff Point (policy units 5g09 to 5g11)

This is a mainly cliffed section of coast dominated by clay-rich cliffs, which experience episodic landslide events, causing tens of metres of retreat as a result of a single event. In places there is a risk of relict landslide complexes becoming reactivated, which makes management of this coastline more difficult. The coast is largely undefended, apart from a short stretch of defence in Ringstead Bay. The continuation of the natural erosion process is essential to the integrity of the World Heritage and SSSI status of the cliffs.

The long-term aim is to return this coastline to its natural state. This will have an impact on a number of cliff top assets. It is therefore recognised that there needs to be a transition period to enable measures to be put in place to manage this change in management. Under the long-term policy there will be potential loss of cliff top properties along the coastal stretch due to erosion. Holiday developments in Ringstead Bay will also be affected.

15 Redcliff Point to Portland Bill (policy units 5g12 to 5g23)

This is one of the more heavily developed stretches of coastline within the SMP area, incorporating the key service and tourism centre of Weymouth and the Isle of Portland. The area also has a number of nature designations for both geological and biological reasons. The Isle of Portland and the Portland Harbour breakwaters are also key controls on future evolution as they provide shelter from the dominant south-westerly waves. This whole stretch of coast is therefore heavily dependent on any changes to the breakwaters. Policies developed in this area have assumed that the breakwaters will remain and be maintained.

A key driver of policy in this area is the continued protection of commercial and social assets, which requires the continued defence of the shoreline for much of this area. This will, however, result in coastal squeeze of intertidal habitats against fixed sea defences.

At Bowleaze Cove and Preston Beach, the long-term vision is to provide more sustainable defences through realignment of existing defences. This will require measures to be in place to manage this transition in policy. Intervention along the northwest shore of Portland Harbour, where it is economically viable to do so, would prevent localised cliff recession. However, it is unlikely to be possible to intervene along all parts of this section



of coast, and loss of further parts of Sandsfoot Castle and some cliff top properties could occur.

There is also a need to start to plan for how future transport links can be provided in the future, especially how the road link to Portland is provided in the longer-term as the risk of Chesil Beach being overtopped and possibly breaching increases. Should this occur then the current road link could become unusable.



14 Portland Bill to Thorncombe Beacon (policy units 6a01 to 6a13)

This stretch of coast is dominated by Chesil Beach, which as well as being internationally important for its habitats, geomorphology and landscape characteristics, also provides an important defence role. The shingle barrier is undergoing an ongoing natural change as it rolls landwards in response to sea level rise. Whilst this natural process is integral to its designated

status, there are also environmental implications as The Fleet is gradually becoming squeezed.

In relation to natural processes, potential conflicts may arise where there are small settlements, such as West Bexington and Burton Bradstock, as this coast is also

important for tourism which relies on access to the beach and the provision of facilities. However, as the ridge naturally rolls landward, sustaining defences along these stretches will become technically more difficult and will also impact on the shingle ridge system as a whole.

A key driver of policy is maintaining the natural status of Chesil Beach and taking measures to ensure its future sustainability. Therefore, for most of this stretch the policy is for 'No Active Intervention'. Along the section of Chesil Beach towards Portland this will result in an increased flood risk due to overtopping and even breaching in the very long-term. This could have implications for how transport links to Portland are provided in the future, and consideration is needed in the shortterm of how this can be provided should Chesil Beach fail. At Hive Beach the policy of 'No Active Intervention' would result in a naturally functioning beach system, but will lead to the potential loss of properties along the top of the adjacent cliffs in this area. At Freshwater Beach and East Beach, the long-term vision is for realigned defence. This will allow a beach to be retained in these areas as it rolls back, whilst continuing to provide sustainable long-term management of flood risk to Burton Bradstock and West Bay respectively.

The exception to this is at Chiswell (Isle of Portland), where a long term policy of 'Hold the Line' through maintaining existing defences is the preferred approach. This is not expected to have a detrimental impact on the Chesil Beach system as a whole, although locally rollback will be inhibited, with net loss of shingle possible.

13 Thorncombe Beacon to Beer Head (policy units 6a14 to 6a33)

This section of coast is characterised by dramatic, geologically important cliffs which are subject to large-scale complex landsliding. Such events are difficult to predict making management of this shoreline difficult. Sediment linkages along this frontage are relatively weak due to the interruptions caused by headlands. The natural erosion of these cliffs is integral to their designations and landscape value, however, the area is also important for tourism, with resorts at Seatown, Charmouth and Lyme Regis. Technically, some defences will become more difficult to sustain in the medium to long-term, and the presence of defences also has an impact on the landscape and geological and biological interests of this area. A key driver of policy is therefore the continuation of natural coastline evolution along this stretch, whilst managing the risk of erosion and flooding to the key settlements.

The long-term defence of Seatown will become technically more difficult and expensive; therefore the long-term vision is for a

more naturally functioning coast through a policy of 'No Active Intervention'. This would result in the potential loss of assets, although the shoreline should reach a more sustainable position, such that a beach will be retained. The South West Coast Path would also require realignment in this area. Along the eastern side of Lyme Regis, a longer-term policy of 'Managed Realignment' recognises the need to address the increasing risk that further recession of the landslide complexes would cause outflanking of the presently defended area. Therefore the risk in this area may be managed in the short and medium term whilst assets are relocated away from the areas at risk in the longer term. This would be based on continual monitoring and also require changes at a national level to enable this to occur.

'Managed Realignment' within the Axe Estuary may provide habitat creation opportunities, although consideration as to what happens to the route of the tramway would need to be made.

To the west of Seaton, a proposed policy of 'Managed Realignment' would ensure defences along the cliff toe continue to be provided but this will not prevent cliff erosion completely and some cliff top assets could be lost over time.

12 Beer Head to Otterton Ledge (policy units 6a34 to 6a38)

This is a predominately undeveloped stretch of cliffed coastline, with one key settlement at Sidmouth. The cliffs are internationally important and their natural evolution is integral to their designated status. A key driver of policy is therefore to conserve the natural status of this shoreline, through minimising intervention, whilst recognising the importance of Sidmouth, and other small coastal developments, to the social and economic structure of the area.

Accelerated cliff recession as a result of low beach levels along the River Sid section will eventually lead to exposure of the fluvial defences of the River Sid and so increase the risk of flooding to the town. In In order to restore a more



natural rate of retreat along this section, beach management would occur to provide a healthy beach level along the River Sid section.

Exeter

This will not prevent cliff recession occurring but would result in a slower rate of retreat. This would protect cliff top properties to the immediate east of the River Sid for a period of time, but these assets would ultimately need to be relocated away from the area of risk, which would be based upon continual monitoring of the beach and cliffs, and depend upon changes at a national level to enable this to occur. The policy of 'Managed Realignment' would see this activity help roll back the beach as sea levels rise and cliffs retreat such that protection to the fluvial defences of the River Sid is retained.



II Otterton Ledge to Straight Point (policy units 6a39 to 6a42)

This is a short stretch of shoreline lying between the headlands of Straight Point and Otterton Ledge. There is an important sediment feed from west to east, which maintains the integrity of the spit at the mouth of the Otter Estuary. Although a naturally functioning coastal system is a key driver along this stretch, there is a requirement for continued protection of Budleigh Salterton, which is a key tourist and service centre. Management of this frontage therefore needs to consider impacts on the adjacent shorelines to minimise impacts on the natural environment.

As such, whilst defence of the majority of Budleigh Salterton would continue, to the west of Budleigh Salterton, a policy of 'No Active Intervention' may cause loss of some cliff top assets (unless they are relocated) in the medium to long term, but will continue to provide sediment to the beaches fronting the rest of Budleigh Salterton towards the mouth of the Otter Estuary.

A policy of 'Managed Realignment' within the Otter Estuary offers both habitat creation and flood storage potential.

10 Straight Point to Holcombe (policy units 6a43 to 6b24)

This is a long stretch of coastline that encompasses the Exe Estuary, the large urban and commercial centre of Exmouth and the resort of Dawlish. Key drivers are therefore the conservation of currently undefended areas, which have outstanding landscape and geological value, whilst ensuring the continued protection of important social and commercial assets. A key area of conflict is the protection of rail infrastructure, through which geological exposures become obscured. Future rise in sea level will also result in coastal squeeze in front of the defences leading to increased pressure on these defences and the loss of inter-tidal habitat.

There are, however, areas of opportunity. For example, habitat creation possibilities exist through the potential 'Managed Realignment' at The Maer, Powderham and within parts of the Lower Clyst. There is also potential for managing the realignment of Dawlish Warren. However, there is significant uncertainty about how best to manage Dawlish Warren in the medium to long-term. The policy is therefore to 'Hold the Line' of Dawlish Warren in the short-term to maintain its defence function for the benefit of the inner Exe Estuary, whilst more detailed studies are undertaken to determine a sustainable long-term management solution.

Within the Exe Estuary there is a requirement to retain many of the existing defences in order to maintain adequate levels of protection to important social and commercial assets.

9 Holcombe to Hope's Nose (policy units 6b24 to 6b42)

This is a heavily populated and developed area of coastline which encompasses Tor Bay. Policy options are therefore limited along much of this shoreline, where the key driver is the continued protection of the important social and commercial assets.

As well as the geological and environmental importance of this shoreline, a key policy driver has been the continued protection of the mainline railway. The preferred policy along this stretch is to continue to hold the existing defences to ensure the mainline railway link between the wider South-West region and the rest of the UK is maintained; this also serves to protect a range of tourist related assets.

Within the upper Teign Estuary, an area of 'Managed Realignment' could help reduce flood risk within other parts of the estuary whilst also providing habitat creation opportunities. Along the undefended coast, the main driver has been to maintain this current natural status through a policy of 'No Active Intervention' in these areas.

8 Hope's Nose to Berry Head (Tor Bay) (policy units 6b45 to 6b61)

This is a heavily populated and developed area of coastline which encompasses Tor Bay; therefore policy options are limited along much of this shoreline, where the key driver is the continued protection of the important social and commercial assets.

The embayed nature of this coastline means that the beaches tend to be selfcontained, with limited sediment linkages between them, meaning that impacts tend to be confined locally. A key future issue is the technicality of maintaining sandy beaches along the key tourist resorts under a scenario of rising sea levels, which would be subject to coastal squeeze. However, the sheltered nature of the bay lends itself to retaining a beach artificially in the future, which may be increasingly important as other beaches in the area and wider region are lost in the long term due to rising sea levels.

14

There are potential environmental opportunities at Goodrington Sands and Broadsands, where a policy of 'Managed Realignment' could allow a more naturally functioning beach to be retained in these areas as sea levels rise.

7 Berry Head to Blackstone Point (policy units 6b62 to 6b70)

This coastline is characterised by cliffs of outstanding landscape value and encompasses the Dart Estuary. Much of it is undeveloped with development centred at Dartmouth, Kingswear, Totnes and Brixham (St Mary's Bay). Along much of this coastline the key driver is to continue to allow natural evolution of the shoreline, although in the long term natural coastal squeeze may occur due to the combination of resistant cliffs and rising sea levels, which could impact on inter-tidal habitats

Along the cliffed open coast a policy of 'No Active Intervention' will lead to loss of some properties in St Mary's Bay due to erosion (unless they are relocated). Within the Dart Estuary, retaining and maintaining existing defences through a 'Hold the Line' policy will continue to minimise flood and erosion risk to the various assets that are currently protected. This policy does not envisage construction of new defences in currently undefended areas, for which the policy is 'No Active Intervention'. In this way the large areas of natural estuary will be retained, and as such the impact on the long-term estuary evolution is expected to be minimal.

6 Blackstone Point to Start Point (policy units 6b71 to 6b79)

This coastline is characterised by vegetated cliffs, freshwater lagoons and a shingle barrier which over geological timescales has progressively become segmented by emerging headlands as it has migrated landwards as a result of rising sea levels. There are a number of shingle beaches, with the longest being Slapton Sands, which are important tourist attractions. It is therefore of outstanding environmental, landscape and geological/ geomorphological value. A key driver of policy is therefore conservation of this asset, through allowing natural processes to occur and taking measures to ensure the sustainability of the shingle ridge as far as is feasible to do so.

Developments along this stretch are small in scale, but continued protection of these may become increasingly difficult and detrimental to the integrity of the shingle ridge as it continues to migrate landwards. As such, the policies along this section involve managing the realignment of the coast in the longer-term. The main current implication for this area is the future of the A379 between Torcross and Strete Gate; here it will be increasingly unsustainable to provide in the current form in the longer term as evidenced by the storm damage to part of the road in 2001.

envisage construction of new defences in currently undefended areas which will be subject to 'No Active Intervention'. In this way the large areas of natural estuary will be retained.

The impact on the long term estuary evolution is expected to be minimal, although within parts of the Kingsbridge Estuary there would be some loss of designated intertidal habitat due to coastal squeeze, be it in areas backed by defences or simply naturally rising ground.



Portland Bil

An adaptation plan to help adjust to the eventual loss of the road has already been developed following community consultation in 2006 (refer to <u>www.slaptonline.org</u>). These measures need to be enacted such that the issue of future transport provision is addressed in good time.



5 Start Point to Bolt Head (policy units 6c01 to 6c08)

This is a mainly undeveloped length of coastline (with the exception of sizeable settlements at Kingsbridge and Salcombe) with minimal coastal defences. It is characterised by cliffs of outstanding landscape and geological/geomorphological value, therefore a key driver of policy is for the continued natural evolution of this shoreline, including the Salcombe-Kingsbridge Estuary.

As such, the policy along the open coast is for 'No Active Intervention'. Within the Salcombe-Kingsbridge Estuary, the policy to 'Hold the Line' seeks to allow existing defended areas to continue to be protected against flooding, but does not

Erme and Yealm Estuaries. Much of the coastline is relatively undeveloped with minimal or no coastal defences and is characterised by cliffs of outstanding landscape and geological /geomorphological value. Therefore along much of this coastline the policy is to continue with 'No Active Intervention'.

At Thurlestone and Challaborough continued defence is unlikely to attract public funds from the flood and coastal defence budget. However, retention of defences in these areas will not adversely affect coastal processes in a wider area though will likely result in loss of beach in the long-term due to coastal squeeze. Therefore future defence provision here will depend on availability of alternative funds for this purpose. Within the Avon Estuary, 'Managed Realignment' in the upper reaches provides potential for both habitat creation and flood storage of benefit to the wider estuary.

A policy of 'Hold the Line' at Newton Ferrers and Noss Mayo within the Yealm Estuary would allow continued protection to this developed area.

