

# How is the TE2100 Final Plan different from the draft?



Changes made	What this means
<p>Identified our preferred sites for intertidal habitat creation</p>	<p>We have used public consultation responses to identify our two preferred sites for intertidal habitat creation over the next 25 years as Bowers Marsh in Essex and St Mary's Marsh in Kent.</p> <p>Bowers Marsh has the potential to be the first site for intertidal habitat creation in the Estuary because, through the public consultation, an opportunity to work in partnership with the RSPB on the site has been identified and a promising dialogue is now underway.</p> <p>Successful habitat creation on these sites will create enough intertidal habitat to satisfy our requirements up to 2050. We do not know what conditions will exist in the Estuary after this time. If climate change mitigation worldwide has been unsuccessful, the Estuary will look very different indeed and the choices for us all will be stark. However, if climate change mitigation has been successful then the choices will be easier and more varied.</p> <p>The TE2100 recommendations for the second half of the century, including further intertidal habitat requirements, will be made around 2050. They will be based on a comprehensive public consultation and consideration of our indicators for change at that time.</p>
<p>Changed our recommended flood risk management policy for Hadleigh Marshes and Two Tree Island</p>	<p>As a result of information provided to us during the consultation about contaminated land on Hadleigh Marshes and Two Tree Island we have reappraised and amended our flood risk management policy for the area. The P2 policy (reduce current action to manage flood risk) has been changed to a P3 policy (maintain the flood defences at their current level accepting that as sea level rises flood risk will increase) to reflect the environmental damage that could be caused if contaminated materials contained within the defences were to leach out into the river. This highlights the constraints that are placed on flood risk management by land contamination. Alongside reappraising the flood risk management policy for Hadleigh Marsh and Two Tree Island we have strengthened Action 6.4 (see action tables in Chapter 9) highlighting the urgent need to investigate land contamination issues in the area.</p>
<p>Amended our indicators for change</p>	<p>Suggested improvements in the wording and emphasis of our indicators for changes have been accepted in some cases. In addition, a new indicator has been added that takes account of other major changes that could affect the Plan. Examples of major changes include a major development that could affect the location of a new barrier, or a change in Government Policy.</p>

<b>Changes made</b>	<b>What this means</b>
Identified future implementation partners	A number of organisations and groups have told us that they or others should be included as future implementation partners of the Plan. We welcome this enthusiasm for involvement and we have added these partners to our action plan (see chapter 9).
Improved the way we describe our flood risk policies	Numerous comments from stakeholders highlighted confusion over what was actually meant by some of our policy descriptions. We changed the way we describe our P3 and P4 flood risk management policies to make them more succinct and easier to understand whilst remaining consistent with national policy descriptions.
Highlighted the historic value and sensitivity of key sites, historic landscapes and urban townscapes in the Estuary	A number of consultation responses said that the Plan did not reflect the broad range of TE2100 studies on the historic sensitivity of the Thames estuary (reported in the TE2100 Strategic Environmental Assessment and Environmental Report). Others told us that the text in our Plan did not sufficiently appreciate the importance of particular historic landscapes or urban townscapes as well as the historic importance of some key sites in the Estuary. We have used this feedback to improve the way we describe the Estuary characteristics in chapter 9 of the Plan.
New glossary of key terms and abbreviations	To improve the clarity of the Plan text we have added a glossary of key terms and abbreviations.
Included cost estimates for floodplain management	Many of our Local Authority and transport and service provider implementation partners asked for more details on the provision of their part of the TE2100 Plan actions which are not related to the operation, maintenance and improvement of defences and flood warning – and were therefore not included in the presentation of costs. In preparing our TE2100 final Plan we have included costs and further details for this essential floodplain management activity to enable Local Authority and other partners to plan with confidence as an integral part of the TE2100 Plan implementation.
Changed the time horizons for implementation and profile of expenditure over the century	Many of our stakeholders felt that it was difficult to comment on decisions that would be made late in the century, but were happy to relate to decisions and planning to the middle of the century. Following discussions with these implementation partners together with a review of additional information on costs and lead-in times for the major end of the century option, we have adjusted the time horizons for implementation to reflect the fact that work must start on the end of the century option well in advance of 2070 – so that it is ready for use by 2070. The first 25 years (2010–2034) period remains the same but now includes third party costs for floodplain management. The middle transition period has been reduced from 35 to 15 years (2035–2049). The final time horizon (from 2050) will see the end of the century option, planned, designed and constructed taking the flood risk management in the Thames estuary into the 22nd century [all dates based on current climate change guidance].