

East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
21st September 2010, 10.30am

MINUTES

Present:

Andrew Lawrence (AL)	National Trust (NT)
Jane Cecil (JC)	National Trust
Gavin Holder (GH)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Lone Le Vay (LL)	Chichester District Council
Jim Robertson (JR)	West Wittering Parish Council (WWPC)
Keith Martin (KM)	West Wittering Parish Council
Alison Fowler (AF)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Richard Craven (RC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy
Richard Shrubbs (RS)	F.G. Woodger Trust (FGWT)
Marcus Irwin-Brown (MIW)	West Wittering Estate (WWE)
Stella Hadley (SH)	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)
Gordon Wilson (GW)	Environment Agency (EA)
Clive Moon (CM)	Portsmouth, Havant and Gosport Coastal Partnership

Apologies

David Lowsley (DL)	Chichester District Council
Nick Gray (NG)	Environment Agency
Nick Bean (NB)	Environment Agency
Peter Morton (PM)	West Wittering Estate
Emma Kelman (EK)	Natural England

Discussions focused on three separate areas of work

- Flood Defences at West Wittering involving a recharge of the beach
- Options for maintaining the integrity of East Head, particularly the "hinge"
- An agreed approach to an Emergency response to a catastrophic event

Item		Action
1	Round table introductions. Apologies noted as above.	
2	LT Col John Q Davis 1947 - 2010 John's contribution to the Advisory group had been greatly appreciated and he will be missed. RC advised that a new Harbour Master would be appointed in due course. RC will be fulfilling the role in the meantime.	
3	Actions from meeting of 30th March 2010. An update on progress on actions was e-mailed to the group on 15th July 2010	
3.1	Adaptive management at East Head a) <u>Planning Advice</u> regarding approvals required for the beach management plan and/or for the installation of a geotextile sill either in an emergency situation, or ideally when critical triggers are reached (GH) .	

	<p>Discussions have been held with Development Management and both the beach management plan and installation of a geotextile sill at East Head would require planning permission and a full Environmental Impact Assessment (the level of which would be determined by Natural England). Three options have been identified: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One off application for recharging of beach material (6-10weeks) • Rolling application for recharging of beach material annually • Rolling application for recharging of beach material plus installation of geotextile sill (or alternative). Note that if applied for separately the sill would need to be installed within 3-5 years of approval being given. Agreed approach to be discussed under Agenda Items 4 and 5 below. <p>b) <u>Circulation of Mott McDonald Scoping Report (GH)</u>. Completed, indicative costings for the sill are included. Issues to be discussed under Item 5 below.</p> <p>c) <u>Approach to Malcolm Bray for borehole data (AL)</u>. Approach made and this will be provided at a later date.</p> <p>d) <u>DL approach to consultants</u> to seek expressions of interest for installation of sill (GH). David Lowsley had not approached any consultants. GH has spoken to Jacobs (who wrote the majority of the Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy) for his thoughts on best approach and to indicate costs. Issues discussed under Item 5 below.</p> <p>e) <u>DL Report on the range of options (GH)</u>. CDC does not have resources at present to prepare such a document in house. However, the scoping report from Mott Macdonald contains a number of options for the group to consider. To be discussed under items 4 and 5 below.</p> <p>f) <u>Letter to Jacobs regarding preparation of consultant brief (GH)</u>. See item d above.</p>	<p>See item 4 and 5 Below</p> <p>See item 5 Below</p> <p>AL</p> <p>See item 5 Below</p> <p>See item 4 and 5 Below</p>
3.2	<p>East Head, West Wittering and Cakeham: Interpretation of beach changes</p> <p>i) <u>Advice from planners regarding the need for permission for beach management plan GH</u>: See item 3.1 a) above.</p> <p>ii) <u>Approach to Channel Coastal Observatory (CCO) (GH)</u>. GH is still to contacted CCO regarding recommendations 1-4 and whether there are any additional costs. Agreed: Linking of Triggers in Item 6 below to CCO Data should be explored as this provides an opportunity to take advantage of their free</p>	<p>GH</p>

	<p>information/data and to obtain additional data and analysis. Suggested that triggers should allow comparisons in order to identify areas for further study.</p> <p>iii) <u>SH to be provided with Julie Whitney's contact details (GH)</u>. Completed</p> <p>iv) <u>Approach to MB regarding cost and potential frequency of update reports (GH)</u>. MB had advised that annual update reports could be provided at a cost £1,000.</p> <p>v) <u>Invitation to Clive Moon to attend meeting (GH)</u>. Invitation issued and Clive was in attendance</p> <p>vi) <u>Template for recording data to be sent to KM (GH)</u> GH has met with Malcolm Bray on site and a template for recording data will be circulated at this meeting.</p> <p>vii) <u>SH raised issue of monitoring of sand dune movement</u>. GH advised that template would enable the Estates to monitor. Dunes currently subject to annual LiDAR survey and fixed aspect photography. AL would provide SH with details of a PhD student who may be interested in monitoring dunes as part of his/her studies.</p>	<p>Working Group</p> <p>NFA</p> <p>NFA</p> <p>NFA</p> <p>AL</p>
3.3	Emergency response to a catastrophic event	
	GH reported on Chichester District Council Emergency Powers and confirmed that the power to intervene would only arise if life or property were at risk. It was therefore important to pursue the work on the triggers as a matter of urgency.	All
4.	West Wittering Flood Defence Scheme	
4.1	<p>GW gave an update on progress. A Project Appraisal Report (PAR) had been prepared for two options developed, A) Basic concrete wall and B) more environmentally sensitive scheme (preferred option) for consideration by the Project Appraisal Board. It is in the EA Medium Term Plan for next financial year. Issue is the Outcome Measures calculation. Due to new financial climate the preferred option is unlikely to achieve the target score of 7, even with habitat creation so we may be faced with the basic option being the one the EA will fund. GW advised that if the community contribute towards the preferred option the prioritisation would be raised. A meeting is to be held in 2 weeks to discuss.</p> <p>Some discussion followed: a contribution of £600K had been muted but this would not be achievable. RC advised that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) would not support the basic (concrete sea wall) approach.</p> <p>Potential for volunteers to implement landscaping aspect discussed but this would raise problems with future maintenance liabilities etc.</p> <p>Action: Meeting to be arranged between EA and CHC to see if a compromise can be reached. EA would like costs to be brought down to £1M.</p>	JC/NG
4.2	The possibility of linking the Flood Defence Scheme to the	

	East Head adaptive management discussed and it was agreed that there were no connections between the two schemes.	
5	East Head: Geotextile sill vs. beach recharge:	
5.1	RS advised that £40K was available from FGWT for East Head, which would need to be match funded.	
5.2	AL advised that the NT preferred approach was to allow for change to occur as naturally as possible. However they would agree to a further recharge of the beach as a result of a trigger being reached and this represented a relaxation of their previous position.	
5.3	RS advised that the priority FGWT funding would be the West Wittering flood defences rather than the sill at East head.	
5.3	RC and AF voiced strong support from the CHC to the preparation of a Management Plan in accordance with the Coastal Defence Strategy and work to progress preparation for installation of the sill, or whatever option emerges from the study recommendations, including obtaining relevant planning permissions. Main issue is one of resources and who to progress/fund the work.	
5.4	Some discussion on issue of resources. GH advised that CDC's priority in the short term was to develop the triggers and their monitoring in order to provide time to develop options and identify sources of funding. Under this approach applications would be submitted when appropriate triggers were reached. Progressing installation of a sill was not a priority in relation to the District's other coastal defence works to which current staff resources were being targeted. If installation of a sill is a priority for group members they would need to take a lead in taking work forward.	
5.5	RC and AF advised the CHC would be willing to explore funding options and would consider if they could resource preparation of planning applications/EIA. This would need to be taken forward in consultation with NT as landowners.	RC
6	Trigger Points for Management Actions at East Head	
6.1	GH circulated Plan indicating location of Cross-Section Trigger points, a set of draft proposed triggers, management actions associated with them and a site survey record sheet on which to record measurements.	
6.2	There was some discussion as to who would undertake the monitoring work. This would need to be undertaken locally and arrangements would need to be agreed by the group.	
6.3	GH recommended a smaller working group be set up to take this forward and report back to the whole group. This was agreed and a meeting on site would be held to agree the proposal and details for implementation. Members of the Group were agreed as follows: GH/AL/RC/JR/MIB/CM.	GH/AL/RC/ JR/MIB/CM
6.4	Discussion on Asset Survey procedures. CM advised that surveys were carried out quarterly using GPS technologies and these were funded by CCO.	

7	Strategy / Shoreline Management Plan – status.	
7.1	GW advised of EA's scrutiny of all Strategies. Pagham to East Head has now been signed off by EA and DEFRA. Work would be progressing on the East Head to Emsworth Strategy.	
7.2	The North Solent Shoreline Management Plan (Hurst Spit to Selsey Bill) is due to be approved imminently. This follows large scale consultation.	
7.3	With respect to Pagham to East Head actions. The Medmerry managed Realignment Scheme has been submitted for planning, if approved it would be subject to consideration by the National Review Group with a recommendation for approval. If approved work will start in Spring 2011. Very likely to be approved as it is high scoring and goes a long way toward the UK's EU targets for habitat creation	
8	Recent Monitoring Activities at East head + Other Ongoing Studies	
8.1	CM confirmed last survey took place between 6th and 9th September 2010. Quad bike ground survey undertaken by Havant Borough Council	
8.2	Option of including East Head in the annual LiDAR survey was being pursued, next is due in December/January.	
8.3	Next survey is of interim profiles at 200m intervals to be undertaken during November.	
8.4	Some discussion on analysis of data and whether this would assist in forecasting trends. This was problematic and would be a large-scale exercise. It is possible to set profile trends, for example build up during the summer, but no certainty as to accuracy if included in Annual Report.	
8.5	CM confirmed that all data is accessible and can be downloaded form the CCO Website	
8.6	Smaller scale LiDAR can be done on request. Other survey include Hydrographic surveys carried out at 50 m intervals. The last was undertaken in 2008. With respect to more detailed monitoring of dunes and off shore sand bars airborne LiDAR may work, alternatively there is mathematic LiDAR. Other options include Multibeam, but not next summer. Problems due to shallowness of area restricting access for boats and lack of water clarity. It is possible to laser scan the bars when they are exposed.	
8.7	CM also updated group on the Tracer Pebble project on beach movement. Good success with 82% of pebbles traced so far. 300 on East Head of a total of 2,700. Some photographs were circulated and CM advised that results would be assembled in a Student Project paper.	
9	Website News and Templates	
9.1	Webpage hosted by WWPC website on which minutes are posted. Agreed this could also host the trigger monitoring	

	forms and the survey results.	
10	Accounts	
10.1	GH advised that he had been unable to locate a budget at CDC. It was noted that contributions of £400 had been made by each member of the group, although GW requested if their contribution could be checked. Contributions had been to cover admin and venues and food, although now have a free venue and food/refreshments no longer provided. Suggested funds be paid annually and used to retain Malcolm Brays Services. Agreed: GH check with CDC accounts and accounts to be reported to next meeting	GH
11	Any Other Business	
11.1	Further discussion on the sill Option prompted by AF and RC. GW recommended that two actions be pursued A) The triggers and monitoring arrangements; and B) Adoption of an "Emergency Protocol" along the lines of that at Paghham. Further information can be obtained from Roger Spencer at Arun District Council. If a sill is to be progressed a Lead is required to take project forward and funding needs to be identified.	
11.2	Arrangements for DEFRA Workshop discussed. To be held at Football Pavilion West Wittering which would be reviewing 12 schemes and 6 sites and looking at achievements and lessons learned.	
11.3	Natural England attendance should be requested for next and future meetings	GH
12	Date of Next Meeting	
12.1	Meeting of Triggers and Monitoring Working Group to be held on site on 15th November, meeting at 12.00 at East Head car park	GH/AL/RC/ JR/MIB/CM
12.2	Next meeting of whole group to be held on 11th January at 10.00 at West Wittering Football Pavilion.	All