

East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
16th January 2012

MINUTES

Present:

Dominic Henly (DH)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
David Lowsley (DL)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Marcus Irwin-Brown (MIB)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
Stephen Hammet (StepH)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
Mark Wardle (MW)	National Trust (NT)
Lisa Trownson (LT)	National Trust (NT)
Siun Craggy (SC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Richard Craven (RC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Jayne Field (JF)	Natural England (NE)
Keith Martin (KM)	West Wittering Parish Council (WWPC)
Richard Shrubbs (RS)	F.G. Woodger Trust (FGWT)
Uwe Dornbusch (UD)	Environment Agency (EA)
Stella Hadley (StelH)	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)

Item		Action
1	<p>Review of previous Minutes</p> <p>Group members raised the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding item 4, DL informed group he has not yet seen the CCO report as expected and when available will distribute to the group. • Regarding item 5, RC mentioned that following further research he did not feel the Hayling Island site was a good comparison for East Head due to its sheltered environment • Regarding item 6, MIB asked if he could receive the response to Peter Morton's report, DH to action <p>The group unanimously agreed that the minutes were accurate.</p>	<p>DL</p> <p>DH</p>
2	<p>Asset Condition Update and Adaptive Management Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIB, DL & DH inspected the site before Christmas and updated the group- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Stone behind failed breastwork was holding fine. ➢ There had been no change to the failed gabions. ➢ Recent storms had caused some cliffing of the sand. • KM raised the question whether the defences had been allowed to fail and not maintained- DL responded that minor repairs had been carried out up to 5 bays as agreed by the group but that this was now beyond repair. • KM highlighted that he believed there was a possibility that the geomorphological report was open to wide interpretation and could be used to justify different possibilities, especially regarding increased risk of breach from removing defences. The group responded that 13,000m³ had 	

2 cont.	<p>been moved to behind the hinge since the report precisely to address concerns expressed in the report and to reduce the risk of a breach in accordance with the adaptive management process already agreed</p> <p>Other points discussed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current alignment of the frontages is not sustainable and we do not want to leave the problem for future generations. • The group need to develop an on-going management plan to achieve desired outcomes, this does not currently exist. • The group seems to have extremes including hold the line, extremes should not restrict progress as decisions by the group only need to be by majority. • We need an option to avoid catastrophic changes, agreed by the whole group. • The group agreed unanimously that priority was to avoid a breach. • Where possible changes should be reversible • Any asset condition surveys and life expectancies should be undertaken by qualified coastal engineers <p>MIB circulated a proposal, which in summary involved the use of rip-rap to protect the areas from C20-C24, The group made the following comments regarding the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIB, they had consulted Atkins, a sediment expert, Mackleys Construction and the group agreed that the proposal be put to Dr Malcolm Bray as part of the questions. • DL had reservations about the use of rip-rap, as, depending on the size, it could easily become rock armour. The location of the rip rap is crucial and it should be allowed to move by coastal processes. MIB responded that the project will be expert designed, and rip-rap must be strong enough to resist the sea and not be stolen but be adaptable. UD mentioned rock would need to be bigger than that used on the local flood defence scheme. • Rip-rap should be used as a repair to failure on an unknown future line; rip-rap was deemed to be portable and adaptable but questioned as to whether it was any better than shingle and sand which is readily available. • There seems to be an element of hold the line in the proposal which is not acceptable as the policy agreed is adaptive management, the group do not know the eventual alignment so cannot plan a definitive line of rip-rap. • Any action should be re-active when risk exceeds what is defined by the group as acceptable. • The aerial photos used in the proposal where taken before renourishment behind the hinge, LT to circulate up to date aerial photography • The plan sketch appears to following the existing line; questions raised over hold the line or repair/strengthen against breach. • The use of rip-rap is likely to require permission from the Marine Management Organisation, NE will need more details on scheme to form a view, JF to get NE view for next meeting • UD questioned if any proposed cross sections existed, reply was that it was too early and that would be part of any detailed design. 	<p>LT</p> <p>JF</p>
---------	---	---------------------

<p>2 cont.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS thanked MIB for circulating a proposal, stating that something physical for public to see should be investigated. <p>MIB raised the option of lowering groynes to allow material to move towards the hinge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC raised fears of material moving into the channel, the option for structures on east head to hold material was not acceptable to the group. • Lowering planks would increase stress on the breastworks and could ultimately lead to more catastrophic failure was the opinion of UD, DH & DL <p>The group considered other options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacing breastworks- considered not an option as contrary to agreed policy of adaptation • Complete removal of existing defences- Considered not an option as contrary to agreed policy of adaptation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rip-rap combined with shingle where needed would likely be acceptable if shown to be mobile. • Over washing was acceptable to the group, where if natural repair does not occur the group should intervene, shingle has been moved in the past and this could be repeated. • To prevent a breach, holding the current line was not required. • WWE have to manage the site and demonstrate to the public what they are doing is correct. • East Head has no overnight solution and whatever happens must be manageable and where possible reversible • Trigger points should be used to dictate action, for triggers to be used the group must define what is acceptable, initial suggestions were 20m of beach should be considered a minimum width, current width is over 50m • Management could be undertaken differently on a bay by bay system, with separate desired outcome and trigger points. • The current waiting does not look good to the public and nor does the little fix it jobs of rip-rap currently being employed. • StepH, the term “management” indicates a pro-active approach which is what we should be working towards. • Any proposal must be able to deal with issues raised and the frontage needs to be allowed to adapt. <p>Km raised the question of whether there was a short or long term increase or decrease of risk of a breach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13,000 tonne of beach has already been deposited behind the hinge to reduce any risk • The group agreed that action needs to be taken to re-assure and inform local people who feel there is too much risk if we do nothing. And re-assure that action will be taken so a breach is not allowed to establish. • West Wittering village will not be affected. 	
----------------	---	--

2 cont.	<p>The group discussed breach scenarios</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UD highlighting examples in the USA and Japan after catastrophic events the breaches naturally healed. • Questions were raised over whether residents would be willing to wait for natural repair or expect immediate action. • The salt marsh is approximately 60ft higher than the main harbour channel which further reduces the risk of a breach. • Nobody will accept a breach, and nor is it expected but in case it does occur the group believe there should be suitable permissions in place to rectify any breach including planning permission. DL to ensure planning permission is valid for shingle recycling, <p>KM challenged CDC policy, expressing a concern that residents where ready to challenge CDC or NE through the courts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DL response, CDC will continue to repair within agreed triggers and maintain safety but has no plans to replace or wholesale removal of failed/failing defences • KM responded, residents unlikely to be accepting of this approach • CDC does not expect a breach and has no plan to allow one to form and on the contrary wants to ensure the group is ready to react immediately should a breach occur. • The group agreed that a management plan should be developed and work should be undertaken before the next meeting. • RC questioned how far into snow hill creek would NE accept shingle, and would there be a stop point, • JF response was there is no stop point for natural processes 	DL
3	<p>Sign of Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The group signed the terms of reference and the document was put in the care of CDC, DH to scan and circulate pdf copy to group.</p>	DH
4	<p>Questions for Dr Malcolm Bray</p> <p>The group supported the questions with the following comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The questions may take too long to answer; they should be compacted or simplified. DL to action • The answers must be put in layman's terms for them to be useful for the wider public; there is currently an issue of misinformation and misunderstanding which must be resolved. • WWE proposal to be attached to questions for expert comments. • KM, the question should be asked whether removal of the gabions would increase the risk of a breach, and if possible this risk should be quantified to make it useful. 	DL
5	<p>Financial Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invoices have been received for the annual membership contribution, many have been paid 	

6	<p>AOB</p> <p>SC questioned numbers of attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group agreed a maximum attendance of two people from each organisation, with one vote per organisation • The group discussed the usefulness of viewing other examples of spits or adaptive management coastlines, Group to consider before next meeting 	
7	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>TBC by DL, desired attendance of Dr Malcolm Bray will determine suitable dates</p>	DL