

East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
2nd October 2013

MINUTES

Present:

Stella Hadley (StelH)	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)
David Lowsley (DL)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Dominic Henly (DH)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Siun Cranny (SC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Richard Craven (RC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Uwe Dornbusch (UD)	Environment Agency (EA)
Richard Shrubbs (RS)	F.G. Woodger Trust (FGWT)
Mark Wardle (MW)	National Trust (NT)
Lisa Trownson (LT)	National Trust (NT)
Jayne Field (JF)	Natural England (NE)
Marcus Irwin-Brown (MIB)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
Stephen Hammett (SH)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
Gavin Holder (GH)	(Observer) East Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP)

Item		Action
1	<p>Review of previous Minutes</p> <p>Group members raised the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect spelling of names and a misprint of the date as 2012 • Page 1 - 13,000m³ should read 13,000 tonnes • Page 4 – Point three should be 30ft not 60ft <p>Group agreed remaining minutes to be accurate</p>	
2	<p>Asset Condition Update</p> <p>Update provided by WWE –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WWE have had an asset survey undertaken by Atkins which has recently been received. SH to seek approval for the report to be shared with the group. • SH summarised that the report provides 4 options two of which, do nothing and total rebuild had been ruled out. • DL raised condition of failed gabions • MIB confirmed WWE where taking action periodically to ensure the structures remained safe, including removing any sharp edges. 	SH

3	<p>Review of Dr Brays Presentation and Questions</p> <p>The group were asked to provide personal feedback. The comments were unanimously positive with the following additional notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • StelH – findings presented to residents and found very helpful • UD – findings are speculative, but highlight change is happening and the need is there to adapt. Limited data exists and the 6yr deadline is not a certainty. 	
4	<p>Adaptive Action Plan</p> <p>SH – questioned whether having triggers was pointless and suggested decisions made on observations from regular monitoring would be better. DL- supported SH comments and stated that current monitoring by the group had been of little benefit</p> <p>DL – raised the proposal of seeking (possibly rolling) planning permission to undertake shingle recycling, which would enable swift action to be taken should a breach ever threaten. MIB – raised issue that not the entire group agreed to shingle recycling. No reason was given for objection. JF – confirmed in principle NE would have no objection</p> <p>GH Joined the meeting.</p> <p>SC – asked whether Gavin was an observer or a member, DL confirmed GH was simply an observer from the neighbouring coastal authority.</p> <p>DL - stated/questioned that he believed there was unanimous support for the option to recycle shingle to seal a potential breach. No objection raised- DL to action seeking relevant permissions (including Planning and MMO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle to apply already demonstrated and consented from previous recycling with an established procedure, action also in line with strategy. • Recycling must demonstrate sustainability <p>DL – confirmed planning permission sought by CDC would have to be in conjunction with the landowners, Target set to have planning in place by the end of the year.</p> <p>Area most at current risk confirmed as breastwork between C20-24 but with potential for breach also present north C24.</p> <p>Question raised over period of MMO license – UWE confirmed license normally stands for 5 years but can extend longer examples exist of 50yr licenses for offshore operations.</p> <p>RC – questioned whether further points for material could be found, DL</p>	DL

	<p>responded that it was unlikely</p> <p>Question raised over volume & funding DL responded volumes required expected to be between 5 & 10,000 tonnes Previously works where funded by the FGWT & CHC (£30k) SC/RC – confirmed funds where available from the conservancy which should be sufficient to cover the proposed scale of recycling.</p> <p>Shingle would be placed behind the area at risk, making it less likely to breach again as it will have a greater area to dissipate wave energy and an additional buffer. Triggers of 20m = meeting 15m = action 10m = on-site suggested</p> <p>UD - raised question over points of measurement DL – decision to be based on high tide points leading to a shorter distances and a safer decision. Tide line to tide line on site a simple option.</p> <p>Area for deposition likely to be along the frontage C20 to approx. 250m north of C24.</p>	
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>The issue was raised regarding getting what is important but sometimes technical information out to the public.</p> <p>RS- suggested re-launch and statement after next meeting, where more information will be available.</p> <p>Agenda item to be added specifically to cover community engagement</p> <p>Thanks was given for the continued financial support given by the Woodger Trust</p>	DH
7	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>7th November 2013, meeting to start at 09.30 with a meeting on site</p>	