

East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
18th November 2014

MINUTES

Present:

Stella Hadley (StelH)	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)
David Lowsley (DL)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Dominic Henly (DH)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
Dave Picksley (DP)	Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP)
Richard Craven (RC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
Richard Shrubb (RS)	F.G. Woodger Trust (FGWT)
Mark Wardle (MW)	National Trust (NT)
Lisa Trownson (LT)	National Trust (NT)
Jayne Field (JF)	Natural England (NE)
Brinsley ?	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)
Stephen Hammett (SH)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
Keith Martin (KM)	West Wittering Parish Council (WWPC)

Apologies: Marcus Irwin Brown (MIB) West Wittering Estates (WWE)

Item		Action
1	<p>Review of Previous minutes</p> <p>5- C24 raised by 1 plank</p> <p>Minutes agreed as accurate</p>	
2	<p>Asset Condition Update</p> <p>Gabions north of C23 removed by WWE, at request of NE, between C23 & C24 Where the gabions have been removed the northern end appears stable but there are signs of erosion and cliffing at the southern end.</p> <p>The back row of gabions have become exposed, these will need removing in due course. CDC to monitor and remove when required.</p>	CDC
3	<p>Adaptive Management Plan</p> <p>Draft plan circulated to group in advance of meeting with comments received from WWE.</p> <p>Comments at meeting:</p> <p>KM- Trigger points appear to differ from those agreed DL to investigate and provide marked up version for group approval if changes have been made</p>	DL

SH- questioned whether planning was being held back and whether the option of a sill should be part of the plan
DL- No, planning is not being held back and the sill should not form part of the application because if it is required it will be too far in the future to be relevant

Arguments raised and explored for taking action-

- 1, The current configuration is damaging the neck , the group noted the fact that north of C24 has not recessed this year.
- 2, The defences are unsustainable in the long term

The group noted that the current alignment of groynes may be wrong and that their alignment should be considered if a landward extension is proposed. The breastworks failing, provides the group with an opportunity to change course of management.

The group agreed that the position of the seaward end of the groynes is vital in preventing the shoreward movement of the deep water channel and the groynes will not be shortened.

- 3, Financial constraints, WWE & FGWT indicated that funding should be able to be found for the right solution so cost should not influence the decision.

The Adaptive Plan references a cycle of accretion and erosion, UD cautioned using the past to predict the future of coastal processes.

Additional points raised by the group-

The West Wittering Flood Banks scheme has removed flood risk from consideration.

The group is supportive of removing failed structures in a managed way; residents need to be suitably informed and educated as to why.

KM commented that whatever action the group takes we must retain control of the process.

Option of shingle embankment proposed behind tamarisk-

- SH confirmed expert report had considered this and confirmed it as appropriate.
- Option considered a safeguard which would be supported by locals
- NE ok in principle with shingle recharge
- CDC would have no objection in principle to the proposal
- The recharge would need to be done alongside the managed failure of the breastworks.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be a need for the timber groynes to be extended landward if outflanking is considered a problem • Recharge shingle would be preferred (recharge means:- bringing in additional shingle from off-site). The material can be specified and NE confirmed no objection in principle if sourced appropriately. • The back edge of the 2009 recycled beach, currently used as footpath would be the preferred location. <p>Question raised over realignment of potential groyne extension, Group proposed to source a view from an expert.</p> <p>UD- groynes are either there to slow or contain shingle, for straight coasts groynes are normally perpendicular to the coast unfortunately at East Head there is a high level of variance in the waves.</p> <p>SH- Raised Public liability and WWE wanting to be able to react quickly to the managed failure. NE confirmed consent till Feb 2015 for temporary repairs could be extended to 2016 if deemed appropriate.</p> <p>Planning Permission</p> <p>Planning permission will be required for shingle recharge, Planning permission application is to be prepared for next meeting</p> <p>Details of the planning application are to be agreed at the next meeting before permission is sought.</p>	DL
4	<p>Public Consultation</p> <p>Exact format and date to be discussed at next meeting</p> <p>Presentation/engagement proposed to run alongside, not before the planning application as the application is not considered to be contentious.</p> <p>The attended exhibition approach taken for the coastal defence strategy was considered a success and the group agreed to look to replicate it.</p> <p>Notice boards identified as an option for public education.</p>	
5	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DP- an example of where failed breastworks have been allowed to fail, groynes have been outflanked and how the beach has reacted can be observed at Hayling Island and invited members to visit • During the development of the Adaptive Management Plan more regular meetings are required, group agreed to meet monthly for the next 5 months • UWE requested WWE make available professional advice as this 	SH

	could benefit the development of the plan, WWE to circulate	
6	Date of Next Meeting 16 th December 2014 Group agreed four future meeting dates: 21 st January 2015 25 th February 2015 25 th march 2015 23 rd April 2015	