



**Minutes of Meeting held on 9 May 2018  
at Council Chamber, Suffolk Coastal District  
Council**

In attendance:

AA	Alison Andrews	AOEP		JG	Julian Gregory	IFCA
EG	Edward Greenwell	AOEP		RW	Rob Wise	NFU
TP	Tamzen Pope	CPE		HG	Graham Henderson	SCAR
SB	Sharon Bleese	CPE		GN	Cllr Graham Newman	SCC
LW	Lucy Williams (Minutes)	CPE		JB	Jane Burch	SCC
CB	Christine Block	DEP		DR	David Ritchie	WDC (Chair)
MJ	Mark Johnson	EA		KT	Karen Thomas	WMA

Apologies: Cllr David Rose (BDSDC), Cllr Andy Smith (SCDC), Sarah Barker (IBC), Nick Collinson (NT), Paul Hayden (RFCC), John Jackson (NE), Eleanor Johnston (MMO), Tim Woodward (CLA)

1.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	<p>The Chairman welcomed the group to the meeting and brief round of introductions was shared.</p> <p>The Chairman shared with the group the recent and unexpected passing of Cllr Sue Allen who had been such a driving force on the forum and with the estuary groups. The forum held a minute's silence.</p>
2.	<b>Summary of Orfordness study tour</b>	<p>JB shared with the group the success of the Orfordness study tour and thanked Grant Lohoar and Nick Collinson for their work. Learning had included ideas around the management of the erosion and haul road at Slaughden as well as wider issues around the complex nature and history of the Ness itself. JB recommended a tour of the site if the opportunity arose, and it was noted that the lighthouse is open to the public occasionally; information at <a href="http://www.orfordnesslighthouse.co.uk/visit/">http://www.orfordnesslighthouse.co.uk/visit/</a></p>
3.	<b>SCF conference 2018</b>	<p>The group learned it had been necessary to change the conference venue to Wherstead Park. It was hopeful that Nick Crane would be able to attend as key note speaker. The forum noted that this year's conference would be the 65<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1953 surge and the 5<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of the 2013 surge.</p> <p>SB shared with the group her idea for a coastal award in the name of Sue Allen for outstanding work on the coasts and estuaries. The group agreed to this suggestion and suggested there should be one award for paid workers and another for volunteers. It was agreed that the award did not need to be annual.</p> <p><b>Action: Thoughts and suggestions for Sue Allen award for outstanding work on the coast to be sent to LW – All</b></p>
4.	<b>Update and learning about work at Benacre</b>	<p>KT shared with the group the work on the area of Benacre which is currently at risk of both flooding and erosion and reliant on an aging pumping station. The group learned about the migrating ness (moving northwards at ~80m/yr) which had previously offered protection to the land behind from flooding. Now that the ness has moved north the coastline is much more dynamic.</p> <p>KT, on behalf of the IDB and other partners, has been working closely with the community, landowners and businesses to explore the options available. It seems likely that a landowner will allow some of their land (~100ha) to become intertidal and work with natural coastal processes. The existing</p>

		<p>pumping station will need to be decommissioned and current studies are determining what pumping will be needed with the set-back defences. Funding streams are being reviewed to find the most effective way to resource the project. Innovative sources of funding are being discussed. The group heard that this work is raising the profile of the work nationally particularly because Defra are keen for more projects with multiple outcomes.</p> <p>Discussion that followed involved questions about the behaviour of the ness at Thorpeness. This one is held in place by a geological feature and thus less likely to move in the same way as the Benacre Ness..</p>
5.	<b>Update and learning about Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project</b>	<p>SB led the forum through the Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project which is a project working towards reducing flood risk in Lowestoft from fluvial / pluvial elements as well as from tidal.</p> <p>SB shared with the group the location for the tidal wall and how the maintenance would be managed. The complexity of the project and delivery of the barrier was shared with the group. Due to the importance of Lowestoft nationally as a port and particularly for delivering the wind energy projects meaning that the port must continue to operate for most of the year, the barrier can only be delivered in the winter months (October – March) which has meant that the project needs to be creative in the design and delivery which has increased the costs.</p> <p>SB shared with the group the importance of the work to the community and how this project will give confidence to businesses to invest in Lowestoft. With wall and barrier in place the risk of flooding reduces from 71% to 3%. This project has been linked with WDC area action plan, the local plan and with the 3<sup>rd</sup> bridge crossing.</p> <p>The group also learned about the involvement of Flipside Festival, who have been working with schools local to Lowestoft to capture what the sea means to them in poetry. The words captured by the Watertight Words team will be used on displays around Lowestoft, and also engraved on to the sea wall.</p> <p>Funding for the work is from many different sources and the project team are working to also find novel sources of additional funding. A significant challenge is overcoming the increasing costs of the project due to the strategic importance of the port and ensuring it is kept open.</p> <p>The group discussed width of the bridges and barrier, operation of the gates and how the walls have been built to be adaptable to climate change in the future.</p>
6.	<b>Update on Shingle Engine</b>	<p>JB highlighted to the forum the concept that had been explored to protect the Slaughden area. The group heard that the costs for the work may be greater than The Crown Estate originally suggested. Original costs were in the region of £6m - £9m, and the costs could be double this amount. Other options could be viable and are under review. The SMP review will determine the next steps, and the report should be available to circulate in May.</p> <p>The group learned about the recent LGA Coastal SIG sandmotor study tour where the regeneration in the area has been significant. Presentations from the tour can be found on the SIG website <a href="#">here</a>.</p>
7.	<b>Thorpeness Policy</b>	<p>This item was referred to in the partner summaries document and was not discussed.</p>

	Implementation Plan	
8.	Updates on current activities	<p><b>AOEP</b> Costs for the estuary survey should be known by the end of the year.</p> <p><b>SOEMG</b> JB is acting Chair until new one is agreed. There are issues at Pin Mill which BDC – IBC – Port are working together to resolve. At Shotley gate phase 3 is needed to help resolve erosion issues but community not currently in position to take this forward. Application for trial mussel beds in the Stour now looking more likely as most of the issues raise have be overcome.</p> <p><b>DEP</b> The foot ferry will need continued support if it is to operate all seasons – it will not be self-sufficient in the winter.</p> <p><b>AONB</b> The AONB management plan is being reviewed. There were 125 responses to the recent consultation on the boundary review.</p> <p><b>WMA</b> No update further to the partner summary.</p> <p><b>BCP</b> No representative was present from the BCP, SB highlighted that they are finalising the scope for the SMP review.</p> <p><b>EA</b> MJ shared that an EA rep should attend the next forum to share the work of the Ipswich tidal barrier. A site visit could be arranged if there was sufficient interest.</p> <p><b>CPE</b> No update further to the partner summary.</p> <p><b>SIG</b> No update further to the partner summary.</p> <p><b>IFCA</b> Regarding the recent media interest in the paralytic shellfish JG shared that there had been issues with a scientist speaking directly with the media. A group had been formed to manage a media strategy. The Eastern IFCA were speaking with other IFCAs to share learning and issues. The key message from the sampling so far is that there is no risk to humans but that toxins were present in starfish, both in Norfolk and near Felixstowe. For information go to the IFCA website or ask JG for information <a href="http://www.eastern-ifca.gov.uk/paralytic-shellfish-poisoning-incidents/">http://www.eastern-ifca.gov.uk/paralytic-shellfish-poisoning-incidents/</a></p> <p><b>SSG</b> KT shared that the work was progressing and there are now active working groups taking forward different aspects of the work. Support has been offered to undertake work valuing saltmarsh as a bass nursery. JB highlighted with the group that not one bid for saltmarsh restoration work had been successful for RFCC levy funding for natural flood management. The reason cited relates to the fact that it is not possible to make a direct link between the restoration and properties protected from flooding.</p> <p><b>Pioneer</b> PG updated the group that he had submitted a project but to the universities through ARISE.</p> <p><b>SCAR</b> GH reported on the recent SCAR AGM.</p>
7.	Minutes of last meeting	No amendments suggested.
8.	AOB	<p><b>NFU</b> RW shared with the group some recent learning about the NFU and CLA regarding coast path and ferries. It seems that other locations are having difficulties with the coast path routing up an estuary, and the option of</p>

## APPENDIX 1

		<p>a ferry has been considered. The group heard that NE are considering their position, they have a duty to stick to the coastline but a power to take the path up an estuary.</p> <p>The group discussed breaches of walls, and liability for wall and path. It was felt that the two halves of NE for conservation and for path should work together better, particularly for issues of disturbance. It was noted that the Rural Development Programme England (RDPE) could maintain the paths. It was also noted that on the banks of the Stour, the banks had been raised to stop people from walking across the saltmarsh.</p> <p><b>Action: Clarification required for funding, future maintenance, ferries and disturbance. JB to approach NE to attend next meeting to update the SCF.</b></p> <p><b>SZC</b> AA raised that the work around SZC and in particular the coast and potential impacts was very quiet, and would be helpful if more information could be shared. It was noted that there was concern for SSP power lines coming ashore; the cliffs at Thorpeness are solidified sand dunes. The group heard that BP sits on the coast processes forum. SB agreed to contact the SZC project officer and feed back to the forum.</p> <p><b>Action: SB to source more information on SZC and coastal impacts from SZC project officer in first instance and report back to SCF - SB</b></p>
		Close
	<p><b>Dates of next meetings</b></p>	<p>9<sup>th</sup> July (Monday)            12<sup>th</sup> October (Friday) – SCF conference, Wherstead Park            8<sup>th</sup> November (Thursday)</p>