

Minutes of Meeting held on 7 February 2019 at Lakeside room, Thorpeness Golf Club



In attendance:

AA		Alison	Andrews	AOEP		PG		Peter	Garrett	MSBDC
RS		Richard	Steward	BEP		DRo	Cllr	David	Rose	MSBDC
BP		Bill	Parker	CPE		MJ		Mark	Johnson	EA
ASt		Alysha	Stockman	CPE (minutes)		PH		Paul	Hayden	RFCC
CB	Cllr	Christine	Block	DEP		TEP		Tamzen	Pope	CPE
EG		Edward	Greenwell	AOEP		KT		Karen	Thomas	WMA
AM		Andy	Millar	NE		GH		Graham	Henderson	SCAR
RG		Rob	Goodliffe	CPE		IB		Ian	Bradbury	BEP
KF		Kellie	Fisher	CPE / EA		AJAS	Cllr	Andy	Smith	SCDC
JG		Julian	Gregory	EIFCA		DR	Cllr	David	Ritchie	WDC (chair)
LG		Lucy	Goodman	CPE		GN	Cllr	Graham	Newman	SCC

Apologies: Lisa Chandler (SCWDC), Matt Hullis (SCC), Rob Wise (NFU), John Jackson (NE), Eleanor Johnston (MMO), Sharon Bleese (CPE), Nick Collinson (NT), Steff Jones (SCC), Charles Beardall (EA), Cllr Tony Goldson (SCC), Greg Hall (AW)

1.	Welcome and introductions	The Chairman shared a round of introductions with the group.
2.	Bacton	<p>Rob Goodliffe (Coastal Manager (north), Coastal Partnership East) shared with the forum the Bacton to Walcott Coastal Management Scheme. This is a sandscaping scheme to protect the nationally important infrastructure at Bacton, supplying approximately one third of the UK gas demand.</p> <p>The forum heard that at the gas terminal the SMP policy is Hold the Line (long-term) but along the Bacton and Walcott frontage the policy is Hold the line (short-term) moving to Managed Realignment. This is because Hold the Line in the long-term here would not be economically viable.</p> <p>The group noted one of the issues faced is that beach levels at Walcott have significantly dropped, leaving the sea wall likely to fail or be undermined and the beach access steps get swept away by the sea, so there is no access to the beach.</p> <p>The objective of the project in front of the villages is to extend the life of the defences to allow time for adaptation. Under the beach in front of the terminal are pipe lines that need certain beach levels to cover them and the cliff is at risk of failing. The objective here is to enable the terminal to continue to function.</p> <p>The forum were informed that all organisations involved in the project have a shared threat from the North Sea; have the urgency to do something in both locations; recognise the need for a collective solution; and can share the cost and development.</p> <p>MJ added that the partnership is between the EA, North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) / CPE, Shell, and Perenco. This partnership is supported by Royal Haskoning DHV. Perenco is an international company, similar to</p>

		<p>Shell. All organisations in the partnership are doing their part, for example, Shell and Perenco have taken forward and funded a technical appraisal of options; the EA has advised on government funding opportunities and secured alternative funding sources; and NNDC leads the community liaison and will deliver the project.</p> <p>The project will take the Dutch approach of working with natural processes to redistribute sand to the coastline north and south of the project and adapt it to the North Norfolk coast. This will feed beaches and the terminal can choose to do it again in 15 – 20 years if they want to.</p> <p>GH asked what the sediment at the Holland Zandmotor is made up of. RG explained that it is a mix of sand and small shell content, which helps to armour it against the sea. The sediment at Bacton will have a similar content but matched to our coastline. This is better for the environment and fisheries.</p> <p>The forum were informed that the cost for the project is dependent on exchange rates and fuel costs. EG asked why this project is more expensive than the one in Holland. RG replied this is because the UK has higher royalty fees as the sediment belongs to The Crown Estate, who have to seek a profit. The chairman asked if the project could get sand from the Dutch. RG informed the group that fuel is already a big cost in the project so going to Holland would just add to this cost. PH added that the project would then be paying the Dutch government instead of paying the UK government, resulting in net loss of money. RG shared that the project has looked at getting a licence to collect sand but the sand is too fine.</p> <p>The project is two thirds privately funded by Shell and Perenco and managed to get £0.5million from the Norfolk Business Rates Pool. BP added that this is a useful bit of learning for the group. £1000 was raised towards the project through a Just Giving page, which shows the community support for this scheme. BP informed the group that NNDC and CPE have taken the lead in the project to gain access to other funding sources such as Flood Defence Grant in Aid (FDGiA). CB asked that if Shell and Perenco knew the erosion risks, why would they build the gas terminal there in the first place and that they should pay for the defence themselves. RG explained that Shell and Perenco are paying for the protection of the terminal and the public funding is to protect the villages.</p> <p>The project plans to deliver in 2019 and has created a community liaison group to bring up any issues the community has before they become a problem.</p> <p>TEP added that procurement has been done using CPE’s new Dynamic Purchasing System to choose the contractor and has just been through the tender appraisal process. This contractor will check the project is done correctly and be the eyes on sight for NNDC and CPE.</p>
3.	Adaptation	<p>Kellie Fisher (FCERM Senior Advisor, Coastal Partnership East) updated the forum on adaptation and work she has done to help communities adapt.</p> <p>The group learned that coastal change is not new, for example, Happisburgh and Walcott used to be a lot further inland and the Sea Palling reefs are a good example of adaptation. KF informed the group</p>

that adaptation should always focus on risk reduction and understanding the costs of no intervention can help to understand the benefits of adaptation.

The group noted that the pathfinder in Norfolk allowed properties in Happisburgh to be demolished and gave planning permission to build elsewhere. This helped people to move on.

The forum heard that the cliffs at Trimingham collapse in big chunks and 1970s attempts to defend the cliffs failed. The SMP policy for this stretch of coast is now Managed Realignment. The cliffs are a valuable site for education and have a SSSI designation due to their geological importance. Trimingham's village hall (located on top of the cliffs) was at risk of erosion, but through the pathfinder scheme, the village was able to rollback the hall. The new facilities are being used constantly.

KF informed the forum that Easton Bavents Ltd (a farming company based at Easton Bavents) lost 47% of their land to erosion. The cliff here also has a SSSI designation for geological exposures and coastal geomorphology. The farming company have obtained planning permission to change old Royal Navy huts to movable holiday lets to generate income. There are multiple ways the site usage could change to support and fund adaptation, the EA and CPE are helping to formulate ideas and supporting adaptive management.

The group heard that Hemsby and Winterton are located on a dune cliff and as a result of 12 houses being lost in 2018, Great Yarmouth Borough Council commissioned a High Level Review of Options by Jacobs. The café here is at risk of erosion and could be rolled back but this needs to be respectful of the SSSI it sits in.

KF informed the group that she has been promoting adaptation in many ways, including through a workshop at the 2018 SCF conference and writing papers, such as a Coastal Adaptation Review Paper on behalf of the LGA Coastal SIG. A Statement of Common Ground has also been reached between six of the Norfolk and Suffolk local authorities and has been endorsed by the Environment Agency. Its seven aims include a holistic and whole coast approach to coastal change and promoting innovation, including adaptation. The eleven approaches include sharing experience and best practice and recognising the need to relocate or protect infrastructure.

The group learned that Defra have commissioned two pieces of work. A Quick Scoping Review of adaptation by HR Wallingford has not yet been seen. KF informed the group that she has seen a draft of the second one (An Economic Review of funding).

AM asked if the Statement of Common Ground is public / available. BP agreed to share this with AM. AM added that Natural England would like to be supportive of this approach.

CB suggested that local people should be involved in the conversation now not once the SMP policy review is complete. BP added that adaptation is a difficult conversation to have.

Action: Share the Statement of Common Ground with AM - BP

4.	Benacre / Kessingland	<p>KT shared with the group that the Lothingland Valley (just south of Lowestoft) is discharged through Benacre Pumping Station. The group noted there is no formal flood defence across this frontage and Benacre Ness, which used to provide some protection for the pumping station, has now moved north so is no longer in front of the pumping station and leaves behind an eroding coastline. KT informed the group that the Ness has about 80m of movement each year.</p> <p>The access route to the pumping station is currently acting as a defence and the project could build a new defence to continue the defence at Kessingland but it is inconclusive as to where this would end.</p> <p>The forum learned that agriculture, about 44 homes, transport links such as the A12, utilities, and wildlife are at risk. The existing hard defences at this location are a temporary adaptation solution whilst a long-term solution is found.</p> <p>The group heard that Benacre estates, a key landowner in the valley, are giving up some of their land to become intertidal habitat. Other options include a 1km hard defence but this would be difficult to fund as there are limited benefits; and a Lothingland Valley set-back option, which could attract other funding sources.</p> <p>KT informed the group that Suffolk County Council have offered £2million to the project as there is no alternative road transport route inland from the A12.</p> <p>The project engages stakeholders and landowners at a project team level, which makes them feel involved.</p> <p>The forum noted that opportunities for the project include linking freshwater enhancement to Carlton Marshes (just outside Lowestoft), a visitor centre, and Suffolk County Council have been asked if Benacre can be a pilot for their Interreg work. This is a £10-15million scheme.</p> <p>EG asked why there would be a second pumping station. KT explained that a pumping is needed for the main valley and they plan to decommission the Environment Agency one once everything else is in place. Flood mapping will show is a second pumping station is needed.</p>
5.	SZC	<p>BP shared his presentation from the Suffolk County and Suffolk Coastal District councils' event about the Sizewell C consultation in January with the forum. BP explained that between hard points embayments have been created along this frontage and this is how the coastline will naturally evolve. EG asked if the Sizewell B hard point has always been there. BP replied that it hasn't and he thinks it was created by the outfall.</p> <p>The forum noted the SMP policy for the Sizewell area is Hold the Line and at the northern end (Minsmere) it is Managed Realignment. The preferred policy to implement plan in the present day is to maintain Minsmere Sluice and develop managed realignment (north end of Minsmere). In the medium-term this changes to adaptation but to maintain the sluice and manage realignment (north end of Minsmere) and in the long-term there will be the potential need to reinforce the defence at the Sizewell Power</p>

		<p>Station.</p> <p>The group heard that EDF’s coastal processes work has not yet been shared.</p> <p>BP shared that the primary concerns for Stage 3 are the impact of the Beach Landing Facility, Fish Recovery Return and Combined Drainage Outfalls on nearshore coastal processes such as longshore drift. The proposed defences will protect the station but the impact on the coast is unknown. The group noted coastal processes could be interrupted and EDF have not articulated this through their current consultation.</p> <p>The group heard that something will need to be put in place to make sure EDF will do something when certain trigger points are reached. BP added that the design of the defence is incomplete as the toe needs to be extended below mean sea level. The proximity of the rock toe to the beach is a concern as this will likely be exposed as a hard point.</p> <p>KT asked if there is a free flow of information. BP explained that there is a Marine Technical Forum but he doesn’t have much more information than what is in the presentation.</p> <p>The forum noted that EDF have talked about recycling or replenishment but these are both really difficult in this location.</p> <p>EG added that he hopes the monitoring will continue to Orford Ness and BP would like this as a minimum.</p> <p>The group decided it would be a good idea to provide a joined up response to the consultation. PH agreed on behalf of the RFCC.</p> <p>Lucy Goodman and Paul Patterson (CPE) have gone through all the consultation documents and created a summary of the coastal sections.</p> <p>GH asked what happens next, after the Stage 3 consultation. BP explained that Stage 3 is the last round of consultation and in early January 2020 EDF will submit a Development Consent Order, which goes to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Action: Regarding a joined up response to EDF’s consultation. All to include concerns raised above in response to EDF’s consultation.</p> <p>Action: Circulate consultation summary to the group – LG / BP</p> <p>Action: Pull out fluvial strands that are relevant from the consultation documents and circulate to the group - KT</p>
6.	Updates from partners	<p>Updates further to written summary:</p> <p>AOEP – the group heard that the partnership have put in a Business Case for upper estuary as well as the lower estuary.</p> <p>SOEMG – the forum heard that Babergh DC are still mapping assets and there is a new community interest group at Shotley.</p> <p>BCP – No update further to the summary.</p> <p>DEP – the forum heard the DEP are very pleased with their allocation of SIL money.</p> <p>BEP – the forum noted they are awaiting the outcome of their recent</p>

		<p>consultation.</p> <p>AONB – No update further to the summary.</p> <p>WMA – No update further to the summary.</p> <p>CPE – the forum noted that BP will be retiring in July and that CPE is currently recruiting for the post.</p> <p>EA – the group heard that the main Benacre pump is currently being refurbished, emergency works at Southwold are being done to avoid undercutting, and the Ipswich Barrier formal opening is on Friday 8th February 2019.</p> <p>LGA Coastal SIG – No update further to the summary.</p> <p>EIFCA – the forum noted that outside of starfish, crabs, cockles and mussels, no PSP toxins have been found and EIFCA have a successful funding bid for research.</p> <p>NE – the group noted that Sizewell is very time consuming and frustrating as concerns from Stage 2 have not been addressed. Ne will soon be looking at Kessingland geomorphologies and the Coast Path is progressing.</p> <p>SSG – the forum heard that the next meeting is in March and the work is not possible at a local level. SSG will push this back to Defra and will make an evidence based report to potentially bring to the forum in the future.</p> <p>Marine Pioneer – the forum noted the Pioneer is exploring bringing funding in to expand the Pioneer.</p> <p>MMO – No further update to summary.</p>
7.	Previous minutes	<p>The previous minutes were approved with no amendments.</p> <p>Action: Regarding the proportion of objections by landowners that were upheld by Natural England – Mr Merritt agreed to find out. ASt to follow up.</p>
8.	Any other business	<p><u>MMO</u> AJAS informed the forum that the MMO will now start charging for officers to travel from Newcastle. The group heard that planning officers are based locally but the licensing team is based in Newcastle. The forum suggested it would be good to know where the offices are and have someone from the MMO come to the next meeting.</p> <p><u>New chairman</u> The chairman shared with the group that it has now been three years since the last election for chairman of the group. He suggested there should be an election for a new chairman after the election of members for the new East Suffolk Council as he may not be re-elected and therefore lose his place on the forum. This may be DR and AJAS last meeting.</p> <p>Action: Regarding the location of MMO offices – JG to find out where these are.</p> <p>Action: Regarding someone from the MMO coming to the next meeting – BP to speak to Trudi Wakelin, Director of Marine Licensing.</p> <p>Action: Regarding the Seascape presentation at the July meeting – ASt to circulate documents to the group.</p>

		Close
		<u>Date of 2019 meetings</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thursday 13th June (Deben Room, East Suffolk House, IP12 1RT) • Wednesday 13th November (Deben Room, East Suffolk House, IP12 1RT)