

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

In attendance:

AA	Alison Andrews	AOEP	GL	Grant Lohoar	NT
NC	Nick Crick	BCP	SZ	Sarah Zins	RDA
KB	Kevin Burgess	CH2M	PH	Paul Hayden	RFCC
TW	Tim Woodward	CLA	GH	Graham Henderson	SCAR
LW	Lucy Williams	CPE	JB	Jane Burch	SCC
PP	Paul Patterson	CPE	SJ	Steff Jones	SCC
TP	Tamzen Pope	CPE	AJAS	Cllr Andy Smith	SCDC
MJ	Mark Johnson	EA	CB	Cllr Christine Block	SCDC
GW	Gary Watson	EA	DR	Cllr David Ritchie	WDC (Chair)
JM	Jane Marson	IDBs	KT	Karen Thomas	WMA
JJ	John Jackson	NE			

Apologies: Simon Amstutz (AONB), Cllr Sue Allen (BEP), Peter Garrett (B&MSDC), Julian Gregory (EIFCA), Edward Greenwell (Alison Andrews substituting for AOEP)

1.	Welcome and Introductions	The chairman welcomed the group to the meeting and a round of introductions was shared.
2.	SMP Update Slaughden policy review – presentation of stage 1 report and update on proposed scope for stage 2	<p>The Chairman welcomed Paul Patterson (CPE) and Kevin Burgess (CH2M, Jacobs) to the meeting to share findings of the assessment of Sudbourne Beach. The work has been sectioned for delivery in three parts; assessment of viable options, environmental impacts of the viable options, followed by consultation.</p> <p>Slides are available on the Suffolk Coast Forum website.</p> <p>The SMP policy Unit 15.1 is broken down in to 3 sub-units for assessment of options. The group were reminded that the current policy for this section of coast is to Hold The Line until 2025. The Alde and Ore Estuary Plan is based on no breach in the coast.</p> <p>The forum was led through high level cost estimates, and different options that had been considered for the sub-units and why they may have been rejected. Information shared with the group included No Active Intervention at sub unit C. The group learned about impacts of NAI to neighbouring sections of the coast.</p> <p>The group heard about the revetment and timber groynes at sub unit A. The assets were reported as not in good condition.</p> <p>The options that had been considered for sub Unit A were shared with the group (see slides).</p> <p>Questions from the forum [answers in brackets]</p> <p>Funding of potential works [has not been considered] Future maintenance costs [appraisal for 100 years] Overtopping [Is not a major problem. The key issue is risk of a permanent breach. Noted that minor breaches have occurred previously with no issue]</p>

Why was sea wall option rejected? [Would be expensive, contrary to objective to allow natural change and is not acceptable to AONB.]
New flood banks on set back line [exact position of bank line is not fixed, seaward face of bank would be armoured to resist wave action]
A retreated defence line will reduce saltmarsh. [Mitigation may be required]

KB shared with the group details of the wider shingle ridge in sub unit B. While the distance from the coastline to the estuary channel was wider there was still an issue with the haul route. At this location in spring of 2013 there was significant erosion from consistent easterlies.. The group learned about rejected and potential options, and initial and future maintenance costs for each for sub-unit B.

Questions from the forum included:

Not fresh water behind, does salt water gradient need to be balanced [This issue is not a showstopper and can be managed in detailed design.]

Is a haul road required to link Slaughden to the Ness? [Impact of potential loss and alternative options eg stockpiling of shingle, requires further consideration.]

Is climate change / sea level rise built in? [Detailed assessment will be part of detailed design however high level allowances have been made i.e. optimum bias used, design life for 50 – 100 years]

The group also learned about combined options which could be used, as well as a possibility for a Shingle Engine (SE). The group heard that costs used in the CH2M report for the SE were significantly higher than those proposed by HRW.

The reasons for the difference were explained by KB and accepted by the meeting as reasonable.

Questions from the forum included:

What about rerouting the Alde? [not considered in this review]

What learning exists from other sites? [Bacton unit costs are closer to CH2M than HRW. There are many examples of beach recycling at other locations
How would shingle be sourced? [land supply options are likely to be limited and unreliable so must assume sea delivery for larger volumes.]

Interest has been raised locally about the shingle engine, what is the conclusion [The study will review policy and not take a view on a method of implementation.]

The group discussed possible implications of the shingle engine. It was agreed that there are many issues that require further consideration and the lack of a precedent in the UK raises uncertainty on outcomes..

KT noted that further hydraulic modelling of the Ale had been completed by HRW.

The group heard a summary of three basic outcomes of Breach, No Breach and Temporary breach together with a discussion of further actions.

PP shared with the group that the next stage would be an environmental assessment of options in the phase 1 report.. The environmental impact study findings should be available by June 2018. The group agreed that the phase 2 study findings would be added to the agenda at the July 2018 SCF meeting.

		<p>Following this a preferred position will be the subject of a public consultation process that is expected to extend to formal adoption in 2019.</p> <p>There followed a discussion on the viability of the approaches identified in phase 1. Key points were:</p> <p>Ensure that further spending on the Policy Review study is proportionate. The maximum value of FDGiA likely to be available is 3500k. Other schemes have shown that there is potential for significant levels of funding from sources other than FDGiA.</p> <p>Ensure that Adaptation is considered.</p> <p>Noted that potential non FDGiA investment in coastal management will be competing with funding for delivery of A&OEP works.</p> <p>Enabling Development is unlikely to generate significant funding streams.</p> <p>Local engagement shows that the community do understand what the risks are and would consider contributing to the project. The group felt that in 2021 there would be a new calculator which could or could not be beneficial – important to lobby about this. Part of the marine pioneer will be a good route to open discussion with Defra.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> SMP item to return to SCF meeting 9th July – LW</p>
3.	SCF conference 2018	<p>JB confirmed that the conference would be Friday 12th October 2018. This year returning to Trinity Park.</p> <p>The forum discussed possible themes including Defra 25 year plan and funding changes in EA / Defra.</p>
6.	Updates on current activities	<p>Due to the recent previous SCF meeting there were fewer partner reports for update.</p> <p>SOEMG New Chair to be elected.</p> <p>DEP PGL own Bawdsey Manor, will be carrying out work to tops of sheet piles.</p> <p>EA a surge event before Christmas did not become an issue but it helped to test working arrangements.</p> <p>CPE test run with EA and WMA for possible surge event was helpful. It was noted that it was helpful to have a line of communications between EA, WMA, and CPE</p> <p>LGA MMO attended December meeting and it seems now have a good relationship with the MMO which should filter to around the country. BP highlighted improved efficiency working for LAs and EA was shared with EA board. Work on EA project assurance and governance was being shared with LAs to improve working methods.</p> <p>SMP Light touch review BP shared with the group the planned light touch review. ~£50k available for each SMP to improve efficiency and evidence.</p> <p>Saltmarsh A learning event was held in Woodbridge in December and went very well. The group had feedback and made suggestions for investment.</p>

7.	Minutes of last meeting	Minutes of the last meeting were approved with no amendments.
8.	AOB	<p>Orford Ness study tour BP shared that a study tour to Orford Ness is a possibility for next Spring time. To be arranged and shared with forum. [Date now agreed for Thursday 19th April]</p> <p>Action: Investigate possibility of study tour for forum – BP</p> <p>Suffolk Coast and Heaths consultation on boundaries Comments welcomed on this consultation open 26 Jan – 20 Apr 2018. See online at https://consult.defra.gov.uk/natural-england/suffolk-coast-and-heaths-aonb/</p>
		Close
	Dates of next meetings	<p>19th April (Thursday) – SCF study tour, Orford Ness</p> <p>9th May (Wednesday)</p> <p>9th July (Monday)</p> <p>12th October (Friday) – SCF conference, Trinity Park</p> <p>8th November (Thursday)</p>