

East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
7th November 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)
Keith Martin (KM)	West Wittering Parish Council (WWPC)
Gavin Holder (GH)	(Observer) East Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP)

Item		Action
1	<p>Site Visit (09.30)</p> <p>All members of the group met on site and walked the area around the hinge</p>	
2	<p>Review of Previous minutes</p> <p>The group reviewed and agreed the minutes of the previous meeting to be accurate.</p>	
3	<p>Asset Condition Update</p> <p>The update was considered by the group to be covered by point 4 on the agenda</p>	
4	<p>Atkins Asset Inspection</p> <p>The group was asked for comments on the report:</p> <p>SD- provides something to refer to DL- process analysis is limited, MIB stated the brief was specifically to look at structures.</p>	

	<p>It was agreed that there was a good list of alternatives but that 2 & 3 were the only agreeable alternatives.</p> <p>KM – Noted the report gave structures a remaining 10-15 yr life DL – Confirmed this was possible for the groynes but not the breastwork, in this area the groynes are very important, and the breastwork can be good and bad and the gabions only good when buried.</p> <p>C20-C21 Breastworks in reasonably good condition – can be maintained and short term maintenance is sensible</p> <p>C22-C23 Relatively stable</p>	
5	<p>Planning and MMO Licenses</p> <p>DL – head of planning has been asked to confirm whether shingle recycling can be covered by permissive development.</p> <p>DL – Advice has been sought from MMO, there are exemptions from licenses for repair and maintenance that the group will explore – GH to provide exemption sheet Works above MHWS also exempt</p> <p>NE will need to know details of work and be in agreement</p>	GH
6	<p>Adaptive Action Plan</p> <p>Option for lowering groyne C22 DL – option would allow beach to lower and roll back & increase supply to between C22 & 23. DL – WSCC do not consider natural coastal erosion of the right of way an issue. Group confirmed the option is reversible. RS - raised the findings of Dr Bray mentioning groyne extensions inland, DL confirmed this to be a long term option. Option would allow the beach to change and absorb more energy. KM – C22-23 seems ok, DL – stated that problems were local to C22</p> <p>Option for removing failed gabions If gabions removed raising planking on C24 is an option which could help KM – highlighted the issue of scour north C24 UD – reminded the group that we are trying to adapt to a more natural coastline. Without the gabions there would be a more natural alignment</p> <p>The question as to whether all three options, Removing gabions, increasing the height of C24 and lowering C22 should be done at once?</p> <p>STH – raised that last major scour event was 2004; there has been accretion ever since do we need to return to trigger points? Group reminded that last weeks tides were the highest this year and tidal</p>	

	<p>height due to fall next year.</p> <p>DL- Asked the group whether there was agreement to remove the gabions, and monitor evolution seen to the end of winter. KM - raised should we import shingle and remove sudden changes in beach DL – We expect natural processes to work, falsifying with shingle recycling is not supported unless groynes are at risk. Metal should be removed but rock should be left behind if safe to do so. KM - confirmed proposal as remove failed baskets, not content between C23-24 and be ready for recharge if there is a risk of groyne outflanking.</p> <p>Group agreed in principle, but wished to see a plan produced to show the details of action with predicted outcomes, DL to produce plan for next meeting whereby action will be voted upon.</p> <p>Issue rose that there is a perception of the group meeting often without action, public confidence will be boosted if predictions are correct.</p> <p>Option of shingle tracing Option found to be costly and very labour intensive, UD – sediment transfer can be tracked by beach volumes</p> <p>Group agreed action to be put on the plan to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the failed gabions • Lower C22 by 1 level of planking at the inner end • Raise C24 • Area of potential recharge <p>SH- raised option of rock berm sect. 7.3.2 from Atkins report. DL - not perceived as being required, and does limit flexibility RS - the option does re-assure the public The group agreed that it was an option on the table as part of the overall adaptive management.</p>	
7	<p>Public Consultation</p> <p>There may be an opportunity on the 28th November to engage the public. A display poster and leaflet is to be produced subject to confirmation.</p>	
8	<p>AOB</p> <p>ST – asked whether someone could bring new monitoring data to the group, DL – to circulate link UD - to begin process with an aim of handing it over</p>	
9	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p> <p>22nd January 2014</p>	