East Head Coastal Issues Advisory Group Meeting

West Wittering Football Pavilion
25th March 2015

MINUTES

Present:	David Lowsley (DL)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
	Dominic Henly (DH)	Chichester District Council (CDC)
	Richard Craven (RC)	Chichester Harbour Conservancy (CHC)
	Mark Wardle (MW)	National Trust (NT)
	Marcus Irwin Brown (MIB)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
	Stephen Hammett (SH)	West Wittering Estates (WWE)
	Keith Martin (KM)	West Wittering Parish Council (WWPC)
	Richard Shrubb (RS)	F.G. Woodger Trust (FGWT)
	Stella Hadley (StH)	Cakeham Manor Estate (CME)
Apologies:	Jayne Field (JF)	Natural England (NE)
	Leslie Wilson (LW)	National Trust (NT)
	Uwe Dornbusch (UD)	Environment Agency (EA)

Item		Action
1	**Review of Previous minutes** Item 4 KM perceived that the group had agreed to allowing failure via natural processes. Group agreed to a formal vote on this matter and it was agreed by a majority that the defences be allowed to fail by natural means and that measures are in place to maintain access and prevent a tidal breach. Otherwise minutes agreed as accurate and correct	
2	**Asset Condition Update** No change since last meeting Group advised that the beach survey will be undertaken in April and the results should be available approximately two months after the survey. DL to chase results and present them to the group when received	DL
3	**Adaptive Management Action Plan** DL circulated a draft plan in advance of the meeting and the group had the following comments: KM – too little actions, suggested listing possible future actions to which group agreed, Sill to remain as one of these options	

	SH – there is no detailed plan for the breastworks, these should be different for individual bays, group agreed	
	StH – section needed for action to breach DL to confirm whether CDC can act to seal a breach without planning permission.	DL
	StH – question raised over future of footpath DL to seek clarification from Jonathan Perks at WSCC.	DL
	MIB confirmed WWE have consent to undertake minor repairs NE to be asked to confirm definition of minor works.	
	KM Pg.12 there is a lack of understanding of NE position re-mitigation, And the Group agreed this was generally the case. WWE to meet JF on site and will feed back to the group Depending on the mitigation requirements for recycling, WWE indicated their preference for importing material rather than recycling.	MIB/SH
	<u>Trigger Points</u> KM advised group he could not support the updated trigger points as presented to the group and could not recommend them to the PC. The trigger points differ from the ones currently in the public domain. The point was clarified that these triggers will be defined and accepted by the Group and not necessarily represent one individual member's views. DL stated and the group agreed that there was no need to hold the current line and beach replenishment is a positive action to manage potential erosion. Further comments made by the group: Track, watch, action missing from updated version. Group agreed to maintain traffic light colour scheme, but would be better displayed in the individual boxes. Actions must all be reasonably achievable, to be checked with NE Numbering needs to be simplified i.e. 1, 2, 3 not 1a, 1b, 2a etc… Triggers/actions to be on 1 A3 page with each area set in the same table against each trigger for ease of comparison DH to produce re-draft with comments taken into account, to be circulated to the group for comments. JF to be consulted specifically to confirm acceptability of actions	DH

	Question raised over capacity for DL to complete required work before exhibition, DL confirmed that leave had left very little time this month but DH/DL should have capacity to complete the required work. Group agreed approaches to differ between C20-21 & C21-22 General principles agreed C20-21 maintain current defences through minor repairs, re-assess when significant failure occurs (subject to available funds) C21-22 do not replace lost planks from breastwork, manage failure by ensuring the area remains safe. Possible action to include lowering the land, and removing access to the immediate area. It was suggested that Medmerry provided a good example of how a natural beach develops without hard defences, the timber groynes have recently been removed by EA.	
4	**Public Exhibition** MIB presented to the group land surveys with cross-sections as an alternative to the LIDAR based visualisation produced by UWE. Because the height will be questioned group discussed reason for height selected: • 4.5 mOD selected to match existing level behind breastworks • Current extreme water levels (tide+surge) predicted at approximately 3.7m mOD Group agreed to include rational for height in the report Definitions page to be included in the report. A section outlining options ruled out, and why, would be helpful to the public Section setting out why we the policy is Adaptive Management would be helpful, short answer is, because of independent experts advice. DL to action comments and update plan	DL
5	**Subscriptions and Budget** Invoices have been raised to the group, many of which have been paid.	
6	**AOB** None	
7	**Date of Next Meeting** 23rd April 2015 @ 09.30	