

Kelling to Lowestoft Ness Shoreline Management Plan

Members' Dissemination Meeting

18 May 2004, County Hall, Norwich

Summary Note



**Halcrow Group Limited
Terry Oakes Associates Limited**

Halcrow

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Meeting attendees	1
3	Outline of evening's activities	2
4	Summary of the discussion	2

1 Introduction

This document summarises the key comments and conclusions from the Kelling to Lowestoft Ness Shoreline Management Plan Member's Dissemination Meeting held on 18 May 2004 at County Hall, Norwich.

2 Meeting attendees

Name	Affiliation
A Groom	
Mr D Venvell	
Cath Johnson	Broads Authority
Gillian Morgan	Broads Authority
Julia Masson	Broads Authority
Michael Green	Broads Authority
Peter Tallowin	Broads Authority
Dr Murray Gray	Broads Authority Member
Mr Frank Devereux	Broads Authority Member
Mr Julian Swainson	Broads Authority Member
Peter Lambley	English Nature
Guy Cooper	Environment Agency
Jo Cooper	Environment Agency
Jonathon Wortley	Environment Agency
Natashe Temple-Cox	Environment Agency
Simon Barlow	Environment Agency
Stan Jeavons	Environment Agency
Steve Hayman	Environment Agency
Cllr S.A Cullingham	Environment Agency LFDC
Mr Henry Cator DL	Environment Agency LFDC
Mr J.A Sheppard	Environment Agency LFDC
Cllr Shirley Weymouth	Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council
John Hemsworth	Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council
Mr Bernard Harris	Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council
Mr Mike Dowling	Gt. Yarmouth Borough Council
Helen Jay	Halcrow Group
Kevin Burgess	Halcrow Group
T Venes	Norfolk Coast Partnership
Brian Farrow	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr B Crowe	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr C Stockton	North Norfolk District Council

Name	Affiliation
Cllr H Cordeaux	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Mrs A Tillett	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr Mrs H T Nelson	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr N Ripley	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr S J Partridge	North Norfolk District Council
Cllr W Northam	North Norfolk District Council
Gary Alexander	North Norfolk District Council
Peter Frew	North Norfolk District Council
Terry Oakes	Terry Oakes Associates Ltd
Jessica Milligan	University of East Anglia, Tindall Centre
Cllr Andrew Shepherd	Waveney District Council
Cllr Brian Hunter	Waveney District Council
Cllr Mary Rudd	Waveney District Council
Cllr Stephen Chilvers	Waveney District Council
Cllr Wendy Mawer	Waveney District Council
Julian Walker	Waveney District Council

3 Outline of evening's activities

Introduction and presentation by Peter Frew, ACAG Chairman

Peter Frew explained the function of Shoreline Management Plans and outlined the activities and stages in the development of the sustainable shoreline management policy promoted.

Presentation by Kevin Burgess, Halcrow

This outlined the detail of the Shoreline Management Plan and how the policies have been developed, based upon the various issues along this coastline.

Discussion

The attendees were invited to comment on the proposed Plan.

4 Summary of the discussion

Q. Cllr Shirley Weymouth, Winterton and Somerton Borough

What response is going to be given to people losing homes, with regard to compensation?

Also I want it noted that I am not in agreement with the conclusions from the last ESG meeting.

R. *Peter Frew, ACAG Chairman*

At the moment there is no compensation available, therefore it has been recognised that in the next 20 years there needs to be a lobbying of government to have in place proper methods for dealing with the relocation of people, or a clear statement from Central Government if there is to be no compensation.

Operating Authorities are bound by governing laws and therefore the Plan is realistic.

Your comment has already been noted.

Q. *Michael Green, Director of Research and Strategy, Broads Authority*

The presentation provided a very good overview, but it will be useful if the document can explain the coastal erosion process.

How confident are we in the predictions of coastal erosion processes?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

History shows us that there has been significant erosion along this coast, prior to interventions such as dredging. In making long-term predictions, there is obviously always uncertainty and these are 'predictions' not precise calculations, but we have investigated historical change and have used a scientific understanding of coastal processes to make predictions of future response as accurate as possible. In making our predictions we have provided a band rather than a single line, to demonstrate the range of uncertainty in making such predictions.

Q. *Julian Swainson, Broads Authority Member*

What modelling has been used to make predictions and how robust is it. Due to human intervention along the coast isn't there a problem with using long-term evidence?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

Trends of change are relatively easy to predict, with an obvious exception being the ness areas, where there is still a great deal of uncertainty. Past rates give us an idea of the orders of magnitude of likely change, although variations upon these have been assessed.

Q. *Cllr H Nelson North Norfolk District*

The A149 is an important road for tourism and other industries – has there been any consideration of rerouting this link road?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

The Plan is only from a coastal defence perspective, which identifies risks so that Planning Authorities can take account of such risks. We have identified where such assets are at risk and

when, to inform the planning process. There therefore needs to be other plans in place to mitigate for this type of asset and others.

R. Peter Frew, ACAG Chairman

A weakness of the current system is that there is a large number of plans in existence. The government is looking into addressing this, e.g. such as through Integrated Coastal Zone Management. Therefore this may be something that future SMPs (i.e. 3rd generation or beyond) will consider.

Q. Cllr Sheila Cullinham, EA LFDC

If the Plan is non-statutory and only guidance, what will happen in test cases, also how will it control planners developing in flood areas?

You stated that hard defences will affect sediment movement – what does this mean for the offshore reefs along this coast and the Great Yarmouth Outer Harbour?

R. Kevin Burgess, Halcrow

Part of the scheme at Happisburgh to Winterton is to recharge beaches downdrift to mitigate for any sediment shortfall.

It is understood that plans for the Outer Harbour also include consideration and allowance for any interruptions, through sediment bypassing if required.

R. Gary Alexander, North Norfolk District Council Planner

Central government advice states that local plans should take account of SMPs (PPG 25). In considering objections, authorities need to consider whether development plans are appropriate and therefore take on board coastal issues and policies identified.

Q. Cllr Brian Hunter, Waveney District Council

The greatest concern is how consultation will move forward and the public response – there is fear of blight areas and therefore presentations need to take account of this impact.

What do you mean by 'more natural' position?

What do you mean by interruptions to sediment transport?

R. Kevin Burgess, Halcrow

In terms of more natural position – this coastline is eroding, but when we defend the coast, although we stop erosion at the cliffline the inshore subsea profile is still changing, resulting in deeper water at the shoreline. As a result, defending the coast puts greater pressure at that point and therefore when defences fail there will be a period of rapid erosion, as was observed at

Happisburgh. This rate will slow once a more natural position is reached and it may also be easier to defend at this stage as there will be less deep water at the shoreline.

Where we defend a shoreline, a promontory will develop as on either side erosion will continue; this will become like a terminal structure, such as a breakwater. Sediment will no longer be able to move around this structure and is likely to be lost to the offshore rather than feeding beach elsewhere.

Q. Cllr Shirley Weymouth, Winterton and Somerton Borough

With respect to recharge, at Bramble Hill there has been recharge – will this continue? Also there is a strategy in place – are we putting the ‘cart before the horse’ to do the SMP first?

R. Kevin Burgess, *Halcrow*

The SMP policy is for the current practice along this stretch to continue for the immediate term; no change is advocated at present. The ongoing strategy plan is looking in more detail at the options, but studies to determine the most appropriate long-term policy will carry on over several years.

Q. Cllr Shirley Weymouth, Winterton and Somerton Borough

The SMP will impact on properties as soon as the document is released. I also think that it isn't fair that some details given out at the Extended Steering Group meeting were not provided tonight.

R. Kevin Burgess, *Halcrow*

The ESG was a day-long meeting – this is only a 2 hour meeting, therefore it has not been possible to cover all details.

The Plan needs to be realistic – would it be right to tell people that we will be defending their homes if this is not actually going to be the case because it is not economically justified under current rules. The Plan also needs to recognise our legal obligations, for example conservation of natural assets.

Q. Cllr A Tillett, North Norfolk District Council

When will this hit the public as we are already seeing properties being devalued – so we need to be very sensitive?

R. Peter Frew, *ACAG Chairman*

There is a Client Group meeting tomorrow to discuss the consultation, but we fully understand the concerns. We must ensure that the public hear an accurate message not just rumour and therefore we need to be sure that the document is accurate and there is no prior leakage. We are

already in contact with our publicity department. At NNDC, we hopefully have dealt sensitively with the people of Happisburgh – this will be the first of many places in a similar position. All 3 SMPs being carried out at the moment have come from the same standpoint and even on the south coast there will be loss of properties under the preferred Plan.

R. *Guy Cooper, Environment Agency*

The EA has also learnt important lessons from their recent consultation exercises on the Essex coast.

Q. *Cllr B Crowe, North Norfolk District Council*

What about the impact of offshore dredging – this ties up with the compensation issues, as the government takes money from the dredging?

Q. *Cllr C Stockton, North Norfolk District Council*

I have grave concern that the SMP is a macro-look, which is required, but I am concerned about the concept of going back to nature. The proposed Plan will result in changes to the geography of the Norfolk coast. This document will define how this coastline will develop therefore it needs to be based on the best scientific knowledge.

Dredging is a key issue in this area – it is hard for people to swallow the fact that people will lose houses, when the government are making money from such dredging. Therefore the document needs to consider this.

Happisburgh should be considered as a pressure point as there is a limited area of cliffs remaining, therefore there would be flooding behind should erosion continue. I do not believe the rate of erosion at Happisburgh will actually slow, as you predict.

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

Although large-scale, the SMP has undertaken detailed work as part of the policy development, therefore should not be considered as a macro-look. It has taken on board the detailed studies that have been undertaken for this coast. With regard to nature issues – we currently have legal obligations to protect certain conservation interests.

It is not for us to comment on how the government spends the money available to it. But there is evidence that this coastline has eroded for hundreds of years, i.e. long before dredging started.

R. *Helen Jay, Halcrow*

The document has taken on board existing studies relating to dredging, which conclude that dredging is not likely to cause any adverse effects on the coastal erosion rates along this coast.

R. *Peter Frew, ACAG Chairman*

The SMP is owned by the Local Authorities, EN and EA, therefore before we go to public consultation the document needs to present a policy which is defensible in what it says. However, it is important that we do not promise what cannot be delivered. Are we better off telling people what is realistic or what they want to hear?

Q. Cllr Frank *Devereux*, *Broads Authority Member*

It is vital how this is presented to the public – people will see themselves doomed. There is concern regarding the lack of modelling – some areas may have benefited from this.

We need to bring costs into this – the public need to hear something said about compensation, e.g. the Broads Authority could potentially incur costs of several millions.

R. *Kevin Burgess*, *Halcrow*

It is important to note that modelling of coastal response is only really appropriate in short-term predictions, due to data available. This coast has also been extensively modelled in the past and there was also the Southern North Sea Sediment Transport Study which investigated sediment movement along this coast. These have all been taken into account in our analysis.

R. *Peter Frew*, *ACAG Chairman*

You have echoed the concerns that we are trying to make to Defra. To defend any coast costs, and along much of this coastline the costs exceed the benefits therefore we don't get schemes funded. But there are also costs associated with adopting policies of retreat. We are in danger of producing a non-deliverable Plan.

Q. *Simon Barlow*, *Environment Agency*

I have some concerns over planning guidance in the Happisburgh to Winterton flood plain as planning is based on current Standard of Protection – which will change under proposed policy. We need the information necessary so that we can inform the Local Authorities; therefore we need to push the need for studies to be carried out as soon as possible.

R. *Kevin Burgess*, *Halcrow*

The SMP states that in the immediate term we should continue to hold Happisburgh to Winterton, but that in the longer term we should also look at an option of retreat. It is important to note that all the policies are interconnected therefore if the policy were to change at one location it would impact on the policy decision at another location.

Q. *Gillian Morgan*, *Director of Planning and Development, Broads Authority*

I have some concerns about the cost-benefit analysis and the impact on future investment in the Broads. How has the case been made and does it take account of revenue, e.g. from tourism

which generates £146million? How far back from the coast has economic justification been considered?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

The SMP is using the best available information, e.g. from strategies where available; we are working closely with the team involved in the strategy for the flood plain.

In general, the SMP is looking at whether there is a robust case, or not, for defending, i.e. we are looking at the value of assets versus the cost of defence per linear metre.

Q. Gillian Morgan, Director of Planning and Development, Broads Authority.

So the SMP is not looking at revenue?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

There are particular rules, set by Treasury, that need to be followed when undertaking analysis of costs and benefits. The property value is the first stage to determine a case, and then revenue would usually be considered.

Q. Jonathon Wortley, Environment Agency

Can you comment on how the EA should be proactive or reactive in the implementation of the Plan? Also can you comment on the EA flood warning system?

R. *Kevin Burgess, Halcrow*

The Plan is a strategic view on what might be appropriate in the future. It is therefore to inform on risk and does not extend to implementation measures such as flood warning or actual management of changes.
