

[HOME.](#)[About the SMP.](#)[Approved SMP.](#)[Action Plan.](#)[Coastline Photos.](#)[Stakeholder Meetings.](#)[Public Consultation.](#)[Estuary Consultation.](#)[Shoreline Management Plan 1998.](#)[Glossary.](#)[Frequently asked questions.](#)[Contact us.](#)

# Shoreline Management Plan 7 (Previously Sub-Cell 3C)

**Welcome to the new (April 2015) section 8 of SMP7. You have been directed here, prior to entering the main Approved Plan index, to make you aware of changes to the SMP that are described below.**

**Please take time to read this section before moving into the detail of the SMP.**

**If you have questions regarding the changes described below please contact the lead authority for SMP7 - that is, Suffolk Coastal District Council, [here](#).**

## Section 8: Plan Updates

Following completion of the SMP, the Action Plan database will continue to be managed by each authority. This process will include updates as actions are completed or amended.

It should be noted that as time progresses, the SMP document may be updated to take into consideration new information that becomes available (see Section 7.2). This process may include changes to policy that may affect the way in which the part of the Suffolk coast covered by SMP7 is managed.

Updates to the SMP are prepared in accordance with Environment Agency National Framework 'A Change process for Shoreline Management Plans in England' 2012.

The wording in any approved SMP update takes precedence over any discrepancy with the approved SMP7 document.

Successive issues of Section 8 describe individual revisions as follows:

Revision	Date	Policy Unit(s)	Location	Change Summary
A	April 2015	PDZ4v9: MIN 13.3 PDZ4v(: ALB14.1	Thorpeness	Policy Designation
B				

### REVISION A: Policy Units MIN 13.3 & ALB 14.1 - Thorpeness

Revisions including deleted text are shown in the following sections against document references in SMP7.

#### A1: Changes to PDZ4v9 section 4.4.4 and PDZ5v9 section 4.5.4

1st epoch until 2025	2nd epoch 2025 - 2055	3rd epoch 2055 - 2105
Previous Policy: MIN 13.3		
No Active Intervention	No Active Intervention	Managed Realignment
Revised Policy: MIN 13.3		
Managed Realignment with the current alignment maintained at existing defences, (see section A3)	Managed Realignment with review of maintaining the current alignment at existing defences, (see section A3)	Managed Realignment
Previous Policy: ALB 14.1		
No Active Intervention	No Active Intervention	No Active Intervention
Revised Policy: ALB 14.1		
Managed Realignment	Managed Realignment	Managed Realignment

#### A2: Revised policy for MIN 13.3 and ALB 14.1

A 2.1 In the light of new evidence since 2010 the revised policy recognises that intervention may be necessary to provide positive management of the shoreline position in response to episodic events within the 100 year framework of the SMP. It does not make or imply a commitment to measures which may be unaffordable, unsustainable or have adverse impacts.

A 2.2 The revised policy assumes the DEFRA definition of Managed Realignment: allowing the shoreline to move backwards or forwards, with management to control or limit movement (such as reducing erosion or building new defences on the landward side of the original defences). This would not preclude the shoreline remaining in its current position if this is sustainable.

A 2.3 The existing policy unit boundaries remain unchanged. There is no intention to actively manage the area north of the existing defences in front of North End Avenue which is still within the boundary of MIN 13.3. For the small area to the south of Haven House Managed Realignment will align with the policy of the adjacent policy unity ALB 14.2 through all epochs and therefore remove any inconsistency or artificial boundary.

A 2.4 The previous policy of No Active Intervention for MIN 13.3 and ALB14.1 did not preclude minor works resulting in ambiguity of interpretation.

#### A3: Revised policy for MIN 13.3

A 3.1 The existing defences referred to in the revised policy for MIN 13.3 in section A1 are subject to the following conditions:

i. An Agreement dated [8.10.2010] between SCDC and Community Contributors with reference, *inter alia*, to Appendix 1 section R&M2: *Due to the unpredictability of the environment, it is not possible to give an accurate forecast of future repair and maintenance requirements to the Works. The Project Appraisal Report (PAR) assumes that the evolution of the shoreline will follow a pattern of slow long term erosion with occasional increase in erosion pressure of the type experienced in 2010. The scheme assumes that the Works will be sufficiently resilient to act as a backstop defence, but they are not intended to resist constant significant erosion pressure.*

ii. The FCRM Project Appraisal Report for the 2010 Thorpeness Erosion Response Works Version 02 dated 1st December 2010 adopted Option 7:

Section 1.3.5: *Works with a longer design life, providing a more secure toe to the defence and providing the expectation that, when re-exposed by periods of severe erosion, the improvement in defence would be sufficient to maintain the defence over a period of some 50 years,*

Section 1.4.5: *As long term erosion occurs along the whole frontage, as distinct from the short term severe erosion, the approach now taken would allow for progressive failure in line with SMP policy.*

A 3.2 Maintaining the current alignment at existing defences in MIN 13.3 during epoch 1 is supported by retaining the system impact clause: PDZ4 Baseline Scenario 2: *Holding the line south of Thorpe Ness would have little impact on the system as it is to the south of the continuing main control point. There are no significant sustainability issues but this would have a potential impact on the reasons for designation of the area.*

#### A4: Changes to PDZ4v9 section 4.4.2 and PDZ5v9 section 4.5.2

A 4.1 The stakeholder objectives for Thorpeness remain unchanged. The tables in PDZ4 and PDZ5 are revised as follows:

Stakeholder objective unchanged	No Active Intervention			Managed Realignment		
	Fail	Neutral	Acceptable	Fail	Neutral	Acceptable
To maintain in a sustainable manner Thorpeness as a viable coastal settlement and tourist destination recognising its cultural and heritage significance						

A 4.2 The following revision of baseline scenario 1 reflects the episodic nature of change across the whole village frontage based on current evidence: *At Thorpe Ness there would be slow erosion and this has the potential to allow further erosion to the south in front of the village, typically in episodic events with a reducing return period. Initial losses might be anticipated on the coastal frontage during and beyond the next 50 years with the potential for flooding in the lower areas of the village.*

#### A5: Change to economic assessment

A 5.1 Revision to include the episodic nature of change along the Thorpeness village frontage does not align with the previous MDSF Assessment of Erosion Damages in the SMP. This was further revised in the PAR referred to in section A.3.1 (ii). The previous assessment is deleted.

#### A6: Change to Appendix C Annex 2

A 6.1 The following change reflects the upgrading of the gabion revetment at Thorpeness referenced in A.3.1 (ii):

SUF/B/10 Thorpeness Gabions Northern end of Thorpeness village. Chainage 40.61km to 39.81km. A gabion revetment reinforcing a vegetated slope with residential properties at its crest. Suffolk Coastal District Council - Residual life up to 50 years, see section A.3.1 (ii)

The following supporting documents provide evidence of the process by which the above amendments were developed:

[Suffolk Coastal District Council Cabinet February 2014, Paper 07/14.](#)  
Recommendation for a policy change, including the results of community consultation.

[Suffolk Coastal Forum Paper September 2013.](#)  
SMP Policy Change Process review and update

The amendments were approved by the Environment Agency in January 2015 and sanctioned at the April 2015 meeting of the Anglian (Eastern) Regional Flood and Coast Committee.

[Continue to SMP Documents](#)