

Appendix 1 - Stakeholder Engagement



**EAST
ANGLIA
COASTAL
GROUP
SUB-CELL 3C**

**SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN SUB-CELL 3C
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

CONSULTATION REPORT

**v1.2
23rd June 2009**

**SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS
CONSULTATION REPORT**

Blank page

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION and SUMMARY	1
THE WORKSHOPS	2
PURPOSE OF WORKSHOPS	2
WHAT WAS PRESENTED?	3
MANAGING THE EVENT	3
ATTENDANCE AT WORKSHOPS	6
COMMENTS RECEIVED	9
APPENDIX 1: VENUES, DATES AND TIMETABLE	62
APPENDIX 2: HALF-DAY SESSION PROGRAMME TIMETABLE	63
APPENDIX 3: KEY MESSAGES	64
APPENDIX 4: CSG ATTENDANCE AND ROLES AT WORKSHOPS.....	66
APPENDIX 5: GROUP LEADER TASKS	67
APPENDIX 6: GROUP RECORDER TASKS	68
APPENDIX 7: SCENES FROM THE FORUM WORKSHOPS	69

**SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS
CONSULTATION REPORT**

Blank Page

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION and SUMMARY

The preparation of a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) is the responsibility of the operating authorities responsible for managing the coastline. In Suffolk these organisations are Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC), Waveney District Council (WDC), British Energy (BE) and the Environment Agency (EA) – in association with Natural England (NE) and Suffolk County Council (SCC):

The first generation Shoreline Management Plan for the Suffolk coastline, between Lowestoft and Felixstowe, was completed in 1998, covering a length of coastline of approximately 72 km. This SMP is now being reviewed by Royal Haskoning UK Ltd for Suffolk Coastal District Council as lead authority for the operating authorities. Terry Oakes Associates Ltd (TOAL) is project managing the development of the new SMP on behalf of SCDC.

One important aspect of the SMP Review is a wide and comprehensive stakeholder consultation to obtain their views and to examine proposals during the process of determining the appropriate policies.

The Consultation measures also include the establishment of the Representative Members Forum (RMF) and the Key Stakeholder Forum (KSF) which assist the Officers' Client Steering Group (CSG) in developing the draft SMP in advance of it being made available for wider public consultation. The Client Steering Group has prepared an Engagement Plan to steer this aspect of the review.

The Key Stakeholder Forum acts as the focal point for this process, providing discussion and consultation throughout the project development. Membership of the key stakeholder forum provides broad representation of the primary interests within the study area, ensuring consideration of all interests during review of issues.

In late March/early April 2009, a series of workshops for key stakeholders was held at three locations in the area. All key stakeholders were invited to sessions which explained the approach used to review the issues and to seek their comments/feedback on the draft management policies. Drop-in sessions were also held on each evening of the workshops to enable those who could not attend during the day to view the proposals and to make comments.

During the workshops, great importance was placed on recording the full range of views and comments expressed about the methodology of the review, its issues and draft policy proposals.

It is important that Consultees should be able to recognise the issues which they have raised, and the way in which they have been considered, through a transparent process of recording them. This report consists of the record of the comments made by participants both during the workshop sessions and in subsequent written and verbal communications.

The next consultation stage will be a full public examination of the draft SMP in summer 2009.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

THE WORKSHOPS

A series of six half-day sessions were held on three days to examine the proposed draft management policies for the Suffolk coastline. Each half-day session concentrated solely on one (or two adjoining) Policy Development Zones (PDZs) - Appendix 1 contains the full programme of PDZs.

Morning sessions started at 10.00 am; afternoon sessions at 2.00 pm. In addition, each venue featured a drop-in session in the evening from 5.00 pm until 7.00 pm for those unable to attend during the day. The full timetable is appended as Appendix 2.

182 key stakeholders, groups and organisations were invited to send representatives to any number of sessions as long as no more than two people from each group attend each one.

Each meeting was attended by Members and officers of the Partner organisations, along with representatives from Terry Oakes Associates Ltd, who are project managing the review, and Royal Haskoning (RH), the Consultants undertaking the review.

PURPOSE OF WORKSHOPS

The defined purpose of the workshops was to provide key stakeholders with an opportunity to:

- (1) Review the process used to identify possible policy options for the management of the Suffolk coastline;
- (2) examine the proposed draft policies for each policy zone;
- (3) Ask questions of the experts.

The aim was to explain the approach used to review the issues, identify potential policy options and how the preferred option was selected – taking into account technical and social implications, so that stakeholders felt they know enough about what we have done to be able to question our approach and the outcome. In addition, the project team were aiming to show that they were prepared to listen and to change the draft policies – and not to defend the decisions to date.

Their comments/feedback were requested to help us validate our work so that we can develop the final draft management policy options before the full public examination in summer 2009.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

WHAT WAS PRESENTED?

The project team emphasised that they were presenting how they had identified the preferred options for comment and that they were not presenting the final draft options.

All stakeholders had been advised that the draft SMP policies for the Suffolk coastline were available for downloading from a public area on the website www.suffolksmp2.org.uk. Hard copies were sent on request.

Greg Guthrie, Royal Haskoning, presented a summary of the thinking behind the development of all options considered.

The documents are referred to as Policy Development Zone statements (PDZs). There are seven PDZs covering the Suffolk Coastline:

PDZ1: Lowestoft to Benacre Ness

PDZ2: Benacre Ness to Easton Broad

PDZ3: Easton Broad to Minsmere

PDZ4: Minsmere to Thorpeness

PDZ5: Thorpeness to Orford Ness

PDZ6: Orford Ness to Cobbold's Point

PDZ7: Cobbold's Point to Landguard Point

MANAGING THE EVENT

Role of Chair

Role performed by:

Mark Johnson (EA)	PDZs 4 and 5
Cllr. Ken Sale (WDC)	PDZs 1 and 2
Cllr. Bruce Provan (WDC)	PDZ 3
Cllr Andy Smith (SCDC)	PDZs 6 and 7

To welcome stakeholders.

To explain the purpose of the workshop events:

The approach used to review the issues, identify potential policy options and how the preferred option was selected - taking into account technical and social implications; so that stakeholders felt they know enough about what had been done to be able to question the approach and outcome.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

To seek their comments/feedback to help validate the work to date so that the project team can develop the final draft management policy options before the full public examination in summer 2009.

To ask people to understand what we have done and to give us constructive comment.

To present a “work in progress”, not the final draft options

To listen

To set the context of the SMP as one of many documents and frameworks developing policy on how the coast should be managed. It provides a broad assessment of the long-term risks at the coast and offers guidance on sustainable coastal defence policy options.

To introduce the Lead Officer

To manage time of the event throughout the day

Role of Lead Officer

Role performed by:

Karen Thomas (EA)	PDZs 4 and 5
Paul Patterson (WDC)	PDZs 1, 2 and 3
Keith Tyrrell (TOAL)	PDZs 6 and 7

The Lead Officer set the scene,

Outlined the process, purpose and format of the half-day session; explained the programme for the day (see appendix 2);

Explained the approach used to review the issues, identify potential policy options and how the preferred option was selected - taking into account technical and social implications;

Explained that that we have to abide by guidelines set down by Defra and to aspects of National and European legislation using the SEA approach;

Collected and collated the major points from individual group discussions and presented them at the plenary session.

Format of Group Sessions

Delegates allocated themselves to individual groups of between 6 and 8 people, although the project team requested that delegates attending from the same organisation chose different groups.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

A member of CSG acted as Group Leader for each group to manage time and discussion – see Appendix 5 for nominated officer roles and Appendix 6 for brief.

A member of CSG acted as Recorder - see Appendix 5 for nominated officer roles and Appendix 7 for brief.

Final Plenary Session

Chair managed the session

Microphones were used to record comments and ensure that others could hear. Recorders kept notes on flipchart paper that were displayed on walls after the plenary session.

The Lead Officer for the day then presented a summary of the major points emanating from the debates within each of the group breakout sessions.

Questionnaires were also available, for completion either on the day or to be submitted later.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

ATTENDANCE AT WORKSHOPS

Zone 1 & 2 Lowestoft Ness – Benacre Ness Benacre Ness – Easton Broad

Benacre Estate
Benacre Parish Meeting
Covehithe Parish Council
Dunwich Parish Meeting
East of England Business Group
Easton Bavents Association
Easton Bavents Ltd
English Heritage
Kessingland Parish Council
Kessingland Beach Wardens
Reydon Parish Council
RNLI
Scott Wilson
Southwold Sailing Club
Suffolk Chamber of Commerce
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit
Walberswick Parish Council
Wangford with Henham Parish Council
Waveney District Council

Zone 3 Easton Broad - Minsmere

Benacre Parish Meeting
Blyth Estuary Group
Covehithe Parish Council
Dunwich Parish Meeting
Easton Bavents Conservation
English Heritage
National Farmers Union
National Trust
RNLI
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Southwold Harbour and River Blyth Users Association
Southwold Town Council
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Zone 4 Minsmere - Thorpeness

Alde & Ore Association
Alde & Ore Estuary Planning Partnership
Deben IDB
Dunwich Parish Meeting
English Heritage
GO East

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

John Kerr Farms
Leiston Town Council
Minsmere Levels Stakeholder Group
Mr. Glen Ogilvie
National Farmers Union
National Trust
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Suffolk County Council Archaeological Unit
Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Zone 5 Thorpeness – Orford Ness

Alde & Ore Estuary Planning Partnership
Country Landowners Association
Dunwich Parish Meeting
English Heritage
Fir Tree Farm, Blaxhall
GO East
Iken Parish Council
John Kerr Farms
National Farmers Union
National Trust
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Snape Parish Council
Sudbourne IDB
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Tunstall Parish Council

Zone 6 Orford Ness – Cobbold's Point

Bawdsey Parish Council
Capel St Andrew Farms
Dunwich Parish Meeting
English Heritage
Felixstowe Town Council
Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council
Mann Farms
National Farmers' Union
National Trust
River Deben Association
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
Royal Yachting Association (Eastern Region)
Shottisham Parish Council
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk Coastal Against Realignment (SCAR)
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Suffolk Preservation Society
Sutton Parish Council
Woodbridge Town Council

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 7 Cobbold's Point – Landguard Point

Dunwich Parish Meeting
English Heritage
Felixstowe Town Council
Kirton & Falkenham Parish Council
National Farmers' Union
River Deben Association
Royal Yachting Association (Eastern Region)
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit
Suffolk Coastal District Council
Suffolk County Council
Suffolk Preservation Society
Woodbridge Town Council

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Receipt of Comments

Comments were received in one of four ways:

- Formal responses after the workshops, either on questionnaire forms or as letters or emails;
- At workshops during the Forums, as noted on flipcharts by group recorders;
- As recorded and presented by Lead Officers at the Forum plenary sessions, being a summary of the major points expressed in the workshops within each of the groups.
- Comments recorded by Royal Haskoning at the workshops.

Formal Responses

Each comment or set of comments received has been given a unique and sequential reference and entered into a database. All comments are listed below.

Ref No	00001
PDZ	General
Policy Unit	
Location	
Response Type	Questionnaire
Name	Peter Mann
Organisation	Mann Group/Suffolk Rivers IDB
Comment	General public should be made aware that the policies can and will only be enacted if funding is available and that there will be no expectation or guarantee that the policy must be enacted.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00002
PDZ 5
Policy Unit HOL16.5
Location Aldeburgh to Bawdsey
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Mann
Organisation Mann Group/Suffolk Rivers IDB
Comment East Lane has HTL but terminates at the old EA boundary. It should extend 300 metres south to incorporate the new defences of the Martello tower.

It is unrealistic to try to deliver the SMP in exclusion of the estuary. What happens within the estuary will have an enormous effect of the immediate shoreline with a knock on principle.

The change of policy at Slaughden to NAI from HTL is extraordinarily dangerous and would probably lead to destruction of the Alde river estuary, Sudbourne marshes and Iken marshes.

This is in no way a practical response to the continued defence and management of the East Coast.

See also ref 00001, 00003

Ref No 00003
PDZ 6
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Mann
Organisation Mann Group/Suffolk Rivers IDB
Comment Definitely agree with the proposed policy.

See also ref 00001, 00002.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00004
PDZ	General
Policy Unit	
Location	
Response Type	Questionnaire
Name	Peter Boggis
Organisation	Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment	<p>Disturbed at the mindset to accept destruction. Therefore we must act now. The sea has risen (approx 120m.) in the past 20,000 years often at rates far in excess of today's, without the (what is now classed as) sins of human population to cause it.</p> <p>Concerned that a committee consisting of largely Government employees who are forbidden to act in a way which is incompatible with the EC Human Rights act, have produced a draft plan, which proposes to abuse the HR of the people of Easton Bavents.</p> <p>Concerned that the decision of the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs of 11/3/08 ref NSAP37 appears to have been totally ignored.</p> <p>Draft Plan does not appear to take into account Article 6(3) of the 'Habitats' Directive.</p> <p>Great care should be taken to conserve the SAC and SPA value.</p> <p>Kindly give further considerable thought to the whole of the section between Kessingland and Southwold as your present draft plan is unacceptable, against the local people's and the national interest. It is an immoral recipe for disaster.</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00005
PDZ 4
Policy Unit Minsmere
Location
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Boggis
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment Imminent risk of release of explosives on to the sea bed at Minsmere, if the beach is allowed to rollback.

Ref No 00006
PDZ 2
Policy Unit
Location Benacre Sluice
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Boggis
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment Essential that the rocks at Benacre Sluice are consolidated including the flume support as the destruction of this rock mass would have serious effect on both Kessingland and Covehithe and also increase the rate of embayment of the coast to Southwold. Further to this, a Rock structure must be placed in front of the residential section of Covehithe the better, to retard the rate of erosion and give time to protect the village.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00007
PDZ
Policy Unit
Location Easton Bavents
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Boggis
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment Finds the proposals for Easton Bavents to Southwold abhorrent.

Ref No 00008
PDZ 3
Policy Unit Easton Farm Lane
Location Easton Farm Lane
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Peter Boggis
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment
The Secretary for the Environment and Halcrow agree there should be a Hard point at the end of Easton Farm Lane to help reduce the erosion rate to the north. NEIEN own consultant has suggested that a structure at this point is likely to reduce erosion rates by 50% for 1.5km to the North therefore helping to protect the SPA. These matters are not reflected in your Draft plan.

Essential that a continuity of defence should as far as possible be maintained for 1km north of the existing sea wall because any abrupt change in the coast line is likely to effect the sediment distribution to the Southwold beaches. This was proven, by a faulty groyne placing north of the pier in 1950, which dropped the beach level at Easton Bavents by over 2m, created havoc on the beach at Southwold. This material came ashore at the Denes and then completely blocked Southwold harbour to the degree that the harbour mouth had to be excavated for a period.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00009
PDZ	6
Policy Unit	
Location	
Response Type	Questionnaire
Name	JP & SJ Greenwell
Organisation	Capel St Andrew Farms
Comment	<p>Difficult to assess how they will be affected without the estuaries strategy along the Alde, Ore and Butley rivers. At least there are good intentions to protect Bawdsey and Shingle Street.</p> <p>£1 million has been spent on strategies in the last 15 years - this could have been spent on defence.</p> <p>Agree with policy where it is prepared to defend the shoreline; not where it isn't.</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00010
PDZ	General
Policy Unit	
Location	
Response Type	Questionnaire
Name	William Fletcher
Organisation	SCC Archaeology Service
Comment	<p>Issues tables are an inadequate picture of the true Historic Environment resource in the area covered. The number and scope of sites named in the issues table needs to be reviewed. A number of the sites and features that have been included do not have correct details and have insufficient priority ratings.</p> <p>Information on archaeological sites and priorities provided to the consultants by Archaeological Service appears to have been misinterpreted. Further work is required to provide a correct and accurate picture of the Historic Environment resource as depicted on the counties Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Apparent general lack of understanding of the role which the Historic Environment has to play in the perception of the Suffolk coast, and the part it plays in our understanding of how the coast line has developed. Also a lack of understanding on specific issues and an apparent lack of knowledge regarding the broader concerns of the Historic Environment Sector.</p> <p>The lack of a Historic Environment specialist amongst the project team may account for these absences and this is something that needs to be addressed to ensure that the current issues do not perpetuate through to the next stages.</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00011
PDZ	General
Policy Unit	
Location	
Response Type	Letter
Name	S Rake
Organisation	SCC Archaeology Service
Comment	<p>The draft document as presented does not make it clear that historic environment issues were taken into account.</p> <p>The quality and extent of the heritage comments and the way in which the information has been interpreted and presented in the texts give the impression that historic environment issues have not been adequately consulted, nor that the relevant issues have been understood.</p> <p>It would be clearer if there was a specific list of historic environment (and other environmental) assets affected by the proposed policy, even if the rules do not allow a statement of the costs.</p> <p>There is no consistent historic environment/heritage objective throughout the plan or an understanding of the broader heritage issues relevant to this process</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00012
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Questionnaire
Name John Paton
Organisation Suffolk Preservation Society
Comment Continue to monitor offshore dredging to ascertain effect on the coast.

Ensure that all proposals do not harm agriculture or its water supplies. It is becoming more important that we grow as much of our own food as possible.

Ref No 00013
PDZ 1
Policy Unit LOW1, LOW2
Location Lowestoft Ness and Harbours
Response Type Letter
Name Chris Edwards
Organisation RYA Eastern Region
Comment Support the HTL designation. The economic and socio-economic importance of the harbour and its environs should be preserved. Access to and from the sea for commercial and increasingly more important recreational boating traffic and facilities, should be maintained.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00014
PDZ	3
Policy Unit	BLY09, BLY10
Location	The Denes to Walberswick
Response Type	Letter
Name	Chris Edwards
Organisation	RYA Eastern Region
Comment	<p>Extremely concerned at the poor prospects for Southwold Harbour. The Environment Agency Flood Plan for 20 years (predicts the loss of the existing harbour and widening and shallowing of the estuary mouth) will seriously impair recreational boating with a loss of economic and socio-economic benefits to the area and town. Current reports of the imminent failure of the North Harbour Wall will mean a complete blocking of the harbour and loss of all boating facilities, commercial and recreational, as well as the RNLI station.</p> <p>The need for local funding and action is agreed in the light of the withholding of Government Funds.</p>

Ref No	00015
PDZ	5
Policy Unit	ALB14, ORF15
Location	Thorpeness Haven to Aldeburgh, Martello Tower to
Response Type	Letter
Name	Chris Edwards
Organisation	RYA Eastern Region
Comment	<p>Proposed HTL to North Slaughden fine.</p> <p>NAI from 2025 for Martello Tower onwards produces concern that the sea wall will be breached on the bend, causing serious impacts and threat to recreational boating and both Slaughden Sailing Club and Aldeburgh Yacht Club.</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00016
PDZ 6
Policy Unit HOL6
Location Orford Ness to Bawdsey Hill
Response Type Letter
Name Chris Edwards
Organisation RYA Eastern Region
Comment Need to maintain access to the Ore at Shingle Street if recreational boating in and to the Ore/Alde is not to be detrimentally affected with loss of socio-economic benefits to the area.

Ref No 00017
PDZ 6
Policy Unit DEB17
Location Bawdsey Hill to mouth of the Deben
Response Type Letter
Name Chris Edwards
Organisation RYA Eastern Region
Comment HTL supported but concern that MR for Lower Estuary could impact seriously on recreational boating in and out of the Deben with a loss of socio-economic benefit to Woodbridge and whole estuary.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00018
PDZ 1
Policy Unit
Location Benacre
Response Type Letter
Name Edward Vere Nicoll
Organisation The Benacre Estate
Comment Feels that the future of the Benacre Shoreline has been decided, without any consultation with affected landowners and occupiers.

The approach to the Benacre shoreline is not only wrong but will also lead to:

i) Loss of the historic church and village of Covehithe; ii) Loss of the internationally important Benacre Nature Reserve and surrounding bird breeding areas; iii) Loss of agricultural land; and iv) The loss of one out of the two most used roads leading to/from Southwold at Potters Bridge.

Little account has been made of the effect on the sewage pumping station, residential homes and the Kessingland levels, if the Kessingland pumping station should be moved inland.

Similarly to the south, if the coastline is allowed to erode the defence of Southwold will be much more costly when the Easton Bavents shoreline has moved inland, which will result in a greater possibility of Southwold becoming an island.

Understand that detailed liaising with Natural England in regards to the 'impact of intervention' is of vital importance. The aspect of additional private and other funding has not been mentioned in the SMP 3 (sic) report and the Benacre Estate would expect to make a contribution if a suitable way forward can be agreed.

We would expect that the authors of future reports include the following paragraph:
'This policy does not preclude landowners in exercising an option to retain or slow coastal erosion by means of

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

private or other funding means.'

Accept coastal erosion will not disappear; but do not understand why SMP3 (sic) calls for a total capitulation along the Benacre shoreline. Feels that insufficient study has been made on the far cheaper option of 'soft' engineering measures along the coast and has been left with no option but to independently investigate this further.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00019

PDZ General

Policy Unit

Location

Response Type Email

Name Jen Heathcote

Organisation English Heritage

Comment Comments on the issues table:

Note that all designated assets (Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings) lying within the Plan have been captured in the table. N.B. Searches for other designated assets i.e. Registered Parks & Gardens; Battlefields; Protected Wreck should also have been undertaken although in practice when I checked within the 500m zone back from MHW none lie within the study area so need not be of concern for 3c.

Conservation Areas should also be included. Details and the location of these will be held by the local authority, not English Heritage.

There is a discrepancy in the scale assigned to a number of the designated assets, with some national sites only being accorded regional significance. (Apologies for overlooking I reviewed the table earlier and will amend.)

The point of most concern to the sector is the incorporation of the non-designated assets of regional and local importance (understood to have been acquired from Suffolk CC).

I understand from Suffolk CC that they have not seen the revised version of the table late 2006/early 2007 and therefore can't be confident that it represents all relevant assets. English Heritage can't comment on these non-designated assets. I understand that William Fletcher of Suffolk CC archaeology service will be checking the table, together with the scale of significance and will be able to provide feedback soon.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00020
PDZ	3
Policy Unit	
Location	Southwold
Response Type	Email
Name	Sue Allen
Organisation	Blyth Estuary Group
Comment	<p>Why, when we are working towards a sustainability of 20/25 years for the estuary banks and BEG are submitting a planning application for the estuary and the harbour, does the SMP still include within this time scale - the failure of Robinsons bank and the re-alignment of the south training arm? Suggest apply similar text as that in low 3.1. Note that over history pier positions and channel width have not been constant.</p> <p>There was no support for a 100 year plan from all present. This needs to be conveyed to DEFRA. We have no option to change SMP guidance.</p> <p>The economic value of Southwold Harbour must not be underestimated. (Benefit for Southwold of some £25m per annum to much of East Suffolk. Not just the allure of the town itself; also the entirety of its geographical position as it is today. Southwold would not survive in the long term if it consisted of the town, the beach between the pier and the south of Gun Hill and the Common. There must be long commitment to the future of the Town. The local economy value will be considered in local Harbour use assessments.</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00021
PDZ	3
Policy Unit	
Location	Easton Bavents
Response Type	Email
Name	Sue Allen
Organisation	Blyth Estuary Group
Comment	<p>The preference for protection to the north of the pier is for a rock groyne extending approx. 150m. out to sea. Assuming that you are referring to the northern end of the EM seawall then we agree that this is likely to become a critical control point for future management of the Southwold frontage. We do not agree that a long groyne is the most appropriate form of defence.</p> <p>The loss of Easton marsh is unacceptable.</p> <p>Potters Bridge needs to be protected.</p> <p>SMP guidance requires policies to be based upon community aspiration and not to be limited by present day public purse funding constraints. BEG represents extremely wide community aspirations and we therefore feel our expectations should be included in the SMP.</p> <p>Also asked to point out that Greg used the word "uncertainty" more than any other during the afternoon, which we feel is good reason for including the community aspirations .</p>

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00022
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Anne Page
Organisation Shingle Street Settlement/SCAR
Comment Estuary strategies must be taken into account.

The national taxpayers' role in supporting the coast needs emphasis.

Ref No 00023
PDZ 2
Policy Unit
Location Kessingland
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Les Crossland
Organisation Kessingland Parish Council
Comment Concerned about apparent 'defence' line in the middle of Kessingland village.

Concerned that his views had not been taken into account after the site visit meeting as the maps had not changed. (Karen Thomas explained his views had been taken but the maps needed changing after KSF events.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00024
PDZ 5
Policy Unit
Location Slaughden
Response Type Letter
Name R B Skepper
Organisation Ferry Farm, Sudbourne
Comment All stakeholders unanimous about the necessity to prevent a breach at Slaughden.

The two biggest industries that support the economic activity of the aide estuary are TOURISM and AGRICULTURE.

It would completely destroy the unique safe sailing for which Aldeburgh is renowned , and the junior sailing activities that can safely occur.

The likely consequential widespread flooding would destroy much of the scenic beauty of the estuary.

The tidal river level will immediately rise up to 1.5 ft all the way to Snape. At the moment, the tide level in the river at Aldeburgh and Snape is about 1.5 ft lower than the same high tide in the sea. As there is currently only about 2ft of free board at Snape ,a huge wall would immediately have to be built around the £500m Snape Maltings Aldeburgh festival hall complex to protect it.

Another issue arising from the daily higher tidal levels in the upper river is that the existing saltings would be covered by all tides instead of just spring tides. They would disappear rapidly to become inert mud flats. As the entire estuary is a designated European S.P.A.and S.A.C, it requires by European Habitats Law to be protected, or alternate habitat has got be created elsewhere.

The immediate hinterland to the river Aide constitutes one of the most intensive horticultural and vegetable production areas of the U.K. - all totally dependent on irrigation waters from tbe underground acquifers adjacent to the coast.

From Aldeburgh South to SouthEssex a 300/400 metre wide

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

100 metre+ deep london clay strip creates a perfectly impermeable barrier to saline incursion from the seabed. The hill of crag overlying the clay where this farm sits contains a reservoir of above 150m gallons. Tbe three farms that use it ,ours ,Marshland estate and Stannay farm have licences to withdraw 75million gallons anually and even in dry years the water table hardly drops at all in spite of pumping full allocation.

If the sea water gets across the marshes into these sand aquifers it will go brackish for miles inland, wrecking all the underground irrigation of the hinterland and destroying the huge agricultural output.

There is only about 750 metres of narrow land South of the Martello tower until the Ness widens out to up to 1/2mile and this needs to be securely defended, then the whole 10 mile stretch to the South is secure.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00025
PDZ 6 and 7
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Questionnaire
Name Cllr Graham Newman
Organisation Suffolk County and Felixstowe Town Councillor
Comment Agrees with what the SMP is trying to deliver.

Agrees with the proposed policy.

Ref No 00026
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name David Andren
Organisation SCAR
Comment Wondering if there are any representatives of the real business interest along the coast. Does anybody represent business around this room? It is something that's deeply unsatisfactory about this process.

Ref No 00027
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Unknown
Organisation Unknown
Comment The very fact that the premise that we're accepting that this is a natural process, it has never been. This coast has always been managed for hundreds, if not thousands of years, and factors on the coastline have been managed and to leave it to nature is perhaps naive at best

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00028
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type
Name Unknown
Organisation Unknown
Comment No representation of the tourism industry this morning. But whatever the economic value of the tourism industry goes well back from the coast, in fact it goes right inland, probably taking up at least half of Suffolk or more. So I think that's a point that really has to be evaluated in the protection of this area.

Ref No 00029
PDZ 3, 4 and 5
Policy Unit
Location Sizewell
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Unknown
Organisation Unknown
Comment We haven't talked about the Sizewell new build. If they do bring in material from the sea then there's going to have to be new build there. What sort of effect is that going to have on natural processes? I'm particularly thinking of sediment accretion between Thorpeness and Aldeburgh which happens all the time now. Is it not feasible that if there is new build there and that is interfered with then you might get the shingle disappearing from that ridge? Is that being considered in the plan?

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00030
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Unknown
Organisation English Heritage
Comment From the heritage side that we recognise the aspiration that you have to try to balance the various interests. I think that so far you haven't achieved that through the documents presented. They are not taking on board the full range of assets that we know we've got here, whether they're heritage or tourist of whatever else. There's an attempt to do it but this plan is obviously still heavily led from an engineering and a geomorphological and a geological standpoint.

I would like to see you be slightly more balanced in trying to not claim that we're moving to a naturalised system when we've got Sizewell sitting there which is going to pull the whole modelling and position out from an attempt to come at something which is slightly more natural. I think that I'm pleased to see the evolution between SMP 1 and 2 as being something that is more mix and match rather than an extremist, absolutist policy of let natural processes take their course, that's artificial. It may have been economically driven, I couldn't possibly comment but the simple position is that we have always intervened in the coast.

What we need is an intelligent balancing of those interests and a debate which actually puts a proper value and a judgement on each of those decisions. And I think therefore what we want to see at the end of this process is a balancing of those interests and a costing of those interests not just in financial terms but in the other sorts of significances which we have to value - natural environment, manmade environment, tourism, economics. And I think that there's still a bit of a challenge there for you to get that balance right.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00031
PDZ 2
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name John Goldsmith
Organisation Cllr. Suffolk County Council
Comment Plus 100 years I think you're looking too far into the future. There is so much land, there is so much that can happen that would be irretrievable and I hate to think what in 100 years plus time this coastline is going to look like to think about doing anything about putting it right. You've got to keep what we've got now. I don't think anything else above that is acceptable.

Ref No 00032
PDZ 2
Policy Unit
Location Kessingland
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Liam Martin
Organisation Kessingland Parish Council (Chair)
Comment As the Chairman of Kessingland Parish Council, I am really concerned about the effects that this plan is going to have, particularly when you say that this part of the coast where Kessingland is one of the most vulnerable parts of the coast along this part of the East coast.

And I don't feel at the moment you're taking enough consideration in to protecting what is a most vulnerable part of the coastline and you've got a village, you've got people, you've got businesses and you've got a community - nothing I've read shows any consideration being taken of that at all. Plus there are other complicated issues which the District Council are aware of as far as Kessingland is concerned which is going to have a knock on effect if that's not considered in your plan either.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00033
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name John Huggins
Organisation RNLI
Comment Gained the impression that protection will be afforded to the more populated areas. More remote areas will be left for future generations to deal with.

Also expressed concern that protection will be provided by large concrete structures rather than lower cost 'softer' defences.

Ref No 00034
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Sue Allen
Organisation Blyth Estuary Group
Comment Expressed concern that the map which shows Southwold completely encircled by a flood-risk zone will reduce confidence to inward investment and its attractiveness to visitors.

Also would like to see the risk to Potters' Bridge on the B1127 emphasized in a similar manner to that at Wolsey Bridge, in recognition of the importance of the road.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00035
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Paul England
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment The managed realignment at Easton March will result in the loss of a large area of car parking. How well can the location of the natural beach to this frontage be predicted? What sort of control structures will be needed?

Ref No 00036
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Peter Boggis
Organisation Easton Bavents Conservation
Comment Feels that Easton Marsh frontage should benefit from the same quality of amenity beach as the Southwold Town frontage. The recent work to the groyne in front of the Easton Marsh wall has, in his opinion, contributed to the accelerated erosion of this beach, and the increased exposure of the sea wall itself.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00037
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Cllr John Goldsmith
Organisation Suffolk County Council
Comment Attempts to hold the northern end of the Easton Marsh frontage may well bring about conditions which lead to accelerated erosion of the Easton Baverns cliffs.

Ref No 00038
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Cllr Christine Block
Organisation Suffolk Coastal DC
Comment Would like to see mention somewhere within the SMP of the potential difficulties in securing public funding for some of the proposed options and the need to seek alternate forms of funding.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00039
PDZ 5
Policy Unit
Location Alde/Ore
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name David Andren
Organisation Alde/Ore Association
Comment Reference to Alde/Ore Estuary Plan should be replaced with the Thorpeness to Hollesley Coastal Strategy.

Feels that it's reasonable for property owners within a defended flood-risk area to make contributions towards the upkeep of those defences through, for example, s106 agreements.

Ref No 00040
PDZ 6 and 7
Policy Unit
Location Deben and Landguard Fort
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Cllr Graham Newman
Organisation Suffolk County Council
Comment There are instances in the draft plan where a proposal to hold the line will be compromised by a proposal in the neighbouring section (e.g. managed retreat for Landguard Common but hold the line at Landguard Fort; managed retreat for the lower estuary of the Deben, but hold the line for the Martello Tower).

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00041
PDZ 7
Policy Unit
Location Landguard Point
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Susan Robinson
Organisation Felixstowe Town Council (Town Clerk)
Comment I've looked at the stakeholder objective to do with what is described as the Landguard Common SSSI. Now that's only a small part of the Landguard Peninsula, the Landguard Peninsula is larger than the SSSI and within the Landguard Peninsula there is, over and beyond the SSSI, quite a lot of important bio-diversity and indeed rather further up the coast, towards Manor Terrace. I'm just a little bit concerned that this flexibility might take away some of the more interesting features outside the SSSI.

Ref No 00042
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Unknown
Organisation Unknown
Comment Consideration of the estuaries is not immediately apparent in the proposed SMP.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00043
PDZ 7
Policy Unit 20.1
Location Landguard Point
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Jen Heathcote
Organisation English Heritage
Comment Relating to management area 20.1, ie the west side of Landguard Point, note that the 100 year draft preferred policy line stops just shy of the jetty leaving - I do recognise that it is the hold the line policy down that stretch, but we do have some concerns about potential flood vulnerability round the back of the Fort.

Ref No 00044
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Neil Montgomery
Organisation Woodbridge Town Council
Comment Most of the proposals for holding the line are longitudinal, in that they going along the coast line. But if the problem is essentially one of erosion, why do you not also consider lateral protections, in other words modern groynes which have been used for hundreds of years and are pretty rickety rickety now in many cases but they do seem to have been effective.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00045
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Graham Henderson
Organisation SCAR
Comment I'm very concerned about how we put this information out to the public. Because to put the document out on its own to people in the Felixstowe is not going to tell them very much. So how far will the information be expanded in the public examination?

Ref No 00046
PDZ General
Policy Unit
Location
Response Type Forum Workshop
Name Unknown
Organisation Unknown
Comment Will an overarching view of the whole dynamic of the SMP down the coast be included? The interaction from cell to cell is enormously important.

Added note from Graham Henderson (SCAR): give out the fundamentals and tell people all this information is available in depth on the website or whatever.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00047
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Letter
Name Jennifer Hussell
Organisation Southwold Town Council
Comment Councillors were concerned that serious consideration was being given to accepting loss to the marshes and beaches to the north and south of the town, leading to considerable commercial loss though loss of visitor numbers and the possibility of the town's businesses being unsustainable.

Discussions with the EA and others may help preserve the river and harbour but will do nothing for the north of the town. The Council considers that a better option than a clay wall around the town would be a 150-metre rock groyne to the north and would welcome the project team's views on this.

Ref No 00048
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Letter
Name Jennifer Hussell
Organisation Southwold Town Council
Comment Concerned that the strategy appears to be based, at least in part, on figures from 1991. More up-to-date information should have been used for a strategy of this significance.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00049
PDZ 2
Policy Unit COV 7
Location
Response Type Letter
Name Mary Norden
Organisation RSPB
Comment They note that the loss of areas of the SAC (and SPA) are considered natural and point out that the anticipated habitat loss will nonetheless require appropriate assessment and provision of compensatory habitat.

Ref No 00050
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Southwold
Response Type Letter
Name Mary Norden
Organisation RSPB
Comment The RSPB is concerned that the proposed policy does not reduce the sediment input to the south of Southwold, impacting negatively on the SPA/SAC interest.

Ref No 00051
PDZ 3
Policy Unit
Location Dunwich
Response Type Letter
Name Mary Norden
Organisation RSPB
Comment In the summary paragraph under 'Plan', they suggest the wording 'habitat creation' be replaced by 'habitat change'.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No 00052
PDZ 4
Policy Unit MIN 12
Location Minsmere
Response Type Letter
Name Mary Norden
Organisation RSPB
Comment There appears to be some consistency between the text and the summary map. In zone 12.2 in 2105, NAI is proposed which the RSPB accepts. The map proposed MR - please clarify.

They agree with 12.1 and 2.3.

They suggest that 12.4 is altered to MR for all three epochs. Minor works may be required and this should be reflected in the option category.

At the southern end of 12.4, there appears to be an undefended gap between the 100-year shoreline and the indicative line of flood defence. They suggest that the extent of the latter be extended to provide adequate protection of the SPA.

Ref No 00053
PDZ 4
Policy Unit MIN 13
Location Minsmere
Response Type Letter
Name Mary Norden
Organisation RSPB
Comment re 13.1, obviously the HTL category will be maintained to protect the nuclear power stations. This must not be to the detriment of the adjacent designated sites and should be appropriately assessed with in the strategy.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Ref No	00054
PDZ	5
Policy Unit	ALD 14
Location	Aldeburgh
Response Type	Letter
Name	Mary Norden
Organisation	RSPB
Comment	Re zone 14.2 (directly in from of the RSPB North Warren reserve), the proposed category is MR - which the RSPB accepts but would query why the indicative lines of flood defence are proposed to the north and south. A retired line could placed behind the shingle beach to provide protection to Aldeburgh and Thorpeness but with a lesser length of defence needed.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Workshop Comments

These comments were written down by group recorders during the Forum breakout workshop sessions. Due to the nature of these workshops, they are not attributed to either an individual or an organisation.

PDZ 1 and 2 (Lowestoft Ness to Easton Broad)

Covehithe area = NAI. To contribute sediment to coast to South.

NAI policy unlikely to change?

Benacre estate will be affected.

Loss of offshore sandbank due to dredging by Crown Estates. Has affected coastal processes + protection to coast.

Erosion rates here therefore increased.

How will we prevent flooding in the south of PDZ2 (north of pier)?

Area around Benacre P/S may flood very suddenly as it is below sea level.

Why not defend this area?

Groynes in front of Kessingland altered the movement of Benacre Ness.

We are accepting destruction rather than having to stop it with more hard points.

Compensation/social justice?

Aspirational plan – is this affordable?

No objective about the historic environment

No table containing all historic environment assets in SMP area

Problems with re-creating lost habitats

What happens if the councils don't adopt the SMP?

What's the link with the LDFs?

Impact of Great Yarmouth harbour development should be explained/included/analysed

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

SMP-link LDF maps to show all nationally designated landscapes.

Historic landscapes categorisation should be used to help shape the policies.

What problems for smaller coastal communities today are going to increasingly become problems for larger urban coastal communities as time goes on.

More info needed on PDZ2 before we can say we are happy with this.

NAI/MR becomes more acceptable with good sustainable development plans/policies in place.

Kessingland sewage pumping station – effect on whole village

Not enough protection for Kessingland – fresh water flooding backing up

Historic environment inaccuracies

Coherent strategy across whole area.

Benacre sluice as groyne to anchor Kessingland beach.

Take account of linear coast path.

Easton Broad, Potters Bridge Road?

A12?

Compensation for loss of property not addressed

Are commercial costs assessed in plan, especially tourism, Kessingland holiday camps x2

Ground water salinity effects?

Deflect currents away from beaches.

Consultation – should visit communities

Should protect in situ – including land south of Benacre sluice

View of economics is too narrow, needs to include history and landscape

More input from the business community

Recognising where intervention, natural processes & other drivers (economic) interplay – balancing act.

Habitats – which do you keep/not keep.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Creating new habitats can be to the disadvantage of heritage sites – cost implications of this need to be acknowledged in the plan.

Why do we need to be looking 100 years ahead?

Too much uncertainty

Can we 'interfere' with nature?

Are there ways of using softer, more natural defences?

Heritage costs + implications need to be factored in (Covehithe)

There needs to be a connection of policies

LDF + other national research strategies/policies (EH-MORPHE) need to be linked in – fundamental.

Offshore dredging + its implications on erosion needs to be addressed.

Access + recreation – again joining up policies making sure that there is access to the coast and heritage sites

PDZ 3 (Easton Broad to Minsmere)

Links to Harbour/Harbour Plan – how would this work?

Negative perspective – do nothing as baseline.

Other aspects to climate change – not just SLR

100 year time scale too long

More about how the issues have been taken into account.

More information needed to inform land management response; confidence, threats + opportunities – blighting effect of plan

No consideration of Human Rights – issues re loss of properties

Easton Farm lane Hard point not planned?

Can't the bastions be made into a groyne to protect Mr Boggis properties and Southwold? No technical evidence why this is not acceptable.

Financial impact & Human Rights issues

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

SMP says 'allow failure' of Robinsons Marsh + tinkers marsh defences. Is this in conflict with BEG objectives?/why should local people be required to do this? Human Rights implications.

Status/role/function of the SMP. Is it set in stone? – guidance only.

How much flexibility for local proposals?

If plan is being reviewed in 10 years – how can proposals be considered over this short time frame?

How does this fit with long-term thinking?

How do we work with high degree of uncertainty?

Need not to abandon unless certain of need to.

Need to protect Southwold wall (Easton Marsh) for as long as possible.

Clarification of meaning of managed re-alignment – plan is inconsistent

Yellow lines on maps don't show up.

Beach stabilisation frontages at Easton – should be in the plan?

EN/NE predictions of erosion rates

Clarity needed for Easton

Consideration to defending coast is needed.

Not enough info provided to support some policies.

No reference to Dunwich(?) Pier outfall to the sea over 100 years.

Harbour Hydraulic design

Need to be assured the mouth is fully understood. Mouth needs to be maintained. If mouth is changed it will not work.

Do not agree with policy on Harbour Mouth. 1937 – Mouth blocked by shingle due to the works being done i.e. No harbour wall to keep the beach to one side. Harbour needs to be kept deep.

Opportunities need to be looked at if the Harbour Mouth was improved – increased value

Repair north wall & Harbour pier.

South needs to be maintained with policy.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

North bank agree with SMP policy

Houses on stilts – retreat - does that mean translocation or loss?

MR – feeds into Action Plan - LA's adaptation needs to be flagged up if policy does not change. Worried EH becoming liable for loss of structures.

Other heritage sites, Dunwich, Minsmere picked up in S.E.A.

Shingle Ridge – more on consequences of loss of fresh water habitats

MR – mitigation & compensation of habitats.

Don't want habitats sacrificed for housing.

Landscape character – type of HTL hard defences need to have design elements that fit in

Character elements of rural features.

Timescale of SMPs – funding in line with strategies may be an issues

Community Roll Back discussion needed government to deal with Rolling Back Communities.

Creation of new habitats need to be sympathetic – historically informed

Land usage – population 10 millions – food security

What is a legal requirement and what is an option – birds or food.

What is reason for leaving south side of harbour

Position of the Harbour Wall

Shingle bank – Dunwich to Walberswick

Houses on stilts – to possibly be designated

Landscape character – how does it change

Construction – need to know more info

N. Wall – historical construction single wall tied back/Walberswick side

SMP reflects historical construction

Harbour wall – concerns unusable on ebb tide. Any rise erosion increase difficult to navigate.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Harbour needs to be isolated to restrict flow/dam with sluice to maintain flow – navigation

Ebb flow now better for navigation.

Offshore dredging affects coastal processes and coastal protection. SMP should contain more info about this. Statement about impacts of offshore dredging on coast.

Possible human rights issues where properties may be lost in the future?

Flooding from Dunwich River – should be taken into account.

Should have obtained more local knowledge earlier in the SMP process.

Not enough communication about the SMP process. Too long between key stakeholder meetings.

PDZ 4 (Minsmere to Thorpeness)

Heritage

Impact of MR on Heritage is an issue for SMP partner authorities

Settlement rollback

More issues aside from engineering/geology

Sea bed Heritage – wrecks

Undesignated sites – Marine

Landscape assessed for areas

Sizewell C – potential for contribution to sluice

J Pethwick – report to Sizewell SMP

Natural coastline ?? (relative)

Leiston Sewage system

Sluice upgrade – pump

Offshore dredging – aggregates – impact of coastline

Availability of background docs on SMP

Link with estuary strategies?

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Link with CFMPs – Thorpeness, One Hundred River, Minsmere river

Who makes technical recommendations?

Importance of agricultural land re population increase

Minsmere central MR policy 12.3

RSPB not happy with this

12.3 and 12.4 – future of sluice- timeline

NAI? – need for minimal management

Leiston STW – outfall? / pumping station?

Managing water levels

Habitat creation – where will it go?

Impact of Dunwich humps down drift?

Clarity for landowners on impact on them

Compensation/adaptation for people?

Impacts of building power stations?

Sediment flow

Dredging impacts

(Coastal processes) Adequate funding for defences?

No mention of farming in area 4, impact of flooding on grazing

Links with landscape

Impacts on Aquifer – Salination on agriculture

How are timetables / plans of work decided?

12.3 – MR option (NAI) with minor works like 12.4

Sluice – what will happen? Pump?

Economic Evaluation (under-evaluation)

Land farming – changing values

Wider value of the coast i.e. Thorpeness

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Suffolk Coast Path

Tourism

Increased flood risk

Pollution of aquifers with salt water

Economic value of heritage

ICZM – wider approach

Process

Positive response to date.

Active network for consultation in communities

Lack of heritage specialist in team is a concern.

Not enough consultation on heritage issues

Omissions/clarifications

Not adequate weight given to heritage issues

Landscape character assessments included?

Site-specific Issues

Min North:

Proposed secondary defence to be fit for purpose (o/t and breach proof) to prepare freshwater environment

Management of shoreline to continue

Retain public access at shoreline

Arch. features to be identified

Min Central:

Future performance of sluice to sustain land drainage function is of concern. Pump.

Leiston drainage feeds into sluice.

Ensure proactive engagement with AW RE sewage treatment works

Min South:

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Archaeology: Assets at risk.

Clarify why policy for 12.3 & 12.4 is different?

PDZ 5 (Thorpeness to Orford Ness)

What weight does the SMP have?

14.2 Thorpeness – Aldeburgh flooding issues

- Sluice

- Flooding of more – where will water go?

Is it accreting here? EA maps.

Osmosis/saline

Seepage issues here?

Impact on tides of breach

Spring tides

Estuary c.f. sea

Effects on walls

(1 lower (G.G))

Have all types of defences been considered – geo textiles / rocks / etc?

Impact of two mouths on flows?

Impact of defences on Ness on Nature Conservation Values

Defence for Aldeburgh – fort green (coastguard look-out) – is it adequate now?

How is the increased flooding on the Ness addressed in the plan?

Where is the flooding (Kings Marches etc) coming from?

Impact of Salination on Alde aquifer – agricultural impacts

Relative impacts of surges and SLR

How does the plan compare/distinguish/take account of these?

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Part of jigsaw only – can't support until links with estuary strategy are established – social impacts not explored

Collaboration between SMP and Estuaries Study still required

Make reference to the changed name of the Estuaries Study (Aldeburgh coast and Estuaries Study)

Concerned about confidence of data/info provided (i.e. Water levels with and without breach at Slaughden)

Timescale of ICZM and how it works

Need to take account the severity of storm surges on potential breach.

Concerned about taking heritage into account and how this will feed back through policy decisions.

Need to feed all info available (i.e. Appendices) through to stakeholders

Have different options for protection at Slaughden been considered

Thorpeness sluice – as with Minsmere

LDF – timescales

Slaughden:

Breach

Values on land/properties

Impacts upon North Weir Point

Impacts upon Orford Ness South of Breach

Agreement of recycling

Impact upon designated sites within estuary

Economies of breach

Length of time this whole process is taking – how long until results?

What are the opportunities?

Increased surge tide levels as a result of the breach

If hold at Slaughden can IS.SM be funded?

Latest LIDAR Survey

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Process

Consultation docs are geo? & environment led

Heritage values not given sufficient weight

Presentation good

Maps are of appropriate detail and understandable – with local knowledge

Listed buildings and consideration areas not marked! Should be.

Site-specific Issues

ACB 14.1 Works to protect individual properties should not adversely affect adjacent coast

ACB 14.2 What is rationale for policy change? (GG)

Presentation of 'hinterland response' lines (GG)

ORF 15.1 Ensure sediment pathways to/from Orford Ness are properly described in doc.

Expand significance of national policy for Orford Ness

Shingle recycling from Orford Ness is short term. Note English Heritage interest

Ensure comprehensive stakeholder network – as SMP for Alde Ore Study

ORF 15.2 Orford Ness heritage designation about to change. Ensure that policy remains appropriate.

ACB 14.2 Habitat change notes as consideration of policy

PDZ 6 (Orford Ness to Cobbold's Point)

Action – access to SMP2 Guidance
Holesley sea bank maintenance

Economic drivers – Greg to explain figures

SMP Process after these events onto adoption; links to LDF

100-year timeframe; 10 year review; sea level rise

Holesley Sea Bank; explain pressures and intent of management

Economic data; more transparency needed; irrigation values

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Socio-economic impacts
people and property

Links with EA estuary plans

Erosion of Bawdsey Cliffs; impact on flood plain behind

Timing of estuary plans; difficult to draw conclusions in their absence

Continuation of draft plan; Broadsheets to everyone affected in coastal zone; LA newsletters

Role of East Lane Trust; more information on them in the SMP

How will issues identified today and after be taken into account?

What is the link between SMP and estuary strategies? What stage is the estuary strategy at? Wider economic impacts behind the coast

Recognition in the plan that if East Lane fails, it could run all the way through the Deben; needs more clarification in SMP

How can we fund implementation of the policies? Private funding?

Shingle Street first epoch is managed re-alignment – why? Then HTL in 2nd and 3rd epoch; clarification needed; intent needs to be clear to the reader

What is the status of the SMP? Links with planning system? LDF?

Can the SMP feed into the LDF?

16.6 English Heritage object because of impacts on Martello Tower in first epoch

16.3 Better explanation of intent

16.5 Reference to uncertainty around East Lane should be removed because it refers to intent (to UTL), not process.

Links between SMP and Marine Bill?

Issues over how it is broken down

Issue over PDZ influencing policies

Good information gleaned from website – easy to navigate – keep it simple – keep it layered

Historic/Heritage aspects (Orford Ness) have not been captured fully

Need to ensure cross-reference within SMP with estuary strategies

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Can we include link with ICZM and affect on SMP

Concern that estuaries have not been included in SMP

Happy with this proactive approach to engagement and opportunity to consult on policies

Concern over lack of resources able to manage the SMP process in wider scale

Need clarification over whose 'responsibility' it is to manage defences

What is relationship of forthcoming Marine Bill outcomes on SMP

East Lane – Bawdsey (NAI) – concern it is flawed due to sediment movement

Clearer explanation of policies – i.e. HTL/NAI/MR/ATL – glossary

Is East Lane holding back sediment that could recharge Knolls and North Felixstowe beach?

PDZ 7 (Cobbold's Point to Landguard Point)

T.B.A. This session attracted fewer numbers so the format of the Workshop was changed to a single, larger and longer and plenary session.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Plenary Sessions

These are comments presented by Lead Officers at the Forum plenary sessions and are a summary of the major points expressed in the workshops within each of the groups. They may, therefore, duplicate some of the comments recorded in the previous section.

Full transcripts of these sessions are attached as Appendix 8.

PDZ 1 and 2 (Lowestoft to Easton Broad)

The high flood and erosion risk to land at S of Kessingland village is news to community.

The impact of a set bank main flood bank on infrastructure and property is significant.

Why not resist erosion of beach and attempt to retain flood defence in present location.

Offshore dredging is a cause of erosion over this part of coast.

Why is defence of Kessingland to Easton Marsh considered inappropriate and unviable?

Coastal access must be considered and explicitly discussed.

Implication of policies upon landscape and heritage assets has not been adequately discussed.

A 100 yr plan life is excessive and unhelpful. Uncertainties associated with the 50-100 year forecast period are too great.

Need for demonstration of good integration of various coastal policy / management studies. This was raised by EH rep who mentioned a recent Eng Heritage study.

The impact of policy upon local tourism and business interests should be considered. Plan economic assessments should not be limited to GB plc.

It is a weakness of the plan that policies are aspirational and not certainly affordable / deliverable.

How are habitat change / relocation issues considered by the plan?

More info required on adaptation, compensation, social justice issues.

PDZ 3 (Easton Broad to Minsmere)

Time between baseline and Policy consultations is too long.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Proposed hard point at N end of Easton Marsh wall should be a long groyne.

More info required on consequences of habitat loss over Dun - Walberswick part.

Why is Robinson Marsh policy MR after findings of Ken Pye report and local self help works upstream?

A development roll back policy should be allowed to enable threatened communities to relocate locally and not in nearest settlement e.g. Easton Bavents.

Defending settlements on promontories e.g. Southwold and Kessingland will be more difficult if erosion is allowed to occur in between.

The risks / consequences of disruption to the Reydon / Wrentham highway at Potters Bride are not adequately discussed by the plan.

Status / role of SMP should be clarified in docs.

More experimental / low cost coast defence measures should be trialled to challenge benefit cost assumptions based upon heavy expensive works options.

Is GYOH and offshore dredging contributing to pressure on this part of coast?
Comment required in plan.

Southwold Harbour Plan is critical to policy. What is it and when will it be available?

Southwold Harbour North Wall in urgent need of urgent works. Would its failure have impacts upon the coast?

Navigation of the Blyth entrance is currently difficult due to fast water flows. This could be managed by embanking more marshes upstream.

Plan should consider landscape character changes as consequence of policy implementation.

Need for discussion of Human Rights impacts associated with policy options.

More discussion required on adaptation, blight and social justice.

Why no proposal for works to defend threatened properties at Easton Lane?

PDZ 4 (Minsmere to Thorpeness)

Need to find better routes into involving groups who are working with communities and with those who live and work on the coast.

Concerns about managed realignment:

Heritage considerations

Loss of freshwater habitats; have to be replaced somewhere else; costs and

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

implications

Agricultural land loss; saltwater intrusion; saltwater flooding and freshwater flooding caused by water not being to flow out

Individual property owners – what are there are options and what they will/won't be allowed to do

What happens to the plan when it has been finalised?

The effect of the legal requirements related to habitat

Issues related to Sizewell; the role of large developers on the coast and can they be contributing to local defences?

Agricultural issues and food security

Access to and along the coast

The need to take into account the wider economic issues

PDZ 5 (Thorpeness to Orford Ness)

Discussion about process: role, what weight does it have;

SMPs vs. Estuary Strategies v ICZM: Alde/Ore

Policy option around Slaughden; lot of discussion; difficulty to support the policy option without a lot more information

Wider issues:

- Managed realignment
- Freshwater habitat
- Impacts on agricultural land
- Saltwater infusion

Comments about individual property owners and what they could or couldn't do; two groups expressing opposing views – that owners should not take action that affects other coastal processes, and that they could.

HTL – particularly around Aldeburgh, what state are the defences in now; what is likely to happen

Positive feedback – good comments about the maps; several really good suggestions about how to improve the things that are displayed in the maps

Discussions about agencies and local authorities linking in with community groups

PDZ 6 (Orford Ness to Cobbold's Point)

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Importance of linking the SMP issues with those in the Local Framework Directive and the Estuary Strategies now under preparation by the Environment Agency.

The policies should have due regard to the means by which the ensuing implementation actions are to be funded.

Concern expressed about the narrow scope of benefit identification, even allowing for the necessarily coarse evaluation which is possible at the high level analysis within the SMP.

Difficulty of interpreting what is meant by “The Line” when considering the policy options. This is sometimes leading to confusion when the defence is affectively a zone – beach, wall, dunes and immediate hinterland.

Some questioning of the way in which anticipated sea level rise has been taken into account.

Failure to produce the “correct” policy options may lead to Bawdsey becoming an “island” in the future as the sea breaks through between East Lane and Shingle Street.

PDZ 7 (Cobbold’s Point to Landguard Point

T.B.A. This session attracted fewer numbers so the format of the workshop was changed to a single, larger and longer and plenary session.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Comments recorded by Royal Haskoning

The impact of a set bank main flood bank on infrastructure and property is significant.

Why not resist erosion of beach and attempt to retain flood defence in present location.

Offshore dredging is a cause of erosion over this part of coast.

Coastal access must be considered and explicitly discussed.

A 100 yr plan life is excessive and unhelpful. Uncertainties associated with the 50-100 year forecast period are too great.

Need for demonstration of good integration of various coastal policy / management studies. This was raised by EH rep who mentioned a recent Eng Heritage study.

The impact of policy upon local tourism and business interests should be considered. Plan economic assessments should not be limited to GB plc.

It is a weakness of the plan that policies are aspirational and not certainly affordable / deliverable.

How are habitat change / relocation issues considered by the plan?

More info required on adaptation, compensation, social justice issues.

Time between baseline and Policy consultations is too long.

Proposed hard point at N end of Easton Marsh wall should be a long groyne

More info required on consequences of habitat loss over Dunwich - Walberswick part.

A development roll back policy should be allowed to enable threatened communities to relocate locally and not in nearest settlement e.g. Easton Bavents.

Defending settlements on promontories e.g. Southwold and Kessingland will be more difficult if erosion is allowed to occur in between.

Status / role of SMP should be clarified in docs

More experimental / low cost coast defence measures should be trialled to challenge benefit cost assumptions based upon heavy expensive works options.

Is GYOH and offshore dredging contributing to pressure on this part of coast? Comment required in plan.

Southwold Harbour Plan is critical to policy. What is it and when will it be available?

Southwold Harbour North Wall in urgent need of urgent works. Would its failure have impacts upon the coast?

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Navigation of the Blyth entrance is currently difficult due to fast water flows. This could be managed by embanking more marshes upstream.

Plan should consider landscape character changes as consequence of policy implementation.

More discussion required on adaptation, blight and social justice.

**SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS
CONSULTATION REPORT**

APPENDIX 1: VENUES, DATES AND TIMETABLE

Policy Development Zone	Section of Coastline	Venue	Date	Start time	Finish Time
1	Lowestoft to Benacre Ness	Southwold Pier	2 April 2009	10 am	1 pm
2	Benacre Ness to Easton Broad	Southwold Pier	2 April 2009	10 am	1 pm
3	Easton Broad to Minsmere	Southwold Pier	2 April 2009	2 pm	5 pm
4	Minsmere to Thorpeness	Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew	31 March 2009	10 am	1 pm
5	Thorpeness to Orford Ness	Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew	31 March 2009	2 pm	5 pm
6	Orford Ness to Bawdsey Manor	Waveney Room, Ufford Park Hotel	3 April 2009	10 am	1 pm
7	Felixstowe Ferry to Landguard Point	Waveney Room, Ufford Park Hotel	3 April 2009	2 pm	5 pm

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 2: HALF-DAY SESSION PROGRAMME TIMETABLE

10.00	Welcome by Chair
10.05	Introduction by Lead Officer
10:15	Overall Approach: Greg Guthrie (Royal Haskoning)
10:30	Policies for the Zone – Greg Guthrie (Royal Haskoning) <i>The options considered for the zone.</i>
11:00	Refreshments
11:15	Breakout session to workgroups <i>Opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions of an expert and to challenge the decisions taken</i> Draft Questions (to be developed): 1 Do you understand the review process? 2 Are there any major issues that haven't been taken into account which could change the outcome? 3 Do you require more information? 4 Do you support the preferred option?
12:15	Feedback session
12:30	Closing Session
12:45	LUNCH
14.00	Welcome by Chair
14.05	Introduction by Lead Officer
14:15	Overall Approach: Greg Guthrie (Royal Haskoning)
14:30	Policies for the Zone – Greg Guthrie (Royal Haskoning) <i>The options considered for the zone.</i>
15:00	Refreshments
15:15	Breakout session to workgroups <i>Opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions of an expert and to challenge the decisions taken</i> Draft Questions (to be developed): 1 Do you understand the review process? 2 Are there any major issues that haven't been taken into account which could change the outcome? 3 Do you require more information? 4 Do you support the preferred option?
16:15	Feedback session
16:30	Closing Session
17:00 -	Roadshow opens
19:00	Roadshow closes

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 3: KEY MESSAGES

Setting the scene

Suffolk Coastal District Council, Waveney District Council, the Environment Agency and other partners will work together with the community to make sure that everyone is aware of the effects of living and working in our dynamic coast.

We need a plan to help us deal with and manage change. We will involve people in the future of their coast and to increase their understanding of the potential options in terms of maintaining defences in a changing climate.

We have a continually changing low-lying coastline and people living and working here face increasing flood risk. This plan will show us how to manage this risk both in the short and long term.

Over the next 100 years sea level is likely to rise by up to 1 metre. This means the coast will inevitably change.

What is the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)?

The Suffolk SMP will identify the current situation on our coast and then consider how best to manage coastal flood and erosion risk for the future.

It is a strategic plan about how the Suffolk shoreline will be managed over the next 100 years.

It will show us how we can best manage increasing flood and erosion risk on the coast.

Who is involved in shaping the plan?

Those who have coastal management responsibilities from Lowestoft Ness to Felixstowe Landguard Point are working together in partnership to shape the plan.

Suffolk Coastal District Council, Waveney District Council and the Environment Agency, other partners and communities will work together to make sure that everyone is aware of flood risk and to involve them in the future of their coast. We will take every opportunity to raise their understanding of what their options are in terms of maintaining defences in a changing climate.

Working together we will make sure everyone is aware of both the risks and opportunities arising from a changing coastline.

How will it reflect the needs of those who enjoy, live or work on the coastline?

We will involve those with an interest in the coast and raise awareness of the risks and opportunities that a changing coastline might bring.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

We will work with everyone, sharing local knowledge, to help develop a joint approach to managing change.

We want the plan to support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast and work with the changing nature of the coast to maximise the social and economic benefits.

We want the plan to support and enhance people's enjoyment of the coast by maintaining and improving access.

How will we involve people?

We will involve the community and stakeholders early on in the process. We will be honest and open and will make every effort to avoid raising false expectations.

What happens next?

We will balance the interests of coastal users and look at approaches to managing flood and coastal erosion risk that allow us to adapt to the changing coast.

We will work together with communities to explore different approaches to managing the impacts of our dynamic coastline and adapting to climate change.

We will look at how we can work together to explore different approaches to managing flood risk and adapting to a changing coastline

We want to support people's ability to live work and enjoy the Suffolk coast.

Overarching key messages

Suffolk has a dynamic, continually changing coast. The low-lying nature means that people living and working in areas which are currently at flood risk will face increasing challenges in the future.

The Suffolk Shoreline Management Plan allows us to consider how best to manage flood and coastal erosion risks from Lowestoft Ness to Felixstowe Landguard Point.

Suffolk Coastal District Council, Waveney District Council and the Environment Agency are working together with a range of partners, organisations and local groups to shape the plan for Suffolk. Working together we will make sure everyone is aware of both the risks and opportunities arising from a changing coastline.

We will work together with local stakeholders to balance the interests of coastal users to ensure we support local people's ability to work on, live near and enjoy the coast.

We will involve those with an interest in the coast and raise awareness of the risks and opportunities that adapting to a changing coastline might bring.

The SMP will be reviewed periodically, enabling the plan to adapt to changing circumstances and improvements in the science.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 4: CSG ATTENDANCE AND ROLES AT WORKSHOPS

NAME	Stratford St Andrew		Southwold Pier		Ufford Park Hotel	
	am	pm	am	pm	am	pm
John Jackson	GR	[GR]	GR	GR	√	√
A.N.Other (NE)	[GR]	GR	[GR]	GR	[GR]	[GR]
Karen Thomas	LO	LO	GL	GL	GL	GR
Gary Watson	GR	GL	[GL]	GL	GR	√
Stuart Barbrook			GL	GL		
Mike Steen						
Sharon Blease	√	√	GR	GR	√	√
Mark Johnson	Chair	Chair				
Ian Bliss					?	?
Paul Patterson	[GR]	GR	LO	LO		
Julie Hood			?	?[GR]		
Jane Burch	GL	GL	GL		GR	GL
Bill Parker	GL	GL	GL	GL	GR	[GL]
Bob Chamberlain	[GL]	[GL]			GL	GL
Terry Oakes	√	√	√	GR	[GL]	√
Keith Tyrrell	√	GR	GR	GL	LO	LO
Workshop Groups (as at 20/03/09)	2	3	4	5	3	2

Key:

GR	Group Recorder
[GR]	Standby Group Recorder
GL	Group Leader
[GL]	Standby Group Leader
LO	Lead Officer for the day
√	In attendance but no role allocated yet

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 5: GROUP LEADER TASKS

1. Reiterate the Chairs' comments from the start of the meeting that :
 - We are looking for their comments/feedback to help us validate our work so that we can develop the final draft management policy options before the full public examination in Summer 2009.
 - We want people to understand what we have done and to give us constructive comment.
 - We are not presenting the final draft options
 - We are prepared to listen
2. Make sure that the group agrees quickly the questions to be answered.
3. Please use your experience and knowledge of the issues to control and direct the discussion.
4. After discussion, allocate sufficient time for a summary of the discussion so that the Recorder can make representative notes.
5. It's important to keep to time.
6. Ensure full participation – control those trying to “hog the debate”.
7. Maintain an independent view but don't be afraid to be a devil's advocate.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 6: GROUP RECORDER TASKS

1. Ensure that you stop proceedings if you want to make notes.
2. Summarise what has been said on the flipchart.
3. Keep the notes orderly as they will be typed up afterwards.
4. Report back should be kept to 2 minutes maximum.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 7: SCENES FROM THE FORUM WORKSHOPS



SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT



SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

APPENDIX 8: TRANSCRIPTS OF PLENNARY SESSIONS

Zones 1 and 2: Lowestoft – Benacre Ness – Easton Broad Southwold Pier, 2nd April 2009, AM

Q. John Goldsmith, County Councillor for Kessingland and Southwold

Greg, you made a remark just now about the 100 years wasn't long enough. At the rate of erosion that I've seen in my time as a Councillor which started in 1975, I've seen a lot of changes in that time. But to go plus 100 years I think you're looking too far into the future. There is so much land, there is so much that can happen that would be irretrievable and I hate to think what in 100 years plus time this coastline is going to look like to think about doing anything about putting it right. You've got to keep what we've got now. I don't think anything else above that is acceptable.

A. Greg Guthrie

I'm not saying that we should be hard about what's happening in 100 years. I'm not saying that we should decide that we're going to have a sea wall, or we're not, you know, but the overall way in which we're looking at the coast, we need to be aware of what is happening. The long term trends as well as the short term trends otherwise we get ourselves into problems.

Q. Liam Martin, Chairman Kessingland Parish Council

As the Chairman of Kessingland Parish Council I am really concerned about the effects that this plan is going to have, particularly when you say at the very beginning that this part of the coast where Kessingland is is one of the most vulnerable parts of the coast along this part of the East coast. And I don't feel at the moment and having what I've read your taking enough consideration in to protecting what is a most vulnerable part of the coastline and you've got a village, you've got people, you've got businesses and you've got a community and nothing I've read shows any consideration being taken of that at all. Plus there are other complicated issues which the District Council are aware of as far as Kessingland is concerned which is going to have a knock on effect if that's not considered in your plan either.

A. Greg Guthrie

One of the key objectives that we have defined from the various local issues is the importance of Kessingland to this area of the coast. We have set an objective that the integrity of the community should be maintained, that it should be maintained as a commercial, as a tourist centre, as a place to live and that is one of the objectives that we feel we are delivering through the policies. The intention is to allow Benacre Ness to move north and as it moves north over the bulk of Kessingland that will provide a sound defence for well over 100 years. But as it moves north the southern end of Kessingland does come under increasing pressure. It is mainly once **Sureness** moves north that it becomes one of, along with the whole section of coastline down past Covehithe, it becomes one of the fastest eroding sections of coast. But while Benacre Ness is in front of it it is one of the most best protected areas of coast. What we're saying is that we are looking to protect

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

the community of Kessingland, we are looking to how best to manage the defences as Benacre Ness moves south, in a way that will support the protection of Kessingland. Now there may be individual properties that it is not sensible, appropriate, that the funding just wouldn't be there, or it may constrain the better way of managing that section of coast. But throughout this section of what we have written, Kessingland is considered to be one of the key objectives.

Q. John Huggins, Southwold RNL

Can I just ask why we're not dealing with the questions that we've actually raised at each of the stations?

A. Chair

I think it's a good idea to run through those actually.

Greg Guthrie

Yes, I'm quite happy.

Chair

Some have been answered.

Greg Guthrie

Yes we wanted to allow any more general questions to come out because we will be, there's the response sheets that you've got to record any other specific questions. But we will be taking all these and we will be addressing them and looking how to address them in the SMP. But if any of those specific questions, if you want to run through any others Paul?

Chair

I think I would put it back to you John really. Which issues do you think, in terms of the priority you have, which issues do you feel require further discussion now? The problem is that there are a number of issues raised over the three groups and there wouldn't be time within this space we've allocated today to discuss all those really through to completion.

John Huggins

If I may come in there. There is a way around this. When these are all evaluated and set out with answers and that we can, if we've got all your contact details, everybody here is entitled to see that.

Chair

Yes. I believe that is the intention is that correct?

Sharon Blears, Environment Agency

Yes. What we're actually going to be doing with Terry Oakes is the comments that were made on Tuesday and the comments that are been made today, and the comments that will be made on Friday dealing with all the policy development zones, all of them are going to be encapsulated into a report. And everybody that's come along, irrespective of the day, will actually

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

be able to see the collective comments so you'll be able to pick up the commonalities yourself. Is that helpful?

Chair

Thank you.

John Huggins

It doesn't help if you want to come back on any questions I don't feel the answer has been very ???.

Greg Guthrie

Then are there any specific issues that you feel that we should, because you've discussed them in groups, but this session now is really if there are people that feel that some of those points need to be discussed more generally. So if there are specific issues. I just picked out a few very general ones, I appreciate that so are there any specific issues that you would like to ...

?

Well I think those are a good selection.

John Huggins

Perhaps you would like to deal with those few that you did pick out. Particularly projecting the coastline as a whole rather than picking out highly populated areas and leaving the lesser populated areas to the next generation.

Greg Guthrie

Sorry can you be more specific on that.

John Huggins

To hold the line on the lesser populated areas which seem to have a far less priority and we're only off-putting the defences to those areas to the next generation.

Greg Guthrie

No, because what we're actually saying, if you take that issue on Covehithe that was raised and why don't we protect the whole of that frontage, we haven't got the money to do that. There just is not the justification for the sort of investment that you would need to protect the whole of that coastline down from Kessingland levels through to Eastern Broad. You would also in doing that you would have serious consequences on the nature conservation issues, you would also have a very serious consequence on Southwold. And that is, that's bluntly it. That we are trying to balance these things but inevitably there are areas that we are going to have to let this coast erode naturally in order to sustain other values. It is a fast eroding section of coastline now. Does that answer your question?

John Huggins

It does to a certain extent but are we tending to look towards huge concrete structures rather than lower cost protection to our beaches.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Greg Guthrie

In some areas you can get away with, I don't think there is a definitive line between soft engineering and hard engineering. In some places you have to put in hard engineering because that is the sort of pressure. I've tried to build sand fences where the sea doesn't want them and they have just washed away because the pressure is too much. But in other areas you can put in soft defences, you can put in a bit of recharge if, but you don't want to go recharging every year because the amount of effort, so every bit of defence has to be looked at in terms of what you're trying to deliver and the sort of pressures that you are trying to deal with. And that's what we've tried to consider on the coast. So if there are areas, take the Kessingland levels and what I'm saying there, if you try and manage a linear defence in the active zone instead of having a clay flood defence you will have to have a hard rock revetment. And putting in low level, low cost defences just will not work in that area. Once the Ness moves north that is going to be an area that is under considerable pressure. How we manage that frontage, because we're not saying we're walking away from management, we're saying that we're going to move the linear structure back to provide essential flood defence at the back, which gives us a width to start using more imaginative ways in which we can maintain a softer beach. But it's still means putting in effort, it's deciding where you're going to actually put in that effort in order to retain a more robust, softer defence.

Paul Patterson

Thank you Greg. Could I bring in Karen now at this time.

Karen Thomas

I just wanted to say that we have got time at lunchtime and also after this afternoon's session, there's staff here from all different organisations so I think we can have a lot more discussion on a one-to-one basis if that actually helps. Because obviously some of the issues, in terms of going into detail now, we're here to talk to you more but it might not be an awful lot of time left in this session for us to do that. That's why I'm just concerned about that.

Chair

I'll allow one more question. I thought it would be you Peter.

Q. Peter Boggis

Greg, we were talking about Kessingland a few moments ago, or people were and you were. I feel very strongly personally, that the strengthening of the rock revetment etc at Benacre Pumping Station is extremely important for the future of the beach protecting Kessingland. Excuse me if I leave it at that.

A. Greg Guthrie

If I can say in response to that, because one of the questions was the idea of a groyne which effectively is what you're saying. In managing the coast you actually don't destroy or create sediment. What you do is you move it around and try and use it to best advantage. And the best way of moving it around is letting natural processes move it around, if that gives you the right answer. If you actually put a groyne there, just as a groyne and then a linear defence to

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

the south, that area to the south, a little bit further to the south there over the last 20 years has been attempting to erode at about 5 metres a year. If you put a groyne in that actually starves sediment moving south of that groyne that rate of erosion would increase. You would be building quite a substantial structure at the moment and in the future, in 20 years time, you would have to build an even more substantial structure and it would become regularly, you wouldn't have beach in front of it. If in 50 years time it would be more like a key wall that you've got up at Lowestoft Ness. What I'm saying is, lets choose where we try and manage the defence of that coastline. Let's give it a bit of width, lets decide where the most appropriate place - I'm not in disagreement with the idea that we need to manage that section of coastline and where we do decide to manage we are taking on a long term investment. But what I'm saying is let us not be constrained by what is there at the moment and say we've got to defend the Pump Station. I'm saying let's decide where the best place to manage that coast is and give us a bit of width to do that and then we can actually make use of the natural processes rather than being in direct competition with them.

Peter Boggis (some without microphone so hard to hear)

What I'm concerned about in that advice is that if the Kessingland Pumping Station is revoked the embayment of the area will then tend to swing on the Kessingland coastal defences and will increase the length of the embayment off the coast, increase the erosion rates within the embayment and we shall have serious problems from, the closer together the hard points on the coast are the greater benefit it is to the coast even if there is erosion local to the groynes, to the rock reventment. I understand how it works very well. I have photographs of every groyne on this East coast.

Greg Guthrie

In some places groynes are very effective.

Peter Boggis

Yes I agree.

Greg Guthrie

And in some places creating harder controlled structures, or larger controlled structures, or putting in reefs, or managing in a different way is the most effective means of defence. What we're saying is that the intention is to hold onto the south end of Kessingland with some adjustment at that to take advantage of the way in which we can manage that and the section over the Kessingland levels needs to be part of our thinking so that we are actually creating a more stable embayment between there that will defend a flood defence to the weir of a more natural coastline.

Peter Boggis

Yes I understand your thoughts very well but as I say, the greater the distance between the hard points the more aggressive the erosion between them. That is what we're, or one of the things we're suffering from very badly at the moment.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Greg Guthrie

Where you have a narrow width in which to manage things you often have to close down the defences so that you are managing them in a very compartmentalised way. Where you have increased width and can allow a degree of erosion then you can take a more strategic approach to it and that is basically, but shall we take this discussion up over lunch.

Chair

I mean Paul has just got one point to make first and then we'll break for lunch.

Paul Patterson

Yes, I think that the discussions that we've had this morning reveal hopefully to you, the stakeholders, the difficulties that there are in trying to balance the great number of competing interests that do have to be considered in arriving at a policy. And I have to confess from walking around the room this morning, I don't think I've heard anything new, that there have been no surprises in terms of issues that have come forward. They have been issues that have been recognised by the team, considered by the team. They might not have been presented in a fashion that would meet the approval of everybody in the room but it does give me some comfort that I feel that the planning process so far has recognised the issues that need to be considered. That's it.

Chair

Right. I mean discussions can carry on. Lunch is now arriving. So you can carry on your discussions with staff here.

?

Sorry it's not a question. Just one simple thing. The lady at the back volunteered to make herself and other authorities to her, can we...

Chair

That's what I've said, that's what I've just explained that. So you're open to discussion.

Paul Patterson

Could members of the project team stand up please.

Chair

That's the lady you're talking about with the white scarf.

Greg Guthrie

And you have all got those response sheets have you so that, yes.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 3: Easton Broad - Minsmere Southwold Pier, 2nd April 2009, PM

Q. Sue Allen, Ward Councillor, Southwold and Reydon

I have two main problems I think Greg. One is the map on page 36 which shows Southwold surrounded by water. I think it's unacceptable. We all know what's going on to the south, there's a lot of talks going on in the background which are proceeding very well, but if you look at this map which shows Southwold completely surrounded by water the town won't work in the future. People come here for the whole panorama, they don't come here just for a few shops and a walk on the common. And I think the town is being discussed by a lot of people in the town. People will stop probably buying properties, they will stop buying shops because if they look at that map you've no beach except from the Pier to Scun Hill basically, or that's how it looks. I think we've got to look at this, also how we cope with Eastern Marsh. I think this is unacceptable to be honest and I think we've got to find, you engineers who understand these sort of things, have got to find another way around it.

The other thing which is to the north is also Potters Bridge. I think great consideration has got to be given to Potters Bridge. I know the roads have been mentioned but it's one of the, we've got threats to Wolsey Bridge but I think those are going to be overcome, but this is one it's a very, very busy road that.

A. Greg Guthrie

One of the difficulties is trying to portray a complex idea in a simple way and we would really appreciate any comments that you have on that or any, if you feel that you're not certain how it is represented then tell us and we'll try and think of a better way. If you take that map and I don't know how well you can see it, the blue area that is shaded just cross hatched is the area that is at flood risk. It is not necessarily the area that will be flooded. We are just identifying the flood risk there. Where we have shown it dotted we are saying that would be an area with increased flood risk. That doesn't mean to say that it would be standing water there. And this rear line here is nominally, it's a policy line. To the back of that the important assets would be protected, to the front the policy for increased flooding. And what we're trying to say is we recognise important assets including the road bridge that need to be protected. The shoreline would be there. That is where you would see the shoreline. The whole essence of what we're trying to get here is to maintain that continuity of the shore between Southwold and the cliffs to the north. Which is why we're saying we need to be managing the whole of this area but we need to be using width rather than being constrained to a very linear line of defence. As soon as you put in a linear line of defence then you haven't got the scope to actually maintain a decent beach. What we would see is with that defence, with the present defence in, and this is something from the strategy, with the present defence in place over time with sea level rise, or even without sea level rise, there would not be a beach there. You would have a defence with a rock revetment in front of it. What we're saying is from all the issues we've got, your beach area, your recreational space of the coastline is one of the important things that we need to deliver. And therefore

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

we should be allowing the width to actually maintain a decent beach in that area. But that beach would not be artificially maintained so you'd tend to get a shingle ridge there, but it would not be artificially maintained you wouldn't be building it up as an embankment which is the best way of destroying a shingle ridge in the longer term. You would actually allow it to overtop on more extreme events, it would perform naturally so it will have plenty of sediment coming down through it. It will perform naturally, there'll be a robustness to it but it will not provide that area behind with the same level of protection as a hard wall that you know the level of. And therefore we're saying you'll be able to get a natural beach there but let's move the flood defence back to where we're really concerned about having the flood defence.

Q. Paul England, Southwold

I understand completely what you're saying, incidentally Grey, but to create that beach to happen naturally means that we would lose a car park which is another scenario which I don't want to go into, but how would you stop, there must be an end to where the beach would be defined in its natural way. Is there a hard wall at that particular point because in another document you mention that it will have control points by the pier and by the north point. I understand you're not a man of detail, and I don't want you to but just conceptually.

A. Greg Guthrie

Yes conceptually what we're saying is that area needs to be a transition between the hard defence which we are talking about, we need to protect this area from erosion. This is the reason why we're doing it to protect Southwold and therefore you would need something here in terms of some sort of structure, improvements to the groynes or whatever. But you do not want that to become then, if you like, a square corner that you're forever chasing backwards. What you then need to do is impose some control on the way in which the coast behaves so it will be a naturally functioning beach but it will be controlled, it would need to be managed. Now whether you manage that with low level groynes or you manage that by putting a reef off-shore, or you manage that by putting some sort of structure where the current north end of the wall is, that needs to be explored in detail. Each of those approaches you could develop a perfectly sound manner in which to do it but that would need to be looked at in terms of the coast, it would need to be looked at in terms of the detailed impact. Your comment about the car park, in looking at who you maintain that, as I say, we are not thinking of that being a pond. It will be an area that overtops more frequently. Now there are plenty of areas on the coast where that sort of area, or part of that sort of area, is used during the summer as a car park. But what I'm saying is that we want to get away from the concept of this is the line. Allow the beach to develop the line.

Q. Peter Boggis

What concerns me in what has just been discussed is if Southwold can have a beach why shouldn't Eastern Marsh sea wall have a beach protecting its base. Why shouldn't this be maintained in the future and give us the social

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

beach that we've had in the past. The powers that be recently took out seven 70m groynes and replaced them with four only groynes of a length of somewhere around about 35m to 20m with absolutely disastrous effects on that section. We saw the lowest beach levels we have seen, well that there has ever been and at the moment it's a little easier. The reason why it's a little easier is because Waveney District Council, in opening up the coast to allow the recovery of the timber, have not put back the gate on the last groyne of the car park sea wall so the material is now escaping through there and feeding along into those groynes. Where under normal circumstances it passes around the end of the groyne and is swept out to sea leaving a complete dearth of material northwards from that groyne and it's presenting a very great problem to us all. It increased erosion rates initially on Eastern Cliffs nearly fivefold of the norm and people have said well give it time and it'll come, it hasn't come right our beaches are extremely depleted. Thank you.

A. **Greg Guthrie**

I'm not able to get down into the detail of that because I haven't seen the variation on the beach what I would say is that the rock groynes are there to protect the wall and whether you, we won't get into the detail of that, I'm saying that the wall is the problem.

Peter Boggis

No the wall is not the problem. The groyne systems have ??? because that problem was not dire in the past. It is only the changes that have been made ???.

Chair

Shall we move onto the next question.

Paul Patterson

Can I just give a brief comment on that. The policy in the SMP is to hold the line of the present wall for the first timeframe. I would expect that within that timeframe there will be further works required to manage the groynes over that part and hopefully when that review takes place then there will be measures put in place that will improve the situation that we find ourselves in at the moment. I think ...

Peter Boggis

??? very much look forward to that.

Paul Patterson

But I think the issue really is that this is an operational issue for today, or for the next five years and not necessarily an issue for the SMP I would suggest.

Peter Boggis

Yes, but in the meantime the wall is being damaged by its exposure.

Paul Patterson

Okay.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Peter Boggis

As soon as it's corrected the greater life that piece of wall will have and that piece of wall represents, on today's value, a very substantial investment.

Paul Patterson

Okay, thank you.

Greg Guthrie

Can I just take up one point on that from the strategy, the strategy says that at the northern end of the wall there would be a return as the coast erodes back from there, there would be a return structure sealing off the possibility of flooding within there.

Peter Boggis

There was one proposed within the sea originally at that point and various environment bods insisted that it was removed from the sea

Greg Guthrie

There is still, within the strategy, there is still the policy from the strategy is for that northern point that as that becomes exposed to build backwards to stop the flooding into Eastern Marsh. Over the next 20 years that erosion, there will be erosion there and there will be presumably works going round the northern end of that wall coming back out there. We've had discussion as to whether the SMP should be looking forward 100 years or not. What I'm saying is that if we accept these policies that what we are trying to do is actually return that area, not to a natural beach, but to a naturally functioning area but managed then instead of just chasing our tails round the back and forming that corner as a hard point corner that has to be beefed up, we should be looking each time and saying well how else can we defend this corner with the longer term vision that we are actually going to adapt the way in which we manage this frontage. So that we do not end up with a coast that does that.

Peter Boggis

It has done that in the past as ??? can tell you quite easily. The end of the sea wall there, one year he went along and suddenly found he had gone back 38 or 48m, I can't remember exactly which, and it is not unusual even for a period of 10 years to see a loss there in the order of 10m a year.

Greg Guthrie

Yes.

Peter Boggis

If we get that change of circumstances again now all the figures that are in the SMP for that area are utter nonsense. ???

Greg Guthrie

But the concept of having a corner there, as opposed to looking at how we manage that corner in a different way is valid. And that's what the SMP is saying.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Chair

I think you'll have to carry on that discussion outside this to give other people a chance. Do you have a different question or on the same issue?

?

No it's to add weight and a bit more to it.

Chair

Well no I think we'll leave that then sorry.

?

It's very important because people don't know what I'm now going to say. Mr Boggis is quite correct in everything he said, I think we all back him up on that. The wall to the north end was building in 1962. 1984/85 they extended it and they extended it and carried on that same line. It had already curved inwards. People who remember the three bungalows on the cliff that wall was already aiming for the centre one. Billy Nice owned that and I pointed it out to him and he come round the other side to look at it and he flogged his building. Now when they, the end of the 1962 wall was behind the cliff, it wasn't in front of it. It was way behind it and when they done the 1985 extension they had to dig that bit of cliff out to extend it to the length it is now. And that's then when the fun started because they hadn't finished that work, and I've got the photographs to prove it, that that wall, that cliff was already behind the end of that new sea wall by the time they'd done. Within a few months it was 37m because I measured it, today it hasn't gone much further. That route end, it shows you on that narrow piece where you come down, and that's about 40m now at this particular time. And the SSI is protected for 200m inland, I asked at the meeting that Ken Sale came with me and Peter Boggis, and I asked Natural England at this AGM of theirs at Oxford, what are they doing about the 200m, are we going to be allowed to do any developments or not? And they said no, there will be no developments at the SSSI. So where that wall finish that's it. A dog leg, if you put a dog leg in there you will make a wacking great cell, that's what will happen, and that will travel north and you'll have a damn sight more cliff going north of Eastern Bavants than what we've got now. And you want to realise that.

Chair

Thank you very much. I think we've got time for one more question if anyone has one. No, well all I can do then is say thank you all very much for coming and don't forget the feedback forms for any comments you might have in future. Thank you.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 4: Minsmere - Thorpeness Stratford St. Andrew, 31st March 2009, AM

Q. David Andren – SCAR

At earlier meetings I did comment that the general approach to taking into account wider economic impact on the local communities never seems to come through very well. I very much agree that we, and you, need to get through to people in local communities but there is another community out there, and I'm looking round, and I'd be quite interested to know now that Glen Ogilvie has left, whether at this particular meeting we have any representatives of what I would call the real business interest. There's not so much on this coast but does anybody represent business around this room. I pointed this out before, it is something that's deeply unsatisfactory about this process.

A. Mark Johnson

Okay well thanks for that, yes.

Q. ? (Doesn't state his name)

The gentlemen, I can't see him now, who was from English Heritage made a very good point and I agree with. Oh he's still here. The very fact that the premise that we're accepting that this is a natural process, it has never been. This coast has always been managed for hundreds, if not thousands of years, and factors on the coastline have been managed and to leave it to nature is perhaps naive at best.

If I could just come back to David's point that I could loosely be described as having an interest in local business because not only am I a farmer but I have property on the coast and I'm involved in the tourism industry. And particularly from the tourism industry I've heard no representation of the tourism industry this morning. It may well be in the papers because I didn't pre-read them I'm afraid because I didn't have them. But whatever the economic value of the tourism industry goes well back from the coast, in fact it goes right inland, probably taking up at least half of Suffolk or more. So I think that's a point that really has to be evaluated in the protection of this area.

A. Mark Johnson

Thank you. Can I ask Greg to respond to the first part of that question?

Greg Guthrie

In wandering around the groups I did hear this comment about natural processes and I would totally agree with you that much of the UK coast is managed, has been managed. What we're saying on this frontage is not let's just let natural processes happen. What we're saying on this frontage is that the best way, we believe, to defend the things that we value is not to interfere or to interfere as little as possible because as soon on this coastline you start putting in something that holds the line, that stops sediment coming into the system, that stops the natural what I call sloppiness of the coast, you are then

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

going to be forced down a line that you will have to. You'll interfere and then you'll interfere here and then before you know it you will have a heavily managed coast that will actually detract from the nature conservation interest, from the landscape and because of those two aspects you will also start affecting the tourism, you will start affecting the landscape and why people value this coast. There are other areas of this coastline where we are saying we should get a little bit heavy with the coast. We're not scared of intervening where there is good reason to do so. But to step in and mess around with the semi-natural, you know, and I take your point absolutely, the semi-natural processes, there are sections of the coast and this is one of them, where if we start moving in and doing that now we are going down a course of action that I believe my great-grandchildren will regret. We have to manage the present issues, we have to look at that but we don't want to start getting heavy with this section of coastline.

In terms of, you've raised the issues of taking in the broader economics, and I totally agree. The SMP is not ICZM, it is not able to take in the full value but what we have done, and this follows the national guidance, is not to allow the immediate economic to drive our long term policy. Which is why we are looking at trying to say what is it overall about this section of coastline that is valued? How do we manage that in a way that all those aspects can be managed to the best advantage? So, you know, in terms of a village like Thorpeness yes it would be a very different thing if the whole of Thorpeness were under threat, not just because there is more asset value but because we have identified as one of our objectives that Thorpeness as a community is an essential part of the coastline.

Q. Rob/Rod?

You've talked about interfering there, it's quite interesting, and I certainly take your points so what we haven't, I think, talked about here is, in great detail, is Sizewell new build. If they do, I think it came up in our group, if they do bring in material from the sea then there's going to have to be new build there. Now what sort of effect is that going to have on natural processes do you think? I'm particularly thinking of sediment accretion between Thorpeness and Aldeburgh which happens all the time now. Is it not feasible that if there is new build there and that is interfered with then you might get the shingle disappearing from that ridge? Is that being considered in the plan?

A. Greg Guthrie

At this stage the SMP is in advance of further development at Sizewell. What we have said is that the best way to manage this coastline is not to interfere with those natural processes. To allow, and the key points are sediment supply, allowing movement so that you aren't unduly trapping material by groyne or anything like that, which will disrupt that natural balance, maintaining the supply in from the north, maintaining the supply out from the south. In looking at any new development those are the key issues, you know things in the SMP, that would hopefully guide any future development at Sizewell. So if you like we are ahead of the process and we are saying this is how we want to manage the coast, anything new coming into this area should

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

recognise that and work within those constraints. So no we haven't looked specifically at what the impact of new development of Sizewell would be because we don't know what, so we're imposing, if you like, some constraints on how that should be added.

Mark Johnson

I think Karen wants to add a little bit more as well.

Karen Thomas

Can I just add to that. When Sizewell was put in in the first place they brought things in by sea. There's quite a lot of monitoring that has gone on both before and after that work was done so I think that if we've got any concerns about what may or may not happen and how they will do what, they'll probably follow a similar approach to what they did before. I know it involved, obviously, dredging an area so that boats could get in and obviously there is monitoring that's gone on behind that so we would be able to see what happened last time and I think we'd be able to learn from that as well. So I think in terms of the SMP and what's happened before we can be reasonably comfortable about what to expect if that helps.

Q. Didn't give name – English Heritage

From the heritage side that we recognise the aspiration that you have to try to balance the various interests. I think that so far you haven't achieved that through the documents presented. They are not taking on board the full range of assets that we know we've got here, whether they're heritage or tourist or whatever else. There's an attempt to do it but this plan is obviously still heavily led from an engineering and a geomorphological and a geological standpoint. I think that said that I would like to see you be slightly more balanced in trying to not claim that we're moving to a naturalised system when we've got Sizewell sitting there which is going to pull the whole modelling and position out from an attempt to come at something which is slightly more natural. I think that I'm pleased to see the evolution between SMP 1 and 2 as being something that is more mix and match rather than an extremist, absolutist policy of let natural processes take their course, that's artificial. It may have been economically driven, I couldn't possibly comment but the simple position is that we have always intervened in the coast. Two thousand years of coast protection schemes in this nation and this coast we will continue to intervene as we've heard today. What we need is an intelligent balancing of those interests and a debate which actually puts a proper value and a judgement on each of those decisions. And I think therefore what we want to see at the end of this process is a balancing of those interests and a costing of those interests not just in financial terms but in the other sorts of significances which we have to value - natural environment, manmade environment, tourism, economics. And I think that there's still a bit of a challenge there for you to get that balance right. I think there's a problem leading us down a line when you haven't got those things demonstrated in the document so far.

A. Mark Johnson

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

I think you made some very good points there actually, and it would be great, it's your area of expertise and if you could actually feed some of that, of your knowledge into what will be the next stage of the project that would be really, really appreciated. So thanks for your comments there.

Greg Guthrie

Certainly a lot of information on the heritage has been forthcoming and we've mapped that and looked at how that may be affected and a lot of it is identifying the risk. There is risk to various areas and we would value your feedback saying we can't accept that, that's part of this key stakeholder meeting. But I'm sure you accept that there are areas, I'm desperately trying to think of any, where I suppose some of the issues around Dunwich we're saying that we need, and you say it's driven by the geomorphology. Yes, underlying everything is the coastal processes and the geomorphology because that's where we've got to start from and make sure that we are not starting to put pressures into the system that we will later on regret. Then we have said and how does that affect everything else. Now we may not have captured all your issues and good, feedback to us on that, but you take somewhere like Dunwich and we're saying that the Abbey or the Monastery is at risk, yes. The alternative to that is that we defend that, that becomes a headland which affects the whole of the coast further south. Or, and this is where the dialogue between us needs to happen, you say well we need a certain amount of time, or society needs a certain amount of time to adjust to the fact that we're going to lose that and record things, that do you support us in the long term plan that we're going to have to accept that loss.

English Heritage

Can I just come back on that?. There's an interesting point to do with Dunwich. We haven't and we won't be making the case for the protection of Dunwich Priory up on the cliff there, that's not the position English Heritage is coming at when natural processes are taking course it's where actually active decisions are taken over realignment. In the case of Dunwich I think it's a salutary tale concerning the loss of the historic town and port in the whatever, fourteenth century or so, is that in fact whilst it was affected by individual storm events it was the failure to maintain the actual open harbour and the natural seabanks systems, sorry Medieval and Saxon seabank systems that resulted in the actual town going. Funnily enough, if you had maintained those systems, dredged out the port it's possible that the actual Medieval town would still be there. So I just think that you've got to not always assume that there is no intervention that is justifiable on the coast. On occasions there is.

Greg Guthrie

No. Maintaining natural processes is specifically not an objective. It is looking at the natural processes, trying to make maximum use of them in order to deliver the objectives for all the values.

Mark Johnson

Okay. I think thanks very much for your input on the heritage side of things, really appreciated and thanks for your responses, Greg as well. Are there

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

any other questions that people would like to raise or we've captured pretty much everything now, have we? Excellent. Well firstly can I thank you all for your inputs and again, appreciated. It will be captured, there will be a, Terry do you just want to say what the next steps and things are from here?

Terry Oakes

I'm Terry Oakes and we're project managing the preparation of the SMP on behalf of the partners. Following this series of workshops we'd like to receive your comments on any details that we have in the draft policy documents before the end of April so that we can get validation of what we've got in the draft policy documents. We'll then discuss those at the officer meeting, which is called the Client Steering Group, before revising, amending the documents as appropriate and putting those forward to the members, that's the councillors from Waveney and Suffolk Coastal and the members of the Regional Flood Defence Committee on behalf of the Environment Agency. Having done that process, which is the review process, we then go out to full public consultation in the summer, probably the 1 July onwards, for a three month period and that will be the draft SMP as developed following these workshops and reviewed by the members.

Mark Johnson

Thank you Terry, and you put a note in front of me just in terms of after you've had a bite to eat and a drink there are copies of the draft policies and what have you if you haven't got a copy or you want to take it away for a friend or someone who couldn't make it and there on that table over there and the feedback form. Does everyone have a copy of one or are they on the table Terry?

Terry Oakes

They are on the table Mark, we'll distribute them now if we could. They need to go to Suffolk Coastal District Council, Melton Hill, Woodbridge, IP12 1AU.

Mark Johnson

Many thanks, have something to eat and safe drive home. Thank you very much.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 5: Thorpeness to Orford Ness Stratford St. Andrew, 31st March 2009, PM

Q. David Andren – SCAR

You're still talking about an estuary plan. Stefan has now been round to me and I have said in all of this SMP document would you please refer to it, no longer as an estuary plan, it is an coast and estuary strategy which is being developed. Which I've also now remembered, I better not mention his name, Mark can guess who he is, was in the very early days when there was a separate Thorpeness to Hollesley Coastal Strategy, that that David is in effect mini SMP and to all intents and effects will be the SMP. And why I'm getting excited about this is you're actually now saying no there is a bigger SMP and there isn't a mini SMP. Would you please just refer to it throughout as ACES.

A. Karen Thomas

I had gotten it written down David but I just didn't say it out loud, so I'm sorry about that.

Mark Johnson

We normally get picked up for calling things like that, so Aldeburgh Coast and Estuary Strategy is fine.

Q. ?

This is actually not SMP but has there been much thought from the local authorities and Agency about if there are major developments, perhaps a nuclear power station or two, that they could access funds through the planning groups for the good of the local community sea defence work, etc. I didn't know if that had been looked at strongly or whether that's not a capital ...

A. Karen Thomas

We've got a contributions policy which is being looked at at the moment where effectively new development needs to be considering what wider benefit it can bring, either in terms of contributing towards flood defences or community funding because otherwise it can be seen that a developer is buying in to a piece of land behind a flood defence and getting, not a free flood defence, but you know. So I think that policy is there and we had some discussion this morning around the nuclear power station issue with Sizewell and obviously as part of the planning process for Sizewell then those are the sorts of discussions that various agencies and individuals even in the room can express to the people who are developing that power station that they would like to see some contribution locally as a result of it going in there. There is a big agenda on the coast at the moment, obviously for regeneration in coastal towns as well and there is funding coming from different routes for that. From our perspective we have to be very mindful of inappropriate development in the flood plain, but equally not blighting towns so they can't have any development or future jobs and prosperity in the future. So it is quite a big balancing act but it is something which we all consider when we're doing these plans.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

?

Because environmental lobby groups do get significant, there will be a terrific offset for the power stations in environmental terms that we take for granted ..

Mark Johnson

Well perhaps if I can partially answer the question in terms of the discussions we had this morning around Sizewell and around Minsmere Sluice and there was a number of people who said well if there is going to be a further power station at Sizewell if that is the case then perhaps they can look to fund an upgrade to the Minsmere Sluice and that could be well worth exploring, so they may be opportunities from those particular proposals and that's a very large and extreme example obviously.

Okay, Terry can I ask you just to, like I did this morning, just to sort of identify the next steps in terms of we've captured all this information, we've recorded it, there are feedback forms. Terry if you just want to explain the next.

Terry Oakes

My name is Terry Oakes, we're project managing the preparation of the SMP on behalf of Suffolk Coastal, the Environment Agency and Waveney District Council. The next step in the process is that hopefully you will return your comments on these draft policy documents to the Council at that address, to Suffolk Coastal District Council at the address on the flip chart, Suffolk SMP at the Council's main offices in Woodbridge. We do have a form available on the table if you haven't got one already which may help you formulate your comments. Each of these comments will be reviewed by the officer group of the local authorities and Environment Agency and they will assess how, if at all, and how best to amend the draft policies as they stand at the moment to take into account your comments. Those proposals will then go forward to what we call the members group which is the councillors from Waveney and Suffolk Coastal together with the members of the Environment Agency's Regional Flood Defence Committee and they are effectively the group that will agree and approve the document for the full public consultation which will start around 1 July. These workshops are to validate the work that has been done to date, make sure that through contact with key stakeholders, as we regard you, that we haven't missed anything, that we've essentially got things correct before we put them to the general public. There will be a three month consultation period over the summer period and there will be a series of roadshow and opportunities for the people to comment.

Mark Johnson

Thank you Terry. Last chance for any final point of clarification or any burning question and if I don't see any hands go up I'll close the – oh David, apart from you.

Q. David Andren – SCAR

Just one quick aside to our colleague on the right. We too, as the Alde and Ore Association, have been exploring widening the base for funding for flood defence. I mean, just on one example if somebody spends, as we know in Aldeburgh, something like £850,000 having brought a property for £425,000

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

converting it into a desirable marine residence in a flood risk area it does seem to some of us that a small contribution to flood defence would not be out of order and I think it's Section 106.

What I also just wanted to say, I'm not going to speak on behalf of everyone, it would be a bit presumptuous but that recently and particularly since Lord Chris Smith has become Chairman to the Environment Agency, and discussions particularly which the Alde and Ore Association have had with the Environment Agency and SCAR have also found this, we have found a much more helpful approach at the local level and we're working at a number of ways of carrying forward discussions with you and while we have our differences on certain issues we are very grateful for that and I know that some of my colleagues from the Alde and Ore Association will jump up and talk about sea level rise and the answer to this folks is, well it's set out in black and white in DEFRA guidance for all these SMP, estuaries, ACES, strategies, you all have to work within that guidance and we understand it very well. We don't particularly like the way that these SMPs are conducted but, again, there is very detailed guidance from DEFRA saying what is supposed to happen and I do understand the difficulties. So thank you very much and I personally do find these occasions extremely helpful for carrying forward our thinking.

A. Mark Johnson

Thank you David and I'm very glad that I let you have that last chance of the microphone. Excellent okay well thank you very much for coming and safe trip home so take care.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 6: Orford Ness – Bawdsey Manor Ufford Park Hotel, 3rd April 2009, AM

Andy Smith

Just picking up what was said about the interaction with Local Government Frameworks and the like, for example, there is a bigger issue currently rumbling away in Westminster by the name of the Marine Bill which is currently going through Parliament. And which will have many children, one of which will be something called the Marine Plan. Now we have little knowledge at the moment as to how detailed that will be but the Marine Plan will have, we're understanding, more authority than the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Local Development Framework and the Shoreline Management Plan and it will be a plan for the entire marine environment, right up to high water mark, right up to the tidal line on every estuary. And I think generally the coast defence business, which I include the EA and the consultants and all the rest of us, English Nature, I'm not sure collectively we've got our heads round what the implications of that are. I've had some exposure to that through something called the Local Government Association coastal group, which is all the Councils who have coastal interests. On the back of that I was able to talk face to face last week to a guy by the name of Steve Collins, whose putting that through Parliament and we actually have the Minister coming to see us for a couple of hours on Tuesday and we shall indicate to him very strongly that these things needs to be considered. But in particular for the larger bodies who are here today I would really strongly say, reflect up your chain to keep a very close eye on the Marine Bill itself and, possibly even more important, the raft of regulations and guidance that's going to be generated as its children, I won't use the word beginning with 'B'. Okay so that's just a wider point as to how that's all going to pan out over the next few years.

You must have some questions or some comments for Greg. Yes this gentleman here.

Q. ?

Just two questions really. Based on the report you produced or the consultation you've produced, would any of the panel have confidence in buying property on East Lane. And the second point is, does anybody have any idea of the costs so far of the report process and the consultation process and whether or not this report is going to be any different to the '95 report which quite a little bit of it hasn't actually sort of been implemented.

A. Greg Guthrie

In relation to East Lane and confidence of East Lane and, that really ties in with confidence about the use of the land behind Hollesley Bay. We had a lot of debate over these policies and whether we should actually have no policy for the 100 year over this frontage because of the uncertainties. What we decided was that we should actually put in, an uncomfortable word, an aspirational policy. If things, if the coast develops and evolves in the way in which all the evidence suggests it will, then we believe that it is realistic to hold East Lane and that holding East Lane is an important feature of managing that section of coast. That it's realistic to maintain the defences to the land behind, and it's realistic to maintain Shingle Street. But there is the

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

uncertainty and in many ways it's an uncertainty that we cannot resolve through further study. They a fundamental, geomorphological changes, there is uncertainties as to sea level rise and that was a point raised before, I am convinced that there is sea level rise over and above land sinking that is happening at the moment and that that is a real risk. I don't know in 100 years how much that sea level rise will be. We've looked in terms of the realistic estimates that are coming out, so not just one figure. We've said and what would happen if it was 30% greater than that, or 30% less than that and what we are suggesting still seems realistic. There is a recognition of the funding issue and that from a national pot there, certainly under the present funding regime, there isn't the money available and therefore we've got to be highlighting that there may be a need for a partnership approach. So there are all those uncertainties but we did not think that it was sensible to say because of the uncertainties we cannot make a decision as to what we want to do, what we realistically feel that we can. So the intention is the policy is for holding the line at East Lane, Hollesley Bay. There is uncertainty, if you were buying a property at East Lane you would have to make the judgement as to, and see whether you can resolve the uncertainties any better than we can.

?

The answer is yes.

Andy Smith

Can I just chip in on the national funding issue. One of the problems with the way the debate has been structured, both in terms of SMPs and crucially with a lot of focus for example the Blyth Estuary, is that Government funding is at the moment what it is. The natural perception of where coastal defence fits in the overall national priorities against anything else you'd care to name, is what it is and the EAs vanilla model for doing their strategies was we've got this sort of the money to spend for three years, where can we spend it? That becomes a 100 year strategy for an estuary. Well that's now widely accepted, including by the EA, that that's not an accepted route and we have been pressuring very hard, the EA and Government with the Blyth as an example, on that. One of the uncertainties, apart from geomorphological uncertainties, is the political uncertainty and part of our agenda at Suffolk Coastal, very strongly, is to pressure everywhere we can in partnership with other local councils round the coast, over time to raise the whole perception of coastal issues and the importance of the coast at Government level so that the funding pot, it's not going to happen now is it, it's not going to happen on account of the G20 summit, but over a longer period you get the national perception raised because, the sort of thing I say when I get the opportunity is, Government, the nation as a whole, should look at the coast as it were as the front garden of Great Britain plc. And people in Cambridge or Birmingham expect it to be there when they come there. So in that sense it's just as important, and I think the coast doesn't get the political clout that it needs, and there's a simple topological fact isn't there, there's fewer MPs round the coast than there are in the middle. But that is one of the uncertainties in the long term that we're trying, in that sense, to contribute to. I think on the question of the cost of the study and so on Terry might like to chip in on that?

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Terry Oakes

Yes thank you Andy. The contract started off at £150,000 to do this whole review from Lowestoft down to Felixstowe and the reason why it was a significant sum is the review was quite substantial in the fact that it had to consider a 100 year period instead of 50 years, which was the previous SMP1. Which changed the whole emphasis in terms of sea level rise and climate change and the second element was that we had to take more into account the whole question of sustainability. In other words the first SMP, as Greg said at the very beginning, was trying to come up with solutions for the 50 years which really meant how can we actually defend the coast, what works can be taken in the first 25 years and how will they be developed in the next 25, up to 50 year period. But this one is slightly different in that it got some aspirations in in that this is how we'd like to see the coast managed for the next 100 years and so there's a slightly different approach. Since we started the SMP we've actually had to seek additional funds because the EU legislation on water framework directive has kicked in, which we weren't aware of and we've also had to produce a strategic environmental assessment which is another piece of EU legislation to make sure that whatever we're doing doesn't have a major impact on EU designated habitats. And then as part of the preparation of the SMP we had a third variation which was to do additional work at the Blyth Estuary, which was a significant piece of work to make sure that whatever was coming out of the Strategy that the Environment Agency was producing of the estuary tied in with what we were proposing for the coast. So the coast has risen to just over £190,000 now.

Andy Smith

The point is that that's Government money, and one of the frustrations I've acquired over the years on this is that you can nearly always get Government money for reports and paper, it's much harder to get it for rocks and groynes. And I've jested a number of times if we could build groynes from reports with Haskoning on the cover it would all have been done long ago, but there you go. Any other questions?

Greg Guthrie

I was just going to say that if you actually take £10,000 a metre for defending the coast, the cost of this report over 85 kilometres of coast possibly doesn't seem quite as large.

Andy Smith

Any more substantive questions or comments. Come on there must be some. Well the break out session were obviously incredibly effective in that case. Graham you can't sit there and grin without saying something.

Q. Graham Henderson, SCAR

I'm pretty happy with what's proposed for this particular piece of coastline, given that one of the primary points I raised in the last consultancy on this particular subject, was that you should tie in the river or the estuary with the coast. Now Andy you made a very good point actually this morning, that if we get the SMP 2 established for that piece of coastline then that might in fact

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

put restrictions on what could be done in the estuary anyway. So, yes, I think that this particular piece of coastline stands fairly strong, providing what's been proposed is carried out. Other parts of the Suffolk Coast I think have different issues and they will no doubt roll on with significant fighting groups fighting their cause. Obviously there's a major problem coming up at Slaughden Gap and there's still the Blyth situation. But of course the whole thing is depending on money.

Andy Smith

I think that get a DSC within the Haskoning empire, if you can keep Graham Henderson of Suffolk Coastal Against Retreat happy you've distinctly earned a medal. Terry I think would like to chip in.

Q. Terry Oakes

If I can raise an issue for Greg that came out of our group in two ways. One is that the SMP is what we call aspirational, in other words it's showing the intent of how we want to manage the coastline in the future, and this is sort of like the point that Graham just raised. But the dilemma is where's all the funding coming from, and it's all very well having an intent, how can the local authorities and Environment Agency really deliver this and the call that came out of our Group was that they want the intent reinforced to show that this is really what they do want to do and if there's any uncertainty around the policies it's not the policy itself because that is well understood and that's what they want to do then certainty is associated with the funding to implement the policy. Is it possible within the document to sort of bring that over better.

A. Greg Guthrie

I think those issues do need to be clarified within the document, exactly what the intent is but also highlighting the funding uncertainty. There is also the uncertainty of the behaviour of the coast. You know, we are basing, we believe what we are putting forward as policy here is realistic if the funding can be put in place. But that you aren't driving yourself down a dead end in terms of sustainable management of the coast. If there are fundamental changes in the way in which the coast actually behaves compared to the way in which we think it should behave then that also needs to just be recognised. But we're confident that these are realistic policies but like everything if you want something then you've got to sort out how you're actually going to deliver it.

Andy Smith

Thank you Greg and I think assuming that Government we can persuade to see our SMP in the same way, it's a major step forward in, not necessarily next year or in the next five years, but in the future generating the funding. One in the front here please.

Q. ?

I was just wondering about the relationship between emergency works and maintenance work or policy work say in relationship to the Deben entrance where there's emergency work carried out, stone work, in relationship to a

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

channel which is actually getting closer and closer to the stone work and whether that conforms to your hold the line policy there.

A. Greg Guthrie

We've taken that into account and we've been advising on how the fairly hefty maintenance of the maintenance works should be undertaken. One of the troubles, and I'm sure Graham recognises this, is although we understand the overall processes of how the Deben entrance works in detail there can be variations in the way in which the banks work and the pressure that that puts on. Before that heavy maintenance work went on we had a look at in more detail and that plot I put up was part of that analysis. And we believe that again this is one of these phases that there is intense pressure on there now, we need to deal with that, and you can see this in several places. Like the concrete wall, I remember Reg Pernell of Defra or MAFF as it was then, saying yes you've got a concrete wall behind there why have you got it there, you've got 20m of shingle beach in front, or 50m of shingle beach in front, waste of money. But in that entrance you are always responding to local pressure but overall it's sensible to be managing that and it is important that we get it realistic so that the SMP feeds down into the strategies, feeds down into the schemes and also becomes the background against which people say right the policy here is hold the line therefore we need to commit to maintenance. And that is part of the ongoing process of managing the coast.

Andy Smith

Greg's last point there I think is the crucial one. I was going to make the point the reason the guys at EA can even consider, subject to budgets and everything else, doing the work at the Ferry at the moment or elsewhere, is because the SMP in being, which at the moment is SMP 1, says hold the line. If there was an emergency elsewhere where that wasn't the case they wouldn't, within their guidelines, be able broadly speaking, I mean they can always fiddle around the edges, but broadly speaking they wouldn't be able to commit funds to it. I think Christine waved her hand, the last one and then you're all invited to partake of a magnificent lunch at Government expense.

Q. Christine Block

Thank you Andy. I just wanted to stir the pot a little, if I might, over the funding issue, we've mentioned a lot this morning. While I personally have a deeply held, fundamental, kind of baseline view that the Government really ought to be responsible for our coasts and follow the guidance of a shoreline management plan, and be able to come up with the money, the reality is that that doesn't happen. We were incredibly lucky at East Lane with our public sort of private partnership which delivered the funding for the East Lane work. I recognise that it's not the job of the SMP to discuss other funding options, but I kind of half wonder whether at somewhere there should be some recognition that the brutal reality of having to think outside the box about where private funding, or sustainable income for maintenance of private defence work, where is it going to come from and how are we going to actually tackle that problem? Because with the East Lane situation, had the local community not been able to recognise that there had to be funding beyond Defra, I don't know whether we would have progressed. And the

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

understanding of communities that they can't always expect Government funding is a real core problem that I think we should be tackling.

A. **Greg Guthrie**

I think there are many, as we said management of the coast covers a very broad spectrum of things. There is mechanisms for funding for flooding, there is mechanisms for funding of coastal erosion, but in recognising the broader values of the coast there are people, there are areas of the coast that I think are living off coast protection funding where actually what is happening is possibly tourism funding or possibly other. I'm stepping outside the SMP here and I'm stepping into a more just me having seen a lot of experiences round the coast. I still like the coast protection model, the Coast Protection Act model where there was, and this really developed from the big debate that went on in 1906, where it was recognised that on the coast there are individuals who benefit and lose, there are communities or the coastal community that benefits or loses and also as Andy says, there is the nation that benefits and loses. And that under the coast protection model for funding it was that there was a recognition that there was the potential need for funding from all three of those sources. At the local level, at the national level and potentially at a private level depending on the benefits and how much benefit was got from different parties. As soon as you start putting it over 100% on the nation, then the nation has a right to determine how you should be defending your bit of coast and I think that removes the ownership of a lot of those broader issues as to how we want to manage the coast, rather than that very specific thing of the protection.

Andy Smith

Okay, thank you Greg. I think that draws to a close, if there's no other urgent hands to be waved, this morning's session. I think we should thank in particular Greg, who's done this four times already this is the fifth and he's going to be, I'm sure, ready, willing and able to do it again this afternoon. That's quite a tall order on his throat apart from any other parts of his anatomy. So thank you very much Greg for that. Thank you also to Terry and his team for organising today. I believe some lunch is due to appear in here any moment now. Let's use the opportunity now for networking and one on ones and thank you all for coming. And we watch this space for the full public consultation later on in the year roughly beginning of July.

Peter Boggis

??? very much look forward to that.

Paul Patterson

But I think the issue really is that this is an operational issue for today, or for the next five years and not necessarily an issue for the SMP I would suggest.

Peter Boggis

Yes, but in the meantime the wall is being damaged by its exposure.

Paul Patterson

Okay.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Peter Boggis

As soon as it's corrected the greater life that piece of wall will have and that piece of wall represents, on today's value, a very substantial investment.

Paul Patterson

Okay, thank you.

Greg Guthrie

Can I just take up one point on that from the strategy, the strategy says that at the northern end of the wall there would be a return as the coast erodes back from there, there would be a return structure sealing off the possibility of flooding within there.

Peter Boggis

There was one proposed within the sea originally at that point and various environment bods insisted that it was removed from the sea

Greg Guthrie

There is still, within the strategy, there is still the policy from the strategy is for that northern point that as that becomes exposed to build backwards to stop the flooding into Eastern Marsh. Over the next 20 years that erosion, there will be erosion there and there will be presumably works going round the northern end of that wall coming back out there. We've had discussion as to whether the SMP should be looking forward 100 years or not. What I'm saying is that if we accept these policies that what we are trying to do is actually return that area, not to a natural beach, but to a naturally functioning area but managed then instead of just chasing our tails round the back and forming that corner as a hard point corner that has to be beefed up, we should be looking each time and saying well how else can we defend this corner with the longer term vision that we are actually going to adapt the way in which we manage this frontage. So that we do not end up with a coast that does that.

Peter Boggis

It has done that in the past as ??? can tell you quite easily. The end of the sea wall there, one year he went along and suddenly found he had gone back 38 or 48m, I can't remember exactly which, and it is not unusual even for a period of 10 years to see a loss there in the order of 10m a year.

Greg Guthrie

Yes.

Peter Boggis

If we get that change of circumstances again now all the figures that are in the SMP for that area are utter nonsense. ???

Greg Guthrie

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

But the concept of having a corner there, as opposed to looking at how we manage that corner in a different way is valid. And that's what the SMP is saying.

Chair

I think you'll have to carry on that discussion outside this to give other people a chance. Do you have a different question or on the same issue?

?

No it's to add weight and a bit more to it.

Chair

Well no I think we'll leave that then sorry.

?

It's very important because people don't know what I'm now going to say. Mr Boggis is quite correct in everything he said, I think we all back him up on that. The wall to the north end was building in 1962. 1984/85 they extended it and they extended it and carried on that same line. It had already curved inwards. People who remember the three bungalows on the cliff that wall was already aiming for the centre one. Billy Nice owned that and I pointed it out to him and he come round the other side to look at it and he flogged his building. Now when they, the end of the 1962 wall was behind the cliff, it wasn't in front of it. It was way behind it and when they done the 1985 extension they had to dig that bit of cliff out to extend it to the length it is now. And that's then when the fun started because they hadn't finished that work, and I've got the photographs to prove it, that that wall, that cliff was already behind the end of that new sea wall by the time they'd done. Within a few months it was 37m because I measured it, today it hasn't gone much further. That route end, it shows you on that narrow piece where you come down, and that's about 40m now at this particular time. And the SSI is protected for 200m inland, I asked at the meeting that Ken Sale came with me and Peter Boggis, and I asked Natural England at this AGM of theirs at Oxford, what are they doing about the 200m, are we going to be allowed to do any developments or not? And they said no, there will be no developments at the SSSI. So where that wall finish that's it. A dog leg, if you put a dog leg in there you will make a wacking great cell, that's what will happen, and that will travel north and you'll have a damn sight more cliff going north of Eastern Bavants than what we've got now. And you want to realise that.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Chair

Thank you very much. I think we've got time for one more question if anyone has one. No, well all I can do then is say thank you all very much for coming and don't forget the feedback forms for any comments you might have in future. Thank you.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Zone 7: Felixstowe Ferry – Landguard Point Ufford Park Hotel, 3rd April 2009, PM

Q. Graham Newman

When you were talking about Landguard Common there you were saying managed retreat for Landguard Common but hold the line at Landguard Fort. And in the earlier part of the presentation you said much the same thing about the lower estuary of the Deben, where you would envisage managed retreat but the Martello Tower side you would want to hold the line. Well surely in both of those instances the one where you haven't held the line is actually compromised by not doing so.

A. Greg Guthrie

I think that's a very important point because what we are actually saying is managed realignment, not managed retreat. One of the definitions that we were very keen to make in the procedural guidance, when we were consulting on the procedural guidance for the SMP process, is that managed realignment is moving forward or backwards, moving the coast, managing the way in which we manage the coast to create a more sustainable position for providing defence. So it is not managed retreat for a start, it's managed realignment. And that isn't just a soft way of saying managed retreat, there is that fundamental difference. It is also difficult to squeeze what we're trying, often the complex processes or the intent of how we are intending to manage these things, into the simple, one-liner. We have in terms of policy, we have no active intervention, managed realignment, advance the line and hold the line. Those are the very simple, shorthand terms. What we're talking about in these two different areas, in terms of the Deben estuary we are saying that with respect to management of the coast we wish to hold the mouth of the estuary for the important values that that has and also for the important way in which the coast works in transferring sediment across the mouth of the estuary, which we feel is a sustainable way of managing a larger section of coast. Therefore, we have to look from a shoreline management perspective about how that could best be achieved within the estuary, accepting that you've got long lengths of flood defence in the estuary, but we don't want to substantially increase the tidal volume. The tidal volume, if the tidal volume became totally, everywhere was exposed you'd have this large, massive flows, there's still a bit of slack within the estuary at the moment but if you opened up all these areas you'd get flows going through there that would make it very difficult to hold the line at the mouth. Therefore, we're looking at the longer term that as sea level rise increases there is going to be an increased chance of flooding to the agricultural land either side. What we're saying is the way in which we need to be looking at how to manage that is we want to maintain these defences but accepting that it may not be possible to increase those defences necessarily all the time with sea level rise. Therefore there may be increased risk of overtopping. We need to look in the future, in the longer term, at how we manage that so that it may be a case of looking at having slightly lower levels of weirs that are specially designed to allow that overtopping so that you don't get wash out of the embankments, so that they don't suddenly overtop and you get the wash out and you lose the embankment. It may be looking at, in the longer term, how you can warp up

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

the land so that you are not actually, if you did then realign the defences you would not be immediately incurring the large volume. Now that needs to be looked at in the more detail in the estuary strategy. But we feel that there are realistic mechanisms, there are ways of doing this, and we're sort of saying to the estuary strategy we've got to be looking at that sort of approach to managing that lower area. You come down to Landguard Common and it's a very different situation, we are not talking about managed retreat of that frontage. What we're saying is you've got a substantial shingle bank there, that is your main frontline of defence. You've got a flood defence behind that, you do not want that flood defence to be on the front line, linear flood defences and variable coastal processes are something that you want to try and move away from because you want width in which to manage a coastal system. And therefore on that frontage we're not saying hold the line because that would imply that if that shingle moved back you would immediately step in and put in a rock revetment or something to stop the beach moving back, or you'd hard control that beach. We're saying that needs to function properly, if you hold on to Landguard Point, and you hold on to the South Felixstowe frontage down to Manor Terrace is it, then within that section you're not going to get vast amounts of movement but you allow that to develop naturally. And that's why also, we're highlighting that Manor Terrace as being an important area where, from a land use perspective, you don't really want to be developing a premier hotel right up against the sea front at that point because you want to have flexibility in the long term to may be adjust things in that, manage it in a different way, maintaining a bit of option for width so as to maintain that continuity between the two frontages. Does that ...?

Graham Newman

Yes that helps a lot.

Greg Guthrie

Good thank you.

Andy Smith

I think your concept of some flexibility, particularly in the estuaries, is refreshing because those of us who have been struggling with the vanilla version at least of the Blyth Estuary Strategy, it was all or nothing. You either built the wall up to be a 100% defence for a one in 200 year problem in 100 years time, or if you couldn't do that because of cost, you did nothing. Now that process has evolved and I think the recognition that the defence doesn't have to defend 100% of everything in the future, you need to prevent the routine flooding with one degree of certainty and the occasional event with a different degree of certainty. And I think that also applies to the Fort and I'm glad to hear what you say about recognising the set back defence line, for people who perhaps haven't thought about the flood defence line in the vicinity of the Fort, what stops the Dock or the south of Felixstowe flooding is a complex line through the Fort itself, the rifle butts and all of that leading to where the EA flood wall kicks back and that's always been perceived as the line of last resort to prevent another version of '53. But in all normal circumstances the common in being because the shingle beach seems to be

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

stable and the Harbour Board have it for their own interests to maintain the river frontage. I think perhaps the wording in here needs to bring that out more clearly for the coming years.

Greg Guthrie

Yes, if people feel, once they've had a chance to read through the vast quantities of verbiage that I've produced, if you don't feel that that is coming out clearly enough then highlight that to us and we will look at how we can express it. It is always difficult because I live and breathe coastal management engineering and I just assume that everyone else knows what I'm talking about.

Andy Smith

And there's one other aspect you hinted at in your reply and I've underlined in my stuff to send you, the what you've called the Manor Terrace which I think what you mean is the situation at the end of the Promenade where it kicks back to join the EA flood wall ...

Greg Guthrie

Yes.

Andy Smith

... where two sets of your professional colleagues who talked about that with us wanted to do something different there, but the crucial point is we have a major planning permission in being at that point and the options for the foreseeable future for that reason are limited. And I think again the wording needs to give I think at least passing, you are aware of the South Seafront project?

Greg Guthrie

Right, but not in detail.

Andy Smith

Okay, well perhaps we can make sure that we get you updated on that.

Greg Guthrie

Yes, and would be pleased to feedback on that.

Andy Smith

That seems to be an issue that perhaps has escaped through the net. Anymore questions or comments?

Q. Graham Henderson

May I come in there. I just want to clarify something really because you've sat there Greg and given us your views as to what should be with the last two points but that's your view, or SMP 2 Committee view. It's not an EA view is it?

A. Greg Guthrie

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

It's the, don't think of me as just being Greg Guthrie standing up here and telling you how to manage your coast, this has been a long process that we have pulled together the technical information and we've made suggestions to the Steering Group and that Steering Group has included Suffolk Coastal, it's included Waveney, Environment Agency and Natural England and there have been other people involved in the mix and we have thrashed out some of these issues and discussed whether we should be having managed realignment, or whether it should be called no active intervention and a lot of these issues. So what I'm presenting is the view of the Steering Group that is made up of all those bodies.

Andy Smith

Which to emphasise is a draft.

Greg Guthrie

Yes.

Graham Henderson

Okay fine thanks.

Andy Smith

I don't know whether Ian, he hasn't been involved in this process, but from the generality of the EA perspective on these things has got a comment on that. Ian Bliss, for those of you who don't know, who's a guest today in the sense that Ian is running for the EA and they're the lead partner in the Essex SMP, which as I've mentioned before is ...

Ian Bliss

Yes I work with Sue Brown who works for the Environment Agency and Sue does feed in all of the different input through functions within the Environment Agency, feeds that through the Client Steering Group who in actual fact steer the SMP forward, so we have had full engagement and input through the EA.

Greg Guthrie

And I might, while I'm on that point, we're also helping the Environment Agency on the Essex SMP and the guy doing it sits about two metres away from me and we do have a degree of connectivity both at the top through the Steering Groups, and at the bottom in arguing and Yak and I have some quite good fun discussing the philosophy of discussing SMPs ourselves.

Andy Smith

I'm not quite sure what was at the back of Graham's mind, far be it from me to delve, but of course at the end of this process, amongst other things that have to happen, the SMP has to be adopted by amongst others the three partner organisations, which includes Suffolk Coastal and Waveney. They have, or the EA has the advantage over those two organisations, they don't have elected members to deal with. And of course there's the precedent which I hope we don't follow but it exists, that North Norfolk despite having been partners in that one although I don't think they were the lead agency, North

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Norfolk as a Council rejected the SMP, declined to adopt it and the balloon went up and there were some lively discussions.

Ian Bliss

We do have to have the agreement from our Regional Flood Defence Committee though so that is, sort of, our, who will decide it on behalf of the Agency.

Andy Smith

Sort of, yes. Fair comment. Terry?

Terry Oakes

Greg is presenting the technical aspects of the study, because that's why Royal Haskoning were appointed, to look at the coastal processes, to look at the geomorphology and all those sorts of things, and what's happening in a physical sense down the coast and what would happen if you did one thing in terms of coastal impact in another area. The other side, which is why we've brought everybody here, is like the political decisions with a small 'p'. And they're much more subjective, like okay so we implement a policy what will that do to the community, what will that do to the environment. And this is where the members have come in and the officers from the local authorities and the Environment Agency giving this other angle and whilst we know it's going to be difficult for stakeholders to challenge the technical side because you're talking about engineering issues, we felt it was most appropriate that we should put the other political with a small 'p' issues to you, to see whether you felt comfortable with those. Because they will have impacts on the community, they will impact on the economy, impact upon the environment so Greg's presentation covers both aspects but he is really the engineering specialist.

Andy Smith

Anybody else. Susan?

Q. Susan ?

I'd just like to go back to Landguard and I've looked at the stakeholder objective to do with what is described as the Landguard Common SSSI. Now that's only a small part of the Landguard Peninsula, the Landguard Peninsula is larger than the SSSI and within the Landguard Peninsula there is, over and beyond the SSSI, quite a lot of important bio-diversity and indeed rather further up the coast, towards Manor Terrace. I'm just a little bit concerned that this flexibility might take away some of the more interesting features outside the SSSI.

Greg Guthrie

There is always difficulty in managing an actual system and maintaining the things that, what we're saying is with sea level rise you're likely to get roll back of that frontage. To actually stop that, to protect a specific feature, a biological feature, a botanical feature of that, actually would destroy the very thing that that is relying on. Our overall intent is that the whole of that section should be managed to allow it to function naturally, but actually we are

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

imposing harder control either side and yes I think we have to step outside the boundaries. The SSSI defines, if you like, the jewel in the crown of the area, but you have to recognise that it's connected in terms of bio-diversity and there are bio-diversity objectives within the SMP. And all that is looked at through the strategic environmental assessment process that goes alongside and will be reported within the SMP.

Susan ?

Thank you very much.

Q. Andy Smith

That points me along a line of thought I wish I'd thought of this morning. Going back to something that we briefly touched on in some of the previous member forums. Shingle banks generally, in the face of long term sea level rise, I think some of us tend to sort of think about sea level rise as if it were a permanent tidal surge, but it's not. If you have a shingle bank that's evolved naturally to this height, and 99 times out of 100, stay below it and a metre and a half surge comes along and it goes over the top, but that shingle bank, and I've stood down at the Ferry some times and looked at some of the knolls over there, at high tide and somebody's standing on the shore and there's another person or two's height, how did that shingle get there please. The point I'm making is that the sea naturally will build up shingle banks to higher than what you perceive as sea level. What is the overview in the profession, with sea level rise take either the bank at Shingle Street, as we were discussing this morning, or in our case the Landguard Bank, is it your view that that would actually gradually accrete to a higher stage along with the gradual sea level rise over the century, to any degree or not at all or completely?

A. Greg Guthrie

We've looked, in terms of how we've defined the erosion rates, we've taken use of the monitoring and of rates that have been recorded, but we've also looked at the, I think the response of a shingle bank very much depends on its bulk. If you just have a very narrow shingle bank, say up at Walberswick where we've been trying to build, maintain this shingle bank and each time it's a little bit less substantial, it becomes more vulnerable to flattening out. Where you've got a large accumulation of shingle, and our policy for Hollesley Bay is to try and maintain a good, substantial width of bank, then there's plenty of material for the sea to be working on and as sea level rise occurs you'll get it moving up so that you've got a fluctuation in tide here related to a level of a shingle bank there. As this moves gradually up to be working in that area, so the natural shingle bank will also tend to move up and move backwards in order to respond. But to do that it's got to have a good bulk. So your shingle beach, say along the central Felixstowe frontage, where it's actually quite a narrow beach is not, it's working almost as a flat fore beach. It hasn't really got that bulk to respond, it will try and roll back but then how you manage that defence behind it and the interaction is very important. You go down to Landguard Common and you've got a large chunk of shingle, and therefore that chunk of shingle is able to respond fully. So it depends on, and we've

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

looked at that as to whether there is substantial amounts of material or whether it's just a sort of veneer at the coastline.

Andy Smith

But when all's said and done, eight or nine centuries ago it wasn't there. It was created out of nothing by the sea.

Greg Guthrie

Yes, well over a period of several thousand years as it developed, yes. And one of the important things especially in this South Suffolk area is that the sediment that you have got in the area is very much the sediment that you are living with and are managing. There is no big supplies of sediment, what is feeding is Orford Ness and Orford Ness is eroding and it's feeding off itself in order to provide sediment further south. Orford Ness was a result of major sea level rise thousands of years ago that caused the erosion of large portions of the north sea coast and that came down as great drifts of sediment. What we've got now is relic sediment supply which is, and that's also why it's important to hold on to where we are still getting smaller supplies like Bawdsey Cliffs and the Covehithe Cliffs and things like that. We're very much managing what we've got.

Andy Smith

That's very illuminating. Anybody else.

Q. ?

You mentioned the consideration of the estuaries in your SMP plan but there is no mention, as far as I can see, anywhere of the document I've looked at, I haven't looked at them all I must admit, about what is happening on the coast. This extraction of gravel, millions of tonnes of gravel are being taken out and there is now a view that this is possibly having some effect. I know ten or fifteen years ago only one or two people were talking about it, now a lot of people are talking about this and it's interesting the Dutch buy 20% of the extracted material because they do not allow extraction off their own coast.

A. **Greg Guthrie**

On the dredging issue we've looked at various studies, studies such as Southern North Sea Sediment Transport Study, and the conclusion is that the aggregate dredging on the coast line is not having a significant impact on the coast. Obviously if you went and dredged right up against the coastline you would have an impact. But these sites are being selected and have to go through a very rigorous process of selection, and one of the things Southern North Sea Sediment Transport Study was doing was trying to look at whether banks were connected and whether the throughput of that bank system that moved sediment onto the shoreline and therefore if you were removing it you were stopping feed and the conclusion is that the aggregate dredging that is taking place is not having a significant impact on the behaviour direct at the coast. That is not to say that the shoreline banks, you go up to Lowestoft areas and places like that, there are shoreline banks that are having a significant impact but they are not banks that are being dredged. We've highlighted where the key interactions are and you mustn't consider the shoreline to be a line, it's an area that is both ???, but we have looked at that.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

I think it's a statement that needs to be made in the SMP from the concerns that have been expressed.

Andy Smith

Half of what you've said was sport on. Not many people were talking about it and now a lot of people are talking about it. Greg's answered in respect of aggregate dredging and I agree with that and I've picked up a lot of this stuff over time and I can't see any evidence. What I can speak personally for is, and I don't know whether you had in mind aggregate dredging or the shipping channel dredging, but a lot of people locally say it's all the fault of the channel and the port and the Harbour Board dredging it out, on the back of that, after a meeting we had with them, myself and another Councillor, John Goodwin, had one of the best perks I've ever had as a councillor, I had a day out on the dredger because they say, and I didn't disbelieve them, that there's nothing like seeing it for yourself. We went out for a day on the dredger and what they dredge out of the channel, both in the harbour and only small volumes out in the channel itself as it goes offshore, is the finest, finest, finest material. John Brian, the Harbour Engineer, talks about what he calls is north sea soup and I've often thought what's wrong with Felixstowe, you go to Scotland and you look off a jetty and you can see through 10 metres of water and you can see the starfish on the bottom. In Felixstowe you can't see your hand at the end of your arm and the sediment that's floating around in the whole of the southern north sea is the river sediment that's come, not so much from the Thames and the Humber, but in large measures from the Rhine and the Shelt. And the mechanism in the harbour is that the tide goes in, it dwells, it drops some of that and it goes out and incredibly for the area of the harbour off the quays where they need the channel for the big ships, they're taking a metre off there three times a year. But I've got a jar of this stuff at home and you can't feel it between your fingers, it's much finer than the sand on the beach. So what it isn't emphatically is shingle from the beach and I can speak personally for that. It is something that people naturally think but to just reinforce what Greg said, if you look at some of these charts where you have the seabed with a very compressed horizontal access, so that the troughs and dips look very exaggerated, and the shore is here and the channel is out there, the channel looks like a little dip like that and there are sort of much greater variations in between and you think well actually material isn't going to go between the two. So I'm personally, having been kicking around this stuff for quite a long time, as convinced as it's possible to be, that either set of dredging is not significant as far as the shore is concerned. And I think what Greg was saying about the geological timescale of Orford Ness is very interesting. You wanted a go?

Q. ?

It was just a question in relation to the new work on the sea front at Felixstowe and the recharge which has happened. How do you think that's going to develop because it is a specific recharge, do you think it's going to stabilise there?

A. **Greg Guthrie**

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

I've no reason to believe that it won't. We haven't, in the SMP process, we haven't gone down to, it isn't our remit to go down into that sort of detail. But it's been looked at in significant detail before it was developed and I'll hand over to someone who knows a lot more about it.

?

It's being monitored daily, weekly. There have been fluctuations in the early stages, and again it's that sort of down to natural processes but towards now it's starting to level out and it has what was predicted for that recharge. As far as we're concerned we're happy with the way it's progressed.

Andy Smith

Not wishing to detract from that at all, but for that scheme and I had a very lively debate with Terry and the consultant the other day who's doing the central Felixstowe, in both schemes there is a designed in, I think it was a 15 year cycle, 20 year cycle, of recharge. Now my personal view is that a scheme that's designed to need recharge is not a scheme that works because the traditional groynes for 100 years never needed recharge but having said that, touch wood, the beach that formed itself at south Felixstowe, virtually in one night after that surge very, very unusual, I don't know what was unusual, but it was certainly unusual surge tide in February, February 15 I think, overnight transformed that beach from all sorts of cliffs and stuff to an absolutely perfect beach. Far nicer than any bulldozer ever made. At Manor End itself we were getting quite worried, Terry was giving me reports that we could see the rocks that we'd put in three or four years back and it had cut away quite a lot. But that tide was the strangest thing because days after that it was that scar from the prom. And at the moment it seems stable, but what we haven't had of course is a sustained north easterly blow and that will be the crucial test. So I think nothing is certain as we keep saying.

?

I think that's one of the anomalies of sea level rise or climate change that one of the biggest effects is storminess, this change in weather patterns.

Greg Guthrie

Potentially. There is no hard evidence on change in storminess, that we know that storminess does occur in cycles and also that there is shifts in patterns of whether depressions are running through over Scotland or whether they're coming up the Channel and things like that. That is big, long term cyclic changes again that can affect weather patterns over decades. But that is not seen as being necessarily something that will, we don't know about the storminess aspect of climate change. There are certain indications that you may get higher energy coming in and that has to be taken into account. But you'll also get the higher energy coming in purely because you've got increased depth in water which just allows bigger waves to come in. And that's what we take into account when we look at how the coast performs.

Andy Smith

Sorry I don't know your name but the lady from English Heritage.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Q. Jenny ?

Relating to management area 20.1, ie the west side of Landguard Point, it's probably just a point in relation to the presentation within the document but I do note that the 100 year draft preferred policy line stops just shy of the jetty leaving, and I do recognise that it is the hold the line policy down that stretch, but we do have some concerns about potential flood vulnerability round the back of the Fort and the point that I would just like to make ...

Andy Smith

Could you just pause and tell us which page you're ...

Jenny ?

Page 22.

Andy Smith

Of which document.

Jenny?

Which document? Policy Zone 7, PDZ 7.

Andy Smith

That one. No that's 6.

Jenny ?

And it's the very last stretch.

Greg Guthrie

So this area in here.

Jenny ?

Yes, that's probably too small for everyone to see.

Greg Guthrie

That area in here and basically what, where this line finishes here. That is meant to tie in with the southern end of the port.

Jenny ?

Right okay, because currently the draft line stops right there.

Greg Guthrie

Does it?

Jenny ?

Yes, and so that bit ...

Greg Guthrie

Because this a copy from the draft document so, but again that policy unit goes all the way up to the southern end of the Port and ties in with the thing, but it's important that little inconsistencies, or apparent inconsistencies like

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

that are highlighted when, because it can cause enormous confusion when we go out to public consultation.

Andy smith

Are you familiar with, if I say Felixstowe South Reconfiguration does that mean anything to you?

Jenny ?

Yes.

Andy Smith

The point, which is really good news from the point of view of the Fort, is that when the Felixstowe Dock expansion is complete, which is called Felixstowe South Reconfiguration for those who aren't involved, that will bring the Dock Quay at a higher level than now, a one in 200 year, 100 year sea level rise level, down in front of most of the Fort frontage to where they will be creating a ferry berth. And that really will be very clear and obvious once it's built, the split between not only this policy line and that but between the Essex and Suffolk SMPs. The point being that the Dock Quay will then be a flood defence for as far into the future as anyone can see. But there will be then a very sharp transition to what we currently have south of that, but irrespective of exactly which fragment of line, or which map is concerned I think that's now clear between us and there has been some debate in the past month as to exactly where that line should be. But that's the concept. But once FSR2 is finished that is going to be a very clear and obvious boundary and that will actually cover that part of the frontage of the Fort that needed repair seven or eight years ago.

Jenny ?

A follow on point from that is that I note that although it is hold the line, I do note from that yellow line, the 100 year draft preferred policy line, that there is a retreat. It does move back actually from where the current foreshore is and colleagues have highlighted the fact that they do see that as a concern because it does imply that there is a level of erosion backwards.

Greg Guthrie

That line, the forward line, the greyer line that you see there is the mean high water. It's purely that we're saying that the yellow line is actually intended to represent the current defence line if you like

Jenny ?

Okay, so I can take the message back that there is no intention for a movement of that back towards the Fort.

Greg Guthrie

No, there is no intention. But in all these things improvement to that defence, it maybe that you want to actually spread that defence over a greater width, but all that needs to be looked at in detail. This is a policy that says hold the line, protect the important things that are behind it, one of the most important is flood risk to the thing, but any other assets that are in that area.

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Andy Smith

And there will be a sheet pile return out to sea at that point which will provide protection for the new ferry berth so one has to assume that that will act as a groyne as well. Neil?

Q. Neil?

I'm essentially interested in the Deben estuary, but I'd like to ask a question if I may for my own information about the coastal aspect of the problem. I imagine that when SMP2 is finally approved and you reach a stage of implementation there will be some points which you will have identified as being areas that you're going to protect, almost at all costs and hold the line, they'll come into the hold the line category, and there you'll be looking I suppose from my limited technical understanding, at either recharging or by putting up some kind of hardened sea defence, concrete or rock from Norway. But it seems to me from what I've read and understood that most of these proposals for holding the line are longitudinal, in that they going along the coast line. But if the problem is essentially one of erosion why do you not also consider lateral protections, in other words modern groynes which have been used for hundreds of years and are pretty rickety rickety now in many cases but they do seem to have been effective. Because like many people I go to the beach and I like the beach and I quite like the protected area that you get down, literal drift steam so to the speak if I can use the jargon, of a groyne, you often get a very nice area of sand. Because the lighter sediments can tend to collect in the sort of back water area of a groyne. So my question is are you also considering extensions into the sea as well as hardening the shore?

A. Greg Guthrie

In doing the SMP we are focused on policy, we are not focused on the specific way in which that policy is delivered. That would come out of looking at it from a Strategy or looking at a specific scheme. So you'd take the mouth of the Deben and in holding the line for that area from Felixstowe Ferry going seaward, the way in which that is hold the line at the moment comprises effectively a defence system which is the bank behind, the shingle and the groyne structures that have been put in place in order to manage the flow over that frontage. In terms of hold the line that system, that width which is perhaps 50 metres wide, is actually the line. In another area hold the line may be in relation to an existing structure that is a sea wall. We avoided, there was some people said we should be defining the line, whether it was the back or the front of a sea wall, whether in the case of a dune was it the toe of the dune, or the back of the dune or the top of the dune depending on how you managed the dune, and most of us turned round and said don't be daft the line, we're talking about policy. The policy is the line is with the intent to deliver a defence to the important assets and the important use behind that. It is for the strategies and the schemes to actually develop how you deliver that policy in detail. There are many areas where it is more sensible to go as you say cross shore or even detached from the cross shore, we were talking yesterday about north of Southwold and we were saying that we wanted to manage an area, that we wanted to create width by moving the

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

flood defence back from the front line so that we can manage a bigger, a wider beach area. And we acknowledged that might be through key control points, it might be through reefs, it might be through breakwaters, we have in our heads how you could do that because we're delivering realistic policy. But it is not up to the SMP to then say and therefore there will be a concrete wall here or a groyne here. Does that ...

Andy Smith

I mean that's driven amongst other things by the equation of expense and what you're protecting. So for example the Felixstowe frontage is hold the line in SMP1 and is hold the line in SMP2 and you've got live examples there, we've just done rock groynes on the southern half and we're in a lively debate with the consultants, Terry and myself, at the moment about what we're going to do with the next stretch, War Memorial to Cobbolds Point, and the only issue there is should the groynes be rock or should they be timber, but groynes they will be. Conversely if you take East Lane, Bawdsey where we're doing the work in front of the Martello Tower the only conceivably, affordable, practical solution there was rock revetment buttress. In theory some of us would liked to have gone back 100 years and put in the groynes that used to be there. The hold the line doesn't in any way imply, like Greg said, what you put there but there are massive cost restraints on what you can do.

Q. Graham Henderson

Andy this isn't really SMP2 but I think it's relative in my mind, because I need to clarify my mind. We had Black and Veatch and Royal Haskoning do a north Felixstowe and a south Felixstowe presentation some time ago. Am I right?

Greg Guthrie

I certainly did a north Felixstowe investigation.

Andy Smith

Black and Veatch did the south.

Graham Henderson

We put in as a result of that, I think we then put in the hammer head groynes in south Felixstowe. We've now got another consultancy company in, Mock MacDonald, and they're proposing straight groynes, whether timber or rock. I just wonder whether you're going with the consultants obviously, but why haven't we got a unified view on the whole of the Felixstowe sea front. We appear to be trialling different methods having gone from hammerheads now to straight groynes. Am I right or wrong.

Andy Smith

There's a clear answer to that and I'll let either of the professionals answer it. But the seabed is much shallower on south Felixstowe than it is further to the north and the view, I'm told if you're talking rock groynes, is that the T head in the south is appropriate for that shallower frontage and the straight groyne in the north is appropriate for that deeper frontage. And I know myself from having been in both areas, whenever there's a big storm I tend to go and

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

poke about, the type of wave action you get at the south in the vicinity of the Fludgers is quite different. The south you tend to get an onshore rush of water, that's why all the beach huts get washed, at the slightest provocation they get washed back. Where my beach hut is opposite the Fludgers you tend to get much more of a huge breaking wave, energy expending itself against the sea wall. And I can only assume that that has to do with the different depths of water. But Terry.

Terry Oakes

The reason for the proposal for the straight groyne is one technical and another one for financial viability. Mock MacDonalds, that's the people doing the central Felixstowe frontage from War Memorial up to Jacobs Ladder, are saying that the orientation of that part of the beach because it goes round in a bay, would be better suited to straight groyne dealing with literal drift. Whereas the area south of the Pier down to Landguard which is much more open and straight facing the most, the north-easterly storms, then capturing the onshore/offshore shingle is better done by a T head. So that's the first reason. Mock MacDonalds are saying you could use T heads in central Felixstowe if you wanted to have them all looking identical but it probably isn't necessary. And if that's the case reducing the costs by not constructing that T in deeper water will save quite a bit of money and make the project more viable. So that's really the thinking behind it.

Andy Smith

And that's in the context that the viability of getting funding for that is balanced on a knife edge because of the way the outcomes measures work which is what the EA on Defra's behalf now use. The formula essentially doesn't do resort frontages, it does thousands of houses at Tewksbury or it would do hundreds of houses at south Felixstowe liable for flooding, but it doesn't do eroding resort frontages, it's very hard to get justification. Anybody else. Veronica?

Q. Veronica ?

How are the neep tides, the autumn and spring tides monitored in relation to getting your facts and figures for the various policies. I know it's a very elementary question but to me it's very important because the tides can be horrendous at times.

A. Andy Smith

Well being a very sad person most evenings I look at the website that displays that information.

Veronica ?

I want to know, there must be a technical way of monitoring.

Andy Smith

There is a tide gauge, an electrical tide gauge on Felixstowe Pier which gives the tide height every quarter of an hour and within just under 30 minutes generally you can see that plotted on the website. And there's a link to it from the Suffolk Coastal website, it's maintained by the National Tide and Sea

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

Level Service and Proudman Oceanographic Laboratories, and I find it fascinating. And you have super-imposed there, you have the sign wave of the expected tide which is a sign wave and then the amplitude of that varies with the, if you look at a month's worth you can see the variable depth of the spring tides and neap tides. Then super-imposed on that on the plot you have, as I say, every quarter of an hour and when there's, if I get a tide warning come through on email from the EA you go and look and if it's going up the tide and the blue line, which is the prediction, no the red line which is the prediction is there and the plots are going up here and you're half way up the tide and you're a metre above there's a good chance that when you get to the top of the tide you're going to be a metre above. I'll send you the link, it's absolutely fascinating.

Veronica ?

Thank you, yes I'm sure it is.

Andy Smith

And you can get data back. I've actually had a couple of data sets you can pull down data, historically.

Veronica ?

And do the various bodies come into action if it gets pretty high?

Andy Smith

A tide gauge isn't much good for, action for defence but the EA issue flood warnings and surge warnings and they're getting, it has to be said from my perception, significantly more accurate all the time.

Greg Guthrie

And they're looking at the way in which the tide, the surge because you've got, as Andy says, the predicted tide driven by the heavenly bodies and then you've got the surge driven by the meteorological conditions and that develops often down the North Sea. So actually the Environment Agency is looking at gauges all the way down the East Coast to see how that surge is developing to be able to make the prediction at Felixstowe.

Andy Smith

Is that time then to move on and hand over to Terry and see if we can get a collective answer to some of the flip chart questions.

Terry Oakes

Just very quickly. We have been asking these questions at each of the workshops just for clarification really because the main purpose of the workshops was to validate the work that we've done to date. To test the thinking and to make sure that you as key stakeholders understood what we did and agreed with the outputs. So the first question is very simply do you understanding the review process, do you understand how we've gone about it, what we've done, the thinking behind the process, how we've taken forward all the information that we've gained? Is anybody uncomfortable, don't be

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

afraid to say so, is anybody not understand because we can come out individually. The second one relates to a piece of work we did right at the very beginning which is an issues document which is this A43 document. This contains, I'll just get any page, all the issues which were presented to us at the very beginning of the exercise when we went to stakeholders and said what would you like us to think about, what would you like us to take into account, what's important to you, what do you want us to think about and what do you want us to look after. This is on the website but it's available here. It's colour coded for the different categories, there are environmental issues, there are historic heritage issues which are the pink and then there are socio-economic community issues and what we intend to do with this is having identified the issues there's another part of the spreadsheet which will say what we've done to take them into account, or if we haven't taken them into account why we haven't taken them into account, have we affected them, have we helped them and if we haven't been able to do anything with them at all, or it's not within the SMP we'll say that as well. So anybody who wants to inspect that that's available. It's on the website but you can look at it certainly. These are the 500 issues that Keith referred to right at the very beginning. Because these are the things which are sort of been driving the policy as it were So what we're asking was that if you look at that or if you've heard something today which you think you're issue hasn't been taken into account then we'd like to know that as well now before we keep moving along. The other one is having heard everything today, having got the policy documents in front of you, is there any more information that you feel you need. Many of you represent organisations, you're welcome to take more of the documents with you if you'd like, they're readily available. If you feel as though it would be useful for us to come and talk to your organisation, we're happy to do that as well at this stage. Because what we don't want to do is go out to public consultation having missed a point or having got something wrong and then get to the end of the process and then somebody stand up and say well actually I don't agree with that, or you never came to see me or you didn't cover my issue. So there's an open invitation there if you want more information to let us know. And we've got some feedback forms, if we can hand these out, just hand those round. There's just some forms there, if you feel you want to say something or you want to ask any questions just fill them in and send them back to the Council Offices at Melton Hill and we'll pick them up. And then the last one is really the \$64,000 question, do you support the preferred options as we've developed them in the documents as they stand now. Are there any points that, any draft policies that you disagree with or you feel should be amended in any way. If you require more time to look at the policy documents because many of you only picked them up today, then please do that but could you feed back any comments you have by the end of April. As I say send them to Jeremy Schofield's secretary at Melton Hill and she'll pass them on to us.

Andy Smith

Terry you referred to the website there by which you mean the SMP website. Just perhaps remind people, unfortunately that address is not on any of these documents but it is on the email that people's presence here I think

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

demonstrates they had. So there's a lot more information on the website which is called ...

Terry Oakes

Suffolksmp2.org.uk. Yes all these documents are on the website but we know that not everyone's got access to the website. Certainly a lot of Parish Councils haven't got access to websites so we have offered to provide hard copies if they want them. So if you go out to your constituents or other organisations then just please let me know and we'll send some of these hard copies to them.

Andy Smith

Did you get your answer to the \$64,000 question.

Terry Oakes

No I didn't so I was just going to repeat the question.

Andy Smith

Let's get a bit of interaction on question 4.

Terry Oakes

On question 4, are there any preferred options as stated in the documents that's you're uncomfortable with that you've identified so far.

Andy Smith

I don't think you ought to waste all that rock, I think you ought to let it go.

Terry Oakes

Just let us know, by the end of the month if you can.

Andy Smith

Okay. Graham keeps the debate on the go. Thank you Graham.

Q. Graham Henderson

I'll just leave with a question. I'm very concerned about how we put this information out to the public and I was just wondering what you're thinking of doing. Because to put out to people in the Felixstowe are that document on its own is not going to tell them very much because there's an awful lot of background information that you know and probably I know that's not going to be there. So how far are you going to expand the information when you go to the public.

Andy Smith

I think that's a very good point and I was just having a mutter to Greg about that very point a moment ago.

Greg Guthrie

We do need to be discussing this with the Steering Group or the Steering Group need to be discussing, telling us what to do. But overall there will be a far more substantial document which will include appendices which will also

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

include the SEA, the appropriate assessment, it will cover, have an appendix on the coastal processes, it will have an appendix on the stakeholder engagement and when we've talked to people and responses and it'll have the assessment of those issues, whether we feel, it will have an overview of how the whole section of coast, how the preferred policy. My experience is that people generally do not read 700 page documents and therefore, which is a great pity because all this effort and they are fascinating bed time reading for some sad people like me. And we do try and tell a story but we're conscious of that. The documents will also have a front piece which explains the SMP process and things like that. What we need to be working, as a Steering Group, is looking at producing a none technical summary that doesn't go into all the heavy discussion here but does pull out those key points of what we're trying to deliver. Something that Andy said, those principles, those key principles that I put up there may be very useful in that sort of document. What is it that we see this SMP delivering. So trying to communicate in a different form. This is if you like an extract of the main document but we'll look at that.

Veronica ?

And definitely a glossary of all your abbreviations so that, and highlight that right at the beginning because otherwise people will get lost. If you leave it to the end, last page you've had it, you've lost them. You want it right at the start.

Q. ?

Are you also going to include an overarching view of the whole of the SMP down the coast, of what the dynamic is. Because I think the interaction from cell to cell is enormously important.

A. Greg Guthrie

We will have within this larger document both the appendix on the background coastal processes where we've pulled information together all that on a technical, we've also got a discussion document of why we have felt it sensible to break the coast down into these policy development zones and an analysis of how we went about that. And there's another appendix that discusses the overall approach and hopefully it will all be there but it will rely on people reading it.

?

I think the point I'm making is that it's answering really the question of when it goes out to public that an overview of the essential dynamics which obviously people aren't going to look into in enormous depth, but I think the thing that we're aware of just today is that for example at Orford Ness looking at the relationship between Shingle Street, Orford Ness and further south in the, it's very difficult to escape the context of a potential breach at Slaughden and the knock on effects and to gain a sense of the whole picture. I think the same thing goes for eastern and the Blyth and so on, that it is a symbiotic ...

Greg Guthrie

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

But you are actually expressing the very difficulty that we have. You are saying you want an overview of how this coast works. Well I put up an overview this morning saying there's a southerly drift here, Hollesley Bay tends to move like that and there's a southerly drift there. I then went down into a second level of detail which started talking about the individual estuary mouths, another level of detail was the potential of the Slaughden breach and all of sudden you have expanded, because of all these interactions, you've expanded that very simple overview into the document that is the explanation of the coastal processes. And we're always having this battle. You issue a summary document and someone says there isn't the background to this. You issue the full document and they say you don't really expect me to read that do you? Which is why I then get up on my hind legs and try and pull it all together but it's a lot easier to do that through speech than it is through writing it down.

Graham Henderson

But Greg there is a mid way, you give out the fundamentals that Simon has just mentioned and you tell people all this information is available in depth on a particular website or whatever.

Greg Guthrie

Could I just borrow this and you turn to page, overview, built environment, heritage, amenity, nature, conservation, principle features, further details are provided in appendix D. Stakeholder objectives, development of objectives is set out in Appendix B based on objectives based on Appendix E. That is exactly what we are trying to do and that information will be available in more detail.

?

It's really saying, in other sphere's one would call it a digest.

Greg Guthrie

And I could actually go on. This is to a degree a digest but we recognise that there needs to be a none technical summary, but in the physical processes the bit on the physical processes there is something that says where the appendix that that's covered in. We are very conscious of this difficulty of the coast is difficult especially this one. You've got to get down into the detail but if you provide too much detail no one will read it and there are layers.

Andy Smith

I think sufficient to say that a major task for the Client Steering Group and then for the members forum to have a look at is really at this publishing size, it's a huge challenge. The reality is it's complicated and it's a bit like writing electoral literature. The skill of getting something onto one page that you're prospective supporters will relate to is much more difficult than writing a book about it which they won't read so I think the publishing side is going to be crucial as this goes forward. I think we can take it that that point will be addressed with energy by Terry and the rest of the Group. Any other comments? There was, somebody else was after the mike a minute ago over here, who was that? No, we seem to be done then. Can I take this

SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS CONSULTATION REPORT

opportunity not only for the end of this session but the end of the six sessions, to thank Greg in particular, who has done this six times and still manages to make it sound fresh and interesting and exciting.

Greg Guthrie

It is.

Andy Smith

And Terry and his colleagues who have done a vast amount of hard work to the put the events themselves on and so on and so forth. I think it's been a very, very useful, the two sessions I've done today, and I've heard some very complimentary anecdotes about the previous four sessions as well. So many thanks to the team, thanks to all of you who've come and we look forward hopefully to the next public stage and I think the good news is that this SMP2 as it's developing, having been cynical to the point of rudeness about it as Terry will tell you before it came along given the Government guidelines, I think is going very much in the right direction and hopefully will be something that is the right middle ground between the utopia which some of us would like and the minimal amount that certain parts of Defra would like. So we'll see how we come out on that but it seems to be going in the right direction at the moment so thank you all very much indeed and we await the next stage in the summer. Thank you.

**SMP3C KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS
CONSULTATION REPORT**
