

**ANGLIAN COASTAL AUTHORITIES GROUP – SUB-CELL 3C**

**FIRST REVIEW OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

**MINUTES OF REPRESENTATIVE MEMBERS FORUM (RMF) MEETING No 3  
Tuesday 6 November 2007 in Deben Room, SCDC Offices, Melton Hill, Woodbridge**

**Present:**

Cllr Andy Smith	(AS)	Suffolk Coastal DC (SCDC) Chairman
Cllr Christine Block	(CB)	Suffolk Coastal DC
Cllr Sue Allen	(SA)	Waveney DC (WDC)
Cllr Bruce Provan	(BP)	Waveney DC
Cllr John Goldsmith	(JGs)	Anglian East Regional Flood Defence Committee (EA)
Anthony Coe	(TC)	Anglian East Regional Flood Defence Committee
John Sharpe	(JSh)	Anglian East Regional Flood Defence Committee
Jeremy Schofield	(JSc)	Strategic Director, Suffolk Coastal DC
Bob Chamberlain	(BC)	Principal Planner, Suffolk Coastal DC
Paul Patterson	(PP)	Coast Protection Engineer, Waveney DC
Sue Brown	(SB)	Environment Agency (EA)
Peter Roberts	(PR)	Environment Agency
Steve Hayman	(SH)	Environment Agency
Greg Guthrie	(GG)	Royal Haskoning (RH)
Stefan Lombardo	(SF)	Royal Haskoning
Terry Oakes	(TO)	Terry Oakes Associates Ltd (TOAL)
Keith Tyrrell	(KT)	Terry Oakes Associates Ltd

Item		Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
1.1	The Chairman opened the meeting and invited those present to introduce themselves to the rest of the group.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
2.1	Cllr K Sale (WDC), Cllr J Goodwin (SCC) and J Jackson (Natural England)	
2.2	TO reminded meeting that SCDC needed to nominate a third representative for the group following the departure of Rae Leighton.	SCDC
<b>3</b>	<b>Data Collation/Data Management</b>	
3.1	The meeting received a presentation from GG on the progress which had been made on the project since RH were engaged. All data and information from the SMP partners and research institutions had now been received and was being logged and assimilated. RH had now produced an updated version of the issues table and had begun work on defining the objectives. The Chairman opened the meeting for questions.	
3.2	AS asked what core sources were being used for sea level predictions. He was aware that Scott Wilson Kirkpatrick are using some recent work which is suggesting lower predictions than have been used previously.	

**ANGLIAN COASTAL AUTHORITIES GROUP – SUB-CELL 3C**

**FIRST REVIEW OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

Item		Action
3.3	GG responded that the study needed to adhere to the Defra guidance but RH were also relying on the latest output from the IPCC. What was important was to carry out a sensitivity analysis on the final policies to see if they were sensitive to the full range of predictions which could be obtained from bona fide sources.	TOAL
3.4	RH are also using POL to supply current tide data. This has presented some anomalies, particularly at Cromer. There is also a feature at the approximate mid-point of the study area where a “standing wave” type of situation seems to be occurring. As a result of these doubtful areas only a medium level of confidence is being attached to this data.	
3.5	GG expressed an interest in hearing more about the SWK work and was given the name of Steve Brown in the SCDC Planning Dept as a relevant contact.	
3.6	AS asked that an item on the predictions for sea level rise be included in the agenda for the next RMF meeting	
3.7	JG referred to the plotting of defence walls and noted that EA/SCC/WDC had been provided with a map which he had prepared showing the depth of water across the marsh system during flooding events.	
3.8	Following her question on the issue CB was assured by GG that RH had now received all the relevant and available information regarding the estuaries within the study area.	
3.9	TC drew the attention of the meeting to an article in the current edition of the Daily Telegraph.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Issues and Features Table/Draft Objectives</b>	
4.1	TO began this item by explaining that the Client Steering Group (CSG) had prepared an initial list of issues prior to the letting of the contract with RH. One of the first tasks asked of the Consultant was to expand this list and to develop a methodology whereby the fate of each issue could be tracked. In this way there would be a full audit trail of each issue and the way in which it had been considered. This process had now included all the comments which were raised at, and subsequent to, the Key Stakeholders Group meeting at Snape. TO concluded by asking Members to provide comments on the document, which had been issued to them immediately preceding this meeting, within 2 weeks. Once these comments had been received and considered the table would be issued to the Key Stakeholder Group.	

**ANGLIAN COASTAL AUTHORITIES GROUP – SUB-CELL 3C**

**FIRST REVIEW OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

Item		Action
4.2	GG then gave a short presentation on the way in which the Issues Table had been updated and clarified the definitions of “Issues”, “Features” and “Objectives”. RH were attempting to assemble a comprehensive and inclusive listing of issues. These would then be brought together with the outcome of the coastal process work so that the foreseeable risks could be identified.	
4.3	He spent some time explaining the need to be clear about the true objectives attaching to each issue. It might not be readily apparent that the true value of an asset may be realised by alternative methods than simply protecting against flooding or erosion.	
4.4	GG noted that in the work done this far, and notwithstanding the comments already received, had surprised him of some omissions which he felt needed to be brought out. For example, neither Southwold nor Felixstowe Piers had been identified as features, let alone having an issue base on them.	
4.5	TC asked where the issue of maintaining the economic value of a property fit into the objectives	
4.6	GG responded that this was a difficult point to deal with as there is still no Government mechanism for providing compensation for a reduction in a properties value arising from increased flood or erosion risk. It is a matter for the community to determine the best way in which it should adjust to the changing environment. The SMP, at its high level of consideration, should be examining the “values” which the community places on each section of the coastline. The inevitable coarseness of the economic analysis which can be carried out within an SMP leads to a need to establish the value of the asset in the broadest terms. He gave the example of a Post Office whose value to the local community beyond the capital valuation of the building itself.	
4.7	There was a far ranging discussion about the example of a road given that its principal purpose is generally to convey transport from A to B. GG made the point that this might be achieved by a change in the route as well as affording it protection against erosion or flooding. The example has particular significance as the A12 is a feature at a number of locations along the SMP frontage.	
4.8	JS feared that the detailed analysis being carried out was in danger of missing the bigger picture –that the whole benefit can be much greater than the sum of the individual losses.	

**ANGLIAN COASTAL AUTHORITIES GROUP – SUB-CELL 3C**

**FIRST REVIEW OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

Item		Action
4.9	GG said that there was a difficulty in dealing with this because of the need to adhere to the Defra methodology for the assessment of benefits. However RH are assembling issues in order to characterise a given area and will attempt to demonstrate the interdependency of issues.	
4.10	TC was concerned as to how the policies and outcomes of the SMP were to be compared on a national basis. TO advised the meeting of the forthcoming use of Outcome Measures by Defra	
4.11	JS noted that one of the fundamental aspects of coastal management is the potential downdrift effects of actions taken at any point on the coast. GG advised that each issue covered by the SMP will be examined along with the coastal processes which prevail in the area.	
4.11	AS drew the meetings attention to the large areas of yellow colour coded environmental issues within the document – issues such as important infrastructure assets were receiving a lot less attention	
4.12	GG assured the meeting that this was an issue which would be addressed during the consultation period. The environmental details will be represented in a more concise form.	RH
4.13	Following a question from SA GG confirmed that increased flow into and out of the estuaries may have some impact on the adjoining open coastline.	
4.14	GG had explained the methods by which the benefits attaching to each issue were to be assessed. Following some discussion on the subject he invited the Representative Members to comment on these methods in their responses.	ALL
4.15	AS asked RH to provide some explanatory text to the Issues table for the benefit of other stakeholders. Additionally, a glossary should be provided to deal with the large number of acronyms being used.	RH
<b>5</b>	<b>Review of the Programme</b>	
5.1	TO told the meeting that the next important stage to the project was to obtain the feedback comments on the Issues list. Once these had been received the document would be revised and assembled into a suitable form to issue to other stakeholders.	
5.2	Members were advised that 13 February 2007 had been set as the next date for a meeting of the Representative Members Forum – a larger room would be provided.	ALL
5.3	The next Key Stakeholder Forum meeting would take place two weeks later, on 27 February 2008 at The Riverside Centre, Stratford St Andrew.	ALL

**ANGLIAN COASTAL AUTHORITIES GROUP – SUB-CELL 3C**

**FIRST REVIEW OF SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
LOWESTOFT NESS TO FELIXSTOWE LANDGUARD POINT**

---

<b>Item</b>		<b>Action</b>
5.4	AS asked that relevant information was issued to attendees well in advance of each of these meetings.	TO
<b>6</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	
6.1	There was no further business	
<b>7</b>	<b>Date/time/venue for next meeting</b>	
7.1	See 5.2 and 5.3 above.	ALL