

# Minutes of Meeting held on 13 July 2021 on Zoom



In attendance:

DR	Cllr	David	Ritchie	ESC (Chair)		RW		Rob	Wise	NFU
ASt		Alysha	Stockman	CPE (minutes)		AA		Alison	Andrews	AOCP
KT		Karen	Thomas	CPE		MF		Madeline	Fallon	CPE
TB		Tim	Beach	AOCP		KM		Keith	Martin	SCAR
DB	Cllr	David	Beavan	SCAR / ESC		SR		Sharon	Richardson	CPE
CB		Christine	Block	DEP		JM	Cllr	James	Mallinder	ESC
AR		Andy	Rouse	BCP		GS		Georgie	Sutton	MMO
RS		Richard	Steward	BEP		ASm		Andy	Smith	RFCC Rep
TC	Cllr	Tony	Cooper	ESC				Adam	Rowlands	RSPB
GN	Cllr	Graham	Newman	SCC				Will	Burchnall	BMSDC
SB		Sharon	Bleese	CPE			Cllr	Keith	Patience	ESC
SK		Sam	Kench	NE						

Apologies: Simon Amstutz (AONB), Gary Watson (EA), Mark Johnson (EA), Sarah Barker (IBC), Matt Hullis (SCC), Greg Hall (AW), Julian Gregory (JG), Graham Underwood (UoE), James Darkins (BEP), Philip Ridley (ESC), Lisa Chandler (ESC), Emma Dixon (WMA), Jane Marson (IDB)

1.	Welcome and introductions	The Chair shared a round of introductions.
2.	Norfolk and Suffolk Coast Transition Programme	<p>KT shared that CPE were successful with their Innovative Resilience Fund bid and are now starting to develop the project ahead of going for an Outline Business Case.</p> <p>The Chairman asked what KT meant by there is no emergency planning response for coastal erosion. KT added it is not recognised on the national risk register. SB added this is important because the national risk register informs the community risk registers that drive emergency planning within the resilience forums.</p> <p>ASm suggested taking the presentation to the RFCC. KT confirmed she is attending later this month.</p> <p>GN asked if the £8.4m is for planning the improvements rather than structures. KT confirmed this and added it is important not to raise expectations that this will create capital schemes. CPE will be using the funding predominantly to get into the communities, look at their options and create a plan around that.</p> <p>TB the RFCC engagement group had a discussion at their last meeting around different projects that were happening within the area and appointing engagement officers or engagement work on the same thing as CPE is doing in different places. There is some work that can be done to supplement what CPE is doing that will help those discussions.</p>
3.	Pakefield Stage 1 update	<p>Got the funding to do this study through the pipeline fund. Public consultation in the autumn. Monthly meetings with community steering group</p> <p>AA asked if CPE have looked into any impacts the North Atlantic Oscillation Phase may have on the sediment movement. One of the options mentioned is to cut the cliffs back and AA asked what happens to that material. MF added the main sediment transport for Pakefield is still north to south, but the Ness is moving northwards against the southerly drift. There have been a lot of southerly winds recently. The cliff regrade would only be an option for where there are natural cliffs to the south. It would cut back the top and that material would sit at the bottom and make the cliff more stable.</p>

		<p>The Chairman asked if a cliff regrade involves losing land at the top including any caravans or properties. MF confirmed it would but it is not an option that has been put forward for where the properties are.</p> <p>CB asked at what point long term options start to be considered and with regards to breakwaters if the sooner that is done the more stable the immediate problem becomes. MF added Pakefield is unique as the Ness is migrating northwards and at some point it will be in front of Pakefield with a wide beach. The options are medium term at the moment based on the knowledge of Benacre Ness moving northwards.</p> <p>SB added CPE will continue to keep the Forum updated and will come back for the Forum's decisions and thoughts around the SMP policies.</p> <p>AR asked if the large liquid chemical waste dump had been taken on board as a risk factor. SB confirmed it has been raised before and the Environment Agency (EA) are comfortable with the situation as it stands currently. This particular project will not go quite as far as that but it is something CPE will look out for in any plans.</p>
4.	Southwold to Walberswick Board	<p>DB shared the Board has had two meetings so far and members include ESC, CPE, Suffolk County Council, EA, Natural England (NE), parish councils, BEP, local landowners, and harbour users. The Board aims to inform and involve the community, work together with multiple agencies to agree joint defence strategies, identify priorities, and build resilient communities. The Board is currently working on short term measures for next winter at Potters Bridge and community engagement later in the year. The board is also looking at the new harbour study and renewing emergency plans.</p> <p>The Chairman highlighted the new Southwold Harbour Management Committee that he also chairs.</p> <p>ASm asked if the Board covers the BEP area and these interact. DB added the BEP are members of the Board and the Board is working together and looking at the area as a whole.</p>
5.	Relationship between FCERM and Planning	<p>ASm shared the interface between the coastal professionals, represented by the SMPs and flood maps, and planners is rarely good. At both local plan and development control level, that relationship is capable of better cross-departmental understanding.</p> <p>ASm raised the issue that SMPs do not cover the estuaries. The Deben Estuary Plan did fulfil that role between 2015 and 2020 but is not in the current Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. ASm that Coastal Change Management Areas are not represented in a way that would help planners or an applicant in understanding what they can and cannot do.</p> <p>ASm suggested creating a separate group to discuss this and find a way forward to give a better understanding of issues both in terms of erosion lines and floodplains with a possibility of improving things locally to start with. There is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) going through which may be a way forward but in the longer term it does need to be clear in policy terms. ASm suggested someone from planning policy or development control should join the group.</p> <p>KT shared that CPE and the East Anglian Coastal Group are engaging with the planners to look at the SPDs. CPE have agreed across their three councils to progress a standard SPD across the frontage. The intention is to write a SPD that represents what objectives with regards to climate change and sea level rise. The LGA Coastal SIG Adaptation Working Group has identified that engaging planners is really key and are looking for good practice examples where planning has worked in terms of resilience around the coast and later this year will be feeding that into the coastal handbook. The Working Group also want to hold a national planning workshop to invite planners to discuss this topic.</p>

		<p>CB raised that in the Deben issues that are influencing the management of an estuary are not necessarily recognised in planning terms when dealing with applications that are only dependent on the surrounding land in the context of other development.</p> <p>AA added the Alde and Ore Plan was recognised when it was approved as being a document of material importance in planning but was done at a higher level showing all the flood cells and what areas would flood up to 5m if the walls went. AA suggested part of the coming together is that when maps are created they say what it is doing for that function.</p> <p>ASm asked to continue the discussion outside of the meeting. KT agreed.</p>
6.	SMP Refresh	<p>MF shared the objectives of a SMP are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to define, in general terms, the risks to people and the developed, natural and historic environment, within the area covered by this SMP, over the next century.</li> <li>• to identify sustainable policy options for managing those risks.</li> <li>• to identify the consequences of implementing these policy options.</li> <li>• to set out procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the SMP policy options.</li> <li>• to identify areas that the SMP cannot address when following current guidelines.</li> <li>• to inform others so that future land use and development of the shoreline can take due account of the risks and SMP policy options.</li> <li>• to comply with international and national nature conservation legislation and biodiversity obligations</li> </ul> <p>MF added in December 2019 CPE, EA, NE, Jacobs, and Royal HaskoningDHV met to go through in detail every policy unit in SMP 6 and 7. The outcome of that was a very detailed health check document where the units were assessed against policy change, policy implementation, physical factors, funding requirement, planning and adaptation, natural environment, and other. A status tracker will be introduced and sit on the new national website. By April 2022 the action plans will be completed to capture all the data and future planning for that policy unit.</p> <p>As part of the refresh project, the EA have recognised that all the coastal groups require extra resource to carry out these tasks. CPE are recruiting an SMP coordinator focussing on Norfolk and Suffolk to go through all the tasks.</p> <p>AA asked MF to think about any contributions needed from the Forum or estuary partnerships.</p> <p>CB asked what the policy change triggers are. KT added if there was a change in legislation or statutory direction that affected a policy, that would need to be looked at. It is more likely that where there is new information, technical advice, or something is behaving differently now to what it did before would be the trigger for a policy review. CB asked if local change is perceived by the community, they could alert CPE to that problem and ask for a review of the SMP policy. KT agreed and added at Pakefield CPE were going to consider a SMP policy change as a result of something odd that had been included in the SMP but as a result of very rapid erosion, the community asked for it to be looked at. Whether or not a policy change is going to go ahead is something that would be brought to the Forum.</p>
8.	Updates from partners	<p><b>Deben Estuary Partnership</b> – CB shared the partnership were offered the use of a small building on Bawdsey Quay for free so are turning it into a pop-up exhibition/marine centre over the summer.</p> <p><b>Natural England</b> – SK shared NE are advising on Pakefield, Thorpeness and Kessingland pumping station.</p> <p><b>Suffolk Saltmarsh Group</b> – KT shared Graham Underwood has received some funding so is able to support the group and KT hopes to bring something back to the group in the autumn.</p>

		<b>Marine Management Organisation –</b> GS added the South East Marine Plan has been adopted. The MMO are involved in the national drive Operation Seabird to increase education about disturbance on the coast.
9.	Key dates and forward look	SB shared the Southwold to Walberswick Board will meet in September. The virtual conference will be on 7 <sup>th</sup> October.
10.	Suggested agenda items for future meetings	No agenda items were suggested.
11.	Previous minutes	The Forum approved the previous minutes.
12.	Any Other Business	<p>The Chairman raised the issue of Sizewell C.</p> <p>KM added that now SCAR have seen ESC's response on the details of the hard and soft coastal defence features, they are comfortable that the team is working on those issues. SCAR's concern is about the long term and KT has offered time outside the meeting to discuss this. SCAR's view is that there has been too much focus on the short term and not enough on the long term and they doubt the greater Sizewell Bay is a self-contained sediment unit.</p> <p>KT reassured the Forum that Thorpeness has been raised in discussions and any small change could have a big impact there. CPE want to make sure that Thorpeness has been covered off properly in discussions with EDF and in the evidence presented tomorrow. CPE has identified the need for a broader monitoring package to the north and the south and there has been some resistance to that from EDF. KT added there are some issues that may appear to be in the longer term that are not being dealt with at this stage but there are other processes that CPE have started to engage with.</p>
		Close at 12.20