

Overstrand to Walcott Strategy Study

Consultation (Issues and Concerns)

Final Report

**Report EX 4692
Sept 2004**

Overstrand to Walcott Strategy Study

Consultation (Issues and Concerns)

Final Report

**Report EX 4692
Sept 2004**



Address and Registered Office: HR Wallingford Ltd. Howbery Park, Wallingford, OXON OX10 8BA
Tel: +44 (0) 1491 835381 Fax: +44 (0) 1491 832233

Registered in England No. 2562099. HR Wallingford is a wholly owned subsidiary of HR Wallingford Group Ltd.

Contract - Consultancy

This report describes work commissioned by North Norfolk District Council whose representative was Mr Peter Frew. The HR Wallingford job numbers were CDR3212 and CDR3214. Mr. Peter Lawton of St La Haye and members of the Engineering Systems and Management Group and the Coastal and Seabed Processes Group carried out the work. The HR Wallingford project manager was Mr Paul Sayers.

Prepared by
(name)

.....
(Title)

Approved by
(name)

.....
(Title)

Authorised by
(name)

.....
(Title)

Date

© HR Wallingford Limited 2004

HR Wallingford accepts no liability for the use by third parties of results or methods presented in this report.

The Company also stresses that various sections of this report rely on data supplied by or drawn from third party sources. HR Wallingford accepts no liability for loss or damage suffered by the client or third parties as a result of errors or inaccuracies in such third party data.

Summary

Overstrand to Walcott Strategy Study

Consultation (Issues and Concerns)

Interim Report

Report EX 4692

May 2002

This report was prepared in order to describe the process of consultation with both statutory consultees and stakeholders. It describes the methodology used and summarises the responses from all consultees.

There were two tranches of consultation. The first tranche, the initial consultation, was carried out in February 2002 and involved organisations associated with the Overstrand to Mundesley stretch of coast. The second tranche, in February 2003, brought in all consultees associated with the extension of the strategy study frontage to Walcott.

Contents

<i>Title page</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Contract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Summary</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>vii</i>

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Consultation philosophy	1
1.2	Range of interests consulted	1
2.	Methodology	3
3.	Summary of responses	3
4.	Parish Council meetings	6
4.1	Overstrand	6
4.1.1	6 th March 2002	6
4.2	Mundesley-on-Sea	6
4.2.1	18 th March 2002	6
5.	References	7

Appendices

Appendix 1	Documents sent out during consultation
Appendix 2	Further information from Norfolk Landscape Archaeology; Historic, buildings, sites and monuments
Appendix 3	Minutes from Overstrand Parish Council meetings
Appendix 4	Minutes from Mundesley-on-Sea Parish Council meetings

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Consultation philosophy

The MAFF Interim Guidance for the Strategic Planning and Appraisal of Flood and Coastal Defence Schemes (MAFF 1997) recognises the essential nature of consultation in strategy development. In accordance with this guidance, the two key principles underlying the consultation exercise for the Overstrand to Mundesley Coastal Defence Strategy Study were openness and access. Thus, the project was undertaken in a transparent manner, with all relevant information available to interested parties. Furthermore, throughout the duration of the project, efforts were made to ensure that interested parties were able to contact members of the client or project team as necessary.

The two main objectives in undertaking the consultation exercise were:

1. To ensure that all people or organisations with an interest in the long-term development strategy for the study area have the opportunity to express their views and aspirations for consideration during the development process.
2. To collect relevant and up to date information relating to processes and practices within the study area.

However, the approach also recognised the context within which the study was undertaken, in particular the extensive consultation carried out during the preparation of the Shoreline Management Plan (Halcrow 1996) and that associated with the various coastal defence and other types of planning and development initiatives.

1.2 Range of interests consulted

There are very many diverse human and natural environment interests within the study area and the consultation process aimed to consult and involve representatives of as many interest groups as possible. Those parties with potential interests were identified through a range of investigations including the following:

- National, regional, and local organisations such as the Environment Agency, English Nature, and North Norfolk District Council.
- Organisations identified during the preparation of the SMP.
- Other organisations known to members of the consultant's team.

In addition to statutory consultees, those representing the following types of organisations were invited to participate in the consultation process:

- Adjacent local authorities
- Town, parish and district councils
- Councillors and elected representatives
- Conservation organisations
- Landowners
- Commercial interests
- Fisheries and angling
- Recreation, leisure and tourism.

A full list of organisations consulted is shown in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 Initial Consultees

Organisation	Contact Person
Private access to beach	C. Payne
Private access road to lifeboat station	G. Warnes
Anglian Coastal Authorities Group	Paul Patterson
Coastwatch	Richard May
Countryside Commission	David Vose
District Councillor	Wyndham Northam
East of England Tourist Board	Neil Warren
English Heritage	Louise Clark
English Nature	Peter Lambley
Environment Agency	Steve Hayman
GO-East	C. Whitworth
Ministry of Defence	B. Topps
Mundesley Museum	Julie Chance
Mundesley Parish Council	Julie Chance
Mundesley Volunteer Inshore Lifeboat	Bob Fracis
National Trust	Simon Garnier
Norfolk Coast Project	Tim Venes
Norfolk County Council	Heidi Mahon
Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Edwin J. Rose
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	John Hisket
North Norfolk District Council	J. Fathers
North Norfolk District Council	Peter Frew
North Norfolk Fishermans Society	Ivan Large
Overstrand Parish Council	Joan Mapperley
Pubmaster Ltd	Andrew Whetung
Royal Commission on Ancient and Historic Monuments	S. A. Waring
RSPB	John Sharpe
Shellfish Association of Great Britain	G. K. Askew
The Crown Estates	J. V. Molloson
The Manor Hotel	J. Bolton
The National Centre for Ornithology	Claire Forrest
The Norfolk Society	Ian Shepard
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	
Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF-UK)	Sian Pullen

Following the extension of the study area to Walcott, a further tranche of consultation took place to include locally interested organisations and, again, the statutory consultees. The organisations consulted in this tranche are shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 Second Tranche Consultees

Organisation	Contact Person
Anglian Coastal Authorities Group	Mr Paul Patterson
Countryside Commission	Mr David Vose
East of England Tourist Board	Mr Neil Warren
English Heritage	Mr Philip Walker
English Nature	Mr Peter Lambley
Environment Agency	Mr Stan Jeavons
GO-East	Mr C. Whitworth
Government office for the Eastern Region	Ms Caroline Adams
Happisburgh and Walcott Parish Council	Mr. T. Love
Ministry of Defence	Mr Neil Cartwright
NNDC	Cllr. Wyndham Northam
NNDC	Councillor Donald Venvell
NNDC	Councillor Michael Strong
NNDC	Councillor Susan Willis
NNDC	Mr Peter Frew
Norfolk County Council	Heidi Mahon
Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Mr Edwin J Rose
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Mr John Hisket
North Norfolk Fishermans Society	Mr Ivan Large
Paston Parish Council	Mr. M. Cambell
Royal Commission on Ancient and Historic Monuments	Mr S A Waring
RSPB	Mr John Sharpe
The Crown Estates	Mr J V Molloson
Trimingham Parish Council	Mr K. Benford

2. METHODOLOGY

Initial Consultation was undertaken by post. Documents sent to selected consultees included an overview of the aims and objectives of the strategy study, and a two-page questionnaire. Consultees were invited to comment on all aspects of the study and to express their concerns and aspirations for any future strategy. The list of consultees was identified in conjunction with North Norfolk District Council and is listed in Tables 1.1 and 1.2. A copy of the documents sent out during the consultation is given in Appendix 1.

3. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Table 3.1 below provides a summary of the responses received from the initial consultation and the issues emphasised. Table 3.2 below provides a summary of the responses received from the second tranche. Each of these responses were reviewed and taken into consideration when later developing the long-term management strategy. Where appropriate, consultees were contacted for additional information and recommended leads and contacts were followed up.

Table 3.1 Summary of Consultee Concerns – Initial Consultation

Consultees	Summary of response
C. Payne	(Private access to lifeboat station)
G. Warnes	(Private access – details being pursued)
Anglian Coastal Authorities Group	No corporate comment
Coastwatch	No specific comments
Countryside Commission	Main concerns with impact of designs on landscape and that any works should be fitting with local character. Concerns of works also adversely affecting tourism and recreation.
District Councillor	No response
East of England Tourist Board	No response
English Heritage	No response
English Nature	Concerns with general impact on SSSIs
Environment Agency	No response
GO-East	Keen to ensure that appropriate opportunities are taken to improve recreation, agriculture and commercial activities.
Ministry of Defence	No response
Mundesley Museum	No response
Mundesley Parish Council	Concerned with maintenance of defences, groundwater in cliffs, cliff stability to the west of Mundesley and surface water drainage.
Mundesley Volunteer Inshore Lifeboat	No response
National Trust	No ownership, no comment
Norfolk Coast Project	Due consideration should be given to impact on adjacent AONB. Maintenance of public access, and improved access where consistent with AONB. Need to allow natural evolution of coast.
Norfolk County Council	Further consultation required for strategic planning, minerals, environment, landscape, access, historic buildings, highways and Norfolk Coast Partnership.
Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Mundesley – 8 findspots on beach, WWS rare example of military underground headquarters Overstrand – 2 findspots on beach, including aircraft; Pleasaunce historic gardens. Received further information on the Pleasance, Pleasaunce Garden, and defensive WW2 structures (for details see Appendix 2).
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Concerned with impact of strategy on County Wildlife Sites (CWS1228 – Mundesley Cliffs & CWS1202 – Overstrand Cliffs)
North Norfolk District Council	Stated consideration should be given to sustainability of defences, cliff stability, loss of beach and impact on commerce in region, restriction of new development, drainage/run-off on cliff top
North Norfolk District Council	Concerns expressed about beach levels and groynes. Keen that access be given due consideration across rock at base of Clifton Way. Reference should be made to Local Plans.
North Norfolk Fishermans Society	No response

Table 3.1 Summary of Consultee Concerns (continued)

Consultees	Summary of response
Overstrand Parish Council	Concerns with maintenance of defences, groundwater in cliffs, improving public access to beach, WC on promenade, rising sea levels, public boat launching facilities, erosion risk to village.
Pubmaster Ltd	(Possible private defence and access owners)
Royal Commission on Ancient and Historic Monuments	Concern that archaeology be a feature of any impact assessment and that the local NCC archaeological unit be consulted.
RSPB	No major issues. Keen to ensure that implications of options for the wider SMP area are evaluated.
Shellfish Association of Great Britain	No response
The Crown Estates	Interest in easements dating back to 1937 in Overstrand and 1897 in Mundesley
The Manor Hotel	(Possible owner of private defences)
The National Centre for Ornithology	Not able to comment
The Norfolk Society	No response
Trinity House Lighthouse Service	Expressed concerns that works should take account of the navigational needs of mariners, sailors and jet skis. Wish for review of groyne markers used by NNDC
Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF-UK)	No response

Table 3.2 Summary of Consultee Concerns – Second Tranche

Consultees	Summary of response
Anglian Coastal Authorities Group	No corporate comment
East of England Tourist Board	Mark Johnson. Impact of defences and work on defences on Tourism
English Nature	Too many defences. Need to ensure a naturally functioning coast. Concern that we are moving towards a headland/bay scenario. Aspires to the removal of defences which would contribute to UK BAP targets for soft cliffs
Environment Agency	Forwarded to Karen Thomas - no response
GO-East	Proposals to bear in mind the EU ICZM concept.
Happisburgh and Walcott Parish Council	Worried that a bay might form at the end of the defences at Ostend in a similar way to Happisburgh with outflanking.
Norfolk County Council	Interested in sustainability. Concerned about threat to public access
Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	General concern on the effect upon archaeological sites
Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Keen to see a roll back of semi natural cliff top habitats in areas of erosion
Paston Parish Council	Wishes to be kept informed. Particularly interested in the relationship with the Gas Site
RSPB	The importance of this area for birds is not of major significance therefore no comment
The Crown Estates	The southern end of the study area falls within an admitted claim to DGT Tacon or successor in title

4. PARISH COUNCIL MEETINGS

The minutes of the Overstrand and Mundesley parish meetings are included in Appendices 3 and 4 respectively. However, summaries of the issues addressed are discussed below.

4.1 Overstrand

4.1.1 6th March 2002

A presentation of the strategy study was made to the Overstrand Parish Council on 6 March 2002 at the Parish Hall in Overstrand. Chairmen, vice chairmen, councillors, district councillors, and members of the public attended the meeting. An overview of the strategy process was presented followed by the details of the study to date. The opportunity was taken to encourage those present, and others, to contribute to the consultation process. Following the presentation there was a period of open discussion to allow all interested parties to express their views.

The main comments made reflected the keen interest of the Council to maintain and enhance the recreational and tourism attributes of the seafronts. Concerns expressed included the maintenance and repair of existing defences, groundwater in the cliffs, risk of erosion, the appearance of any works to complement local character, and surface water run-off.

In addition to the open forum session, those attending were invited to make further comments by post at a later date. However, no new issues were identified using this feedback process.

4.2 Mundesley-on-Sea

4.2.1 18th March 2002

A presentation of the strategy study was made to the Mundesley-on-Sea Parish Council on 18 March 2002 at the Parish Hall in Mundesley. Chairmen, vice chairmen, councillors, district councillors, and members of the public attended the meetings. As previously at Overstrand, an overview of the strategy process was presented followed by the details of the study to date. The opportunity was taken to encourage those present, and others, to contribute to the consultation process. Following the presentation there was a period of open discussion to allow all interested parties to express their views.

The main comments made reflected the keen interest of the Council to maintain and enhance the recreational and tourism attributes of the seafronts. Concerns expressed included the maintenance and repair of existing defences, groundwater in the cliffs, risk of erosion, the appearance of any works to complement local character, and surface water run-off.

In addition to the open forum session, those attending were invited to make further comments by post at a later date. However, no new issues were identified using this feedback process.

5. REFERENCES

Halcrow 1996 Sheringham to Lowestoft Shoreline Management Plan Sediment Sub-cell 3B. Phase 2, Shoreline Management Plan Strategy Document. North Norfolk District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, Waveney District Council & the National Rivers Authority.

MAFF 1997 Interim Guidance for Flood Defence and Coast Protection: Notes for Guidance. LDW 12 (7/97).

Appendices

Appendix 1

Documents sent out during consultation

OVERSTRAND COASTAL STRATEGY PLAN
January 2002
Initial Consultation Reply Form
(Please expand if necessary)

Organisation: _____

Principal Contact: _____

Job Title (if appropriate) _____

Telephone: _____ Facsimile: _____

Email: _____

1. Areas of Interest (If appropriate, please mark up and return the attached map)

2. Subjects/ Activities of interest (e.g. historic, archaeology, nature conservation, recreation, coastal defence)

3. Concerns regarding sea defence

4. Concerns regarding erosion

5. Concerns regarding the natural environment

6. Concerns regarding recreation use of the coastal zone

7.	Aspirations for enhancement of the natural environment
8.	Aspirations for improved recreation / tourism
9.	Future development aspirations
10.	Particular issues that may constrain development (e.g. public access, risk of erosion, loss of habitat, visual impact)
11.	Information you would like us to review / be made aware of (e.g. publications, field data, historical photographs of flooding / erosion)?
12.	Are you aware of any studies undertaken since the completion of the Shoreline Management Plan that you think may be relevant? Please list.
13.	Any other comments

If you wish to discuss the development of the Strategy Plan further, please contact Peter Lawton of St La Haye, Consulting Engineers.

«Title» «First_Name» «Last_Name»
«Organisation»
«Address»
«Post_Code»
Your reference
Our reference

29 October 2004

Dear Sir

North Norfolk Coastal Strategic Studies

You may recall that North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) completed a Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) for the coastline between Sheringham and Lowestoft some years ago. The next stage in the shoreline planning process is to develop a series of Coastal Strategy Plans; each covering just a portion of the coastline contained in the SMP but in more detail.

In association with HR Wallingford, we have been commissioned by NNDC to complete a study for the Mundesley to Walcott frontage (plans enclosed). This study will consider wave and tidal processes, sediment transport, the condition and performance of the existing coastal defences and how they interact with the human and natural environment. The study will go on to identify the most appropriate future method of managing this stretch of coastline and where appropriate protecting land from flooding, erosion and environmental degradation in so far as it affects or is affected by shoreline management. Where possible, opportunities to enhance the local amenity and natural environment through improved shoreline management will be explored.

In summary, the main objectives in developing a Coastal Strategy Plan, as set out by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), are as follows:

- To develop a Strategy Plan that builds on the coastal policies established through the Shoreline Management Plan.
- To improve the understanding of the coastal processes and predict the likely future evolution of the coast.
- To identify all the natural and manmade assets within the area which are likely to be influenced by coastal processes.
- To identify an optimal approach to shoreline management and coast defence based on an integration of economic constraints, engineering and environmental issues.
- To develop a phased programme of sustainable works and maintenance for each of the discrete coastal frontages identified in the SMP.

- To develop an understanding of the likely extent of potential flooding both now and in the future.
- To develop an understanding of the environmental sensitivities and to enhance the environment (both human and natural). If necessary, effective mitigation measures against environmental degradation arising from proposed shoreline management activities will be identified.
- To take advantage of appropriate opportunities to improve recreation, agriculture and commercial activities.
- To ensure effective consultation and reflect, in the strategy, the views of all interested parties as expressed through the sensitive development of preferred options.

- To establish a programme of monitoring and a method of review for the adopted strategy.
- To report the findings of the study as a detailed non-statutory plan (the Coastal Strategy Plan) for managing the coastline. This will then form the basis for the development of capital schemes (where appropriate) and the implementation of management plans. (It is worth noting that this document will be subject to revision based on developments in the understanding of coastal processes and on unforeseen changes to the demands in the coastal zone).

We can only achieve the above objectives if we are fully aware of the needs and concerns of all interested parties. Clearly, however, our understanding can only be as detailed as the information we receive from you. We have attached a form that highlights a range of issues that may be of concern. Please complete this form and send it back to me at the above address, if possible by 28th February 2003. If you have any difficulty in responding by this date or wish to clarify any particular points, please feel free to contact Peter Lawton directly. If we have left insufficient room for your comments also feel free to expand on as many additional sheets as necessary. Responses will then be compiled and, where necessary, further information will be sought to ensure that we fully understand the interests and issues.

At this stage we only wish to make you aware of the development of the Strategy Plan for Mundesley to Walcott and to collate your initial thoughts, comments and relevant information. As the project proceeds, interested parties will be kept informed of the plans and there will be another round of consultation. We look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours faithfully

Peter A.J. Lawton

Appendix 2

Further information from Norfolk Landscape Archaeology; Historic, buildings,
sites and monuments

Norfolk Landscape Archaeology: Historic Buildings, Sites and Monuments (Full Report)

01/05/02

SMR Number	Site Name	Record Type
6477-NF6477	The Pleasance	Monument

Classification and Scoring

Type and Date		Materials/Evidence
CLOCK TOWER	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Building
HOUSE	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Building
GARDEN	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Building
HOUSE		
GATE	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Structure
GARDEN	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Structure

Class

Rating and Scoring

Proportion Scheduled 7

Location

National Grid Reference

TG24754090 Point

Administrative Area

Civil Parish OVERSTRAND, NORTH NORFOLK, NORFOLK

Address

Historic Names

Status and other references

NCM Site No - TG 24 SW/-
Sites & Monuments Record - 6477
Listed Building (II)

Description

By Lutyens 1897-9 from 2 existing houses <1>. E. Rose
Built for the first Lord Battersea. For full description see listed building description 1988 (grade II).
Also listed grade II each are the clock tower, entranceway, gateway, gazebo and sunken rose garden, the latter designed with the help of Gertrude Jekyll.
Comp. E Rose 8 August 1989.

HBMC register of historic parks and gardens denies the latter point. See 30482 for the garden itself
Comp E. Rose 14 March 1994

Sources

(1) Bibliographic reference: Pevsner, N.,

Associated Finds

Associated Events/Activities

Associated Individuals

Associated Organisations

Norfolk Landscape Archaeology: Historic Buildings, Sites and Monument (Full Report)

01/05/02

SMR Number	Site Name	Record Type
30482 - NF30482	Pleasance Garden	Monument

Classification and Scoring

Type and Date		Materials/Evidence
GARDEN	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Structure
GARDEN	Post Medieval - 1540 AD to 1900 AD	Structure
HOUSE		

Class

Rating and Scoring

Proportion Scheduled 7

Location

National Grid Reference

TG24654080 Point

Administrative Area

Civil Parish OVERSTRAND, NORTH NORFOLK, NORFOLK

Address

Historic Names

Status and other references

NCM Site No - TG 24 SW/-
Sites & Monuments Record - 30482

Description

Historic Garden Grade II*.

By Lutyens 1897-9 but no direct evidence of Gertrude Jekyll being involved. North terrace wall with steps to lawn, views to sea

Octagonal pavillion to west. Covered walk runs south parallel with house. Paved pool garden to west. Lawn, shrubbery and mature trees to south. Further west is rose garden with brick and stone walls. Inf from HMBC Resiter of Historic Parks and Gardens
The garden buildings are listed grade II, for which see under 6477
Comp. E Rose, 14 March 1994.

HBMC register of historic parks and gardens denies the latter point. See 30482 for the garden itself
Comp E. Rose 14 March 1994

Sources

Associated Finds

Associated Events/Activities

Associated Individuals

Associated Organisations

Norfolk Landscape Archaeology: Historic Buildings, Sites and Monument (Full Report)

01/05/02

SMR Number	Site Name	Record Type
14142 - NF14142		Monument

Classification and Scoring

Type and Date		Materials/Evidence
UNDERGROUND MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	Modern - 1901 AD to 2050 AD	Structure
GUN EMPLACEMENT BATTERY	Modern - 1901 AD to 2050 AD	Structure Building

Class

Rating and Scoring

Proportion Scheduled 7

Location

National Grid Reference

TG30953710 Point

Administrative Area

Civil Parish MUNDESLEY, NORTH NORFOLK, NORFOLK

Address

Historic Names

Status and other references

NCM Site No - TG 33 NW/-
Sites & Monuments Record - 14142

Description

Defensive structures, World War II.
Concrete entrances lead down to underground rooms
Seen E. Rose, 18 October 1978

In fact, mountings for 2 six-inch guns; concrete circular platforms with bolt rings for gun attachments.

Brick and concrete entrances lead to row of semi-subterranean rooms now flooded connecting the two.
Comp. E Rose, 27 October 1982

With the demise of the battery at Brancaster (site 31113), this is probably the only one left intact in Norfolk.

Comp. D. Gurney (NLA) 28 February 1995

2 March 1996. Condition very much as in 1982, and air photographs TG 3136, D-E. Most of the entrances have been bricked up, but a number of the closures have been breached by sizeable holes, presumably to permit unauthorised access.

Comp. D. Gurney (NLA) 8 March 1996

See record form in file by source (1), who adds:

Very rare 1940/41 coastal battery. Completely intact except for the covers of the gun platforms. Guns removed 1945/46. Survey No. H1-3

Comp. D. Walker (NLA) August 1996.

Sources

: Secondary File,,,
Aerial Photograph: TG 3136D,E,,,

Associated Finds

NF8102 Air Photography: Edwards, D. (NLA), 01/01/84 -

NF6264 Visit: Rose, E. (NLA), 01/01/78 -

NF13738 Visit: Gurney, D, NLA, 02/03/96 -

Associated Events/Activities

Associated Individuals

Associated Organisations

Appendix 3

Minutes from Overstrand Parish Council meetings

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OVERSTRAND PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 MARCH 2002 AT 7 PM IN THE PARISH HALL

PRESENT: Mr.Partridge (Chairman), Major Aylward (Vice-Chairman) Mr.Fathers Mrs.Brittlebank, Mr.Bolton-Maggs, Mr.Richards, Mr.Worthington, Mr. Paul, Mr.Garrod, Mrs.Haynes, Mrs.Fathers (District Councillor)

- 1 The Chairman opened the meeting and introduced Brian Farrow, Coast Protection Engineer for N.N.D.C. and Peter Lawton, an independent Consultant Engineer working with Hydraulics Research on the Strategic Coastal Study for Overstrand. They each addressed the meeting and gave details of the Shoreline Management Consultation Plan. Completion should be in June or July and the Parish Council will be consulted on the final definition.

The Council meeting was adjourned at 7.50 pm and the discussion was opened to the public.

Mr.Farrow and Mr.Lawton answered various questions from the floor, and, after being thanked by the Chairman for their attendance and information, they left at 8.30 pm. The Council meeting was then re-convened.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Mr.Francis, Mr.Randall (County Councillor)

3. MEMBERS GIVING NOTICE OF INFORMATION: Mr. Richards

4. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING.

After the following amendments, it was proposed and seconded that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2002 be signed.

Page 5 Present Mr.T not V.Richards

Page 9 Code of Conduct not Code of Practice

Meeting closed at 9.53 pm and not 8.53 p.m.

5. MATTERS ARISING:

Mrs. Haynes advised that the Records Office had returned to her a quantity of bank statements, cheque stubs and bills which they do not require to retain. It was suggested that they be taken to the Council Offices for shredding. Mrs. Haynes agreed to do this.

Appeal by Wing Commander Meyer .As this was only discussed at the February Council Meeting, our comments were too late to be considered. The Chairman apologised, and added that the Council's statements had in fact been made on the original application.

Local Strategic Partnership .Major Aylward had prepared a report, and this was put into the file for circulation.

Dog Fouling .The Clerk advised that she had contacted David McGraith, who is now the Dog Warden for this area, and he will be very happy to come to a meeting as requested. It was agreed that this should not be arranged for a Council Meeting and will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Bus Shelter .The Chairman advised that specifications have been drawn up and tenders are being obtained.

Jubilee Celebrations .An application for an Awards for All Grant had been sent off, requesting £2500 (being 5000 of estimated costs .the other 50% being in labour and other costs being expended by individuals and groups.

Allotments .The Clerk advised that she had written to the tenant in question, who has agreed to send a formal letter of notice in September, when the tenancy expires and at that time the

Appendix 4

Minutes from Mundesley-on-Sea Parish Council meetings

MUNDESLEY-ON-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

**“Pine Lodge”, Gimingham Road, Trimingham,
Norwich, NR11 8HP.
Telephone: (01263) 833902**

Minutes of the Meeting of the Mundesley-on-Sea Parish Council held on Monday 18th March
2002, at 7.30 pm in Coronation Hall
Mundesley-on-Sea

Those attending:- Chairman G. Cheadle, Vice Chairman F. Cousins, Cllrs. I. Baldrv, P.
Copeman, J. Corner, C.Flook, S. Jaggard, B. Messer,
E. Payne, R. Reynolds, B. Smith and A. Verney.

- 1) **Apologies for absence:- Received from Cllr. S. Hall.**
- 2) **Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 18th February 2002:-** Having been circulated, were taken as read and signed by the Chairman.
- 3) **Matters arising therefrom:-**

Mundesley Coastal Strategic Study:- Mr. Brian Farrow from NNDC and Mr.

Peter Lawton, Consulting Engineer, attended the meeting Mr. Lawton began by giving a resume of what had taken place so far which was alt reported in the minutes of our meeting of Monday 19th November 2001. In the case of Mundesley it had been decided to adopt a "Hold the Line Policy". The strategic study has been commissioned by NNDC and is being undertaken by HR Wallingford in conjunction with Bristol and Newcastle Universities. The aim is to find the best way in which the "Hold the Line Policy" can he implemented. The outcome of this study will be a proposal to NNDC for the long term planning of management, renewal and maintenance of Mundesley's sea defences. Included in this plan will be the implications for Mundesley and surrounding areas, and it will incorporate a large number of other issues and of which relate to safe guarding our coastal defences, all of which should result in a reasonable management plan for the future.

At present we are in the first consultation process whereby all interested parties are asked to give their views and express concerns and once all these replies have been collated then the second part of the process will commence. Any plans formulated must take account of the three Es. Economics, Engineering and Environment and all these requirements must be satisfied. It must be stressed however that any action which requires to he taken to "Hold the Line" must cost less than any assets to he protected. For example the cost of protecting land is £3000 per metre.

The Chairman commented that in the case of Mundesley he felt much of the erosion was coming from above and not the sea and we are experiencing landslip. Mr. Farrow replied he could not agree with this view as for example in the case of Seaview Road the cliffs themselves were attacked some three or four times a year by the sea thus causing Landslip. In the end any action at all which is taken depends on how much the Government is willing to spend to fund it.

Cllr. Copeman felt that the constant building of new properties very close to the sea was not helping as they produced more water which could add to the cliff erosion. Cllr. Payne said on the other hand if more properties were built then the council may consider there was more to protect.

Brian Farrow commented that on the question of boreholes which was one of our queries, the only way they work is firstly you need to find the source of the water and secondly it has to be taken into an aquaduct or something similar which will accept it.

Peter Lawton said it is clearly defined. The Government have to have it described as erosion or encroachment by the sea before they will consider any protection. The Chairman asked whether we would be allowed to see the report once it was completed. Mr. Lawton said once the information is collected, problems identified and outline solutions prepared we will be allowed sight of it. It is expected to be completed around July or August.

The Chairman then asked about the revetments which are in need of repair. Brian Farrow replied that repairs are being carried out but in view of the shortage of finance are prioritised. Cllr. Cousins asked at what point would Seaview Road be considered not worth saving? Brian Farrow replied the exact erosion rates are not known.

Peter Lawton commented that so far as East Cliff was concerned the policy was do nothing as opposed to hold the line. Cllr. Baldry commented that this was not satisfactory as there is a lot of tourism connected with East Cliff for example the holiday camp, to which Mr. Lawton replied that chalets were relocatable and the value should be to the nation as a whole and not personal.

Cllr. Verney then asked the position with regard to Bacton Gas Site and was told that this site held the same status as Mundesley.

Cllr. Comer commented that there had been a lot of slippage at Town End and Mr. Farrow replied that 18 years ago a large amount of sand had been deposited and he would go and have a look at the situation. Cllr. Baldry asked whether the Promenade could be taken further along. Peter Lawton said this can be taken into account and considered but would not necessarily be implemented.

Cllr. Payne asked whether they knew the effect of dredging. Mr. Lawton did not know but said there was a lot of concern. A study was being prepared. There being no further questions forthcoming the Chairman thanked Mr. Lawton and Mr. Farrow for attending and giving us their time.