

CROMER COAST PROTECTION SCHEME LIAISON GROUP

14th January 2014

COUNCIL CHAMBER, NORTH LODGE, CROMER



Present:

Peter Frew (PF) (Chairman)Project Manager
Brian Farrow (BF)NNDC, Coastal Engineer
Andy Boyce (AB)Cromer Preservation Society
Bill Gaff (BG).....North Norfolk Fisherman's Society
Duncan Nash (DN)Volkerstevin
Mandy Cornell (MC)Residents – Marine View
David MacNaughton (DM)Triangle Amusements
Peter Lawton (PL)URS
Richard Leeds (RL)RNLI Cromer
Bruce Stratton (BS)CTIS – Cromer Pier
Rebecca Wass (RWa)Cromer Pier
William Davies (WD)Cromer Fisherman
Marion Saunders (MS)Cromer Town Council
Ricky Wright (RW).....NNDC, Property Services
Rob Goodliffe (RG).....NNDC, Coastal Management Team Manager
Sharon Garth (SG)NNDC, Coastal Admin Supt

1.	<u>Introductions</u> Introductions were made round the table.
2.	<u>Apologies</u> Apologies were received from Cllr Angie Fitch-Tillett and Cllr Hilary Cox
3.	<u>Notes of meeting 16th December 2013</u> DM said that it was unclear in the note that said access to the Melbourne slope should be kept clear at all times (page 3, 3 rd point, 2 nd paragraph) that it included disability parking at the top of the slope as well. This was necessary as it was being used by disabled drivers as a replacement for the closed disabled parking at the bottom. With this change incorporated the notes of the last meeting were agreed. <u>Matters Arising</u> <u>Beach Huts</u> RW provided the meeting with the latest situation on the beach huts at the far east end. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letters have gone out to the owners of huts up to No 44 advising them to remove the hut/contents before contractor will come to clear up remains after the storm.• Huts 16-20 are still intact and can remain providing all breakables are removed.• 14 – 21st Feb half term week which has been allot for owners to remove huts/contents• 24-26 Feb contractor engage to remove huts and debris. DN to look at the works programme to see how these dates fit in. BF reminded the group that when making arrangements for the work that needed access along this frontage that it was now a Volkerstevin work site and they were to be consulted at all

	<p>times.</p> <p>It was suggested that BF, RW, DN, Volkerstevin site foreman and Mark from Renosteel should meet to walk the area in order to assess requirements and possible dates.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> Property Services to liaise with Volkerstevin with regards to dates</p>
4.	<p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>a. Works contract progress & programme of works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Office has been delivered, utilities connected and security measures put in place. • End of January delivery of sheet piling in 20t loads to the compound. These will then be transferred to the prom in 5t loads for storage until they are used. • Initial groynes work will also be carried out late January • Early February the drilling of the sea walls will begin. The Zig zag slope and the white steps access points will be blocked at this time. <p>BF asked</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Was it possible to allow access to a certain point on the steps to allow people to view the works? DN agreed this might be possible but also emphasised that it would be very noisy. ii. When it was likely that the zig zag slope would close as he had a contractor that would need access to underpin the bottom of the slope. iii. Concerns on the inspection of the nearby properties, had Volkerstevin received the list of addresses. DN confirmed they had received the list and that Ian Cussons was currently working his way through it. <p>b. Storm damage</p> <p>PL told the meeting that held been instructed by the consultants – URS, to look at the parapet walls and the cliff face between the Melbourne Slope and the Hotel de Paris. The report on the parapet walls was due imminently however the report on the cliff face would take a little longer. A visit by a geotechnical engineer had taken place and an outline had been prepared which would be available soon. It was likely this would be done in 2 stage approach, a quick robust temporary repair after which a 2nd geotechnical engineer's appraisal would take place and implemented if needed.</p> <p>WD asked if the new walls would be the same height and had concern over the size of the drainage holes along the parapet walls; when the repairs are carried out will the new holes be bigger. BF said the council were aware of his concern and would look into it. PL replied that the walls would be the same height and thickness but would have better drainage.</p> <p>AS asked how much of the Defence scheme had been re-appraised because of the damage caused by the storm? BF responded that in general the scheme had not been re-appraised only the storm damage. However, it was apparent that the parapet walls were not adequately fixed into the lower seawall and that item would be looked at.</p> <p>DM asked how far behind had the storm put the project. DN said the project was still on track with work on section 2 completed and work on section 3 started before close down of the first season. DM asked if work on the west end would be completed by March, as he was trying to assess whether it would be viable for businesses to set up again this season if the repairs to the parapets walls had not been completed. It was confirmed that it was not in the program of work for the parapets to be done this session. DM emphasised this</p>

	<p>could be a major issue for the businesses until the hole in the wall was repaired it would still leave them exposed to further storm damage.</p> <p>BF said he would look to see if there was something which could be done as he acknowledged that this affected a number of businesses.</p> <p>As the damage and issues caused by the storm was not anticipated, RG posed the question of whether there could be a case to extend the first year session beyond the 31 March.</p> <p>PF said the same thought has occurred to him and although the majority of those present were in favour talks would need to take place with the contractor to see what options were available that would benefit all concerned. BF expressed some concern about extending the contract saying nothing had changed since the last meeting. If this was in response to the loss of the parapet wall forcing the closure of a business then that is an issue which could easily be resolved.</p> <p>RW commented that it could also affect future tourism figures without any attractions it would not make a good impression on tourists coming at the start of the season, which could make them reluctant to return again.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> BF to provide WD with information on the drainage holes</p> <p>c. Information Boards & Flyers RG told the group he'd taken delivery of the information boards and the 1st print of the leaflets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information Boards are to be sited at the Volkerstevin works compound, the Pier and at the top of the Melbourne slope and gangway. • The 1st print of the leaflets had been brought to the meeting for circulation and RG asked the group to contact either himself or SG for further supplies. A copy of the leaflet will be uploaded to the Cromer coast protection scheme webpage. • Media releases would be released by NNDC when appropriate and will be made available on the website. <p><u>ACTION</u> Cromer Coast Protection Scheme leaflet to be added to the webpage.</p>
5.	<p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <p>a. Access RW told the meeting the tender for the rebuilding of the Chalets was in the process of being put together, but would need to speak to DN to ensure dates fitted in with the programme of works, if they don't it could mean tendering may need to be deferred until the first session close down at the end of March.</p> <p>RWa asked for confirmation that there would be access to the facilities on the pier at all times and asked if there would be much noise. RWa said to help with the access issue she had contacted their suppliers to request a smaller vehicles to be used for easier manoeuvrability. DN confirmed they were obliged to maintain access either from the west or the east at all times, and said for the theatre noise would not be too bad it would be more the vibration.</p> <p>AB asked if there was a timescale for when the decking on the pier would be repaired and if it would impact on the work being done by Volkerstevin. BF replied the survey and assessment had been completed and the contractor had submitted his price it was now in the hands of Zurich the insurers. BF would be liaising closely with DN to ensure the pier repairs didn't impact on the works being carried out on the Defence scheme.</p>

	<p>b. Parking DN told the meeting that the site office had received a couple of applications for parking permit which they had forwarded on to the council. RW said Property Services were maintaining tight control over the list of permits issued and issue dates, and suggested meeting with DN to update him on what permits had been issued when and for where to ensure this all fitted in with the programme of works. RW further suggested that the programme of works was circulated to a wider group.</p> <p><u>ACTION</u> Property Services to liaise with Volkerstevin regarding the rebuilding of the Chalets and the issue of parking permits.</p>
6.	<p><u>Future Arrangements and Next Meeting</u></p> <p>It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuesday, 18th February 2014 at Cromer Town Council, North Lodge starting at 2pm • Tuesday, 18th March 2014 at Cromer Town Council, North Lodge starting at 2pm.
7.	<p><u>A.O.B</u></p> <p>MC asked if there was a beach clean-up planned. BF replied there was an order of priority with major priority being the repairs a beach clean-up would be at the other end of the scale but would take place before the start of the tourist season.</p> <p>BS said the district council needed to be congratulated on the work that has been done and the speed that the repairs have been carried out. This was supported by rest of the meeting.</p>
	<p>PF thanked everyone for attending and the meeting closed at 15:10 pm.</p>