

Telephone Meeting with Angela Marlow
 Sussex and Kent Team – Sussex Coast and marina
 Natural England, Worthing, West Sussex, BN11 1LD

Project Ref: 030, Hampton Quay

Re: Informal Advice

Attendees:

Angela Marlow	AM / NE	Natural England
Robert Barker	RB / SSL	Stolon Studio (Director/Architect)
Emma Kingman (notes by)	EK / SSL	Stolon Studio (Part II Architectural Assistant)

Dear Angela,

We are writing regarding our discussion about the inter-tidal areas within the Hampton Quay application site boundary on Monday 17th August 2020.

We have provided points below for your reference and to be kept on file for our future submission.

Item	Discussion	Action
Salt marsh habitat	SSL explained the proposal is to retain the habitat and to seek to protect it where appropriate. RB explained that Carcinus (marine ecologists) provided advice in regard to the salt marsh habitat. Carcinus had indicated that the northern pioneer habitat was establishing well and therefore SSL had changed design to protect this. Carcinus had suggested using the pontoons as protection from boat wash and locating posts away from the edge of the mud flats. SSL had also incorporated this.	
Proposed pontoons	AM queried whether there is any more detail on how the pontoons will be implemented on site. SSL explained that the mooring posts are to be located in the river (not in the mud flats) and that moorings would only be provided on the river side to avoid impact on the saltmarsh.	None

	Carcinus suggested locating the access gantries in locations to minimise overshadowing to saltmarsh, therefore SSL had located one above an old concrete slipway and the others where there was no saltmarsh. SSL stated that further detail would be provided at reserved matters stage.	
Development hierarchy	AM suggested that she would like to see a development hierarchy from the ecology areas to the built up areas. SSL stated that this was exactly their concept and this forms the basis for the design.	
Sea Level Rise	AM indicated that rising sea levels could result in the loss of habitat and ideally, we should consider how this habitat could be provided in the future. RB stated that there was some space to do so but it was limited by the flood defence and raised road embankment, which formed the boundary to the marsh areas. SSL to indicate this in the DAS.	SSL
Habitat monitoring	The provision for habitat monitoring was welcomed by AM to help manage potential signs of erosion through the first five years of the development.	
Managing future residents	AM queried whether any consideration has been implemented to manage the future population of residents on site in regard to the presence of the habitat. RB explained that there is a footpath along the edge of the river / marsh and that this was an important feature. RB explained that visual interaction with the habitat was important and they did not want to create railings or barriers and instead to encourage a natural custodianship for the environment. AM suggested that educational elements could be implemented to increase awareness of the importance of the saltmarsh and to minimise any potential human impact on this.	SSL

	SSL agreed that this is a nice idea and indicate the types of plants and wildlife which are present in the inter-tidal areas on site.	
Previous discussions with EA	AM queried whether the Environment Agency had been involved in any discussions thus far. SSL confirmed that they had been consulted from the beginning of the project and throughout the design development.	