

[REDACTED]

From: Roger Spencer <Roger.Spencer@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 16 September 2021 16:59

To: Tom Day [REDACTED] Dominic Henly [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Church Norton Spit - test of alternatives

Dear Tom,

I think we are pretty much past the point of considering options or alternatives. The change (and rate of change) in the spit/channel alignment is such that undertaking this cut seems to be the only timely, deliverable and therefore viable option.

Please see comments below against your 6 quoted options

Regards,

Roger Spencer
Engineering Services Manager, Place

T: 01903 737812

E: roger.spencer@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk



Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Tom Day [REDACTED]

Sent: 16 September 2021 12:39

To: Dominic Henly [REDACTED] Roger Spencer <Roger.Spencer@arun.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: Church Norton Spit - test of alternatives

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Dom, Roger,

I am drafting the HRA for the Church Norton Spit applications. I am at the stage of the test of alternatives. The 2016 information that has been re-submitted includes the following options:

1. Installing / upgrading cross shore groynes structures. These would be ineffective given the current situation.
2. Excavating a breach in the spit and trying to fix it in place with a training wall. This is allied to, but more invasive alternative than, that proposed and I am not convinced that a training wall would be achievable, effective or sustainable. It would probably introduce other, yet to exist, issues.
3. Closing the existing channel at Pagham beach. Does not address the issue of water quality within the Harbour or flood risk from the fresh water inputs (rifes) – input that would be unlikely to percolate naturally at a rate greater than the input. 'Fresh' water that contains the output from sewage treatment facilities and from chemical input from farming activities, so there would in all likelihood be a worsening of water quality (contrary to WFD) . The proposal is to relieve the pressure on the beach (not spit) at the current channel location
4. Progressively extending existing revetment / protection / shingle recycling on a reactive basis. This alternative was intended to address the eastward migratory erosion focus in front of the properties in West Front Road and ultimately East Front Road. The current issue is west of the property and one of flood risk and not erosion risk. A revetment may be able to be provided across the scour zone but this currently around 500m long and it would not be practicable to deliver in the time available ie before the likely break through
5. Maintaining the new breach further along the spit [i.e. the natural breach] and closing the existing tidal inlet. As below – given the natural evolution of the area, this is no longer an option.
6. Doing nothing and allowing the foreshore to evolve naturally. All indications are that there will be a serious risk of breach over the coming winter – not of the spit but of the beach itself, leading to inundation of many residential properties across the Pagham Beach Estate

Clearly option 5 is no longer relevant, option 6 is always in the running, but are options 1-4 still relevant? Are there other reasonable options which should be considered at this stage so that the HRA is robust? Even if they do not achieve the same outcomes or are potentially more damaging to the SPA , then they should still be tested as those issues will be drawn out as part of the test.

I have put the same questions back to the applicant, but given that they have not submitted a shadow HRA and are relying on several 2016 reports, it seems reasonable to ask for your thoughts at this stage as well.

Many thanks,

Tom



Tom Day

Environmental Co-ordinator
Environment
Chichester District Council

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk>

For all the latest coronavirus and council news, sign up to our monthly email newsletter:

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk/newsalerts>

