

Tracey Headley-Smith

From: Pagham Parish Council <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 January 2016 14:57
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: Pagham Planning Responses

Please be advised that the following application was considered at a meeting of Pagham Parish Council's Planning Committee on 5th January 2016. It would wish the following comments to be recorded:

P/97/15/PL– Managed breach of shingle spit and blocking of adjacent tidal inlet channel with shingle barrier. Formation of shingle island within harbour following excavation of adjacent area of spit. The Parish Council wished to comment in support of these applications which it had originated. Cllr Radmall circulated comments to the meeting which, subject to corrections of some typos, were endorsed by members.
RESOLVED: to SUPPORT the application and submit the following comments:

Pagham Parish Council SUPPORTS this application for the following reasons:

Some residents will recall the public consultation displays held at St Ninian's Hall during the development of the Coastal Defence Strategy for Pagham to East Head. There are many references in that document to managing the harbour mouth. In 2010 the EA project manager, during a crowded meeting at Pagham Village Hall, was asked why this was never undertaken. He responded that this was an option which was not implemented because it was felt that nature might naturally achieve that goal with zero cost. At that time there was up to 75 metres between sea front properties and the tide line along a significant length of the Pagham Sea Front. Much of that frontage is now at or below emergency levels (some as little as 7m). It is quite clear that it has been ADC's own intention to promote the re-engineering of the Church Norton Spit. The technical detail and the financial parameters had been the subject of two reports to Council committees by their Head of Infrastructure and Engineering and is also referred to several times in the 2009 adopted coastal strategy.

Clearly, there is nothing abnormal nor impractical in the proposed "community scheme". Indeed, it can be seen as a resubmission of that self-same solution proposed in 2007.

The June 2015 remastering of the 2005 EA Flood Map shows an extended breach of undefended coastal frontage east of the Yacht Club. Surge driven wave action is depicted as a major incursion into the central built-up area of Pagham. EA figures show 330 homes at risk in 2009, rising incrementally to 1350.

This is endorsed by the ADC-commissioned Strategic Flood Risk Assessment by Capita Symonds, which shows the Yacht Club as the predicted breach zone which at 5.3 – 5.5 metres AOD is significantly higher than much of the 1960's housing development inland.

The EA have admitted that the rate of erosion of the Pagham Beach frontage has far exceeded their own technical forecasts.

The financial burden falling upon ADC, as Erosion Management Authority, will soon be of such a magnitude (with marginal government assistance), that effective defence maintenance will be impossible. A major problem, as stated by Posford Duvivier (consultants) in 2008, is that if the seafront were breached there is no back defence. Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA) is a policy option for Pagham in the ADC Local Plan. It was made clear by EA's Area Manager, that this would be imposed if money ran out! (viz. remove vulnerable infrastructure and prepare a do minimum, retreat policy).

The Pagham Beach Estate was designated an ERA in 1979, by the Local Planning Authority having been inhabited since 1939 (long before the 1960's mass development). This "Established Residential Area" then became an "Area of Special Character" during the early 1990's. A formal "Design Brief" developed in 1975, was then supplanted by a

series of formal policy controls upon new housing, eventually to be replaced by a more relaxed control system of SPG and SPD (Supplementary Guidance).

If the seafront were to breach as predicted, which is a rapidly growing probability due to the extensive, aggressive linear erosion from Groyne 1 to the Aldwick boundary, a major flood route would be along the low-lying remnant of the original 1300-1900 harbour entrance located at Lagoon Road and Well Road, which terminates at the Lagoon, formerly known as "Pagham Basin" when the harbour had been an active commercial port. That would negate the recent EA/Bourne Leisure endeavour to seal the inner harbour and prevent the Lagoon from becoming tidal. The consequence of such a surge driven event would be to render inland Pagham, including the Parish Church, vulnerable once more, together with the Capita Symonds prediction of an outflanking of the sea wall via Slipe Field, which would replicate the 1910 event of tidal incursion via the Pagham Rife as far inland as Runcton.

A 1 in 20 year storm occurred over 4 days in March 2008 which drew crowds to witness the fearful scenes along the beach frontage. Although significant erosion happened, there was sufficient beach width resilience to cope, but urgent works in 2009/10 were rushed forward along the main danger sites (viz. Yacht Club breach zone).

Persistent aggressive storms of winter 2013-14 removed huge amounts of protective beach crest. A similar situation has affected the British Isles during the first part of this winter 2015/16. ADC continue to spend significant amounts on a weekly basis to move remaining rocks and shingle to the most threatened areas. Irrespective of all good intentions, it is becoming abundantly clear that the overriding influence of changing weather patterns, in line with climate change predictions, are now seriously prejudicing these "beach management" efforts, and have exposed the absolute folly of "adaptive management"

It is clear that a return to managing the harbour mouth, the tidal delta and nearshore banks, as previously implemented by NRA and predecessors, is essential for establishing any kind of sustainable future for Pagham.

Nicola

Nicola Jones
Clerk & RFO
Pagham Parish Council
Tel: [REDACTED]