

B10.2.4.5 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTING IN CHANGES TO SMP POLICY AND / OR DOCUMENTATION – *FAREHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL*

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Hill Head Residents Association	Response No	37
Revisions to SMP	Funding Issues Clarified in the final main SMP document.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>I am concerned that the public exhibitions were NOT sufficiently advertised locally to ensure that all interested parties could attend. E.g. were the private beach front householders in Hill head contacted? whilst the PU 5B02 states that this coastline has a proposed policy option of HTL in all epochs it is NOT clear whether there will be any central funding for the private beach front owners to HTL? Whilst it is appreciated that it should be in the interests to do so if they fail to do so in a coordinated manner it will impact on the remainder of the PU 5B02 coastline. this point needs to be addressed and need for a coordinated approach.</p>			<p>Thank you for your consultation response. Advertisement posters were placed throughout the borough of Fareham before the exhibition and the press also advertised the exhibitions in the Daily Echo and on BBC Radio Solent. The posters were also available to view and download on the North Solent SMP and the Fareham Borough Council websites. We also wrote to over 250 key stakeholders who had already expressed an interest to be involved in the SMP with details of all the exhibitions. Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property and the SMP policies of HTL and NAI do not conflict or remove these rights. A policy of HTL does not impose an obligation or requirement on owners to construct new or additional flood defences to manage potential flood risk to their property or neighbouring properties. Improvements or extensions to existing defences will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. Within each individual policy summary statement, where applicable, it is stated that no public funding would be available for the maintenance of privately owned defences even if they are frontages where HTL has been identified to manage the flood risk. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends broad-scale coastal flood and erosion risk management policy that will result in economically, socially and environmentally sustainable management of the shoreline. The</p>		

	subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy will provides further details about the sources and availability of funding and defence requirements required to implement the proposed policies.
--	---

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Hill Head Residents Association	Response No	45
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
A minor point only: the Meon Shore road is an increasingly important through route to Lee and Gosport and will have to be defended. Your current divide between Hill head HTL and Brownwich Cliffs NAI should I suggest be moved about 300 m westward to the area where the Meon Shore road turns inland. In practice the sea does not seem anxious to break through on this section of beach.			Many thanks for your comments, which highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. The Titchfield Haven frontage is included within the Lee-on-the-Solent to Gilkicker frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies.		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	73
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>I am concerned that there has been no mention of the chalets on the beach at Meonshore in the consultation report. I own one of the chalets so any changes to the North shore of the Solent is of particular concern to me and the other 40 odd chalet owners.</p>			<p>Thank you for your consultation feedback. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. This will also mean that the Meon shore beach chalets will be included within the policy unit extending from Titchfield Haven to Gilkicker frontage, with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. Within each individual policy summary statement, where applicable, it is stated that no public funding would be available for the maintenance of privately owned defences even if they are frontages where HTL has been identified to manage the flood risk. This has been stated throughout the draft SMP documents, however to further highlight this funding situation a further section regarding funding and privately owned defences has been included in the Draft SMP document. Public funding from Highways Authority may be available for maintenance of Meon Shore Road. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The SMP team recommend that you contact your local planning authority for further information. Information sent to consultee detailing the reference to the beach huts in appendix C and G1.</p>		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	75
Revisions to SMP	Wallington Frontage included in the plan.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5A22 Cadour Drive to A27 I live in the village of Wallington. The tidal effect of the estuary goes well beyond your boundary at the Delme Roundabout. There are many residents at risk of flooding mainly at spring tides, to this end flood signs are used at times of flooding, and many residents have been supplied with sand bags. Please will you include our Village in your plans for flood prevention?</p>			<p>Thank you for your response, which highlighted that the extent of the tidal floodplain of the River Wallington was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk from the River Wallington so the extent of the frontage and text has been revised accordingly and will be included within the frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need to reduce uncertainties regarding flood mapping and to determine tidal and fluvial flood risks for the River Wallington and the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required, through a Coastal Defence Strategy study or Scheme, has been identified within the SMP Action Plan. These studies will integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The continued requirement for strategic maintenance of drainage channels and former waterways to improve flood drainage has also been included within the Action Plan.</p>		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	76
Revisions to SMP	Cador Drive management unit boundary moved to be consistent on all maps				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5A22 Cador Drive to A27 – The plan shows the line between Units 5a21 & 5a22 is in the wrong place. Cador Drive is about 1/2 mile further east. The plan's policy for Cador Drive is HTL. However, because of the very poor existing condition of the shore-line defence at Cador Drive, to adopt this policy for the next 100 years, the existing sea wall will need to be replaced by a more robust structure. Thus, it would seem logical to ensure that the replacement is built to withstand any tidal surges and rises in sea level expected over the next 100 years. According to a survey carried out 5 years ago, the life expectancy of the existing defence will end in approx. 1 year. Therefore, early implementation of the plan in this area is urgently required. Further, to maintain the HTL 100 year policy east of Cador Drive, the replacement defence should be extended to join the recently built defence adjacent to Alton Grove, Portchester. To maintain the HTL 20 year policy west of Cador Drive, urgent work is required to preserve the existing coastline. Work will also be required to prevent possible encroachment of the sea to the west of the replacement sea defence. Consideration should also be given to a Portsmouth Harbour entrance flood gate or barrier to protect the whole of the Portsmouth, Fareham & Gosport harbour coast in exceptionally high tide conditions. A similar gate/barrier would obviously be needed at the Langstone Harbour entrance.</p>			<p>Thank you for your response, which highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5A21 and 5A22 was drawn incorrectly and will be revised accordingly. The issues raised regarding the degrading flood defences at Cador Drive and flood and erosion risk are recognised by Fareham Borough Council. Once the SMP has been adopted by the Local Authorities and the Environment Agency and approved by Defra, Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes will commence where necessary, which will determine how to implement the recommended policies. Whilst the SMP recommends a policy of Hold the line within Portsmouth Harbour along the Fareham frontage it does not guarantee or secure central government funding for maintenance or urgent improvement works. Cador Drive is a priority to Fareham Borough Council and they are currently exploring an opportunity to obtain funding for a Coastal Defence Strategy in order to progress required works. Monitoring of the Cador Drive sea wall is ongoing and the funding of new works will be determined through the Coastal Defence Strategy. Maintenance will continue until this is completed. The urgent need for the defence issues identified at Cador Drive to be addressed, have been included within the Action Plan. The SMP team recommend that you contact your local planning authority for further information.</p> <p>The feasibility of harbour dams has been investigated in a number of studies; the economic costs and the environmental and social implications of constructing and maintaining tidal barrages across the Solent harbour entrances would significantly outweigh the benefits. Many of the habitats within the harbours rely on the regular exchange</p>		

	of water, which if interrupted would cause a deterioration of these habitats (which would require compensation habitats to be created elsewhere) and reduce the leisure, recreation and aesthetic value that is afforded to this region.
--	--

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Meon Shore Chalet Owners Association	Response No	83
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5B03 Meon Road, Titchfield Haven to Hook Park: As an association and also as individual owners, we are concerned that no mention is made of the existence of the chalets at Meon Shore. These are substantial dwellings and are built right on the shore and therefore very vulnerable to any adverse change in the coastline. There are 49 of them and their average value would be somewhere in the region of £200,000 each in today's market. many have been in the owners family for several generations so there is strong emotional as well as financial bond with the site. We therefore consider it very important that all concerned know that the chalet site exists if any changes to the coastline are being planned which might affect the shingle beach at the Titchfield Haven/Meon Shore area of the coast.</p>			<p>Thank you for your consultation feedback. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. This will also mean that the Meon shore beach chalets will be included within the policy unit extending from Titchfield Haven to Gilkicker frontage, with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. Within each individual policy summary statement, where applicable, it is stated that no public funding would be available for the maintenance of privately owned defences even if they are frontages where HTL has been identified to manage the flood risk. This has been stated throughout the draft SMP documents, however to further highlight this funding situation a further section regarding funding and privately owned defences has been included in the Draft SMP document. Public funding from Highways Authority may be available for maintenance of Meon Shore Road. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the</p>		

	recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The SMP team recommend that you contact your local planning authority for further information. Information sent to consultee detailing the reference to the beach huts in appendix C and G1.
--	--

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	84
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>Our property, 35 Meon Shore, Titchfield Haven, Fareham.PO14 4HN, adjoining Titchfield Haven bird sanctuary is part of a very valuable site of 46 similar homes which apparently did not appear on drawings at the local exhibition. We are concerned that any action regarding the sea defences near to our site may adversely affect our current security and our site should have proper consideration. We are members of the Meon Shore Chalet Owners Association who are now registered as Stakeholders but we wish you to know that each Chalet owns the freehold of their individual property plus an interest in the common parts of lands surrounding the Site in the ownership of the Association. It is difficult to say the value of the properties but an average could be £200,000 making the total £10m without allowing for the value of the surrounding land.</p>			<p>Thank you for your consultation feedback. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. This will also mean that the Meon shore beach chalets will be included within the policy unit extending from Titchfield Haven to Gilkicker frontage, with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. Within each individual policy summary statement, where applicable, it is stated that no public funding would be available for the maintenance of privately owned defences even if they are frontages where HTL has been identified to manage the flood risk. This has been stated throughout the draft SMP documents, however to further highlight this funding situation a further section regarding funding and privately owned defences has been included in the Draft SMP document. Public funding from Highways Authority may be available for maintenance of Meon Shore Road. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been</p>		

	identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The SMP team recommend that you contact your local planning authority for further information. Information sent to consultee detailing the reference to the beach huts in appendix C and G1.
--	---

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	The Fareham Society	Response No	87
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>I think the North Solent SMP is a sensible and pragmatic approach. It appears to me to represent a more general and strategic approach than the East Solent SMP which it supersedes. My recollection of the latter was that it took a much more detailed look at the individual sections of the coastline rather than putting forward a general policy for the longer sections. There is one specific matter I wish to draw to your attention. The boundary between 5B02 and 3 is in the wrong place. As it stands it is positioned part way along the boundary for Titchfield Haven. The policy for 5B02 is HTL and 5B03 is NAI. This exposes the western half of the Haven and the low lying marsh are to the west to inundation which would outflank the area to the western end of 5B02 and make a nonsense of the HTL for this region. The boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 should be moved along the coast about 500m to the north west with plans to form a safe transition to rising ground behind the Brownwich cliffs, thus protecting the whole area occupied by the new reclaimed estuary of the River Meon.</p>			<p>Many thanks for your comments, which highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. The Titchfield Haven frontage is included within the Lee-on-the-Solent to Gilkicker frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies.</p>		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Wallington Village Community Association	Response No	88
Revisions to SMP	Wallington Frontage included in the plan.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>Our chief concern is the likely effect of predicted sea levels on areas of Wallington Village close to the tidal stretches of the River Wallington. The fact that the upper reaches of the estuary have been totally omitted from the published proposal is very disturbing- but not totally unexpected.</p> <p>Wallington has a long history of flooding. This organization came into being 30 years ago over an issue directly concerned with flood prevention and it has been devoted a lot of time pursuing a lasting solution in the years since. Environment Agency records will show that the Halcrow group, following very damaging floods in Hampshire in 2000/1, carried out the major study commissioned in recent years. In the wake of the report a number of recommendation were made and these have been mostly implemented. These include the replacement of a footbridge that had been identified as a significant factor in the flooding 92006) and collaborative work by WVCA, HCC and FBC in drawing up a Flood Emergency plan (1st edition 2003). In 2007 we became aware that a follow up study (Atkins Report) had been commissioned but was largely sterile because all of the larger solutions proposed had been rejected on cost/benefit grounds. At around this time FBC were also undertaking were also using Atkins to prepare a Project Appraisal Report for the Portchester castle to Hoeford Lake Shoreline Defence Strategy. In the copy of the draft that we obtained we were especially concerned to see the following:- “ It can also be seen from the flood risk mapping that there is an area</p>			<p>Thank you for your response, which highlighted that the extent of the tidal floodplain of the River Wallington was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk from the River Wallington. The extent of the frontage to be considered and text has been revised accordingly and will be included within the frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need to reduce uncertainties regarding flood mapping and to determine tidal and fluvial flood risks for the River Wallington and the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required, through a Coastal Defence Strategy study or Scheme, has been identified within the SMP Action Plan. These studies will integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The continued requirement for strategic maintenance of drainage channels and former waterways to improve flood drainage has also been included within the Action Plan.</p>		

<p>along the tidal reached of the River Wallington that is affected by tidal flooding. Atkins is currently carrying out a feasibility study for flooding along the River Wallington on behalf of the EA. For the feasibility study, tidal flooding was not considered to be significant flood risk along the Wallington compared to the risk of fluvial flooding. On this basis, tidal flooding along the Wallington has not been included in this strategy study on the basis that the area has been assessed as having little tidal flood risk.”</p> <p>Our concern was twofold in that the firstly it voiced the often repeated assertion that Wallington’s flooding problems are chiefly fluvial, but also seemed to have fallen between 2 stools. The CDS had left us out because it believed that our flooding was more fluvial than tidal and because Atkins has already carried out flood feasibility studies- studies which had now rubber stamped doing nothing. This SMP, whilst admirable in other respects, seems to perpetuate a sidelining of the significant number of at risk properties because the accompany plans do not show the River Wallington at all above the Cams Hall viaduct. In fact detailed maps show the normal tidal limit at Wallington bridge a third of a mile upstream and even the EA ‘Indicative combined fluvial and coastal floodplain’ diagram extends up to that point. We have been in detailed discussions with EA at Colvedene Court (Mr Ian Tripp) since Sept 2008 concerning the long-term solutions to Wallington’s flooding problems. With the emphasis now shifting more towards the tidal element of flood risk in the future we are particularly anxious that these discussions become more joined up and that you can confirm that there is no danger of Wallington River being missed from the latest plan.</p>	
---	--

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	107
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>I think the North Solent SMP is a sensible and pragmatic approach. It appears to me to represent a more general and strategic approach than the East Solent SMP which it supersedes. My recollection of the latter was that it took a much more detailed look at the individual sections of the coastline rather than putting forward a general policy for the longer sections. There is one specific matter I wish to draw to your attention. The boundary between 5B02 and 3 is in the wrong place. As it stands it is positioned part way along the boundary for Titchfield Haven. The policy for 5B02 is HTL and 5B03 is NAI. This exposes the western half of the Haven and the low lying marsh are to the west to inundation which would outflank the area to the western end of 5B02 and make a nonsense of the HTL for this region. The boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 should be moved along the coast about 500m to the north west with plans to form a safe transition to rising ground behind the Brownwich cliffs, thus protecting the whole area occupied by the new reclaimed estuary of the River Meon.</p>			<p>Many thanks for your consultation feedback. Many of the comments received regarding this section of shoreline have highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. The Titchfield Haven frontage is now to be included within the Lee-on-the-Solent to Gilkicker frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The SMP recognises the importance of recreational open space and the natural environment, both of which have been considered during the objective-led policy appraisal process. Coastal flood and erosion risk management are the primary concerns of the SMP and the most economically, socially and environmentally sustainable defence policies have been proposed. There is reference to the beach huts in both Appendix C Baseline Process Understanding, and Appendix G Policy Scenario Testing.</p>		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	D.Cox & Associates	Response No	127
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>Feel there is a need for a coordinated approach by the beach frontage owners to maintain their defences and that assistance should be provided by the Local Authorities towards the cost of these defences. The cut off for HTL at Meon Road Titchfield should be extended to a point west of the beach chalets to ensure the sea does not breach the chalets and Meon Rd.</p>			<p>Thank you for your comments. We have received a number of comments regarding the road and causeway to the west of Titchfield Haven and these have highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. The Titchfield Haven frontage is included within the Lee-on-the-Solent to Gilkicker frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage, with significant consultation with land, property and defence owners has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies.</p>		

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	130
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.				
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>My wife and I notice no mention of the holiday site of 47 huts/chalets situated at Meon Shore fronting Meon Marsh. We and other owners have diligently renovated and spent a great amount of time and money on stewardship on this area of the Solent shore. We feel whatever the Management Plans are consideration to the above area and its Council Tax paying owners efforts are not forgotten. Yours sincerely</p>			<p>Many thanks for your consultation feedback. Many of the comments received regarding this section of shoreline have highlighted that the draft policy unit boundary between 5B02 and 5B03 was drawn incorrectly. The intention is to manage the potential tidal flood risk at Titchfield Haven and Meon Valley so the policy boundary has been revised accordingly, moving it to the west to where the land rises at the start of the cliffed section of shoreline that runs westwards. The Titchfield Haven frontage is now to be included within the Lee-on-the-Solent to Gilkicker frontage with a recommended Hold the Line policy, although this does not guarantee public funding will be available for required future works. The need for a Coastal Defence Strategy Study that considers this frontage has been identified in the SMP Action Plan. This will undertake more detailed investigations to review and determine how to implement the recommended policies and the implications on the existing infrastructure and transport links. These studies will also need to integrate with other plans such as the Environment Agency's Catchment Flood Management Plans and site-specific studies. The SMP recognises the importance of recreational open space and the natural environment, both of which have been considered during the objective-led policy appraisal process.</p>		