

B10.2.4.15 CONSULTATION FEEDBACK RESULTING IN NO CHANGES TO SMP POLICY AND / OR DOCUMENTATION – EASTLEIGH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	18
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
Sound and practical			Many thanks for your comments.		

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	44
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
I regularly with my dog walk along the foreshore between Netley hard and Netley Castle and its erosion is quite fast moving. Several large shrubs and trees have slipped from the clay cliffs in the past few months in the unprotected areas- particularly by the now abandoned school frontage. I feel that if no remedial action is taken soon the slippage and erosion will accelerate. Perhaps a series of gabions is the solution as several privately owned properties have used this method to successfully protect their frontage.			Thank you for your consultation response. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends coastal defence policy. Further details are included in the emerging Itchen to Hamble Coastal Defence Strategy study which determines how to implement the recommended policies for this frontage and assesses various defence options. Please contact you local council for further details.		

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	46
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
I find it disconcerting when planning permission is granted (albeit 5 yrs ago) to a site that fronts Netley foreshore and has and will experience			The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends broad-scale coastal flood and erosion risk management policy. Planning		

<p>severe onshore weather and erosion (Nightingale House- rear development). The site is constantly boggy and has underground tanks within- drainage must be an issue as well as irresponsible approach to planning in an area of flood zone. Why the permission has been extended as they only cleared the site i.e. removed bushes the day before the permission expired- surely this was an opportunity for the council to bring in a motion that this site is not appropriate for development as I understand would be the case if planning was now sought.</p>	<p>authorities will refer to the recommended policies to aid them in their decision making process when it comes to appropriate development and planning in the coastal zone to ensure spatial development takes place in an appropriate, sustainable way, from a functional, social, economic and environmental point of view. The SMP is only however one source of information that planning authorities refer to when making planning decisions, which will not be biased by the SMP policies. Each application will be dealt with on a case by case basis by the local planning authority. It is important to note that flood and coastal defences aim to reduce the risk of flooding and erosion to the assets they protect but they do not remove the risk completely. To be suitably adaptable to future change and future risks all new development should be appropriately adaptable, resilient and resistant and decisions on land use within flood and erosion risk areas should fully consider the risk and be adaptable to change. To discuss the specific planning issue you refer to please contact you local council.</p>
---	--

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	65
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5C09: this length of shoreline is relatively sheltered from wave/sea action and in my view it may be the action of rain and frost is the cause of the erosion of the cliff face. May I suggest that if this is the case, then the bank should be graded and planted with suitable vegetation to ensure stability and provide long-term protection to the adjoining properties?</p> <p>5C06- 5C11: this length of coastline is one of the longer lengths of coastline open to the public in the whole study area and forms the edge of extensive residential areas with probably ¼ million people</p>			<p>Many thanks for your comments. The SMP recognises the importance of recreational open space and the natural environment, 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.</p> <p>The SMP however is a high level strategic document and many of the issues you are raising are not specifically addressed by the study. Once the SMP has been adopted by the Local Authorities and the</p>		

<p>within easy reach. The policy of the various public bodies seems to have been one of leaving it alone for environmental reasons. However, there is unsatisfied demand for open space. Obviously there is a clear potential conflict between the environment and people’s needs so I would suggest that you consider low- key improvements to this coastline by:</p> <p>5C11: This has been subject of much investment but there is very little to show for the money spent. No further action needed.</p> <p>5C10: up-grade the public footpath.</p> <p>5C09: Provide a simple Board Walk to open access to this length of shore and to provide some protection to the cliff face. The boardwalk need only be a simple structure that can easily be maintained rather than a major promenade. There are now virtually indestructible foot boards available and they will need re-laying probably twice a year.</p> <p>5C08/09: Royal Victoria County Park: Re-pair and re-open the sea wall.</p> <p>5C08/07/06: Upgrade footpath and provide board walks.</p>	<p>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. This may then go some way towards addressing the issues and concerns that you have kindly raised. We will forward on the information you have provided onto to Eastleigh Borough Council's coastal team and recommend that you contact your local planning authority for further information.</p>
--	---

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	72
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>More action required imminently as frequent erosion in last couple of years. Why can we not use clean gravel dredged by ABP? This was agreed before so what has changed? Any wildlife living along the shoreline is being constantly disrupted by erosion and dredging</p>			<p>Many thanks for your consultation response. The use of material from the Southampton Approach Dredge at Netley has been dismissed due to concerns on how the pluming of dredged sediment could destroy the shell fishery, affect salmon migration and therefore potentially</p>		

<p>anyway. What is the difference paying for gravel from elsewhere? Hardly any mention of ABP but they are most responsible for the erosion?</p>	<p>have an adverse affect on the nearshore environment.</p> <p>A scheme will now be promoted using a different source of shingle, or even a modified scheme using different techniques. However this will need to be reassessed and go through the formal government funding scheme on cost benefit grounds etc, as any new proposals will not benefit from the urgency of taking advantage of the potential windfall resulting from the dredge.</p> <p>In light of the worsening situation at the frontage of Netley in front of some of the Victoria Road properties, Eastleigh Borough Council are proposing to apply for funding for emergency works to provide protection to the exposed soft sandy cliff areas to slow down the current rates of rapid failure. However they have been advised by the Environment Agency that it will be necessary to complete the Shoreline Management Plan and the Strategy before any schemes could be considered. The earliest these plans can be approved is in the last quarter of 2010. Therefore any immediate action is unlikely.</p>
--	--

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	BP Oil UK Limited	Response No	137
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5C07 Hamble Oil Terminal to Ensign Industrial Park Policy units 5C06, 5C07 and 5C08 BP are in agreement with the policy of holding the line for 5C07, where the developed frontage accommodates the Hamble oil storage site. It is also noted that the private owner retains the right to maintain sea defences so that the line can indeed be held. There is concern that for the units either side, 5C06, Hamble Common, and 5C08, Ensign Park, the recommendation is one of no active intervention. Although the report states that the natural topography and relative stability of the frontage</p>			<p>Owners of defences have rights to maintain defences and protect property/assets and the SMP policies do not conflict or remove these rights. The SMP makes provision for the coastal squeeze habitat losses resulting from maintaining existing sea defences to be met at public expense. This provision does not extend to any additional losses caused by new private defences. Improvements or extensions to existing defences (whatever the SMP policy) will require planning permissions and consents, as is currently the case and is not a new requirement. This includes identifying any impacts to designated</p>		

<p>restricts the extent of the tidal floodplain, there is a danger of flood water entering these frontages and outflanking BP's defence wall as depicted on the 2115 indicative 1 in 200 years flood maps. BP commissioned ABPmer to report on the effectiveness of the existing sea defences and a greater danger of flooding was identified from a tidal surge with high waves heights coinciding with high water levels. Leaving Hamble Common and Ensign Park defenceless could result in flood water outflanking the BP sea wall. It is recommended that the policies for 5C06 and 5C08 are reviewed. BP also have concerns arising from associated papers published as part of the draft SMP issued by the Environment Agency and Natural England in that they seek to curtail the improvement or extension of existing sea defences and would be seeking from the land owner the cost of providing compensatory habitats as replacements for those not created (not those actually lost) as a result of "coastal squeeze". With the prospect of land either side of the terminal not being protected, BP may well require to improve or even extend their existing defence.</p>	<p>habitats and providing appropriate mitigation or compensation. Responsibility for this rests with the party undertaking the works and causing the damage. The issue of private landowners funding compensatory measures, that are additional to the coastal squeeze losses already identified to be delivered through the Regional Habitat Creation Programme, is complex. The delivery process for such habitat requirements has not been confirmed at this stage. We welcome the opportunity to explore this issue with external partners.</p>
--	---

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	River Hamble Harbour Authority	Response No	145
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>The River Hamble Harbour Authority is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan. We have taken note of the policies for the various areas in and around the Hamble and their potential implications for the River as a whole and for the Harbour Authority, but we have no particular concerns at this stage. In due course, when more is known about proposed schemes (or any independent proposals by private landowners), the Harbour Authority will need to consider their potential impact on aspects of the Harbour Authority's remit – e.g: maintaining navigational depths, the impact from erosion/siltation, the impact on our responsibilities to</p>			<p>Many thanks for your consultation response. The SMP is a high level strategic document that recommends broad-scale coastal flood and erosion risk management policy. Further detail on the expected levels of maintenance and improvement work required will be provided in the draft Itchen to Hamble Coastal Defence Strategy Studies, which will look at how to implement the recommended policies. The Action Plan has identified the need that Schemes will need to be developed with consultation with land and defence owners and the commercial and recreational communities within the River Hamble.</p>		

<p>conservation sites, and the impact on our lease from The Crown Estate (currently bounded by the Mean High Water Mark). Our only other comment concerns Para 4.2.1, in which it is stated that it is considered unsustainable, technically unfeasible and uneconomic to protect sites such as water-side and boatyard facilities in the River Hamble. It should be noted that boatyard facilities, although not strictly within the Harbour Authority's jurisdiction, are a major economic driver in the local area and individual boatyard owners may well wish to take action to protect their land and the jobs which depend on it in due course.</p>	
--	--

Comment relates to	Eastleigh Borough Council	Consultee	Warsash Residents Association	Response No	163
Comment received			Client Steering Group Response		
<p>5C01 Hook Park to Warsash North: The footpath along the shore (no. 6 on the Definitive Map) forms part of the Solent Way. It is a valuable recreational asset providing uninterrupted views of the Southampton Water and the Solent. The path should be designated as MR so it is not lost. 5C02 Warsash North to Swanwick Shore Road: The footpath along the River Hamble (no. 3a on the Definitive Map) is a valuable recreational asset. It provides an alternative route from Swanwick to Warsash with unique views of the River. The path should be designated as MR so it is not lost. 5B03 Meon Road, Titchfield Haven to Hook Park: The footpath along the shore (no.7 on the Definitive Map) forms part of the Solent Way. It is a valuable recreational asset providing uninterrupted views of the Solent and the Isle of Wight. The path should be designated as MR so it is not lost.</p>			<p>Your comments have been noted. The SMP recognises the importance of coastal access 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. The provision and rerouting of coastal access in response to coastal and climate change will need to be integrated within subsequent Coastal Defence Strategy Studies and/or Schemes, which will determine how to implement the recommended coastal flood and erosion risk management policies. This issue has been included within the Action Plan. Specific details on coastal access will be addressed through the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.</p>		