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

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Cons	sultee	Hill Head Residents Association	Response No	37
Revisions to SMP Funding Issues Clarified in the fina			main SMP o	locument.		
Со	mment received			Client Steering Grou	p Response	
advertised locally to ensure E.g. were the private beach whilst the PU 5B02 states option of HTL in all epochs central funding for the priva appreciated that it should be so in a coordinated manner	public exhibitions were NOT suffic e that all interested parties could a front householders in Hill head conta that this coastline has a proposed it is NOT clear whether there will b te beach front owners to HTL? Whils e in the interests to do so if they fail it will impact on the remainder of th needs to be addressed and need	attend. acted? policy be any st it is to do ne PU	were placed and the press BBC Radio download or websites. W already expr all the exh defences and do not cont impose an of additional fl property or existing defe is currently individual por no public fur owned defe identified to document th managemen	for your consultation resp throughout the borough of so also advertised the exhibit Solent. The posters were the North Solent SMP and Ve also wrote to over 250 ressed an interest to be invo- ibitions. Owners of defen- id protect property and the flict or remove these rights obligation or requirement of ood defences to manage neighbouring properties. In ences will require planning the case and is not a nu- plicy summary statement, whe nding would be available for nces even if they are from manage the flood risk. The plicy that will result in cally sustainable managen	Fareham before the itions in the Daily E e also available to the Fareham Borou 0 key stakeholders lived in the SMP wit ces have rights to SMP policies of HT s. A policy of HTL n owners to constr potential flood ris portential flood ris permissions and co ew requirement. Where applicable, it is r the maintenance ntages where HTL e SMP is a high lev e coastal flood and en economically, so	e exhibition cho and on view and igh Council s who had h details of o maintain L and NAI does not uct new or sk to their tensions to onsents, as /ithin each stated that of privately has been el strategic erosion risk ocially and

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 5B0	2-03 to reflect co	mments.		
Со	nment received		Client Steering Grou	p Response	
through route to Lee and G current divide between Hill h I suggest be moved about	on Shore road is an increasingly imposport and will have to be defended. nead HTL and Brownwich Cliffs NAI s 300 m westward to the area wher and. In practice the sea does not this section of beach.	Your unit boundation is a continuity of the cliffed seem accordingly, the cliffed seem front frontage with not guarant works. The this frontage undertake mot implement existing infratored for integrate	s for your comments, which lary between 5B02 and 5B0 to manage the potential tida Valley so the policy b moving it to the west to whe section of shoreline that ru cage is included within the h a recommended Hold the tee public funding will be need for a Coastal Defence has been identified in the nore detailed investigations the recommended policie astructure and transport links with other plans such a Flood Management Plans an	3 was drawn incor I flood risk at Titch boundary has bee ere the land rises at ins westwards. The Lee-on-the-Solent Line policy, althoug available for requ Strategy Study that e SMP Action Plator to review and deters and the implications is the Environmentions and the Studies with a the Environmentions and the Studies with a the Environmentions a t	rrectly. The field Haven en revised the start of e Titchfield to Gilkicker this does uired future at considers n. This will ermine how ions on the II also need at Agency's

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	73
Revisions to SMP	Boundary Moved between 5 description of unit.	302-03 to reflect	comments. More reco	ognition of beac	h huts in
Com	ment received		Client Steering Group	Response	
the beach at Meonshore in the chalets so any changes	has been no mention of the chalets of the consultation report. I own one to the North shore of the Solent is d the other 40 odd chalet owners.	of potential tidal flo of boundary has b land rises at westwards. This included within frontage, with a guarantee publi each individual that no public fu owned defences to manage the documents, how section regardi included in the Authority may b need for a Coa has been ident detailed investig recommended p and transport li plans such as te contact your lo	Your consultation feedback. bod risk at Titchfield Haven een revised accordingly, mo the start of the cliffed s s will also mean that the Me the policy unit extending fro recommended Hold the Lin c funding will be available fi policy summary statement unding would be available fi s even if they are frontages flood risk. This has been si wever to further highlight ing funding and privately be available for maintenant stal Defence Strategy Stu- cified in the SMP Action Fi gations to review and de policies and the implication nks. These studies will als the Environment Agency's -specific studies. The SM cal planning authority for the e detailing the reference to	and Meon Valley s poving it to the west to ection of shoreline on shore beach char om Titchfield Haven be policy, although the or required future we to re	o the policy o where the e that runs alets will be to Gilkicker his does not orks. Within it is stated of privately en identified e draft SMP on a further has been n Highways Road. The his frontage ertake more olement the frastructure e with other lanagement of that you Information

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	75
Revisions to SMP	Wallington Frontage included in the plan.				
Co	mment received		Client Steering Grou	ıp Response	
well beyond your boundary many residents at risk of floo flood signs are used at times	ofton. The tidal effect of the estuary go at the Delme Roundabout. There are oding mainly at spring tides, to this en s of flooding, and many residents hav gs. Please will you include our Village on?	tidal floodpl intention is Wallington s accordingly in recommend public fundin reduce unce and fluvial fl of maintena Defence St SMP Action the Environ site-specific maintenance	for your response, which hig ain of the River Wallington to manage the potential t so the extent of the frontag and will be included ed Hold the Line policy, alth ng will be available for requ ertainties regarding flood m lood risks for the River Walli ance and improvement work rategy study or Scheme, h Plan. These studies will inter ment Agency's Catchment I studies. The continued e of drainage channels and ge has also been included w	h was drawn incol idal flood risk fron ge and text has be within the frontag nough this does no ired future works. T apping and to dete ington and the expe k required, through has been identified egrate with other pla Flood Management d requirement fo former waterways	rrectly. The n the River een revised ge with a t guarantee The need to ermine tidal ected levels n a Coastal I within the ans such as t Plans and r strategic to improve

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		
Со	mment received		Client Steering Grou	ıp Response	
5a21 & 5a22 is in the wro further east. The plan's p because of the very poor e at Cador Drive, to adopt this sea wall will need to be rep would seem logical to ensur any tidal surges and rises years. According to a su expectancy of the existing Therefore, early implement required. Further, to mainta Drive, the replacement do recently built defence adj maintain the HTL 20 year p required to preserve the exist to prevent possible encroar replacement sea defence. Portsmouth Harbour entrance of the Portsmouth, Fareham	- The plan shows the line between ong place. Cador Drive is about 1/2 olicy for Cador Drive is HTL. How xisting condition of the shore-line det spolicy for the next 100 years, the ex- placed by a more robust structure. The that the replacement is built to withs in sea level expected over the next rvey carried out 5 years ago, the g defence will end in approx. 1 ation of the plan in this area is urg in the HTL 100 year policy east of C efence should be extended to join facent to Alton Grove, Portchester policy west of Cador Drive, urgent we isting coastline. Work will also be req achment of the sea to the west o Consideration should also be given be flood gate or barrier to protect the w a Gosport harbour coast in exception ar gate/barrier would obviously be ne- ntrance.	mile unit bounda be revised fence flood defer isting recognised us, it adopted by stand approved f t 100 Schemes w e life to impleme year. recommend gently the Fareha Cador government the Cador Drive the Cador Drive the Cador D pork is Defence Sta uired the Cador D f the be determine to a will continue whole issues ident within the A your local pl The feasibil studies; the implications Solent harb	for your response, which h ry between 5A21 and 5A22 accordingly. The issues ra- nees at Cador Drive and by Fareham Borough Cour- the Local Authorities and by Defra, Coastal Defen- ill commence where necess ent the recommended p s a policy of Hold the line wi- im frontage it does not c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- m frontage it does not c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- m frontage it does not c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- m frontage it does not c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- c funding for maintenance of a policy of Hold the line wi- c is a priority to Fareham E c ploring an opportunity to rategy in order to progress orive sea wall is ongoing and be until this is completed. The tified at Cador Drive to be a faction Plan. The SMP team lanning authority for further in ity of harbour dams has been be economic costs and the of constructing and maintal bour entrances would signife thabitats within the harbours	was drawn incorrect aised regarding the flood and erosion ncil. Once the SMF the Environment A ce Strategy Stud sary, which will deter policies. Whilst thin Portsmouth Ha guarantee or secu- or urgent improver Borough Council an obtain funding for required works. Ma d the funding of new efence Strategy. M the urgent need for t addressed, have been n recommend that y nformation. en investigated in a ne environmental ining tidal barrages ficantly outweigh th	ctly and will e degrading on risk are P has been Agency and lies and/or ermine how the SMP rbour along ure central nent works. Ind they are a Coastal onitoring of w works will laintenance the defence en included you contact a number of and social a across the ne benefits.

	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 description of unit.		omments. More recogni	tion of beach hu	ts here in
Co	mment received		Client Steering Grou	ıp Response	
and also as individual own made of the existence of substantial dwellings and a very vulnerable to any adve of them and their average v £200,000 each in today's family for several generatio financial bond with the site that all concerned know that	d Haven to Hook Park: As an assoc ers, we are concerned that no ment the chalets at Meon Shore. These are built right on the shore and the erse change in the coastline. There a value would be somewhere in the reg market. many have been in the owns so there is strong emotional as w e. We therefore consider it very import at the chalet site exists if any chang nned which might affect the shingle to n Shore area of the coast.	tion is the potential policy bound refore where the la runs westw ion of chalets will wners Haven to Gi although thi ortant required fu beach be available they are from risk. This h however to regarding fu the Draft SM be available coastal Def identified in	for your consultation feedbac I tidal flood risk at Titchfield I dary has been revised accor and rises at the start of the of ards. This will also mean be included within the policy lkicker frontage, with a recor is does not guarantee publi uture works. Within each where applicable, it is stated for the maintenance of priv- ntages where HTL has been has been stated throughou further highlight this fundi- inding and privately owned of AP document. Public funding e for maintenance of Meon fence Strategy Study that co- the SMP Action Plan. This ns to review and deterr	Haven and Meon V dingly, moving it to cliffed section of sh that the Meon sh y unit extending from mmended Hold the c funding will be a individual policy d that no public fur vately owned defen identified to manage the draft SMP ong situation a furth defences has been from Highways Au Shore Road. The nsiders this frontage will undertake mo	alley so the the west to oreline that nore beach m Titchfield Line policy, vailable for summary nding would nees even if ge the flood documents, her section included in othority may need for a e has been ore detailed

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 5B0 description of unit.	02-03 to reflect c	omments. More recogni	tion of beach hu	ts here in
Cor	mment received		Client Steering Grou	up Response	
adjoining Titchfield Haven b of 46 similar homes which the local exhibition. We are sea defences near to our sit and our site should have p the Meon Shore Chalet Ow as Stakeholders but we wis freehold of their individual parts of lands surroundin Association. It is difficult to	re, Titchfield Haven, Fareham.PO14 ird sanctuary is part of a very valuabl apparently did not appear on drawin e concerned that any action regardin e may adversely affect our current se proper consideration. We are member yners Association who are now regis sh you to know that each Chalet own property plus an interest in the cor- ng the Site in the ownership o b say the value of the properties b making the total £10m without allowin land.	the potential policy bound where the la runs westw ers of chalets will the although the norm required ful f the statement, we be available risk. This h however to regarding ful be available	for your consultation feedba I tidal flood risk at Titchfield dary has been revised accor- and rises at the start of the vards. This will also mean be included within the polici- ilkicker frontage, with a reco- is does not guarantee publ- uture works. Within each where applicable, it is state of the maintenance of pri- ntages where HTL has been has been stated throughou further highlight this fund- unding and privately owned AP document. Public funding of maintenance of Meon fence Strategy Study that co-	Haven and Meon V rdingly, moving it to cliffed section of sh that the Meon sh y unit extending from mmended Hold the ic funding will be a n individual policy d that no public fun vately owned defen n identified to manage ut the draft SMP of ing situation a furth defences has been g from Highways Au Shore Road. The	alley so the the west to oreline that nore beach m Titchfield Line policy, vailable for summary nding would ces even if ge the flood documents, her section included in thority may need for a

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 5B0 description of unit.	2-03 to reflect co	omments. More recognit	tion of beach hu	ts here in
Co	mment received		Client Steering Grou	p Response	
appears to me to represent than the East Solent SMP of latter was that it took a me sections of the coastline rate for the longer sections. The your attention. The boundad place. As it stands it is por Titchfield Haven. The polic exposes the western half of the west to inundation which end of 5B02 and make a boundary between 5B02 ar about 500m to the north we rising ground behind the B	P is a sensible and pragmatic approa at a more general and strategic approa which it supersedes. My recollection of nuch more detailed look at the indivi- ther than putting forward a general p ere is one specific matter I wish to dr ary between 5B02 and 3 is in the w sitioned part way along the bounda y for 5B02 is HTL and 5B03 is NAL the Haven and the low lying marsh a ch would outflank the area to the we nonsense of the HTL for this region ad 5B03 should be moved along the est with plans to form a safe transiti rownwich cliffs, thus protecting the we eclaimed estuary of the River Meon.	roach unit bounda of the intention is to vidual and Meon policy accordingly, aw to the cliffed s vrong Haven front ry for frontage with This not guarant are to works. The estern this frontage . The undertake n coast to implement on to existing infra- whole to integrate	s for your comments, which h ry between 5B02 and 5B03 to manage the potential tida Valley so the policy b moving it to the west to whe section of shoreline that ru age is included within the h h a recommended Hold the h ree public funding will be need for a Coastal Defence has been identified in the nore detailed investigations the the recommended policie astructure and transport links with other plans such as Flood Management Plans an	3 was drawn incor I flood risk at Titch oundary has bee ere the land rises at ns westwards. The Lee-on-the-Solent f Line policy, althoug available for requ Strategy Study tha e SMP Action Plan to review and dete s and the implicati s. These studies wil s the Environmen	rectly. The field Haven en revised the start of e Titchfield to Gilkicker h this does ired future t considers n. This will ermine how ons on the I also need t Agency's

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Wallington Village Community Association	Response No	88		
Revisions to SMP	Wallington Frontage included in the plan.						
Cor	mment received		Client Steering Group Response				
Valington Holtage included in theComment receivedOur 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.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 		River tidal floodpl been intention is intention is Wallington. been revised a recomme guarantee p flood The need t asting determine ti v that expected le ire in identified wite and other plans ment Managemen 7 we within the Act been arger s. At ins to le to	Plan. Client Steering Group Response 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.				

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."

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 studiesstudies 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.

Comment relates to	Fareham Borough Council	Consultee	Private Individual	Response No	107	
Revisions to SMP	ions to SMP Boundary Moved between 5B02-03 to reflect comments. More recognition of beach huts here in description of unit.					
Сог		Client Steering Group Response				
appears to me to represent than the East Solent SMP ve latter was that it took a me sections of the coastline ration for the longer sections. The your attention. The boundar place. As it stands it is po Titchfield Haven. The policy exposes the western half of the west to inundation which end of 5B02 and make a me boundary between 5B02 and about 500m to the north we rising ground behind the Br	P is a sensible and pragmatic approa t a more general and strategic app which it supersedes. My recollection buch more detailed look at the indi- ther than putting forward a general re is one specific matter I wish to dr ary between 5B02 and 3 is in the v sitioned part way along the bounda y for 5B02 is HTL and 5B03 is NAI the Haven and the low lying marsh the would outflank the area to the we honsense of the HTL for this region of 5B03 should be moved along the est with plans to form a safe transit rownwich cliffs, thus protecting the sclaimed estuary of the River Meon.	roach received reg of the draft policy vidual incorrectly. policy Titchfield Ha aw to revised accur wrong the start of ry for Titchfield Ha . This Solent to Gi are to although this estern required futur that conside coast Plan. This will by determine I implications studies will Environmen specific studio open space considered flood and e SMP and sustainable to the be	s for your consultation feed garding this section of shore unit boundary between a The intention is to manage aven and Meon Valley so to ordingly, moving it to the we the cliffed section of shore aven frontage is now to be in lkicker frontage with a recons s does not guarantee public ure works. The need for a Co ers this frontage has been will undertake more detailed how to implement the recons on the existing infrastructure also need to integrate we t Agency's Catchment Flood dies. The SMP recognises the and the natural environment during the objective-led polition the most economically, so defence policies have been each huts in both Appendix G Policy S	eline have highlight 5B02 and 5B03 the potential tidal f the policy boundary est to where the la line that runs west ncluded within the nmended Hold the c funding will be a oastal Defence Stra identified in the S d investigations to commended policies it nother plans su d Management Plan the importance of ent, both of which icy appraisal proce the primary conc socially and envi proposed. There i endix C Baseline	ted that the was drawn flood risk at y has been and rises at wards. The Lee-on-the- Line policy, vailable for ategy Study SMP Action review and es and the nks. These uch as the ns and site- recreational have been ss. Coastal eerns of the ronmentally s reference	

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.					
Co		Client Steering Group Response				
owners to maintain their of provided by the Local Author The cut off for HTL at Meo	bordinated approach by the beach fro defences and that assistance shou prities towards the cost of these defe n Road Titchfield should be extended lets to ensure the sea does not bread	Id be comments r ences. Haven and between 5B ch the manage the Valley so the to the west shoreline the included wi recommend public fundin a Coastal D significant of been identified detailed inver- recommend infrastructur integrate w	for your comments. We regarding the road and caus these have highlighted that 302 and 5B03 was drawn i e potential tidal flood risk a e policy boundary has been to where the land rises at the nat runs westwards. The thin the Lee-on-the-Solent ed Hold the Line policy, althe ng will be available for require Defence Strategy Study that consultation with land, proper- fied in the SMP Action Pla- estigations to review and de ed policies and the im e and transport links. The <i>v</i> ith other plans such as Flood Management Plans an	seway to the west of the draft policy un ncorrectly. The intra at Titchfield Haven revised accordingle the start of the cliffer Titchfield Haven to Gilkicker fronts hough this does no red future works. T t considers this fro erty and defence of an. This will unde termine how to imp pplications on the se studies will als the Environmen	of Titchfield it boundary ention is to and Meon y, moving it d section of frontage is age with a t guarantee he need for ontage, with owners has entake more plement the need to t Agency's	

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.					
Cor		Client Steering Group Response				
situated at Meon Shore fro have diligently renovated money on stewardship on whatever the Management	ntion of the holiday site of 47 huts/ch nting Meon Marsh. We and other ov and spent a great amount of time this area of the Solent shore. We Plans are consideration to the above g owners efforts are not forgotten.	wners received reg e and draft policy e feel incorrectly. Farea Titchfield Ha Yours revised accord the start of Titchfield Ha Solent to Gi although thi required futt that conside Plan. This will Environmen specific studio open space	s for your consultation feed garding this section of shore unit boundary between a The intention is to manage aven and Meon Valley so to ordingly, moving it to the w the cliffed section of shore aven frontage is now to be in lkicker frontage with a recorn s does not guarantee public ure works. The need for a Corners this frontage has been will undertake more detailed now to implement the recorn on the existing infrastructure also need to integrate w t Agency's Catchment Flood dies. The SMP recognises the and the natural environment during the objective-led policity	eline have highlight 5B02 and 5B03 w the potential tidal f the policy boundary est to where the la line that runs west ncluded within the nmended Hold the c funding will be a oastal Defence Stra identified in the S d investigations to commended policies ine and transport li with other plans su d Management Plan the importance of p ent, both of which	ted that the was drawn flood risk at y has been and rises at wards. The Lee-on-the- Line policy, vailable for ategy Study SMP Action review and es and the inks. These uch as the ns and site- recreational have been	