



ALDE AND ORE ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP

DRAFT MINUTES FOR AGREEMENT ON 7th MARCH 2018

MINUTES OF THE ALDE AND ORE ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP HELD ON TUESDAY 6th FEBRUARY 2018 AT ORFORD TOWN HALL

PRESENT	Edward Greenwell (EG)	(Chairman, Farmer Nominee)
	Alison Andrews (AA)	(A&O Association Nominee)
	Guy Heald (GH)	(Finance and Business representative)
	Brian Johnson (BJ)	(Boyton and Bawdsey Parish Council Nominee)
	Mike Finney (MF)	(Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council Nominee)
	Peter Palmer (EO)	(Aldeburgh TC Nominee)
	Tim Beach (TB)	(Snape Parish Council Nominee)
	Rodney West (RW)	(Ecological Representative)
	Jane Burch (JB)	(SCC)
	Harry Young (HY)	(Business Representative)
	Amanda Bettinson (AB)	(Partnership Secretary)

ADVISORS	David Kemp (DK)	(Environment Agency)
	Karen Thomas (KT)	(IDB)
	Pete Cosgrove (PC)	(AONB)

APOLOGIES	David McGinity (DMcG)	(Butley Parish Council Nominee)
	Emma Hay (EH)	(Natural England)
	Jane Marson (JM)	(Landowner Nominee)
	Bill Parker (BP)	(SCDC)
	Andrew Hawes (AH)	(Hawes Associates- Partnership Consultant)
	Emma Hay (EH)	(Natural England)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Roger Baxter, Colin Chamberlain, Mike Caplan Chairman of Friston PC, Nick Turner, Louise Mangeot, Emma Dixon (IDB), Sheena Barrow, Richard Davey, Loulou Cook, Paul Shipman, Joy Castle, Sally Walton, Susie Bridges, Andrew McDonald, Ana Sarginson

- DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** BJ/GH declared that he was the AOEP nominated trustee of AOET and EG notified the Partnership of a potential conflict as he had been approached by Tidal Lagoon Power (TLP) to offer land to help with their mitigation but this did not relate to the Iken issue under discussion. Should there be any actual conflict at a later date he would declare it.
- THE MINUTES** of 7th December 2017 were agreed with the amendment to minute 5 (page 4) ... *In terms of the AOEP plan implementation, the EdenVale Young modelling had indicated that the Iken flood cell needed to be treated differently to accommodate the upper estuary upgrading: the AOEP are asking HR Wallingford to reassess this.* [see also minute 4 below]
- MATTERS ARISING**
Funding Group – Guy Heald as Chairman of the AOET noted that the total to date of fundraising was £1.5 million. This was made up of £450K in the bank account, recent pledges and the David Andren legacy. The Trust had been very touched by the amount of money given many of which had been very generous and significant gifts from the heart which lends encouragement to all the fundraisers. In some cases there were several of £10,000 and one unsolicited for £250,000 which gives confidence to the whole project and everyone associated with it.
Charity Funding -At this early stage there were no further results from charities and the



Heritage Lottery Fund who have now changed the rules on the Landscape Partnership Fund but it is hoped that an application can be made to the HLF in due course, potentially for a project nearer the £5M mark.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)– J Maxim and J Skepper met Ray Herring to discuss CIL applications and were advised that only one application would be considered. It would be preferable to apply in 2019 but discuss the details before any application is made.

4. IMPLEMENTATION GROUP

There had been a considerable number of meetings to discuss the HR Wallingford (HRW) report which was received at the end of last year. This report followed the EdenVale Young assessment commissioned by Snape Maltings which had highlighted that Iken and Orford were at increased risk when raising the walls at Snape and Aldeburgh. HRW was commissioned by both TLP, and IDB on behalf of the AOEP, to assess the managed retreat (MR) issues for TLP and the wall heights and flood risk for the whole estuary. This was necessary to show the flood risk and mitigation (where necessary) to enable the Environment Agency to give the consents (FRAPs) for the work.

After meetings with the landowners concerned, although 2 landowners did not wish to have any land flooded, it was quite clear that the primary preference from all three was for the whole Iken wall to be at the same standard as the rest of the estuary. The second preference was a limited area of MR (some 600 acres) when the land would be sold to TLP and flooded, and the last and least desired was a spillway which would mean the land would be intermittently flooded with very little ability to farm apart from summer grazing.

The Estuary Trust had felt very concerned that any MR would drastically alter the whole estuary and have an adverse affect on sailing which could then affect tourism and the local economy. Should this be considered a possibility, it might then be necessary to go out to public consultation again with a revised plan. This would inevitably mean further delays in starting work and this alone could affect fundraising. Both The Partnership and The Trust were in favour of keeping to the Estuary Plan as it was agreed and upgrading the walls to the agreed standard.

The Implementation's recommendations to the AOEP were agreed:

1. Further model runs required from HRW:

- A run with all defences, including FC5, at the estuary defence standard of 3.3 (resilient to a 1 in 200 +CC year flood) but in two phases. Phase 1 would put Iken west to 3.3m, and include a cross wall, and phase 2 would raise the remaining eastern section of the Iken wall to 3.3m, once the rest of the Upper Estuary was completed to standard.

KT/AH

- A run with the Iken west wall at 3.3m, and a cross wall at 3.1 (splitting FC5 flood cell into east and west) and with the east wall at 3.1 for 3600m (Andrew Hawes to give KT maps to show cross wall)

KT/DK

Costs for these two additional runs were £7600 which The Trust agreed to fund.

- **Report from HRW** needs to be in by end February to make decisions for public drop-ins planned for March 8th, 13th and 14th, and a full community meeting on April 14th.
- **Assess local protection requirements for properties put at greater risk by raising defences in the Upper Estuary:**
 - a. Obtain locations of properties affected from HRW. [now received]
 - b. Carry out doorstep surveys of each property to assess the nature and seriousness of the threat.
 - c. Propose and cost solutions for each property.

KT/ED

- **Devise a timed and costed work programme for the Upper Estuary**, making and stating such assumptions as are necessary, and aiming at as fast a delivery of improved

KT



flood defences as is practicable. [now in first draft] Follow this asap with a similar programme for the remainder of the estuary, accepting that the assumptions made will be cruder and the confidence level lower.

- **Provide a costed plan of actions by the IDB** (primarily by Karen) needed over the next 12-24 months, to deliver programmes such as above, modelling runs, Business Plans etc. The Trust require a costed and timed programme of work to complete the Estuary Plan in order to be able to assess funding requirements over the next 8 years. GH felt that there would be a huge impact if funding not in place.
- Produce a community communications/engagement strategy
- The AOEP to discuss at high level with the EA the principles governing their approval of schemes that may, temporarily or permanently, increase risk to individual properties.
- Following on from the modelling runs, to seek agreement with affected landowners to whatever new solution is agreed by the Implementation Group and then the AOEP.
- Work up a job description for Project Director and request Trust to fund
- Trust Funds were required to pay the IDB for their time for business cases, etc approx £50K pa

KT

ED

EG

AJB

5.

ENABLING DEVELOPMENT

A pause was in place so no formal applications will be made until November but in the meantime discussions continue with planners, lawyers, agents and the community. Three people are being interviewed shortly as possible enabling development managers when they come to be needed.

There was still public concern about ED as a number of tit for tat letters and articles that had been aired in the local Orford magazines and it was felt unhelpful to have inaccurate information persistently in public view. A further meeting had been offered to the group to discuss their concerns over the status of the partnership, location of sites, funding the estuary plan and even the principles of the plan itself.

The Partnership will be holding a meeting shortly with all parish councils, who are the representatives of the community, to confirm the agreement of communities around the estuary for the plan as it stands and funding the plan including some ED, and to discuss other issues including representation. Andrew McDonald agreed that parish councils have overall responsibility but he felt they had not shown any interest in the Partnership work. Colin Chamberlain disagreed and noted that Iken held a public meeting early in 2016 and he fully backed the work of the committee. [Note: Parish councillors from 5 different parish councils sit on the partnership]

Guy Heald noted that there was still a lack of awareness of flooding risk and the amount of support required should not be underestimated.

6.

NEXT MEETING

Agreed for Tuesday 24th April at 2pm

Drop in Sessions to update on Estuary Plan

Orford Town Hall 8th March 2-7pm:

Aldeburgh Church Hall 13th March 2-7pm:

Snape Village Hall 14th March 2-7pm

Annual Community Meeting at Snape Maltings Recital Room 14th April 1030-1pm

10 February 2018/AJB