



ALDE AND ORE ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP

DRAFT MINUTES TO BE AGREED by email 5 December 2019

MINUTES OF THE ALDE AND ORE ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 14th November 2019 IN ORFORD TOWN HALL

PRESENT	Edward Greenwell	(EG)	(Chairman, Farmer Nominee)
	Tim Beach	(TB)	(Snape Parish Council Nominee)
	Alison Andrews	(AA)	(A&O Association Nominee)
	Brian Johnson	(BJ)	(Bawdsey Parish Council Nominee)
	David McGinity	(DMcG)	(Butley Parish Council Nominee)
	Harry Young	(HY)	(Business Representative)
	Colin Chamberlain	(CC)	(Iken Parish Council)
	Peter Palmer	(PP)	(Aldeburgh TC Nominee)
	Frances Barnwell	(FB)	(Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council)

ADVISORS

David Kemp	(DK)	(Environment Agency)
Giles Bloomfield	(GB)	(East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board)

DISTRICT COUNCILLOR

Ray Herring	(RH)	(East Suffolk District Council)
-------------	------	---------------------------------

APOLOGIES

Amanda Bettinson	(AB)	(Partnership Secretary)
Edward Boyle	(EB)	(Natural England)
Guy Heald	(GH)	(Finance and Business representative)
Diane Ling	(DL)	(Ecological nominee)
Jane Marson	(JM)	(Landowner Nominee)
Jane Maxim	(JMaxim)	(Funding Chairman, Estuary Trust)

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Roger Baxter, Andrew McDonald (AMcD), Janine Edge (JE)

ACTION

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** There were no declarations of interest.
2. **MINUTES OF 27 June 2019** Agreed.

3. MATTERS ARISING

The Chairman noted that the meeting, which Therese Coffey MP had called as an ‘informal summit’, involving Anglian Water, Essex and Suffolk Water and UK Power Networks (all of whom have assets in the estuary), LEP and EDF Sizewell, was held at Snape Maltings (with thanks to Harry Young for hosting this) on 6 September. AA reported that with presentations from the Partnership on the Plan, IDB on the estuary project and the Trust on the finance and fund raising, the meeting had gone well. It was the first time that the infrastructure holders had been together in one room. They had responded positively to the proposal for collaboration on the plan which would safeguard infrastructure as much as it would houses, land and the local economy. Karen Thomas, Coastal Partnership East, was taking the next step forward to bring the infrastructure holders into a meeting with the LEP to discuss how best to work collaboratively together.

(CPE)

4. REPORT FROM IDB AND EA ON BUSINESS CASE AND PROGRAMME

4.1. Business case progress:

- i. GB reported that the final draft of the Business Case had been submitted to EA at the end of August. There had been several exchanges since between IDB and EA including a long list of questions from the EA economists. These had been sent to the IDB consultants, RPA, for comment. GB and DK had considered the RPA responses and agreed that these were robust. The main areas of questioning related to the apparently anomalous prices of land and houses compared with the national averages but the evidence was there to show that such prices in the Alde and Ore area were well above average. The main challenge would come in relation to Iken because of the modest number of houses there but GB thought that the full case for the upper estuary dealt with that. The next step was for the RPA and EA economists to meet to discuss questions and responses with a view to enabling the Final Business Case to be formally submitted, hopefully in December. The final hurdle within EA, before the outcome of the application would be known, would be the Large Project Review Group.
- ii. GB also mentioned that consideration had been given to delaying the submission of the Business Case until April when it was expected that there could be changes in the Partnership Funding Calculation. While it seemed that current thinking might lead to higher rates of grant for some items there was no guarantee of that and he took the view that the submission should not be delayed which itself then delayed when work might start. Nevertheless there could be changes in funding anyway so the figures could well change. It was best to go ahead and submit the Business Case as soon as possible.

4.2. Programme

- i. GB presented a flow chart for the project, which would take four years, showing the steps to be taken over the first six months until end June 2020 for the Upper Estuary areas of Snape Maltings, Snape Village, Iken, and Aldeburgh Phase II (Brickdock). These steps included detailed design assessments; for which grant would be sought from the Trust and a request had been made already for grant needed in December/early January; Environmental Assessments; FRAPs; Natural England Consents; Environmental Mitigation; Engineering Assessments, such as core sampling; and Construction enabling works (essentially access routes to be done in the drier months). Some of these could be done in parallel. Everything that was proposed was to get as much in place as possible prior to actual construction and which would not have any impact on grant availability prior to approval of the Business Case. For Snape Maltings, which could stand alone, it was hoped that actual construction would start in September/October but at the very latest January to March 2021. The Chairman welcomed this start to the programme.
- ii. On funding, GB explained that the Trust held funds and there was the IDB loan so work could go ahead. There were a number of uncertainties such as the time of actually hearing EA's decisions on the Business Case and the exact details or conditions, so judgements would need to be made on what to do and when to avoid work that had to be aborted.
- iii. In response to FB, GB said that he was the accountable person for delivering the project on the ground and the task was divided up between different staff and operations worked in both a bottom-up /top down way. Once on site fortnightly letters would be written. Letters would be sent out early to give good warning to people in areas where frontline mitigation involved cutting down trees and vegetation.
- iv. Asked if the Business Case could be made available, GB said that while it was under consideration by EA it might change but, once the Case had been agreed, he saw no reason why it might not be available in the public domain and would check. He would prefer that to preparing a summary which would divert resources. He said that it was a very large and complex document.
- v. To ensure the community were well informed, it was agreed that parishes might

GB

Notice to Parishes (AOEP)

6. AOEP RESPONSE TO THE SMP CONSULTATION

AA introduced the paper setting out the background to the Shoreline Management Plan consultation about a proposed change in policy for the stretch of coast between the Aldeburgh Martello Tower and along Sudbourne Beach (SMP Unit 15.1) The proposed change to move from in interim policy of No Active Intervention after the year 2025 to one of Managed Realignment by providing resilience against erosion was very welcome. While the policy change did not guarantee government funding, without it there would be no chance of securing action to defend the coast. A draft to the consultation response to go from the AOEP supporting the change and giving reasons from the AOEP's view point had been prepared.

In response to PP, AA said the protection afforded by managing resilience along the shoreline would prevent the sea cutting a channel permanently through to the river for the next period of years and so would afford protection to all the estuary wall works of the Estuary Plan.

AA asked members to send in comments on the draft response, which had just been circulated to the consultation to her by 25 November.

ALL

7. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

AA presented the Annual Monitoring Plan report. The Monitoring and Review Strategy was designed to monitor the impact of coastal squeeze on the estuary and its setting in place had been an essential element of the Estuary Plan needed to secure endorsement from the relevant authorities. At its fourth annual meeting in October the working group agreed the final checks or work to ensure data would be in place to write the first Five Year Report in 2020. The AOEP were very appreciative of the considerable data EA and NE were able to supply to help the assessment.

The Group had noted that as the construction work of the estuary project was unlikely to start being implemented by spring 2020, the 2020 report would provide a good data base for later five-year reports. Also, as the targets being measured mostly changed slowly, even with five-yearly reviews significant changes from the impact of maintaining estuary walls might only emerge after many years. The meeting took note of the report.

8. FUNDING GROUP REPORT

On behalf of J Maxim, BJ drew attention to the latest AOET press notice, which AOEP members might have received but which was available on the AOET web site (www.aoetrust.org). This set out in summary the annual income and expenditure in the last full financial year, 2018, as well as fund raising activities. He encouraged anyone not yet committed to join the coming Pub Quiz on November 22.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

DMcG asked whether the new organisation meetings might be in the evening as this had yielded a good turnout for Key Stakeholders' meetings and comments had been received that afternoon meetings were not possible except for the retired and those who worked at home.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: As the next meeting was likely to be the inaugural meeting of the new AOCP it was agreed that the likely date would be **Thursday 30 January and the meeting would be held in the Orford Town Hall at 6.30pm.**

Tim Beach, as Deputy Chairman, then said that as this was probably the last meeting of the AOEP, with sadness that it had been a privilege to work with the Chairman, Edward Greenwell, and without Edward the AOEP could not have realised the community estuary plan. We owed him a great deal and were very grateful to him. The meeting endorsed Tim's comments and added their thanks.

15 November 2019/AA
Final 12.12.19

