

## **Report to Standing Conference on Problems Associated with the Coastline**

**Date: 22 September 2011**

### **Report of the Chairman of the Southern Coastal Group**

#### **4.1 National network of strategic regional coastal monitoring programmes (2011-2017)**

This report is to inform Elected Members on progress for the development of the Southeast Strategic Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme into the National Network of Regional Monitoring Programmes.

The existing DEFRA grant aid funded Southeast Strategic Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme has been in operation since the financial year 2002/03. Funding continues until March 2012.

Following technical approvals for a five year programme commencing in April 2012, the financial and administrative approvals process has now been completed. Approvals have been now been received for the scheme.

The coordinated approach to procurement is being undertaken nationally for contracted programme elements; this is being coordinated by Steve Cook from New Forest District Council. Following EU advertisements in November and prequalification questionnaires, technical and financial evaluations are now complete. A short list of those to be asked to tender for the framework has been developed and framework documents for the southeast are now out to tender. These are due for return in late September. The southeast sector is well on schedule for commencement in 2012.

Although the approval has been provided for the full sum requested in the scheme application, the sanctioned list shown for the medium term plan does not identify this programme; this will not be confirmed until February. It should be noted that for other regions the approved sums have been reduced in the (2011/12) sanctioned list by about 20%. Following discussions with the EA finance team it is clear that the approval remains for the full sum, although the sanctioned list provides some ambiguity which remains unexplained.

Recent discussions with Natural England have identified some potential opportunities for further savings, related to aerial surveys and ecological mapping, which are currently under consideration by NE. Joint working with the MCA to deliver bathymetric surveys continues to provide excellent value.

#### **Recommendation: For information**

#### **4.2 SMP progress**

There are 4 SMPs that have been completed within the SCOPAC region. They have been revised following public consultation and have been adopted by their Local Authorities and EA Regional Flood Defence Committees. All SMPs within the SCOPAC region have now been approved.

The Action Plans for the North Solent, Isle of Wight, Poole and Christchurch Bays and South Devon and Dorset SMP2 have been collated, by Andrew Colenutt (NFDC)

on behalf of the Southern Coastal Group. The SMP2 Action Plans summarise the specific actions that have been identified, where works are anticipated, where further investigations are necessary, and to resolve uncertainties or are needed to implement the SMP2s and the policies before the next review of SMPs in approx 10-15 years time. Implementing the SMP2 policies and actions will depend on availability of funding from the national FCERM budget or from other national sources or from local and / or third party funding. In many instances the confirmation and delivery of the final SMP2 policy recommendations in the medium to long-term epochs will be determined through subsequent detailed studies and monitoring to resolve uncertainties and improve understanding of issues and potential consequences. Action Plans are considered 'live' documents and will be updated, monitored and revised through the Southern Coastal Group. A tiered review structure is proposed.

#### **A The Southern Coastal Group**

The Southern Coastal Group (SCG) will establish an SMP2 Action Plan sub-group to coordinate the review, monitoring and progress of implementation of the actions in the SMP2 Action logs; this will meet for the first time on 24<sup>th</sup> November.

#### **B The SMP2 Action Plan Sub-Group**

The SMP2 Action Plan sub-group will focus on the urgent and Coastal Group-wide regional-scale actions. Some of the proposed actions can be dealt with most efficiently at a regional scale, across the boundaries of two or more SMPs; these actions will be considered and coordinated by the SMP2 action plan group. For this group to be effective, representation is needed from all SMPs spanning the coastal group.

The SMP2 Action Plan sub-group will evaluate those actions that have direct implications on the coastal monitoring programmes for the southeast and southwest regions, and the national network of monitoring programmes, and keep the SCG informed of progress and developments.

Additional actions that are identified will need to be included in the appropriate SMP2 Action Plan and, where necessary, included in the MTP process. Changes to actions or lead authorities responsible for the progression and implementation of actions will be reported to the SCG.

#### **C SMP2 Client Steering Groups**

Each SMP2 Client Steering Group (CSG) will continue to review, monitor and progress the non-urgent, site-specific, and/or local-scale actions identified in its SMP2 Action Plan. These groups will be required to keep the SMP2 Action Plan group informed of progress and report on implementation progress, status of actions and to maintain an Actions log detailing whether the identified actions have been achieved or not. Amendments to existing actions or Lead Authorities, or if additional actions are identified, will require further discussions and agreement to assign an appropriate Lead Authority for progressing and implementing the additional or revised action. This will require close liaison between the relevant Lead Authority and the CSG.

#### **D Lead Authorities**

Each specific action has been assigned a Lead Authority to progress and implement the action, following discussions between CSG members during development of the Action Plans. This may require the action to be included in that authority's MTP submission in order to seek and secure funding to undertake the action, either in-house, through a partnership approach or commissioning the work to a third party. Site-specific, local-scale or non-urgent actions will be actioned through the identified Lead Authority.

The Action Plans have been prepared using the SMP guidance and discussions with the EA regarding the level of detail, content and layout. Despite this, there is a widely varying range of detail provided in the Action Plans. Where possible, actions have been grouped into themes within this review. The principal categories have been identified as

- Urgent;
- Regional or SMP-wide scale;
- requirements for FCERM Strategies; and
- those with Regional Monitoring Programme implications.

Where possible, details have been included for actions. These identify

- whether they have been included in MTP submissions and
- if so for which year
- whether they have been included in the Sanctioned List
- whether alternative sources of funding are required to progress the action
- whether the action has been identified from other studies and will be included in future MTP submissions.

#### **Recommendation: For information**

### **3.3 Member and Officer events**

Coastal Change Management areas Workshop - feedback

Regional monitoring annual review 18<sup>th</sup> October (Durrington)

ACCESS launch 18<sup>th</sup> November (venue either Havant or NOC TBC)

SCOPAC meeting Thursday 8 December AM

#### **Recommendation: For information**

### **4.4 National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping – regional validation**

New Forest District Council are undertaking the technical validation of the National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (NCERM) for both the North Solent and Poole and Christchurch Bays Shoreline Management Plans (SMP2s). Both of these SMPs have been adopted by their Local Authorities (LA) and approved by the Environment Agency (EA) on behalf of Defra.

The technical validation process is separate from any local agreements to make data available, or presenting data through the NCERM public facing website; these will be

subject to consultation with and agreement from each Local Authority (LA) by the EA. The data that will appear on the public facing website will be based on exactly the same information as the technically validated data.

The technical validation process will provide LA partners an opportunity to comment on the baseline data provided in NCERM. If the LAs have confidence in their SMP2 mapping, they should not have issue with the NCERM outputs, unless more site specific data has become available subsequent to the completion of the SMP2s. It is worth noting that the majority of the LAs within the region covered by these SMP2s were involved in the first run validation exercise of NCERM a few years ago, where significant revisions were made to the baseline and erosion rate data.

### **Technical Validation**

The final validation process is required to ensure that LAs approve the data to be used for all NCERM products. This process comprises cross-linking NCERM GIS and database files with SMP2 information, identify missing data and identify any data anomalies. The technical validation process has been divided into two broad elements: a) Comparison of the NCERM baseline with the SMP baseline; and b) Verification of data within the NCERM spreadsheet

### **Comparison of the NCERM baseline with the SMP baseline**

The technical validation is currently being coordinated by the Channel Coastal Observatory team. From validation undertaken so far, for the vast majority of the frontage covered by the two SMPs, differences identified for baseline position are principally due to differences in SMP and NCERM definition of the baseline. The position of the baseline is defined as the 'point of impact of erosion', for example, Mean High Water contour, back of beach, saltmarsh or defence, cliff top edge, etc. The NCERM information says that the SMP2s generally use the MHW line as the baseline, however, this is rarely the case as it is generally the back of the beach or front of the defence that has been more often used.

A summary of baseline comparisons has been collated, with a summary of the reason for the difference and the distances between baselines. A proposed baseline position is then recommended. In most instances the recommended baseline is the SMP2 baseline as this is the baseline that has been agreed previously by the LAs. Where this is not the case a reason why the NCERM baseline, or another alignment, is provided. These summaries will be considered by each authority for approval.

### **Verification of data within the NCERM spreadsheet**

For the vast majority of the frontage covered by the two SMPs, the SMP erosion/recession rates and SMP policies per epoch have already been incorporated into NCERM. Only relatively minor revisions to the NCERM dataset will be required. The indicative erosion rates that are recorded in the NCERM database give an indication of the magnitude of potential erosion under a No Active Intervention Scenario.

### **Your involvement and timetable**

Technical validation by the CCO team is nearing completion. Comments and approval for the proposed recommendations for the baseline position and amendments in the NCERM spreadsheet are to be sought over the next couple of weeks.

### **Recommendation: For information**

Report by Professor Andrew Bradbury, Chairman of Southern Coastal Group