

JQD/S819

4 December 2006

Dear Harbour User

**Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy 2007  
Initial Public Consultation**

Many of you will be aware that the Coastal Defence Strategy for the sector of coastline from Pagham to East Head will determine how East Head will be managed in the future. East Head is an important feature in the harbour, as an amenity in its own right and because of the impact it may have on navigation and utility of the harbour.

The Environment Agency and Chichester District Council have now produced the Initial Consultation document for the Strategy and I enclose a copy of the sections that relate to East Head. The whole document can viewed on the Environment Agency's website at: [www.environment-agency.gov.uk/yourenv/consultations/current-consultations/](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/yourenv/consultations/current-consultations/)

The Conservancy is concerned that the Strategy has failed to consider what impact the Preferred Option of Managed Realignment at East Head will have on navigation and the wider socio-economic interests of the harbour. A copy of the Conservancy's letter of objection to the Strategy is enclosed for your information. It also outlines a possible way forward for the management of East Head.

If you share the concerns of the Conservancy about East Head, please can I encourage you to respond to the consultation. A copy of the Consultation Form is enclosed, please complete and return it to the Environment Agency. The Conservancy will be placing 'Chichester Harbour' in Box 1 (h) of the Form and answering 'No' in Boxes 2 to 5, for the reasons explained in our Letter of Objection.

The more objections that are made the better, and if you know of any other harbour users who may be interested in responding to the Consultation please direct them to the Conservancy's website where this information is available.

Yours sincerely

John Q Davis OBE  
Manager & Harbour Master

Distribution:  
Chichester Harbour - Boat Owners, Businesses, Sailing Clubs, Resident Organisations, Parish Councils, Friends of Chichester Harbour

## 8. With regard to Environmental Value

- It has failed to identify what impact realignment and other options would have on the designated features of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours SAC and SPA.

## 9. With Regard to Overriding Public Interest

- It has failed to consider whether the facilities and infrastructure of the largest leisure harbour in the country can reasonably be provided elsewhere and whether, and to what degree, there is an overriding public interest case in maintaining the social and economic value of the harbour.

## A Way Forward

### 10. Further Work

The Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy 2000 and the Selsey Peninsula Strategy Review 2005 recognised and accepted that Managed Realignment at East Head should not proceed until the substance of the Conservancy's objections, detailed above, had been addressed. In the case of the Pagham to East Head Strategy 2000 it recommended a policy of Hold the Line until this was done and, in the case of the Strategy Review 2005, it was left as a 'Residual Issue' to be resolved.

A programme of Managed Realignment that is to a set timetable, even if it is a phased timetable, should not proceed until this work is done and the outcome shown to be acceptable.

### 11. An Option for Managed Realignment

If for any reason all of this further work cannot be done, a process of Managed Realignment that seeks to maintain the socio-economic and amenity value of the Harbour and East Head, for as long as is reasonably possible, in a way that is economically and environmentally sustainable, may be acceptable.

12. To this end, Managed Realignment must manage the inherent but unquantified risks and

be adaptive to change. It will mean:

- Monitoring the condition of East Head and the Harbour for environmental and socio-economic impacts arising from physical changes to East Head.

- If the feature appears to be in balance, even temporarily, and no adverse impacts are being experienced, maintaining the status quo is the best option. It would not be acceptable to remove existing sea defences if the system is in a steady state and functioning satisfactorily. It may be necessary to repair existing defences but not raise or build new ones. Any maintenance work would be subject to funding, private or public, being forthcoming.

- If the feature goes out of balance and adverse impacts are being felt on the socio-economic and/or environmental value of the Harbour, small scale incremental management measures and careful monitoring of the outcome, based on prevailing circumstances should be implemented. This may include: lowering, shortening, removing groynes and defences, recycling of beach material to seal a breach or to assist the feature to realign in a measured way, sand trapping/dune management and dredging of navigation channels, if necessary.

- There will still be a requirement to identify where the eastern side of the harbour entrance will eventually be fixed, how this will be achieved and an assessment made, using existing models, of likely impacts on tidal flows in the harbour.

13. A Managed Realignment scheme that incorporated all of these options may be supported by the Conservancy.

J Q Davis OBE, Manager & Harbour Master  
1 December 2006



## Chichester Harbour Conservancy

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Harbour Office, Itchenor,  
Chichester PO20 7AW  
01243 512301  
harbourmaster@conservancy.co.uk  
www.conservancy.co.uk

To keep in touch with what is happening at East Head please sign up for the Conservancy's eNewsletter at [www.conservancy.co.uk](http://www.conservancy.co.uk)

# Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy 2007

## Initial Consultation

by the Environment Agency, Chichester District Council and Arun District Council

The Conservancy has serious concerns about the Strategy and will be objecting to it. For your information please find below the relevant extracts from the Strategy followed by a copy of the Conservancy's response. If you share our concerns please complete the enclosed consultation form. This must be returned to the Environment Agency by the **14 February 2007**. Copies of all these documents are available at [www.conservancy.co.uk/environment/east\\_head.asp](http://www.conservancy.co.uk/environment/east_head.asp).  
John Q Davis, Manager & Harbour Master

### Extract from Pagham to East Head coastal defence strategy 2007

#### What do these options mean for me?

What the indicative preferred options mean for you depends upon where you live. Risk of flooding and erosion varies across each of the three areas, as does the condition of the existing coastal flood defences. Some are in better condition than others.

#### East Wittering, Cakeham and West Wittering

Our assessment shows that we should continue to maintain the beaches between East Wittering and Cakeham as they are now. Irrespective of this, the level of flood risk to people and properties will increase as sea levels rise.

The scale of works needed to maintain defences at East Wittering and Cakeham depend upon the amount of shingle that drifts naturally along the coast from the bank at Medmerry. This provides protection against erosion even as the groynes and wooden defences wear out. As some properties in East Wittering are very close to the beach, they would be at risk from erosion if the shingle is lost. Without any action this could be in as little as five years time. Over 100 years, the eroding coastline could result in the loss of 550 properties.

#### West Wittering managed realignment

Chichester Harbour is important to the local economy; the Harbour Conservancy estimate that many of the 650 marine related jobs depend on continued navigability of the harbour. The indicative preferred option of managed realignment at West Wittering's

frontage would allow East Head spit to change in response to the sea's actions. The changes would need managing to take account of the spit's important role in coastal protection for West Wittering, maintaining navigation in the harbour and as an attractive amenity for people. Management needs to be sensitive to the environmental importance of East Head and the Harbour and avoid unnecessary impacts. If the sea breaks through the spit it could create a second channel into the harbour reducing the tidal flows that help keep the main channel clear. Alternatively, the sea may simply wash over the spit and have no impact on navigation. There would be a need to manage visitor access if the spit became cut off at high tide. The defences that hold the Hinge in its current position would need to be removed to allow the spit to realign. The management of this realignment would involve taking out defences gradually. Over time, the western end of the car park would probably erode away and the beach would move inland. Flood banks would need to be built to protect the centre of West Wittering village from flooding. Without any works, around 100 properties in West Wittering would be at risk of flooding. Careful monitoring will be needed after each change to find out effects on the spit, channels and neighbouring frontages. If adverse effects are seen, such as the formation of a second channel into the harbour as a result of the spit breaching, adaptive management actions may be needed. This could include recycling of local beach materials, sand trapping or other appropriate measures. It will be important that such operations don't harm

**CHICHESTER HARBOUR CONSERVANCY  
OBJECTION TO THE PAGHAM TO EAST HEAD  
COASTAL DEFENCE STRATEGY 2007 - INITIAL CONSULTATION**

the internationally designated habitat of the harbour. We want to consult with the local community to determine the best way to manage this stretch of the coast.

**Options for East Wittering, Cakeham and West Wittering**

Coastal defences along East Wittering and Cakeham frontages comprise a mixture of shingle and sand beaches backed by concrete walls and timber breastworks ending with the sand spit at East Head. The failure of these defences would lead to the loss of 550 properties through erosion over the next 100 years. These defences benefit from shingle transferred naturally from the replenished Medmerry frontage. However, many of the timber groynes and breastworks are in poor condition with a

remaining lifespan of less than five years.

The situation at West Wittering is more complex. As a dynamic sand and shingle spit, East Head is of international environmental value. It also acts as an offshore breakwater reducing the risk of wave action affecting the harbour shoreline of West Wittering. The spit has changed position over the past 250 years in response to coastal processes, gradually rotating towards the shoreline at West Wittering. The existing groynes at the Hinge, where it joins the land, have contributed to erosion of East Head. Options for different ways of managing this frontage need to be considered. If no action is taken around 100 properties at West Wittering would be subject to flooding.

Option	Description	Positives	Negatives	Estimated Cost
No active intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cease all maintenance activities</li> <li>• Walls, groynes and shingle banks allowed to deteriorate or fail</li> <li>• East Head spit allowed to realign</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastline develops naturally</li> <li>• Potentially creates area of inter-tidal habitat</li> <li>• No maintenance commitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 650 properties and holiday parks, as well as other local amenities, at risk from flooding and erosion</li> <li>• Coastal defence uncontrolled; may impact upon navigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Wittering Less than £1 million</li> <li>• Cakeham Less than £1 million</li> <li>• West Wittering Less than £1 million</li> </ul>
Hold the line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Wittering – existing sea wall repaired and maintained, groynes replaced</li> <li>• Cakeham – existing groynes and breastworks repaired/ maintained, harder defences required over time</li> <li>• West Wittering – a new sea wall required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All property and land given some protection</li> <li>• Delays loss of land due to erosion</li> <li>• Reduced risk to changes in the Harbour</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased need for future funding</li> <li>• Over time, increasingly out of step with natural processes</li> <li>• Continued risk of erosion of East Head</li> <li>• Loss of protected habitat to rising sea levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Wittering £8 million</li> <li>• Cakeham £5 million</li> <li>• West Wittering Greater than £50 million</li> </ul>
Managed realignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Wittering – proximity of properties mean realignment not possible</li> <li>• Cakeham – any realignment must be consistent with actions at East Head</li> <li>• West Wittering – phased removal of defences around the Hinge, possible intervention to maintain integrity of spit, flood banks inland to protect the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most property and land given some protection</li> <li>• Adapts to the effects of climate change</li> <li>• Works with natural coastal processes</li> <li>• Reduced need for maintenance</li> <li>• Amenity value of East Head can be maintained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of small area of existing car park (West Wittering)</li> <li>• Sediment build-up in Harbour entrance possible</li> <li>• Some changes to land use in some areas necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Wittering N/A</li> <li>• Cakeham Less than £1 million</li> <li>• West Wittering £3 million</li> </ul> <p><b>The options in bold are the indicative preferred options</b></p>

**The Chichester Harbour Conservancy**

1. The Chichester Harbour Conservancy is the Statutory Harbour Authority for Chichester Harbour responsible for the safety of navigation and management of the harbour. It is also the Joint Advisory Committee for the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) responsible for the management of the AONB.

2. Under the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Act 1971 it has the Statutory function to:

"take such steps from time to time as to them seem meet for the Conservancy, maintenance and improvement of:

a) The Harbour, for the use of pleasure craft and such other vessels as may seek to use the same.

b) The Amenity Area (AONB), for the occupation of leisure and recreation and the conservation of nature (including in relation to the Harbour, navigational facilities) afforded respectively therein or in connection therewith"

3. In the discharge of these functions the Conservancy has a duty of care to 28,000 regular harbour users and their 10,000 vessels, 50 marine businesses employing in excess of 700 people (£300 million annual turnover), 1.5 million visitors a year to the AONB and the communities of the 13 villages sited within the AONB.

**Objection to the Coastal Defence Strategy 2007 - Initial Consultation**

4. The Chichester Harbour Conservancy objects to the Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy 2007 on the grounds that, contrary to Government policy and DEFRA Flood and Coastal Defence Project Appraisal Guidance FCDPAG 2 and FCDPAG 3:

- It has failed to consider what impact the Preferred Option of Managed Realignment at East Head will have on the adjacent waters of Chichester Harbour, its shoreline and communities.

Specifically:

5. With Regard to Navigation

- It has failed to assess what impact widening the harbour entrance, by Managed Realignment, will have on the hydrodynamics of the harbour and consequent sedimentation in the navigable channels.

- It has failed to identify and quantify what impact that sedimentation will have on the safety of vessels navigating the harbour and on the existing utility of the harbour.

- It has, accordingly, failed to quantify and include the cost of dredging the navigable channels in the economic assessment of the Preferred Option, as required by FCDPAG 3.

- It has failed to identify how East Head will realign, where it will realign to, what the likely end state will be, how long this will take to reach and what impact it will have on the sheltered waters, anchorages and use of the Chichester and Thorney Channels.

6. With Regard to Economic Value

- It has failed to assess the economic value of the marine businesses, clubs and organisations that depend directly on a navigable and viable harbour and how they might be affected.

- It has failed to consider the impact of sedimentation on the oyster fisheries and other shellfish in the Chichester, Thorney and Itchenor channels.

7. With Regard to Amenity and Intangible Value

- It has failed to assess the recreational value of East Head both as a feature in its own right and the impact that Managed Realignment will have on the erosion of the wider coastal footpath network in the AONB. An assessment of recreational value and tourism is a requirement of FCDPAG 3.

- It has failed to consider the value of East Head and the Harbour on the health, well-being and welfare of the harbour users and the local community.

# questions for consultation

To be read with *Pagham to East Head coastal defence strategy 2007: A guide for local communities.*

Please send completed questionnaires to the Environment Agency, Saxon House, Little High Street, Worthing, West Sussex BN11 1DH.

1.	<b>In which of the following areas do you live?</b>								
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>a) Pagham/Pagham Beach</td> <td>e) East Wittering</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) Church Norton</td> <td>f) Cakeham</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c) Selsey</td> <td>g) West Wittering</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d) Bracklesham</td> <td>h) other (please specify) _____</td> </tr> </table>	a) Pagham/Pagham Beach	e) East Wittering	b) Church Norton	f) Cakeham	c) Selsey	g) West Wittering	d) Bracklesham	h) other (please specify) _____
a) Pagham/Pagham Beach	e) East Wittering								
b) Church Norton	f) Cakeham								
c) Selsey	g) West Wittering								
d) Bracklesham	h) other (please specify) _____								
2.	<b>This document summarises flood and erosion risks between Pagham and East Head, including increased vulnerability caused by climate change, sea level rise and increased storminess. Do you understand the level of risk in your area?</b>								
	yes / no								
3.	<b>This document explains the preferred option for each frontage as indicated by technical, economic and environmental criteria. Referring to pages 12 to 17, do you understand how we have used this information to reach the preferred option for your area?</b>								
	yes / no								
4.	<b>Referring to pages 6, 7 and 8, do you understand what the preferred option means for you?</b>								
	yes / no								
5.	<b>Do you support the preferred option for your area? If not, please summarise an alternative suggestion.</b>								
	yes / no _____ _____								
6.	<b>We are unlikely to receive any central government funding in the near future to continue defending the coastline between Pagham and East Head to the existing standard of flood and coastal defence. Please circle only one answer to each of the questions below.</b>								
	<p>6a. For those frontages with the hold the line option, who do you think should pay for the continued maintenance and replacement of the existing sea defences?</p> <p>a) those directly affected (currently protected by the defences)</p> <p>b) other communities on the Manhood Peninsula, including Pagham</p> <p>c) the whole district (due to the associated benefit of a protected coast)</p> <p>6b. How do you think people should pay?</p> <p>a) private funding (people should contribute personally)</p> <p>b) increased council tax</p> <p>c) other (please specify)</p> <p>_____</p>								

7.	Are you aware of the Environment Agency's flooding support services available through the floodline helpline (0845 988 1188), including advance flood warnings and how to protect and prepare yourself for floods?
	yes / no
8.	How would you like to be kept up to date on the <i>Pagham to East Head coastal defence strategy 2007</i> ? Please circle your top choices of communication method.
	a) local newspapers (please specify) _____ b) posters and public notice boards in community locations c) websites (please specify) _____ d) community workshop or public exhibition e) local radio station (please specify) _____ f) existing community routes, such as, council newsletters and local groups (please specify) _____ g) other (please specify) _____ h) I do not want to be updated

If you would like to receive updates on the future 2007 strategy, please complete the following details:

<b>Name</b>	
<b>Address</b>	
<b>Email</b>	
<b>Frontage area of interest</b>	

All of your answers are confidential and will only be used in the development of the Pagham to East Head coastal defence strategy 2007. Anonymous responses may be shared with other agencies, such as local authorities for the purposes of comparison or analysis.

Where you have asked to be kept updated about the strategy the personal information you have provided will only be used for this purpose. We may pass the information on to our agents/representatives to do this on our behalf.

If you have any additional information, which you feel may be useful for the strategy, we would be grateful to receive it. If you are willing to be contacted for clarification of the information, please indicate yes or no and leave your additional contact details. This extra personal information will only be used for this purpose.

<b>Additional information</b>	_____ _____ _____
<b>Are you willing to be contacted?</b> yes / no	
<b>Telephone</b>	