

Appendix 3

Report on the outcome of the first round of public consultation

Over 150 people were contacted directly using an established database for this study, there was a press release by both Adur and BHCC and an article in the Evening Argus.

There were 15 responses, either written (as detailed below) or via the consultation portal response form on the council's website. Both sets of responses are summarised in Table 1 (below) and cover Unit 1 the locked basin as this council has significant interest in the port area and Unit 2 (Open Coast), as the council is responsible for coast protection, over part of its length.

Natural England

- Noted that features of interest along the coast often require natural coastal processes (such as movement of shingle, cliff erosion and avoidance of coastal squeeze) to be maintained.
- Key designated sites are Adur Estuary SSSI, Brighton to Newhaven Cliffs SSSI and proposed Marine Conservation Zone Beachy Head West.
- Unit 1 (Shoreham Port) – potential impacts on River Adur SSSI. Identified a need to understand whether sustaining or increasing the defences affect volume or movement of water entering the estuary and, if so, what the potential impacts on River Adur SSSI may be.
- Unit 2 (open coast) – the sustaining or improving options could have impacts, depending on where the shingle is sourced. Operations involving only recycling within the area are unlikely to cause impacts on designated sites. Other impacts may arise at the deposition site and if there are structural changes to the coastal defences that influence shingle movement and coastal processes, possibly affecting habitats at the mouth of the River Adur or within the SSSI.
- Unit 3 (Brighton Marina) – options have potential to affect Brighton to Newhaven SSSI and Beachy Head West pMCZ. For example, impacts on the chalk reef (SSSI and pMCZ) from extending any structure or impacts from work to the inner wall on the pMCZ.
- Further assessment will be required as the options are progressed. NE is happy to advise on potential impacts and solutions to avoid or mitigate potential impacts.

Adur and Worthing Councils (Planning, Regeneration and Well-being)

- Comments relate to Shoreham Harbour area.
- Regeneration aims for the harbour are set out in the Draft Adur Local Plan.
- A Joint Action Plan is also being developed (Adur District Council, Brighton and Hove City Council and West Sussex County Council) for revitalisation of the area, working with Shoreham Port Authority, to bring back vacant and underused sites into use (new employment and housing developments, raising the quality of the local environment and waterfront access).
- Development Briefs for the Western Harbour Arm (to south of railway, from new footbridge to Kingston Beach) and South Portslade Industrial Estate and Aldrington Basin are being finalised. Further details on <http://w4ww.adur-worthing.gov.uk/shoreham-harbour-regeneration> .
- A Flood Risk management Technical Guide with a Design Code is also being developed by the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Partnership. This may provide information to the current strategy. The Regeneration Partnership is also seeking external funds. There may be potential to work together to deliver aspects of the current strategy.

- Key aspirations for Shoreham Harbour are presented.
- Unit 1 – Option 4, Sustain and Option 5, Improve are most appropriate. Option 5 would be preferred, but could be expensive and technically difficult. Options 1 to 3 conflict with Port future operating capacity, due to increased flood risk.
- Unit 2 – Notes that none of the options refer to public realm improvements or reductions on height of seawall defences. Would like to see removal of the (tall) wall along Basin Road South, or provision of pedestrian /cycle route on seaward side or reduction in its scale. Options 1 to 5 would result in increased flood risk and therefore not considered appropriate (for businesses, residents and image of area as a tourist destination). Option 6 would maintain current standard of defence and increase size of beaches (recreational benefit). Option 8 would be similar but also raise level of protection. These two are the preferred options. Option 7 would provide similar protection to Option 6, but without increasing beach size. Option 9 would be similar to Option 7, except with increased levels of protection. These two options are considered acceptable but less preferable to Options 6 and 8. The impact of the offshore breakwaters of Option 10 could result in a negative impact on recreation and visual attraction, and the impact of rock revetment of Option 11 on public access and visual amenity is considered negative. These two options are therefore considered less attractive options. Option 12 is also likely to result in negative impacts on recreation and visual amenity and is also, therefore, considered a less attractive option.

Environment Agency, Partnership and Strategic Overview East Sussex

- Raised a number of technical queries in terms of how the benefits of the strategy would be calculated for the three areas.
- Unit 1 – Suggested that a wall along the open coast should be considered
- Unit 2 – Suggested that it is unlikely that the volume of shingle under Option 4 would remain constant and that it would therefore require input from another source. Suggested an alternative option for Option 5, similar to Option 3 except movement of shingle from Kemp Town to further west than Shoreham, with continued by-passing of Shoreham Port. Suggested a further option to realign the seawall to remove protrusions (such as at the King Alfred complex) as development proposals arise. Queried whether there could be any options where the spacing between groynes is increased.
- Unit 3 - Suggested that an alternative to increase the height of the defences and water-resistant building is considered.
-

Local resident 1

- The No Active Intervention option is not feasible and reactive work is not considered sustainable for any area.
- Unit 1 – Options 4 and 5 considered most suitable as sea level rises are accommodated. Option 5 preferred.
- Unit 2 – Despite some reservations, the offshore breakwaters of Option 10 are considered beneficial due to reduction of wave energy and control of long-shore drift of sediment to help maintain beaches and provide habitat for marine life (including fish). The down-drift effect of retention of sediment, however, could be negative.
- Unit 3 – Considered Option 4 the most appropriate despite minor temporary adverse impacts during any works.

Local resident 2

- Stated that the final decision should be based on a social cost-benefit analysis taking environmental consequences into account, but suggested that the no active intervention and do minimum options would be unacceptable for an urban service and industrial economy environment, whilst the maintain/ sustain options are likely to be better options and the improve option less acceptable in social cost-benefit terms.
- Suggested direct consultation with Brighton and Hove Geological Society, all local schools, tertiary colleges and university departments of environmental studies and geology.

Dr Uwe Dornbusch (Environment Agency)

- Provided electronic link to sediment budget reports produced for the South East Coast Beach Management Plan Project

Local fishing club

- Comprising a club with over 1,300 members, located directly on promenade at Hove, considers the premises to be extremely vulnerable to coastal erosion and wave damage
- Commented only on Unit 2 (open coast)
- Options 1 to 5 considered unacceptable as they would result in increased flood risk.
- Options 6 and 7 not favoured due to no improvement to flood risk, movement of shingle (environmental impact) and ongoing annual cost and consequential vulnerability to future budget squeeze
- Options 8 and 9 would reduce the flooding risk but retain the ongoing environmental and cost impacts and would not provide any other 'added value'
- Option 10 would reduce the risk of flooding without requiring annual shingle movements, thereby eliminating those environmental and cost impacts. Assuming that it would be based on the same concept as trialled at Sea Palling in Norfolk, which protects and enhances the beach and coastline, creating a series of sheltered beaches ideal for all forms of water activities, a boost to the Brighton and Hove tourist economy.
- Options 11 and 12 would reduce the risk of flooding. However the loss of beaches and difficult access to the water would affect waterborne activity, including the sea anglers club. It would be a disaster for tourism and would probably reduce the appeal of the city as a place to live, so hitting house prices and the economy as a whole.
- In summary, Hove Deep Sea Anglers advocates Option 10 and requests that it is implemented, at least along that section of the coast, in the very near future.

Anonymous (local resident)

- Concerned to protect Central Hove from flooding as sea level rises, and suggests that a longer time frame than 100 years should be examined.
- Concerned that as sea levels rise houses near the seafront will become very vulnerable to flooding. Also concerned about damage to listed buildings, the need to maintain public access to sea for leisure, including cycle route access along its length and the need to maintain the existing beaches, Shoreham Harbour and Brighton Marina in their current state.

Table 1

Unit 1 – Shoreham Port Locked Section					
	1	2	3	4	5
A&WDC	–	–	–	2	1
NE	No preference Stated				
EA	No preference Stated				
G Legg			–	1	1
E Clay	No preference Stated				
U Dornbusch	No preference Stated				
HDSAC	No preference Stated				
Anomynous	No preference Stated				
General Public Response 1	No preference Stated				
General Public Response 2	–	–	–	–	1
General Public Response 3	–	–	2	1	2
General Public Response 4				1	
General Public Response 5	No preference Stated				
General Public Response 6	No preference Stated				
General Public Response 7				1	

Unit 2 – Open Coast													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
A&WDC	–	–	–	–	–	1	2	1	2	3	3	3	
NE	No preference Stated												
EA	No preference Stated												
G Legg	No preference Stated												
E Clay	No preference Stated												
U Dornbusch	No preference Stated												
HDSAC	–	–	–	–	–	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	
Anomynous	No preference Stated												
General Public Response 1	No preference Stated												
General Public Response 2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	2	2	–	
General Public Response 3	–	–	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	–	–	–	
General Public Response 4											1		
General Public Response 5	–	–	–	–	–	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	
General Public Response 6			1										
General Public Response 7								1	1	1	1	1	

Some useful comments were provided. It is not always easy to identify which option a consultee prefers, but the table above attempts to do so (where – denotes that the option was considered unacceptable, 1 denotes preferred option/s and 2 denotes next preferred option/s). What this shows is that apart from the Do Nothing and Do Minimum option being widely identified as non-viable options, there is no clear consensus on the preferred option, except in Brighton Marina, where the Sustain option was preferred.