

**TDC Responses to Questions Raised by Holland Residents Association
on the Proposed Clacton and Holland Coastal Defence Work**

Copy of covering email:

From: June Clare [mailto:jclare@tendringdc.gov.uk]

Sent: 08 February 2013 14:26

To: 'Trevor Bright'

Subject: RE: Clacton and Holland Coastal Defence Work, Questions Raised by Holland Residents Association

Dear Mr Bright

Thank you for your e mail on behalf of the Holland Residents Association.

I attach the Council's response to your queries (in the same order) which I hope explains the project and our current work more clearly for you.

Kind regards

June Clare

Mrs June Clare MSc, BA (Hons) FCIH, FCMI
Corporate Director
Tendring District Council
Council Offices
Thorpe Road, Weeley
C016 9AJ
01255 686741
jclare@tendringdc.gov.uk

**Cover page added by T. L. Bright
9th. February 2013**

Section 1 – General

1.1 Why does A.9 Appendix 2 only give five options?

Why are these options not considered:

- fewer larger fishtails (as at Jaywick)
- Offshore Reefs (Rock and/or scrap oil rigs)

If it has been decided to discount these options then where are the documented reasons as to why they have not been considered and who discounted them?

At this stage cost should not be a reason for rejecting an option as the five options given in the report will have differing costs.

All technical viable options should be put on the table. It will then be possible to evaluate each one against a set of agreed criteria (see question 1.2).

Appendix 2 contains the five options that have been shortlisted from a longer list. The Project Team has been through an assessment process to evaluate possible options along the frontage. This process included looking at the technical, economical and environmental aspects of each option. The reasons for discounting options from the longer list of options will be detailed within the Project Appraisal Report (PAR).

It is important to remember that a fishtail groyne solution for the Clacton to Holland frontages could not be the same as Jaywick due to different influencing coastal processes (such as sediment transport, aspect & exposure of coastline, dominant storm wave approaches). In addition, the options shown in Appendix 2 show only an idea of the options, exact spacing and lengths will be refined after further ground investigations and modelling occurs.

1.2 a) What criteria will be used to evaluate the options given in A.9 Appendix 2?

Suggestions are:

- Project cost
- Lifespan of selected solution
- Maintenance plan/costs
- Risk of storms removing beach and other damage
- Total Area of accessible beach at high and low water
- Quality of beach provided
- Improvements to Clacton/Holland as an attraction for tourists

These and any other criteria should be weighted so that an objective selection can be made.

The options shown in A.9 Appendix 2 all have a lifespan of 100 years (assuming suggested maintenance is carried out – this is included in the estimated whole life costs). The options will be evaluated by the Project Team by taking into account: the economic assessment, an environmental assessment, comments from statutory stakeholders and members of the public. The appraisal process will follow the Environment Agency's Flood and Coastal Risk Management Appraisal Guidance (FCERM-AG) 2010, which considers projects in light of the criteria suggested above and more. Reasons for any decisions will be clearly stated within the Project Appraisal Report.

b) Who will be evaluating the various options and making the decision as to what option to proceed with?

The Project Team will evaluate the various options using criteria mentioned above. The Project Team includes: technical and economical specialists from Mott MacDonald (including coastal process specialists, geomorphologists, coastal engineers and regeneration specialists), Tendring District Council engineers and other Council representatives. In addition, throughout the selection process a number of wider statutory and non statutory consultees will influence the process including (but not limited to) the Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage and the Marine Management Organisation. In addition to this, Tendring District Council Tourism and Regeneration Officers, Tendring District Council planners and responses from members of the public will influence the selection process.

1.3 Why is the do nothing strategy even being considered as it is acknowledged it will lead to destruction of Clacton and Holland?

The 'Do Nothing' option is to provide the Environment Agency and the Project Team with a baseline that the other proposed options can be assessed against in terms of the benefits provided. It is standard practice (as per FCERM-AG – mentioned above) to consider the economic and social losses from a 'do nothing' option in order to derive the value of 'doing something'.

1.4 Why are Tendring District Council (TDC) only focusing on Holland and Clacton when there are imminent danger of the sea breaching the sea wall at the Naze and St Oysth?

Most of the Tendring District Council frontage consists of urban cliffs with sea defences at their bases and are managed by TDC under the Coast Protection Act 1949. The low lying areas like the sea wall at the Naze and St Oysth are protected by flood defences and these are the direct responsibility of the Environment Agency under the Water Resources Act 1991

1.5 Why are TDC acquiescing to Environment Agency (EA) plan to knock down sea wall between Holland and Frinton? Isn't this part of Tendring too?

The Shoreline Management Plan is a plan for managing flood and erosion risk for a particular stretch of shoreline over 100 years, looking at the short, medium and long term. The SMP identifies the best way to manage coastal flooding and erosion risk to people and the developed and historical environment. The SMP Zone C2 polices for Holland Haven to Frinton are to hold the line in the short and medium term and in the long term 2055-2105 to adopt a hold the line/managed realignment of the existing flood defence with low lying land at flood risk whilst continuing to provide defence to dwellings, roads and sewerage works to the same or an upgraded standard. This plan underwent an extensive consultation and has now been adopted by Government.

1.6 Do the proposed schemes ensure that a beach will be available, from the Pier to Holland Haven, at all states of the tide?

From a tourism point of view it is important that the beach is available all of the time. At present the beach in the majority of areas at Holland is only available for approximately 2 hours each side of low water.

All schemes include beach recharge. The levels of recharge are designed by looking at water level data including potential impacts of sea level rise over 100 years. The aim of the recharge is to allow part of the beach to be accessible throughout the tidal cycle. The only option where part of the frontage will certainly not have an accessible beach is Option 5: Fishtail and Straight Rock Groynes, Beach Recharge and Rock Revetment as there will be no beach recharge in front of the revetment.

1.7 None of the schemes shown in A.9 Appendix 2 show work being done to improve the beaches at beach hut area 'J' (near the Gunfleet Boating Club). Why is this?

The options that were presented in A.9 Appendix 2 are out of date. The options that were presented at the public exhibition included the frontage from the Pier to the Port of London radio mast.

1.8 Will TDC be employing a Managing Contractor or will TDC be Project Managing the works?

It is possible that a consultant will be employed to project manage the construction phase, but at this time no decision has been made

Section 2 – Technical

2.1 Groynes

a) What are the dimensions of the proposed groynes?

b) In Option B (in A.9 Appendix 2) why are the groynes shorter for Holland?

c) Is there any difference in the performance of short and long groynes?

d) Is there any difference in the cost of long and short groynes and why is the cost 1/2 to 1/3 of the estimate by Royal Haskoning less than 1 year ago?

e) What is the proposed groyne height?

The exact dimensions of the groynes have not yet been finalised, as results from modelling and ground investigations will be needed. The crest level of the groynes is expected to be similar to the level of the promenade, with beach levels recharged to around 0.5-1m below this level, through the levels of the beaches will naturally fluctuate over time.

The groynes by the pier are longer in length, as the aim here is to maintain a beach of finer sand material than to the north. The type of recharge material dictates the slope of the beach and therefore the length and slope of the groynes. The performance of the groynes will not therefore be affected, but they are designed to be suitable for a particular location and type of beach material.

Estimates from Royal Haskoning are from the Strategy study, which is a higher level study than this more detailed Project Appraisal Report. This means designs are not as detailed and a larger risk is added to the economics, which can significantly increase cost estimates.

2.2 Has TDC/EA/DEFRA considered the cost of damage to infrastructure if groynes not implemented?

Yes, included in the cost-benefit analysis is the cost of:

- Erosion damage of residential and commercial properties
- Damage to Marine Parade/Kings Parade along the frontage and damage to the roundabout at Holland-on-Sea between the B1032 and Kings Parade.
- Damage to Anglian Water infrastructure
- Impact on the tourism economy

Section 3 – Project Programme

3.1 a) Why is it going to take until 2015 before work starts?

b) What is happening until then?

The works are proposed to begin in February 2015. Between now and February 2015 the project team will be finalising the PAR which will be submitted to the Environment Agency in May 2013 to obtain funding for the scheme. Following the approval of the scheme (likely to occur late summer/early autumn 2013) the numerical modelling of the scheme and detailed design of the scheme will commence along with the procurement (following the relevant EU procurement rules) of a Contractor to undertake the works.

3.2 The local paper reported that the work could take up to six years to complete.

a) Is this true?

b) Why? Surely the area will be divided into sections and the detailed design, construction, each replenishment will roll from section to section creating parallel activities. Every year there is a delay may well result in costs being incurred for emergency repairs to the frontage. Money that will be wasted.

The timeline for the works is considered to be between three and six years. The time taken for the works to be completed is dependant of the available funding from the Environment Agency each year.

The timeline for the works also includes contingency for delays that could be identified during the detailed design period. These delays could include the availability of the equipment, storm events and unforeseen technical issues. It is important understand that at this stage the project team are producing the documents to get the scheme through the funding process. A more realistic length of on-site construction will be determined and publicised at the detailed design stage when a Contractor will be on board.

During the construction phase monitoring of the rest of the frontage will be undertaken. Should any emergency works be required during this period, these will be undertaken by the on site Contractor to minimise failure of the structures prior to the proposed scheme being implemented.

June Clare/Mike Badger
TDC