

Notes from the LSWG



Subject:	Langstone Stakeholder Working Group (5)	
Venue:	Havant Borough Council Public Services Plaza – Hollybank Room	
Date:	Monday 4 th July 2022	
Time:	12:30-16:30	
Attendees:	Coastal Partners: Lauren Burt [LB] Amy Brittan [AB], James Spragg [JKS], Mark Stratton [MS], Andrew Pearce [AP]	
	AECOM: Jon Short [JS], Harriet Ridler [HR]	
	Key Stakeholders:	
	Mill Lane and Harbourside Sea Defence Group	Mark Effenberg
	Mill Lane and Harbourside Sea Defence Group, LVA	Andy Lewis
	Frontline Action Group (FLAG)	Marilyn Rodgers
	Frontline Action Group (FLAG)	Cecily Hughes
	Solent Protection Society, Civic Society	Bob Comlay
	Havant Borough Council - St Faiths Ward Cllr	Cllr Tim Pike
	SOS	Martin Murphy
	Chichester Harbour Conservancy	Richard Austin
	HBC Conservation Officer	Peter Fellows
	Langstone Harbour Board	Meg Roberts
	Coastguard Cottages	Kate Hart
	Langstone Cutters Rowing Club	Mike Gilbert
	Langstone Residents Association	Angela Armstrong
Havant Borough Council - St Faiths Ward Cllr	Cllr Phil Munday	
Langstone Flood Watch	John Henly	
Langstone Village Association	Richard Leslie	
Apologies:	Langstone Village Association	Sarah Graham
	Langstone Flood Watch, LVA	Catharine Russell
	Frontline Action Group (FLAG)	Helen Donald
	Langstone Conservation Area	Ann Griffiths
	The Ship Inn	Mark Dawson
	Langstone Road	Edmund Neville
	Langstone Village Association	Polly and John Chapman
	Langstone Road	Kevin Edwards
	Langstone Conservation Group	Nigel Armstrong
	Langstone Conservation Group	Mike Combes
	Frontline Action Group (FLAG)	Peter Oliver
	Royal Oak	Emma Gelder
	Langstone Sailing Club	John Radford and Ray Watterson
	Green Cottage	Colin and Gemma Monk

Agenda Item	Discussion
<p>1.</p>	<p>Intro Slides (CP: AB/LB)</p> <p>[LB] Housekeeping arrangements, introduction to the team and LSWG representations (including apologies). Meeting agenda confirmed alongside meeting objectives and aspirations.</p> <p>[AB] Overview of the need for the scheme (recap case for change).</p> <p>[LB] Engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous SWG engagement agenda and outcomes. • Stakeholder working group (July 2021). <p>Engagement key influencers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Glass around Royal Oak. • Ship Inn car park road raising. • Alternatives between the Lookout and the High Street. • Langstone High Street floodgates. • Mill Lane and Harbourside considering a staged approach of options. <p>[AB] Progression so far; Currently at the 50% design stage, 80% in the future will have a SWG and public exhibition event. Info from this will be fed into the 100% design and we will gain HBC approval to proceed (planning permission etc...). Construction currently scheduled for Spring 2024.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Design Slides (AECOM: JS/HR)</p> <p>[JS] Outlined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress to date in detailed design. Outlined the '50% design' having no set definition. Half the engineering thought/effort/work for the scheme. Focus is on key principles and characteristics of the scheme and various liaison and engagement on aspects of the scheme. 3D model being prepared to support the designers, will be shared at the 80% design stage. • Outcomes of Structural Investigation confirmed. • Walkthrough of each frontage and progress in design. • Highlighted the aspects which are to be shaped by Stakeholders; (Wall appearance/materials, Floodgate appearance, Landscaping) • Introduced potential alternative alignment for wall positioning at frontage 4 (Green cottage to Winklemarket) and that this would be discussed during breakout session later. • Core Scheme 50% design walkthrough. For each frontage, an example present day photo, map with alignment, cross sections, artistic illustration and key considerations shown. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ F1A, Billy Line North: Raised embankment with footpath (footpath raising). ○ F2, Billy Line South: Raised embankment.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ F3, Ship Inn Car Park: Dwarf wall along A3023 and Raised surface in car park. ○ F3, Ship Inn: New Sheet piled wall in replace of the existing wall. Cladding material is up for discussion, and subject to further consultation. ○ F4, Lookout and Green Cottage: New Sheet piled wall in front of the existing wall. Wall heights built to match the existing heights. ○ F4, Flint Wall and Winklemarket: New Sheet piled wall in front of the existing wall. ○ F5, Langstone High Street: Pedestrian and vehicle floodgate at the end of the High Street. Gate swing confirmed as swinging out seaward to open. It was confirmed that position of gates had been investigated (results set out in slide pack). ○ F5, Royal Oak: New sea wall with opportunity to include glass top investigated (as a result of consultation feedback) and a buried sheet pile toe. ○ F5, Allotment and No.21, and footpath: Solid wall with a floodgate at the transition point by allotments. Emergency access to be further considered. ● Additional Scheme 50% design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ F1B, Mill Lane and Harbourside: Embankment, stepped wall/toe and new wall. Slipways are present here and are to be considered going forward (are these being used? / are these needed? Further consultation required) ○ F6, Langstone Spit: Rock armour revetment (to stabilise the erosion spot at the end of the spit). ● 3D Model: Currently being developed to support design.
3.	<p>Breakout (AECOM/CP: All) See Breakout Summary</p>
4.	<p>Cost and Close Slides (CP: AB/LB) [LB] Core scheme funding (Partnership Funding) balance of all schemes cost/benefit scoring to achieve Defra Flood Defence Grant in Aid and proportion of Contributions required. [AB] Overviewed the committed, High, Medium, and Low confidence funding. £6.1million already committed as ‘Contributions’ to scheme funds.</p> <p>High-level cost estimate summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Construction cost build-up: (costings relevant at the current time). 2022 estimates include all the minimum requirements for working on site, provided as a breakdown on the slides. ● Construction costs: cost increase reasons outlined on the slide.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry wide cost increases outlined. • Cost Estimate timeline: Level of certainty in the cost estimations will increase as the design continues to progress. Next cost estimate due for the 80% design, and this information will be shared when known. • How we are looking to increase our certainty: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Design outputs to come. ○ ECI advice. ○ Early efficiencies of construction methods/sequency/programming? ○ Cost effective safe access. ○ Considering levels of (acceptable) risk. ○ Until we go to tender, full costings will not be known. ○ 100% scheduled for Spring 2023. Construction is scheduled for Spring 2024. • Whole Scheme preliminaries: outlined on slides. <p>[LB] Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the LSWG: ACTION- Feedback forms will be collected and compiled. Minutes/summary of discussions will be compiled and circulated to all attendees and stakeholders who were not able to attend. Q&A's will be compiled and passed onto AECOM to integrate this feedback into the 80% design. Project webpage will be updated. • Programme ahead: Currently at 50% and there will be another LWSG for the 80% design milestone (Autumn 2022) where more details surrounding the design will be available, including a photo-visualisation of the design from a variety of viewpoints. A public exhibition will also be provided for 80% design. 100% design planning application will be developed. • Wider community engagement: Not just LSWG. Various 1:2:1 meetings are being held with residents. Newsletters, web updates and emails. Webpage will have updated information.
	<p>[LB] Any other business/outstanding questions? Note that questions raised during breakout are captured in breakout summary Q&A.</p> <p>[Richard Leslie] Pleased to see information on cost increase. For the 80% (or before) please also show the analysis of the benefits, because the benefits need to outweigh the costs. For number of houses involved, costs associated need to outweigh the benefits. Need to see the benefits of the scheme alongside the costs.</p>

[JKS] There are £24.6m of avoided cash damages over the 50 year appraisal period. However, only a proportion of these are included in the governments benefit calculation and therefore the calculated benefits that help draw down Grant in Aid funding is £13.m.

[LB] Need to return the benefits and explain these side by side as they were presented early on in the process and can get left behind.

ACTION - CP will look to see how we can share these benefits, and whether they will be need to be refreshed in line with latest guidance.

[Martin Murphy] What is the difference between the costings and the funding (i.e. the funding gap?)

[AB] £10.6mil is costing for the core scheme construction.

[Martin Murphy] Funding looks as though it could go down (as some is not yet secured), whereas costings will not go down. The costs have increased significantly since 2020, and there are still 2 years left before the scheme construction starts. Where will the additional funding come from if you have exhausted the funding options available? Are we wasting the time doing this at the moment, since the funding gap is not likely to be closed. Funding sources: where has the committed come from and are we likely to get any more from these sources (we have already got money from), will the additional sources provide enough to close the funding gap? At the moment the funding gap is £4/4.5mil and is only likely to get worse. What are CP going to do about this?

[MS] Initially £3.5mil cost estimates were questioned and now we have raised £6.1mil. Securing funding is an iterative process. All these funding sources have the same problems nationally and we will be going back to these to ask for additional funding to match the inflation rates. If the funding is not secured by the 100% design, the project will have to pause. But we will look into additional funding to close this gap.

[Martin Murphy] Over the next three years what do you think the final figure is going to be?

[MS] Cannot be answered currently. Some local projects (e.g., Southsea) have increased from £100mil to £150mil. On a wider scale, surplus funding was handed back to the EA last year because projects do not meet the criteria set to secure funding.

[AB] Spent circa. £1.3million currently (July 2022) from inception to the current stage of the detailed design.

[Andy Lewis] Is 80% design stage too late to be knowing these costs?
Response: It is not too late to be knowing these costs. We are creating a bespoke solution, that needs the details for accurate pricing. As we continue to the develop the design, we are able to increase our level of certainty with the cost estimations as more information and design specification is prepared. Each updated cost estimate incorporates the

Notes from the LSWG

latest understanding of the materials, construction methods and the construction industry market.

[Mike Gilbert] Thanks given for the information provided. Concerned about the length of time looking ahead and where this is going (with inflation). 17% inflation is not realistic. The ECI Contractor should be advising on costs etc... If the money is available, why do we not start the project now/get on with it. £1.3mil has been spent and many years has been spent to get to this point. Can you do a phased approach?
Response: We have considered whether construction could be brought forward, and unfortunately it is highly unlikely that we will be able to bring forward a section of the scheme. This is because the works would be required to receive planning permission, and environment and marine consents, and these are not likely to be received unless we can show that the scheme will deliver the reduced flood risk to the whole community, and this cannot be demonstrated until we have completed the whole of the design for the scheme.

[Cllr Phil Mundy] Thanks given for the information provided. Agree to work sooner rather than later is better for the costs. Request to do something about the wall collapse to the east of the Mill Pond, stressed importance for Village.

[LB] Thanks given to attendees. Working group concluded: 16:10.