

Meeting Minutes	
Subject	Langstone Coastal Defence Scheme – Langstone Stakeholder Working Group 4
Date	20 th April 2021
Time	1600 to 1800hrs
Venue	MS Teams (Virtual Telecall)
Attendees	Coastal Partners – James Spragg [JKS], Mark Stratton [MS], Kirsty Klepacz [KK], Lauren Burt [LB], Ed Rowsell [ER] AECOM- Jonathan Short [JS], Ben Taylor [BT], Peter Neville-Jones, Clifford Phang, Marilyn Rodgers, Cecily Hughes (Frontline Cottages Group), Mark Effenberg (Mill Lane and Harbourside), John Radford (Langstone Sailing Club), Louise MacCallum (Langstone Harbour Board), Ann Griffiths (Langstone Residents Association), Andy Lewis (Langstone Village Association, Mill Lane Residents Group), Martin Murphy (Save our Shores), Bob Comlay (SPS / Havant Civic Society) Peter Noble (The Royal Oak/Greene King) Nigel Armstrong (Langstone Conservation Group), Catharine Russell (Langstone Village Association, Langstone Flood Watch)
Apologies	Richard Austin (Chichester Harbour Authority), Sarah Graham (Langstone Village Association), Angela Armstrong (Langstone Residents Association), Ray Watterson (Langstone Sailing Club), Mike Combes (Langstone Conservation Group), Mark Dawson (Fullers/The Ship Inn), John Henly (Langstone Flood Watch)
Item	Minute
1	<p><u>These meeting minutes reference the supporting slides presented in this meeting.</u></p> <p><u>Welcome to the Meeting – [LB]</u> It was confirmed that the meeting would be recorded for accurate meeting minute records, that microphones would be automatically muted whilst presentations commenced, and that there was no requirement for attendees to have their video on.</p> <p><u>Agenda [LB]</u> The agenda for the two-part session was shared and summarised.</p> <p><u>Wider Community Engagement [LB]</u> It was explained that this Langstone Stakeholder Working Group is part of wider engagement with the community at Langstone, including meetings with frontline residents which were being planned. It was announced that the project’s website has been further updated.</p>
2	<p>Introductory Slides</p> <p><u>Journey so Far [JKS]</u> A timeline was shared, which explained progress to date, starting with the Shoreline Management Plan and Strategy recommendations. Progress with the option appraisal and outline design has also been completed, alongside further consultation on the Royal Oak alignment. The leading options identified during this stage were presented to Havant Borough Council Cabinet in October 2020, which then led to the procurement for professional services to deliver the detailed design phase. The contract for these professional services is being finalised imminently. Due to the importance of integrating the designer early in this engagement process, the preferred bidder AECOM after a competitive</p>



tendering process was invited to attend and we welcomed members of the AECOM team joining the session today. Further announcements about this appointment are due to be made upon execution of the contract award.

Introducing the Detailed Design Team [JKS]

Confirmation of the design team members from Coastal Partners and AECOM was provided, all of whom were in attendance to the session.

Introductions [LB]

Confirmation of the special interest groups who had been invited to join the Langstone Stakeholder Working group was provided.

Purpose and Objectives [LB]

Brief recap of the purpose and objectives of the LSWG, which was formed in 2018 at the start of the Langstone Scheme. The group have met three times at key points (start-up, identification of shortlist options, and at leading option stage). This LSWG is the 4th meeting, with a slightly larger membership than before. The terms of reference had been updated and circulated to members alongside the invitation to this session. The Objectives were recapped.

Aim of this SWG Session [LB]

The aims of this (4th) LSWG session were confirmed.

3

Project Update (Coastal Partners)

Engagement Outline Plan [JKS]

A diagram explaining the plans for engagement was shared alongside project milestones ahead (also now available on the project website).

Case for Change at Langstone [MS]

The benefits of the scheme were reaffirmed. The key driver for this scheme was reducing flood and erosion risk to the Langstone Community, alongside protection of the A3023 and preservation of Heritage.

The flood risk was also reaffirmed and explained, and that risk reduction is a key requirement for the scheme.

How we have Responded [JKS]

A summary of the original programme for this phase was provided, alongside how this has been adapted and extended in response to the community's concerns emerging in January 2020.

You said, we did- Royal Oak Quay Wall [JKS]

The concerns of the community for this frontage were summarised, alongside how the design team have responded to these concerns.

You said, we did- Ship Inn to High Street [JKS]

The concerns of the community for this frontage were summarised (boardwalk, use of existing structures, access for all), alongside how the design team have responded to these concerns (investigation to determine if the use of existing structures is possible, structural/ground investigations).

You said, we did- Hayling Billy Trail [JKS]

The concerns of the community for this frontage were summarised (bund considered unnecessary along the Billy Line, perceptions of dividing the community, extent of protection to the spit), alongside how the team have responded to these concerns (inclusion of Mill Lane and Langstone Spit frontages in detailed design, exploring options for funding contributions to ensure additional scheme can be added to core scheme delivery). If it is possible to deliver both core and additional scheme at the same time, there will not be a requirement to raise the levels of the upper section of the Hayling Billy Trail footpath (dotted grey line). In response to calls to reconsider full protection of the spit, it was confirmed that this

	<p>would not be possible, however if the community wished to progress this, Coastal Partners would provide their support and assistance wherever possible.</p> <p><u>You said, we did [JKS]</u></p> <p>Further responses to feedback were presented, including the attendance of the designer early in the detailed design process engagement. Increased numbers of visualisations have been included in the detailed design scope, and up to 12 architectural sketches to help visualise the scheme design. A landscape architect will contribute to the design development as well as integration of independent Heritage and Archaeological support to aid the design process. An independent cost consultant will also be appointed to help build detail on cost. Parking near the Ship Inn and slipway access would be maintained.</p>				
4	<p>Project Update (AECOM)</p> <p><u>AECOM's role [JS]</u></p> <p>AECOM is pleased to be continuing involvement in the project, introductions for the project team at AECOM. A quick summary of the team structure and specialisms, and the scope of their involvement in the project.</p> <p><u>The Design Process – Stakeholder Input [JS]</u></p> <p>Programme is just over one year. A number of milestones have been identified where engagement with stakeholders is required to shape, review and obtain feedback on proposals. Opportunity to review and ratify leading options ahead, namely at Ship Inn car park, and between Ship Inn and Royal Oak frontages.</p> <p>The outline design is the starting point, and this will be refined and optimised. AECOM will work collaboratively to finalise the scheme plans, utilising tools such as artistic impressions to present the design and facilitate feedback.</p> <p><u>Programme for Engagement</u></p> <p>One of the additional items in AECOM's proposal is for community working day on site to walk over and discuss key areas of the design and bring it to life. This is due early summer 2021 (TBC).</p> <p>There will also be further stakeholder working group meetings scheduled for 50% design milestone (Oct 2021) and at 80% design milestone (Jan/Feb 2022). A public exhibition will be used to present final designs in March 2022.</p> <p><u>Community Working Day- ideas to discuss</u></p> <p>Proposal to meet on site for full walkover and focus on key areas. Project team will be in attendance to answer questions from community. Looking to visualise proposed defence heights using cardboard tools to help visualise structure and impact on views and inform options for the design.</p>				
6	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="230 1134 1182 1187">Questions</th> <th data-bbox="1182 1134 2145 1187">Answers</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="230 1187 1182 1481"> <p>Q1- Thank you for presentation and additional information from AECOM on final design programme. A lot of the presentation was about the main [core] scheme, but the residents on other side of A3023 are also concerned about the impact of the scheme. What is AECOM's proposal for the design for these residents to the west side of Langstone.</p> <p>Follow- up- to confirm that AECOM are doing the design for the core and additional scheme</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1182 1187 2145 1481"> <p>A1 [JS]- <i>The additional scheme frontage is included within the detailed design scope and remit to the same level as the core scheme.</i></p> <p>A1 [JKS] <i>Yes both core and additional scheme will be designed to same level.</i></p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Questions	Answers	<p>Q1- Thank you for presentation and additional information from AECOM on final design programme. A lot of the presentation was about the main [core] scheme, but the residents on other side of A3023 are also concerned about the impact of the scheme. What is AECOM's proposal for the design for these residents to the west side of Langstone.</p> <p>Follow- up- to confirm that AECOM are doing the design for the core and additional scheme</p>	<p>A1 [JS]- <i>The additional scheme frontage is included within the detailed design scope and remit to the same level as the core scheme.</i></p> <p>A1 [JKS] <i>Yes both core and additional scheme will be designed to same level.</i></p>
Questions	Answers				
<p>Q1- Thank you for presentation and additional information from AECOM on final design programme. A lot of the presentation was about the main [core] scheme, but the residents on other side of A3023 are also concerned about the impact of the scheme. What is AECOM's proposal for the design for these residents to the west side of Langstone.</p> <p>Follow- up- to confirm that AECOM are doing the design for the core and additional scheme</p>	<p>A1 [JS]- <i>The additional scheme frontage is included within the detailed design scope and remit to the same level as the core scheme.</i></p> <p>A1 [JKS] <i>Yes both core and additional scheme will be designed to same level.</i></p>				

No further questions received, 5-minute break to return at 1720

7 Forum on Funding and Contributions

Project Funding [MS]

A brief summary of funding journey to date and secured funding, alongside introduction about the funding gap.

Closing the Funding Gap

The current estimated funding gap is approximately £900,000 towards the core scheme, and £1.1 million for the additional scheme (Mill Lane and Langstone Spit frontages). The project team have been working to identify how to close this gap.

Methods for closing the funding gap were presented, including managing out the risk to the project, refining cost estimates as the detailed design stage progresses, and seeking contributions and investment from the community and other stakeholders. Seeking contributions from residents was a specific request by HBC Cabinet.

The benefits of closing the funding gap were also reaffirmed including better protection to residents, protection of the A3023 and other wider benefits.

Closing the Funding Gap – Activity.

With the aim of generating discussion around the funding gap, four questions were posed to the group:

1. Who will benefit from the scheme? (responses as residents, pubs, visitors, recreational users, walkers, tourism/visitors both locally and nationally, is this fully valued?).
2. Can the community/individuals contribute to the scheme? If so- how?
3. What are the barriers towards contributing?
4. How can the LSWG facilitate closure of the funding gap?

This was due to be presented with use of an interactive whiteboard tool, however this was not accessible to all participants due to restrictions, and instead these questions were discussed in turn, prompting further questions and feedback from the group.

Questions

Answers

Q2- what is the purpose of the first question- who will benefit from the scheme?

A2 [LB] the aim is to map out who/what could be seen to benefit from the scheme, so that we can move forward and understand who might want to invest in the scheme as they will benefit from it. Residents and pubs have been mentioned as good examples, recreation users.

Q3- who do you [the project team] think will benefit from the scheme

A3 [MS] we have done a lot of thinking to try and understand this but pose the question to the group to help us identify whether we have missed anything.

Q4- The community can help in a number of ways, but the problem in the early stages is that it is difficult to understand how to contribute (financial or other), or how much? What is actually involved? We need specifics on scope and benefit of flood defences. The community has shown desire to contribute.

A4 [MS] Hopefully now that detailed design stage has started there will be further information developed that should start to answer these questions. If we start with the question about closing the current expected gap, we can refine exactly how much as we move forwards.

	<p>Q5- Sailing club concerns. Leading option for Spit defences seems to have changed over time (increased) and even reduced costs have been discussed. There is also difficulties as current proposal is not our land, this limits access to funding pots. An alternative proposal on sailing club land would enable funding.</p>	<p><i>A5 [MS] The process of obtaining funding for this type of project is very challenging. Costs estimations do change, and we do appreciate that how we present costs is complicated and can lead to uncertainty. We understand that this is a barrier to contributing, and that we aim for more cost certainty as the project develops.</i></p> <p><i>A5 [KK] It does come down to the timing of conversations about funding gap and gaining certainty of cost. If we wait for cost certainty, this can cause a delay. Need to find a balance, start conversations and identify barriers now and get ahead of the barriers.</i></p>
	<p>Q6- With reference to the barriers, the community needs to understand exactly how much. The question is when will costing be settled? If we know this, we can understand how to close the gap.</p>	<p><i>A6 [JS] The design is a progressive process, we start with confirming leading options to 50%, 80% and 100% design. As this progresses this funnels down detail and risk. By the end of this, we will have the best estimate of cost (working alongside the early contractor engagement). Improved certainty as we go. Seems prudent to aim high, since additional funding could be used to fund wider benefits or simply not used and returned. Work proactively with existing funding gap.</i></p>
	<p>Q7- Follow on question. If core scheme comes in cheaper, can this surplus be used for the Harbourside/Mill Lane to complete construction of these defences.</p>	<p><i>A7 [MS] It would depend on availability and who the funding partner was, but if there was a surplus of funding nationally or locally, we would look to deliver construction of core and additional scheme. Overall shortfall is £2M, hence conversation started with the community. Due to funding approach, and reliance on partnership funding it is not uncommon to approach beneficiaries for funding.</i></p>
	<p>Q8- Is it possible to move funding between frontages, and can we receive a breakdown of cost clearly showing shortfall. Need greater understanding of cost</p>	<p><i>A8 [MS] Agreed that we need detailed breakdown of costs, and that certainty and detail increases over time. We now have better understanding of likely range of funding gap. Any savings will be used to close funding gap for the core scheme first</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the board walk option has been replaced with an accessible path, a structure will still be necessary along this frontage so not sure of savings yet as may just be different material/option. We share the same concerns, but certainty will improve with the detailed design progression.</i></p>
	<p>Q9- Please can costings be well controlled and justified?</p>	<p><i>A9 [JKS] Through employment of an independent cost consultant we will be working on this. The optimism bias is a reasonable inclusion in the cost estimates at this stage and is applied in line with the treasury green book. As we improve our certainty about the design in this next stage, we will be able to refine this risk allowance in the costs. The optimism bias is necessary as evidenced on a national scale for this type of project and helps us to cover this aspect.</i></p>

No further questions received

Concluding the Meeting

Wider Community Engagement

Reminder that this LSWG is part of wider plans for engagement.

Find out more

Website has been updated:

<https://coastalpartners.org.uk/project/langstone-coastal-defence-scheme>

You can also sign up to our new Langstone Scheme e-Newsletter for project updates.

Meeting minutes will be prepared and circulated to members of the LSWG.

Thank you to all attendees for joining today's session.

1815 The meeting closed.