



Mike King IEng. MIIRSM MInst.NDT
79 California Avenue, Scratby,
Great Yarmouth, Norfolk.
m.king.insp.safety@totalise.co.uk



Mr Peter Frew – Chairman
Anglian Coastal Authorities Group
Sub-Cell 3b
North Norfolk District Council
Holt Road
Cromer
NR27 9LT

79 California Avenue
Scratby
Great Yarmouth
Norfolk
NR29 3NS
22nd. January 2007

Kelling to Lowestoft Ness Shoreline Management Plan **Final Report November 2006**

Dear Mr. Frew

Thank you for your letters Ref PDF and PDF/ET4209 dated 4th. December 2006 detailing the Anglian Coastal Authorities Group (AGAG) and North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) responses to the above document.

Firstly I must say that I admire the stance that NNDC have taken in response to this document and the fact that they are spending their reserve capital to install interim sea defences in the areas of coastline under their responsibility.

I sincerely hope that Great Yarmouth Borough Council will be similarly committed for their remaining unprotected coastal area from Winterton Ness to Scratby.

However I am objecting on behalf of the above organisations to the following sections in this document:

Paragraph 3.2 SUSTAINABILITY POLICY – Section 3.2.1 Coastal processes and coastal defence:

“Licensed aggregate dredging is often cited as a cause of erosion but studies conducted to assess this activity indicate that it does not have a noticeable impact upon coastal evolution, and there is no evidence to the contrary. Indeed there are many other observations that can be made to support these studies, including the fact that significant erosion of this coast took place long before present dredging”

I dispute there is no evidence to the contrary.

The following evidence confirms that the intense offshore aggregate dredging along the Norfolk and Suffolk coastline has been responsible for the accelerated erosion of this coastline.

Local Physical Evidence:

I have been a resident near the cliffs at Scratby for 30 years I am also a Norfolk man who has visited the beaches along this stretch of coast line for as long as I can remember and I have observed that the Low and High Tide marks in this location have advanced at least 100 metres over the last 30 years with the most significant sea water rises and erosion losses during the last eight years.

Why is this happening?

The movement of global tectonic plates is causing a tilting effect to the UK Scotland is rising and the East coast is sinking by approximately 1mm per year also global warming climate change is causing sea levels to rise by approximately 4 to 5mm per year, consequently these global effects cause only a small annual rise in sea level (approximately 5 to 6mm per year) and can not account for the accelerated beach level losses and coastal erosion that has occurred between Winterton and Scratby since 1992 when the offshore dredging companies significantly increased the tonnage of aggregates removed from the seabed along the east coast.

When offshore dredging commenced along the East coast in 1973 just 3 million metric tonnes were removed per annum, by 1992 this had risen to an annual extraction rate of 18 million tonnes, in 1994 22 million tonnes were removed and aggregate extraction rates continue increasing annually. The beaches, from Winterton to Scratby did not have the annual beach level sand losses and the sand dunes and cliffs did not have accelerated erosion (as detailed below) prior to the commencement of offshore coastal dredging.

Winterton to Scratby erosion losses in recent years:

The dual sand dune banks which existed along Winterton and Hemsby valleys now have only half to one third of their last dune bank remaining.

The Hemsby inshore life boat launch ramp was undercut by erosion and had to be rebuilt further back.

Winterton sand dune cliff at the beach access has eroded to within a metre of the beach café.

The sand/marram grass cliffs from Newport to Scratby have had approximately 2 metres stripped from them every year for the last 6 years and during the spring of 2005 an average of 3 metres was stripped away leaving a 1.5 to 2 metre drop at beach access points.

In addition to the sand dunes and cliffs erosion the sand has been stripped from the beaches every year for at least the last 7 years and sucked into the sea, during the past three years this has accelerated to a depth of at least 2 metres stripped from the beaches between Newport and Scratby, this is assisting the sea to encroach nearer the cliffs.

Historic Evidence:

The ruins of the lost village of Hallsands Devon which was swept away by the sea on the night of 26 January 1917 serves as a reminder of the folly on interfering with the offshore seabed.

In the village of Hallsands the greatest sadness was that this disaster need never have happened. Its origins lay in plans, unknown to local fishermen at the time, to extend the naval dockyard at Plymouth.

The plans involved sand and gravel being taken from the seabed further up the coast.

Dredging began in the spring of 1897 and during the next four years some 660,000 tonnes of material were removed.

Activities were eventually stopped when opposition from several fishing villages grew as they saw their shingle beaches being relentlessly carried away.

It took 18 years from the start of dredging to the final destruction of Hallsands village.

It had been assumed that the removal of any shingle would be replaced naturally by more material that lay somewhere out in the channel.

We now know that the same shingle which protected Hallsands and protects the nearby villages of Beesands and Torcross was deposited thousands of years ago during the ice ages, and is not being replaced.

For more information visit:

www.hallsands.org.uk or www.bbc.co.uk/devon/outdoors/nature/hallsands/shtml

Study Reports:

The following non UK Coastal Impact Studies irrefutably link offshore dredging to coastal erosion:

(A) The EUrosion Project Report

The following is a quote from the EUrosion Project Report "Living with Coastal Erosion – EuroSION Policy Recommendations December 2003" in section 2.2.2. Human structures and activities have exacerbated coastal erosion:

"(ii) Aggregate extraction. Dredging of river and seabed for navigational purposes (i.e. deepening navigation channels) or constructional purposes (e.g. sand and gravel mining) removes an important amount of sediments. This creates a sediment starvation which is in certain circumstances compensated by (re)activation erosion processes along the shore areas.

This has proved to be the case in a significant number of cases including Cove do Vapor (Portugal), the Western Scheldt estuary (Netherlands and Belgium), Donegal (Ireland), Cavado (Portugal), **and North Norfolk (UK)**. In some cases, dredging activities, by modifying the water depth in the near-shore area induce wave refraction which in turn modifies the long-shore and cross-shore sediment transport patterns."

(B) USA Navigation Study for Canaveral harbour Florida US Army Corps Final Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement – August 1990.

The US Army Corps of Engineers dredged a channel 14 miles offshore to keep shipping clear, but in fact created a massive, hydraulically self-sustaining open pit mine offshore serving to denude the onshore coastline.

The report concluded that even though this dredging took place 14 miles from the coastline and it was a relative small project it brought about massive shoreline changes stopping previous accreting and causing highly significant coastal erosion.

Further study reports can be viewed on MARINET website: www.marinet.org.uk

Present. Medium-term and Long-term Policy of "no active intervention" for Unit reference 3b14.

My second objection – which was relayed to Terry Oakes when the Draft SMP 3b was first introduced and no explanation was given at that time and remains unchanged in Final Report; is that Unit 3b14 Winterton to Scratby has been selected for sacrifice with a policy of "no active intervention" whilst the units each side 3b13 Eccles Beach to Winterton and 3b15 California to Caister have policies of "hold the line" – why is this?

Yours Sincerely

Mike King