

FAO: Dr. L.J. Seiderer
Marine Ecological Surveys Limited

Ref: H202/EX/2

c.c. Dr. A.H. Brampton
HR Wallingford

Ref: P4762

Dear Dr's Seiderer and Brampton,

Thank you for your letters dated 19th April and 7th April respectively regarding our concerns on further dredging of Area 202. I appreciate your detailed and comprehensive response to the sixteen points of objection made to you in my original return.

The replies from yourselves and HR Wallingford will need a period of close study, so I will defer comment upon these until that opportunity presents itself and our advisers have met upon them. But I would like to come back to you on the first prime claimed discrepancy, i.e. the distance of Area 202, Cross Sands, from the nearest shoreline.

Both yourselves MES and HR Wallingford are saying that MARINET made a basic error in stating that the nearest edge of Area 202 to the shoreline is 4.7 km, and you are both stating categorically that the nearest edge of area 202 to the coast is 7km (4.5 nautical miles). I was then given a short lesson on the conversion of miles to kilometres, so can only assume that you consider that Marinet made a basic error/mistake in the conversion of nautical miles to kilometres, hence going on to give a basic lesson in chart reading.

Let me explain to you how I arrived at the distance of Area 202 to the nearest shoreline, so that you can tell me precisely at what point you feel I have erred.

I used the map by Crown Estate, as below, which, as The Crown Estate is the effective landowner and licensee of the site, I take to be accurate. It clearly shows Area 202, the area in question, at 10 o'clock in the whole block.



The dotted lines paralleling the coastline show the six mile and twelve mile limits respectively, as labelled. Note that the distance is given in miles as '6 miles' and '12 miles', and not given in nautical miles. If one now ratios the western edge of Area 202/436 to the six mile limit, it falls exactly half way, i.e. three miles from the nearest shoreline to the west-south-west.

Next I multiplied the three miles by 1.60934 to bring it to kilometres, so $1.60934 \times 3 = 4.82802$ km, which I rounded off to the whole number giving 4.8 km, then allowing 0.1 km for the low tide mark. Thus we arrive at 4.7 km, a distance far closer to the shoreline than the 7 km you have claimed.

So, where do you think I may have miscalculated? A cartographer colleague at the local University has just looked at my methodology, and assures me that my calculations are wholly and totally correct. In no way could he or I see how you could have arrived at 7 km. So who is it that needs a lesson in simple map reading and metric conversion?

As a combination of a (retired) scientist and a (retired) magistrate, I have always made a point in being accurate, and I have not lost my marbles just yet.

Other than it casts doubts on my accuracy, I am not really that concerned of the precise distance as it is a diversion from the major points of objection that we are making. The beaches would still draw down even if dredging came about ten times further out. It is just that being so close to the shoreline the erosion will come quicker and be addressed in a greater concentration to a more localised area.

I hope and trust that you know see the reasoning behind my calculations, and why 4.7 kilometres was given by MARINET and the NSAG.

Yours Sincerely,

Pat Gowen

NSAG & MARINET