

Page 20 (2014/15)

Minutes of a meeting of the '**DINGHY PARK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**' which was held on **Thursday 26th June 2014 at 6.30pm** in the Parish Office.

Present:- Edward Allen (Chairman), Margaret Benson, John Byfield, Tony Faulkner, John Seymour, Penny Wiles and David Woodcock. Also John Sizer of the National Trust.

Clerk:- Tracey Bayfield.

Public:- 0

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** – were received & ***accepted*** from Alban Donohoe (*away*).
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – There were none.
3. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that the **MINUTES** dated Tuesday 8th April 2014 are signed as a true record.
4. **ADJOURNMENT** – To allow for public participation was not required.
5. Members received and gave updates and reports of the proposed **DREDGING WORK** and agreed the next steps:-
 - i) **Present position & particle analysis.**

Land & Water Services had sent a copy of their 'Analysis Interpretive Note: Blakeney Sediment' dated 11th June 2014 for the members to consider. The report consisted of 19 pages. 6 samples were taken on 21st May 2014. The general description of the sediment is: Brown gravelly sand and sandy clayey silt. Samples 2/3/6 consisted of approx.. 99% sand. Sample 1 consisted of approx.. 48% gravel and 44% sand. Samples 4/5 consisted of predominantly silt and sand fractions.

All were found to be non hazardous dredging's which consisted on low overall contamination levels. The report stated that the material is not potentially beneficial to agriculture, not suitable for re-use with plant uptake* , but that it may be suitable for general re-use without plant uptake*. (**Further checks may need to be made if a specific type of re-use is required.*)

Actions - Jessica Flemming – (The Land Partnership) had today spoken with Adam Thurtle, Environment Agency at Ipswich, with regard the use of the spoil and reported back as follows: He has concluded that the materials are too sandy to be used in bund construction or for local flood alleviation works. He suggested that we contact the Marine Management Organisation for advice. They may have other similar projects and may also know of a licensed location where spoils may be deposited at sea. Alternatively we could assess use as building construction

Page 21 (2014/15)

materials. The key to moving this on is to develop a viable plan for disposal, Mr Thurtle acknowledged that this is difficult, will be expensive, but it is possible.

Actions – Jessica Flemming will contact the MMO and a local construction supplier, 'Drury's Recycling in North Walsham, although the members felt that this really would not be financially viable.

A plan needs to be developed for spoil disposition, even if expensive; Absolute clarification on the amount of material to be moved is needed. (Email dated 27th June Jessica states that under the current plan we are looking at about 5,000 m³ to be removed, and was going to look into the use of geo-tubes.) She will make enquiries about the suitability of the sediments and the site, ie, whether they can be exposed during low tides, costs and logistics for the packing machine.

Spoil would need to be dewatered prior to transport if moved off the site to the land. There are portable devices available.

John Sizer (National Trust) has said that it cannot go on the west bank. The N/T and the Environment Agency have met with all the landowners associated with The Freshes back on the 19th May. Natural England says that this area has to be maintained as a habitat in situ, but the E.A. proposals present problems with overtopping. The N/T thinks that it would be good to build up the levels for the future.

Tony Faulkner had gathered from conversations that the material may be suitable for backfilling. The Environment Agency had produced a 105 page report following the tidal surge, and as part of this review into the future of the flood defence bank, there are 6 options, which fall under section 5.1. Discussions and conclusions.

Formal approach to Brent Pope to ask if there is about possibility of depositing the dredged material onto his strip of land which runs along the bank, which is outside of the SSSI protected area.

Questions which had previously been asked were asked again:-

- Could the Wells dredger help us – Initially we were told no, it was too busy to even think about leaving its site, when we started this discussion. The question will be asked again, but of course logistics play a huge part, not just whether or not the equipment is available. ie. would it fit, where would the material go, what would be the methodology here, is it even practical?
- Had the channel been deeper, would it have helped to drain the saltwater of the marshes much quicker following the December storm surge?
- Why not improve the existing channel rather than cut a new one? If we did this, then what proportion would the spoil be reduced to, if we were to just remove material from the eastern side of the channel? If we cut the

Page 22 (2014/15)

material to be moved to about a quarter, then Brent Pope's strip of land would be able to cope with the material. What we need to know is how much spoil this option would produce.

- *It was agreed that John Byfield will draw up a new proposal based on the above question and have it ready by the end of July.*

We need to keep in close contact with the Environment Agency as we have to somehow redesign the outfall from Bridge Creek as they too would like to improve the outflow.

The National Trust feels that the drainage solution needs to be looked at as a matter of urgency, especially the sluices, which could be improved for both the creek level and the marsh level. The E.A. would like men and machines on site in September with regard the bank work, and they seem to like the idea of lowering and widening, which would mean that each year there would be a flood event, but the N/T thinks that the E.A. have got their levels wrong. There were 37 failures in the bank during the December storm.

ii) **Costs to date, amount of remaining grant available.**

The project costs to date (approximate) including expenses and VAT in the case of 'The Land Partnership' are: £3,800 (ecology surveys, meetings and co-ordination), and 'Land & Water Services' are: £2,500 (survey and mass balance) for which we have not yet been invoiced. Lab analysis: Approx. £1,000 - £2,000 (not yet confirmed).

The initial grant received was £10,000, the Committee have agreed to add the £400 winter works allowance to this budget, as they do not plan on any minor works during this period, following the damage caused by the storm surge. This means that the approximate balance left for further expenditure is around £2,100.

iii) **Fund raising.**

Jessica Flemming suggests that we approach the new Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (Norfolk & Suffolk) as well as Norfolk County Council and other external sources for funding and stress the economic importance of this scheme within the local area.

6. Other **MANAGEMENT ISSUES** – The Committee will do a walk round site inspection ahead of the next meeting.

7. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING** – Thursday 7th August, commencing at 5pm on the Dinghy Park, and then back to the Parish Office for 5.30pm.

Meeting closed at 7.57pm.

Chairman _____