

Seaton Beach Management Plan (BMP) – Issues, Current Management Practices and Actions

PREPARED FOR: East Devon District Council
PREPARED BY: Emma Allan
DATE: 13 February 2018
PROJECT NUMBER: 694226
REVISION NO.: v2
APPROVED BY: Emma Allan

Issues for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management, Current Management Practices and Actions

1.0 Introduction

There are a number of issues related to Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) within the BMP study area, which extends from Seaton Hole, in the west, to the Harbour Wall, on the east side of the River Axe, and the Axe River up to the Axe Bridge. Some of the issues are already addressed by existing management practices, be it in part or fully. However, in some instances these issues are only addressed in part or not addressed at all.

The aim of the BMP is to guide coastal flood and erosion risk management activities in the next 20-30 years, and from that, define the management regime for the next 5 years. This will be done in the context of the longer-term (100 years) sustainable and integrated plan to implement the SMP2 policy for the study area.

As part of the BMP process, it is therefore important to identify the existing FCERM issues, determine how they addressed at present, and identify the actions that can be taken to resolve these issues.

With that, this document provides:

1. A summary of the FCERM issues in the BMP study area;
2. A description of the current management practices that either in part or fully address the issue; and
3. The actions that will be taken as part of the BMP development to address the issue. The summary is presented in Section 3.0.

2.0 Sources of Information

The issues have been identified from a number of sources, including:

- Stakeholder meeting (16th November 2016) – minutes provided in subsequent stakeholder meeting;
- The original project scope;
- Pre-contract meeting (3rd May 2017);
- Project site visit (24th May 2017);

- Stakeholder meeting (25th May 2017) + WeSSHA (notes on aims and objectives of the West Seaton and Seaton Hole Association);
- Public drop-in session (25th May 2017);
- Baseline understanding reports prepared as part of this project, including:
 - Coastal Processes Baseline Report
 - Defences Baseline Report
 - Environmental Baseline Report
 - Economics Baseline Report.
- Stakeholder meeting (30th August 2017); and
- Axe Harbour meeting (6th September 2017).

3.0 Summary of FCERM Issues, Current Management Practices and Actions to be Taken by the BMP

3.1 BMP Wide Issues

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
1	Beach monitoring- time limited	Beach profile data is only available from 2007 to 2016, through the South West Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme (SWRCMP). Therefore, there are inherent uncertainties relating to long-term trends which extend beyond 2007.	Coastal Processes Baseline Report Stakeholder meeting – 30 th August 2017	Beach monitoring undertaken through the South West Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme (SWRCMP).	Not required to consider in options appraisal. However, action is to include a recommendation in the BMP to continue SWRCMP, and following additional monitoring needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a minimum, on-going analysis of PCO beach profile data is recommended following each new survey. This will, over time, provide a longer data set from which to determine trends in beach behaviour. At present, PCO only monitor eleven profiles between Seaton Hole the distal end of Seaton Spit biannually. Monitor intervening profiles at the same frequency and provide the information necessary to estimate CSA and volume change. Use alongside analysis of LiDAR data. Use fixed cameras to monitor beach change. As part of the potential changes being considered for the flood gates at Fisherman’s Gap, the Environment Agency has discussed the introduction of telemetry to monitor whether the flood gates are open or closed. The telemetry could simultaneously be used for beach monitoring.
2	Beach monitoring – limited and unreliable	At the western end of the BMP study area between Seaton Hole and West Seaton, the beach profile data is limited and unreliable.	Coastal Processes Baseline Report	Beach monitoring undertaken through the South West Regional Coastal Monitoring Programme (SWRCMP).	Not required to consider in options appraisal. However, action is to include a recommendation in the BMP for following additional monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve quality / frequency of beach profile data, where possible. Use alongside analysis of LiDAR data.
3	Beach monitoring – not collected at Beer	Presently beach profile data is not collected by the SWRCMP at Beer.	Coastal Processes Baseline Report		Not required to consider in options appraisal. However, action is to include a recommendation in the BMP or following additional monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the SWRCMP to include regular beach profile monitoring at Beer. This will help to determine, in more

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
					<p>detail locations of erosion and accretion, and provide the information necessary to estimate CSA and volume change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use alongside analysis of LiDAR data.
4	Movement of beach material during storms	Understanding of the sediment movement between the beach, nearshore and offshore is limited.	Coastal Processes Baseline Report		<p>Not required to consider in options appraisal. However, action is to include a recommendation in the BMP or following additional monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake detailed bathymetric surveys to help to improve the understanding of the sediment movement between the beach, nearshore and offshore.
5	Partnership Funding	Any future FCERM activities along the BMP frontage will likely need some level of partnership funding contributions to deliver them. The economics baseline report has identified a number of potential beneficiaries of FCERM activities and assessed the likelihood of gaining contributions. Further discussions between the Environment Agency and the other organisations identified need to be undertaken to develop a funding partnership for this area.	Economics Baseline Report		Action to be included as recommendation in BMP. Not required to consider in options appraisal beyond assessing likely PF scores and so contribution levels required.
6	Economic Benefits (Erosion Risk Damages)	The assessment of erosion risk damages reported in the economics baseline report assumes assets are all lost at the same point in time. In reality this is unlikely, so refinement of the analysis should determine bespoke “year of loss” for each asset at risk. In doing so, it would also be appropriate to assess the impact on the resulting Present Value (PV) damages of different safety buffers (i.e. allowing a set distance seawards of the asset at which it is deemed unsafe to	Economics Baseline Report		Action to be included as recommendation in BMP as part of future detailed business case development. Not required to consider in options appraisal.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		<p>continue to use – in effect bringing forward the “year of loss”).</p> <p>Further work to potentially refine the analysis could usefully include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining bespoke capital valuations (not at erosion risk valuations) of each asset. • Refining the assumptions about costs associated with loss of the road. • Assessing when assets at risk of flooding and erosion are likely to be lost to erosion, and therefore to what time in the appraisal period could these assets be included in the flood damages assessment. 			
7	Economic Benefits (Flood Risk Damages)	<p>Further development of the flood risk damages assessment could be undertaken, including consideration of addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including a range of climate change epochs as applicable. • Incorporation of property-specific threshold surveys (if available) would decrease uncertainty in final AADs estimates. Commission of property surveys (if not readily available) would incur additional costs. • MCM code for residential properties used in this assessment was ‘1’, regardless of the type of property. This could be further refined into two or more digits. 	Economics Baseline Report		Action to be included as recommendation in BMP as part of future detailed business case development. Not required to consider in options appraisal.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recoding '999' properties and investigating further the non-residential rental yield. • Including damages to Seaton Tramway Line and other utility assets. However, further work may be needed to establish existing levels of defence/resilience of these. • Understanding if any of the assets are also at risk from fluvial/surface water flooding and requires sharing with other schemes. 			
8	Economic Benefits (Amenity)	<p>In order to undertake assessment of amenity damages and potential gains to increase the economic case for future investment in FCERM, the following data is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Estimated or Actual) day, staying and local visitor numbers in 2015 / 2016. • Identification of a nearest equivalent beach / location amenity (likely would select one of Sidmouth / Budleigh Salterton / Lyme Regis). • Estimated additional travel costs to the alternative beach / location for each type of visitor • Conduct a survey of visitor preference and use contingent valuation methods to appreciate the value of enjoyment at the preferred and alternative sites. <i>NB: this aspect</i> 	Economics Baseline Report		Action to be included as recommendation in BMP as part of future detailed business case development. Not required to consider in options appraisal.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		<i>can be quite costly so it may be appropriate to use values contained in the MCM from previous studies around the coast of the UK to provide valuation.</i>			
9	Requirement for HRA	Early consultation with Natural England during the development of the BMP will be required. There is a potential requirement for a Habitats Regulations Assessment to assess impacts of beach management activities on the integrity of international nature conservation sites. There is also a potential requirement for a Marine Conservation Zone assessment.			As part of options appraisal, need for HRA screening will be considered and taken forward if required on the final selected preferred option, in discussion with Natural England and East District Council.
10	Valuation of assets	The method to value properties within the economics assessment has been questioned. Residential properties were valued (and capped) using current market value from property websites / land registry. Other commercial properties are valued using rateable data from national archives. Work can be done to define better the values, including bespoke valuations by local estate agents as part of future studies.	Economics Baseline Report Stakeholder meeting - 30 th August 2017		Action to include a recommendation in the BMP. Not required to consider in management options appraisal.
11	Valuation of impact on physical health	The inclusion of the valuation of the loss of road and effect on physical health was questioned. Costs associated with the loss of the road and a diversion have been included in the economics assessment. At present, it is not possible to define in monetary terms the impact on physical health, but research is being undertaken on it.	Economics Baseline Report Stakeholder meeting - 30 th August 2017		Action to include a recommendation in the BMP. Not required to consider in management options appraisal.

3.2 Seaton Hole to West Seaton

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
1	Cliff monitoring	At present, the cliffs at the western end of the BMP area are inspected but not monitored. This is not undertaken for various reasons, including the difficulty in collecting data and health and safety concerns. A suggestion has been made to monitor the cliffs in order to better qualify / quantify the changes occurring.	Stakeholder meeting – 30th August 2017	Between the ‘Hideaway Café’ and Castle Hill, the cliffs are inspected annually. Works are planned to take place between April 2018 and April 2019.	Not required to consider in options appraisal. However, action is to include a recommendation in the BMP or following additional monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drones, but margin of error in photography does not reflect actual change. • Improve monitoring to inform on rates of erosion and feed into estimates of cliff erosion.
2	Cliff erosion – Old Beer Road and Adjacent	Land slips in 2012/13 severed Old Beer Road towards the Western end of the frontage, and there continues to be further land slippage. There are suggestions that the rate of cliff toe erosion has increased in the past two years. At the western end of the BMP frontage, near Seaton Hole, beach levels fluctuate considerably Th residents and wider community are concerned with the ongoing erosion and the efficiency of rock revetment between Seaton Hole and West Walk. However, studies have found the revetment to be working. Residents also note that beach levels have risen to such a level that approximately 50% length of the revetment at its eastern end is buried and its effectiveness of absorbing wave energy is diminished.	Stakeholder meeting – 16th November 2016 Project scope Pre-contract meeting – 3rd May 2017 Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA	A 65m long rock revetment was first constructed following loss of the beach here in the early 1990’s. Following that, a further rock revetment was constructed in 1998/1989 and extended some 400m from Seaton Hole eastwards.	Consider within long-list options appraisal, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoreline control /beach management measures to reduce beach loss in front of the cliffs and revetment. • Maintain revetment and re-instate the revetment to ‘as-built design’. • Extend the revetment along the cliffed frontage. • Construct a walkway along the cliffed frontage. • Cliff stabilisation scheme. • Cliff drainage scheme to minimise erosion from surface water. • Bridge across Old Beer Road. • Cliff top adaptation (see item 8 below).
3	Revetment condition	Observed that between the toe of the cliff and the crest of the revetment, there is an area that is as much as 10m wide,	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016	Revetment (as above)	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Item 2 above.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		which has been filled with both seabourne and cliff fall material, and has in effect become a walkway. It has been observed that this has been used in the summer months by the public on a daily basis. It is suggested that this is a considerable health and safety risk, that will increase over time.	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA Defences Baseline Report		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check against the design drawing; as parts of the rock revetment were constructed as a double-sided revetment, with a gap between the cliff face and revetment.
4	Cliff erosion – The Pillar	Gully in cliff, behind The Pillar, and increased rates of erosion of the geological feature, The Pillar, have been observed. Suggested that erosion rates reviewed and consideration given to intervention. Lack There is also concern that there is a lack of coastal protection in front of the pillar.	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016 Project site visit – 24 th May 2017 Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA		Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend rock revetment eastwards. Cliff drainage scheme to minimise erosion from surface water (see Item 2 above). Improve monitoring to inform on rates of erosion and feed into estimates of cliff erosion.
5	Gabion condition -West End of Check House Seawall	The gabions at the western end of Check House Seawall were partially destroyed by storm activity in 2014/2015. Little maintenance has been undertaken since and the original defence has not been reinstated.	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA	Gabions, which are in poor condition.	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain the gabions. Re-instate to ‘as-built design’. Upgrade the defences. Replace the defences.
6	Current SMP2 policy	The current SMP2 policy of managed Realignment after 2025 is not considered appropriate and it has been suggested that it is changed to “hold the line”. Although this is possible, it has to be justified on the grounds of suitability to the current technical, environmental and economic climate.	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA		Consider within long-list options appraisal to identify which potential long-list options would represent a more “hold the line” approach versus the currently adopted SMP2 policy of “managed realignment”. If any such options are progressed to short-list or preferred option, BMP will include an action for East Devon District Council to undertake formal SMP2 policy change process with Environment Agency and other statutory stakeholders.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
7	King's Eye Hole and	It has been speculated that infilling of the King's Eye Hole and construction of the concrete groyne at King's Hole (Beer) has reduced the volume of sediment reaching the Seaton coastline.	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 Coastal Processes Baseline		Consider within long-list options appraisal.
8	Adaptation measures	A local resident has raised the issue of lack of funding for coastal protection and the need to consider adaptive approaches, including potential replacement/relocation of assets.	Project site visit – 24 th May 2017	Addressed through the East Devon Local Plan but no current strategy,	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to liaise with EDDC planners; make recommendations for future work including working with a planning consultant in order to define a Coastal Change Management Area. Consider adaptive approaches within the long-list appraisal.

3.3 Seaton

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
1	Inadequate flood defences.	Local feeling that improved defences are required near Seaton town centre, including Harbour Road, due to the risk of local flooding.	Stakeholder meeting – 16th November 2016	Wave return wall, with flood gates, and natural shingle beach.	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher seawall. Land raising behind current seawall / secondary seawall(s) to manage flow path of water overtopping defences. Manage beach profile / increase beach volume to reduce wave overtopping (see item 2 below).
2	Seaton Beach wave run-up	Accretion of the beach towards the centre of the EA defences along the Esplanade has at times promoted wave run-up and overtopping of the defence; this may have contributed towards flooding in the Town. It is also observed that shingle can be thrown onto the road behind the seawall.	Project scope Pre-contract meeting – 3 rd May 2017 Coastal Processes Baseline Report.	Wave return wall, with flood gates, and natural shingle beach.	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase beach volume. Manage beach profile to reduce wave run-up. Consider options to reduce amount of overtopping, including secondary defences. For example, demountable defences. Consider management of shingle that is thrown onto the road behind the seawall.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
3	Seawall ad design beach level	A report exists that suggests that for the wave return wall at Seaton to function as designed, it should be fronted by a design beach level.	Stakeholder meeting - 30 th August 2017	Wave return wall, with flood gates, and natural shingle beach.	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage beach profile to design beach level.
4	Fisherman's Gap Flood Gates – opening	The flood gates provide a potential flood route if left open or not closed in time. Reference was made to the time when a low-pressure/surge resulted in of water through Fisherman's Gap and overtopping of the seawall. The holder of the key is reported to have been in North Devon and did not get to close the flood gates in time. Shingle, from the beach, was washed over the top of the seawall and blocked the gates, which meant that they could not be closed.	Public drop-in session – 25 th May 2017 Defences Baseline Stakeholder meeting - 30 th August 2017	Flood gates at Fisherman's Gap.	Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to flood gate options being considered by the Environment Agency. Refer to recommendations made by the Lyme Bay coastal flood forecasting project, including recommendations for flood gate closure procedure and triggers. Consider who holds the flood gate keys. Telemetry and options for alternative use, such as beach monitoring.
5	Fisherman's Gap Flood Gates – condition	The condition assessment completed for the Defences Baselines highlighted that the gates and seals for the gates, showed clear signs of corrosion and diminished/missing rubber. The inability to close these structures will result in a significant reduction in the standard of protection afforded by the defences	Defences Baseline		Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to flood gate options being considered by the Environment Agency.

3.4 Seaton Spit and Axe Harbour

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
1	Spit erosion	In 2013 / 2014 Seaton Spit was overtopped and eroded by waves during a storm, which allowed the storm surge to enter into the estuary. Natural	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016		Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gate at the yacht club entrance.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		recovery has since occurred, but need to consider future management of the spit.	Pre-contract meeting – 3 rd May 2017		
2	Disposal of dredged material from Axe Harbour	<p>The Axe Yacht Club (on behalf of the Harbour Authority) dredge Axe Harbour annually within the limits for exemption from MMO licensing and Environment Agency permitting. Previously and presently, the arisings have been disposed of within trenches dug into Axe Spit.</p> <p>However; (i) damage to the spit in 2014; (ii) concerns held by the Axe Yacht Club that the space for disposal of the arisings is diminishing; and (iii) the fact that the disposal trench has extended so far to the west that it is now located in front of the seawall, which could be detrimental to the integrity and functionality of the seawall as a defence against flood risk, means that the Environment Agency are now seeking that the Axe Yacht Club dispose of this material by alternative means.</p>	<p>Pre-contract meeting – 3rd May 2017</p> <p>Site visit – 24th May 2017</p> <p>Coastal Processes Baseline Report</p> <p>Axe Harbour meeting – 6th September 2017</p>	As described.	<p>Consider alternative approaches to disposal of the dredge material with the long-list options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Towards this, undertake sediment sampling to determine potential for disposal within the river/estuary water course / or at sea. • Investigate licenses (MMO) and offshore disposal. • Consider relative merits of placing dredge material lower than the beach profile towards MHW rather than in upper beach above this level.
3	Flooding behind the spit	<p>Flooding of the Axe Yacht Club boat yard comes about when high spring tide and high levels of rainfall combine. Water flows up the river and deflects of the wave wall to the west of the ridge, up the ramp and into the boat yard.</p> <p>Flooding behind the spit is noted to occur as a result of wave run-up and overtopping; water level is not considered to be an issue.</p>	<p>Site visit – 24th May 2017</p> <p>Axe Harbour meeting – 6th September 2017</p>		<p>Consider within long-list options appraisal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of flood gates on top of the ramps, but it is believed that the flood waters would go around these so would need to be integrated with wider area measures. • Increase permeability of the shingle to enable it to better dissipate wave energy rather than promote wave run-up.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		Wind and waves also push the water into the river/estuary causing it to back-up.			
4	Axe Spit No Active Intervention –	The 2010 South Devon and Dorset Shoreline Management Plan (SMP2) recommended a policy of No Active Intervention along Axe spit on the basis that no management was being undertaken. However, the disposal of dredged material into the spit had been undertaken for some time prior to this (and subsequently) and as such the policy requires review as part of the BMP. The spit was severely overtopped and eroded during the storms of 2014, and it is of concern to the stakeholder group that this may reduce the standard of protection from flooding in the Axe.	Project scope		Consider within long-list options appraisal to identify which potential long-list options would represent a more “hold the line” or “managed realignment” approach versus the currently adopted SMP2 policy of “no active intervention”. If any such options are progressed to short-list or preferred option, BMP will include action for East Devon District Council to undertake formal SMP2 policy change process with Environment Agency and other statutory stakeholders.
5	Axe Harbour Scour	The Eastern side of the Harbour entrance was extended by EDDC in 2000, scour has been reported along the Eastern side of the harbour entrance and EDDC commissioned an investigation in 2015 which recommended further monitoring.	Project scope Pre-contract meeting – 3 rd May 2017		Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scour protection measures based on 2015 investigation and any more recent monitoring data. Also, include monitoring of this as an item in the BMP monitoring regime.
6	Axe Harbour Wall Accelerated Low Water Corrosion (ALWC)	An inspection of the piles along the Eastern Wall of Axmouth Harbour. The survey indicated that ALWC remains widespread in most of the harbour and recommended a programme of repeat surveys. A repeat survey is now due	Project scope		Consider within long-list options appraisal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options to address ALWC in immediate future. Timing of future replacement of piles. Also, include monitoring of this as an item in the BMP monitoring regime.
7	Axe River Training Wall	It is believed that the training wall at the mouth of the estuary is not as designed	Axe harbour Meeting – 6 th September 2017		Consider within long-list options appraisal.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		and does not curve in the same way as the previous wall.			
8	Further studies required	Further studies into the interactions between coastal flooding and the impact of fluvial influences in Axmouth harbour were requested.	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016		Action to include a recommendation in the BMP. Not required to consider in management options appraisal.

3.5 Non-FCERM Issues

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
1	Debris falling from cliff	A consequence of erosion of the cliffs between Seaton Hole and West Seaton is the accumulation of debris at the cliff toe, for example an outfall pipe and a large section of trees and vegetation. Such items could represent a health and safety hazard to beach users and removal of such items should be considered.	Site visit – 24th May 2017 Coastal Processes Baseline Report		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP. However, as this is a public safety issue it will be flagged as an issue to be addressed in the BMP.
2	Pollution of beach at Old Beer Road	It has been observed that pollution is entering the sea from the brook running adjacent to Old Beer Road (west). The BMP should seek to identify options to improve beach quality on the beach, which is also used by tourists.	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 + WeSSHA		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP. However, as this is a public safety issue it will be flagged as an issue to be addressed in the BMP.
3	Landscape and connectivity with the beach	The stakeholder group have raised concerns over the height of the existing Environment Agency wall which can cut off views from Esplanade, and the lack of connectivity between the Esplanade	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016 Project scope		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		and beach as a result of the limited access points through the seawall itself.	Pre-contract meeting – 3 rd May 2017		Suggestions to consider as part of options appraisal include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce walkways • Change colour of seawall. • Introduce more seating along the seawall. • Add shelter. • Increase lighting on the seawall, particularly at access points. • Add a public toilet.
4	Opportunities for Concessions	EDDC Streetscene who manage the beach, and the stakeholder group have expressed a desire to encourage more activity on the beach to attract visitors, generate income to maintain the area and add to the economic activity within the Town.	Stakeholder meeting – 16th November 2016 Project scope		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.
5	Seaton Sea Front Enhancement	Seaton Town Council have been granted planning permission for the enhancement of the Esplanade between the point known as Fishermen’s Gap adjacent to the junction with Marine Place, and the junction with Beach Road. The Beach Management Plan should aim to complement and guide these plans.	Stakeholder meeting – 16th November 2016 Project scope Stakeholder meeting - 25 th May 2017 Stakeholder meeting - 30 th August 2017		The BMP will seek to complement the plans and options appraisal will include direct reference to implications of each option on these plans.
6	Waterborne Transport	Seaton currently lacks landing facilities for tourist boats (for example Stuart Line Cruises in Exmouth) and as such, it is difficult for operators to regularly run services as landing onto the beach is heavily weather dependant. The stakeholder group would like to see improved landing facilities considered	Project scope Stakeholder meeting - 25 th May 2017		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
		as part of options for management of the frontages.			
7	Overnight anchorage	Overnight anchorage and development of an enclosed bay. Moorings are also being looked at as part of aspirations to improve of waterborne access (see above).	Stakeholder meeting - 25th May 2017 Stakeholder meeting - 30th August 2017		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.
8	Public Engagement	Consult locals and visitors when determining future of Seaton	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016	In progress	Ongoing consultation and engagement activities are planned and allowed for within the BMP process and the tasks due to be undertaken. BMP will include this as a requirement when undertaking any future activities directed by the BMP. No further action required otherwise.
9	Car parking on harbour road	There is a local feeling that Devon County Council charging for Parking on harbour road all year round has resulted in a decrease in visitors to the beach and town centre in the winter period.	Stakeholder meeting – 16 th November 2016		This is not a matter for the BMP to address. No further action required otherwise.
10	Beach access	Access over shingle for walking, wheelchairs and pram, is difficult.	Public drop-in session – 25th May 2017		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP. Suggestions to consider as part of options appraisal include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Something laid on-top of the shingle, e.g. matting, such as at Beer.
11	Beach huts	The beach huts should remain on the beach.	Public drop-in session – 25th May 2017		Consider alongside long-list options appraisal which (if any) options may help to address this issue. If not viable and does not directly address FCERM, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.

	FCERM Issue	Description of Issue and Associated Concerns	Where Identified	Current Management Practice	Action to Take Forward in BMP
12	Boat access across the beach.	Extend slipway at Fisherman's gap for day-trippers to launch boats from	Public drop-in session – 25th May 2017		Consider in long-list options if extension of the slipway could form part of an overall FCERM solution. If not, then this will not be considered within the options appraisal and will need to be addressed via an alternative route to the BMP.