



**CUCKMERE ESTUARY PROJECT – SCOPING REPORT (Rev A03)
CONSULTATION REPLY SLIP**

The Environment Agency would be grateful if you would take the time to fill out this questionnaire and return it by 26th September 2005 to:

Steve Thompsett
Environment Agency
Guildbourne House
Chatsworth Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1LD

Please feel free to attach a letter to this form if you wish to provide further details regarding the Cuckmere Estuary Project.

With reference to the Data Protection Act 1998, please place a cross in the box provided below if you **do not** wish your details to be kept on record for future consultation on the project.

1. Contact details

Full Name.....
Organisation.....
Telephone Number.....
Fax Number.....
Email Address

2. Do you wish to remain on the list of consultees for further consultations?

YES/NO

3. Do you hold any additional information, other than that you may have already provided, relating to the environmental conditions and features affected by the Cuckmere Estuary Project?

If so please provide details:

4. What are your main interests and concerns with respect to the Cuckmere Estuary Project?

5. Do you support the proposed environmental objectives (please refer to pages 22 - 28 of the Scoping Report)?

Objective Category	Yes	No	Comments
Human life, built environment and communities			
Biodiversity			
Recreation and Tourism			
Farmland			
Water Resources			
Feature of archaeology and cultural heritage			
Landscape			
Climate Change			
Sustainable Development			

Please note that the agreed environmental objectives will be the criteria against which the environmental acceptability of the proposed policy options will be judged within the later stages of the SEA.

6. Are there additional environmental objectives you consider should be included?

7. Do you support the proposed strategic options (please refer to pages 29 - 56 in the Scoping Report)?

Policy Option	Yes	No	Comments
No Active Intervention			
No Active Intervention			
No Active Intervention with Exit Strategy			

Policy Option	Yes	No	Comments
Hold the Line			
Maintain the Existing Defences			
Sustain the Existing Defences			
Managed Realignment			
Breach Realignment (Cells B & C)			
Breach Realignment (Cells A, B & C)			

8. Which of these policy options do you prefer and what is the basis for your choice?

9. Are there any errors or omissions within the consultation document?

Please note that responses will be included in the SEA Environmental Report to be produced for the Cuckmere Estuary Project.

Thank you for your time taken completing this consultation.

Revision: A04
Date: May 2006

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

Introduction

This document provides a summary of the responses received (to date) from the consultation period for the Cuckmere Estuary Project - SEA Scoping Report (document revision A03). This document is used to summarise who has responded and to provide a summary of the responses to the objectives and the options proposed in the above report. A more detailed summary has been produced which outlines the key issues raised.

Responses Received

No.	Organisation	Response received	Comments
1	English Nature	Yes	
2	English Heritage	Yes	
3	Countryside Agency	Yes	
4	Wealden District Council	Yes	
5	Lewes District Council	Yes	
6	East Sussex County Council	Yes	
7	National Trust	Yes	
8	Sussex Downs Joint Committee – Eastern Area Manager	Yes	
9	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	Organisation No. 15 responded on behalf of a coastguard cottage owner.
10	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	
11	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	
12	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	
13	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	
14	Mitchells & Butlers (Golden Galleon Public House)	Yes	
15	Plan Sussex acting for Mr N Newton	Yes	
16	Foxhole Cottage resident	Yes	
17	Sussex Downs Joint Committee – Park Ranger & Foxhole Cottage resident	Yes	
18	Foxhole Cottage resident	Yes	

Revision: A04

Date: May 2006

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Comments
19	Seaford Head LNR Committee	Yes	
20	Seven Sisters Canoe Centre	Yes	
21	Alfriston and Cuckmere Valley Partnership	No	Documents issued and received. No formal response.
22	Cuckmere Cycles Seven Sisters Country Park	Yes	
23	Sussex Wildlife Trust	Yes	
24	South Downs Society	Yes	
25	Seaford Residents Association	Yes	
26	East Sussex Coastal Biodiversity Project	Yes	
27	Clerk Alfriston Parish Council	No	No formal response received
28	Clerk Arlington Parish Council	No	No formal response received
29	Clerk Cuckmere Valley Parish Council	Yes	
30	Parish Clerk East Dean and Friston Parish Clerk	Yes	
31	Clerk Hellingly Parish Council	No	No formal response received
32	Town Clerk, Seaford Town Council	Yes	
33	Cuckmere Valley Canoe Club	Yes	
34	7 Sisters Country Park Tea Shop	No	Documents issued and received. No formal response.
35	Coastguard Cottage owner	Yes	
36	Cable hut owner	Yes	
37	The Ramblers' Association	Yes	

Responses received from consultees outside the original list of stat and non stat key consultees

No.	Organisation	Response received	Comments
38	Seaford Resident	Yes	

Revision: A04

Date: May 2006

Summary Responses to the Objectives and Options

Points to notes:

1. The following table summarise the response to the objectives and the options. A '✓' indicates a consultee agrees with the objective and supports the option. A 'X' indicates a consultee does not agree with the objective nor support the option. A '✓' indicates the consultee agrees with the objective and supports the options.
2. Sections of the table that are blank indicate that the consultee has made no comment on the reply slip.
3. The objectives are numbered as follows:-
 - a. Objective 1 – To reduce flood risk to human life and community
 - b. Objective 2 – To protect and enhance biodiversity
 - c. Objective 3 – To maintain and enhance opportunities for recreation and tourism
 - d. Objective 4 – To protect farmland where sustainable to do so
 - e. Objective 5 – To protect and enhance water resources
 - f. Objective 6 – To protect features of archaeology and cultural heritage
 - g. Objective 7 – To maintain and enhance landscape character and visual amenity feature
 - h. Objective 8 – To mitigate/minimise future impacts of climate change
 - i. Objective 9 – To promote the principles of sustainable development
4. The options are numbered as follows:-
 - a. Option 1 – No Active Intervention
 - b. Option 2 – No Active Intervention with and Exit Strategy
 - c. Option 3a – Hold the Line – Maintain
 - d. Option 3b – Hold the Line – Sustain
 - e. Option 4a – Managed Realignment – Partial
 - f. Option 4b – Managed Realignment – Complete

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Objectives										Options					Preferred Option Comments
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3a	3b	4a	4b	
1	English Nature	17/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						Option 4b - Breach realignment (cells A, B & C)
2	English Heritage	04/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				Hold the Line in the short term with realignment of cells B & C	
3	Countryside Agency	26/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 4b – Breach realignment (cells A, B & C)	
4	Wealden District Council	17/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Hold the Line, maintain the existing defences	
5	Lewes District Council	24/11/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						None stated. Would be inappropriate for local planning authority to indicate preferred option	
6	East Sussex County Council	10/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						The County Councils general position is to support sustainable management of the coast. However it reserves its views on the policies discussed within the scoping report until it has seen a detailed proposal with a relevant assessment of the impacts.	
7	National Trust		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	None stated. However, comments received on each option. More information required.	
8	Sussex Downs Joint Committee-Eastern Area Manager	1/11/2005															None stated. Recommended the EA seek a solution that works with natural processes, with minimal man-made intervention.	

Revision: A04
Date: May 2006

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Objectives										Options				Preferred Option Comments		
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3a	3b	4a		4b	
9	Coastguard Cottage owner																		Note: A Edgar responded on behalf of Mr Newton
10	Coastguard Cottage owner	10/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Cannot express a preference as all options fail to address securing the defences of the coastguard cottages
11	Coastguard Cottages owner	19/09/2005																	A less ambitious Hold the Line options. One that caters for the next 30 to 40 years.
12	Coastguard Cottage owner	19/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Options 3a & 3b – Hold the line policy option
13	Coastguard Cottage owner	19/09/2005																	Option 3a & 3b – Hold the line or Option 4a – Breach Realignment with Cells B & C only.
14	Mitchells & Butlers (Golden Galleon)	21/11/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓									Options 4a & 4b – Managed realignment
15	Plan Sussex	29/10/2005					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Hold the Line, sustain the existing defences but only by raising the banks 300mm
16	Foxhole Cottage resident	7/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 2 – No Active Intervention with an exit strategy. However, alterations to the complete Managed Realignment option (option 4b) would also be considered acceptable.
17	Sussex Downs Joint Committee-Park Ranger Foxhole Cottage resident	12/12/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 4a & 4b – Breach Realignment
18	Foxhole Cottage resident	24/11/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓									Options 4a & 4b – Managed realignment. Not the preferred option but the best out of the 4

Revision: A04
Date: May 2006

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Objectives										Options				Preferred Option Comments	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3a	3b	4a		4b
19	Seaford Head LNR Committee	26/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 4b – Breach realignment (cells A, B & C)
20	Seven Sisters Canoe Centre	10/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Hold the line, sustain the existing defences
21	Alfriston and Cuckmere Valley Partnership																	
22	Cuckmere Cycles Seven Sisters Country Park	22/11/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Hold the line, sustain the existing defences
23	Sussex Wildlife Trust	29/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 2 – No active intervention with exit strategy or Option 4b – Breach realignment A, B & C
24	South Downs Society																	
25	Seaford Residents Association	24/11/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Options 3a & 3b – Hold the line policy option Option 3b – Hold the line, sustain the existing defences
26	East Sussex Coastal Biodiversity Project	29/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 4b – Breach Realignment (Cells A, B & C) without the proposed bund.
27	Clerk Alfriston Parish Council																	

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Objectives										Options				Preferred Option Comments			
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3a	3b	4a		4b		
28	Clerk Arlington Parish Council																			
29	Clerk Cuckmere Valley Parish Council	14/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Sustain existing defences
30	Parish Clerk East Dean and Friston Parish Clerk	20/09/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Does not feel able to comment which is the best policy.
31	Clerk Hellingly Parish Council																			
32	Town Clerk Chairman, Planning and Highways Committee Seaford Town Council																			None stated
33	Cuckmere Valley Canoe Club	24/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Options 3a & 3b – Hold the line policy option
34	7 Sisters Country Park Tea Shop																			
35	Cuckmere Cottage owner	17/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 3b – Sustain the existing defences
36	Cable hut owner		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Options 3a & 3b – Hold the line policy option
37	The Ramblers' Association	14/10/2005	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Option 4b – Breach Realignment (Cells A, B & C)

Revision: A04

Date: May 2006

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report - Summary of Consultation Responses to Date (02/05/2006)

No.	Organisation	Response received	Objectives									Options				Preferred Option Comments				
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3a	3b		4a	4b		
38	Seaford Resident (not a key or non stat consultee)	17/10/2005		X									X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	Option 3a – Maintain the existing defences

Introduction

This document provides a detailed summary of the responses received (to date) from the consultation period for the Cuckmere Estuary Project - SEA Scoping Report (document revision A03). Sections of the table that are blank indicate that the consultee has made no comment on the reply slip.

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
1	English Nature	17/10/2005	Yes		To develop working with partners a sustainable estuary strategy for Cuckmere that works with natural processes and delivers long term benefits to people, places and nature	Agrees with all objectives	Managed Realignment - Breach realignment (cells A, B & C) – Best approach to secure a sustainable long term solution and meets full range of objectives and issues	No active intervention No active intervention with exit strategy, but in the long term would lead to a more natural estuary system, but fewer opportunities to manage risk and provide access. Hold the line Managed Realignment – Breach realignment (cells B & C) – does not take a wide approach and in the long term is not the most sustainable solution	Managed Realignment taking an estuary-wide approach would provide the most sustainable and multi-objective solution in the long term	Options need more detail and evaluation although anticipates that they will be in the sea
2	English Heritage	04/10/2005			Protecting archaeological remains as they are seen as a finite and non-renewable resource. The area is identified as being an archaeologically sensitive area. The importance of the historic environment assets of the estuary and the impact of the proposed coastal defence schemes are key factors (Recommends that LCA1	Agrees with all objectives, but apparently no historic environment legislation, planning or policy was consulted during the preparation of the report.	Hold the line, in the short term, least impact on historical environmental assessments Managed Realignment, long term, but minimising and mitigating the impact of the scheme at the development		Hold the Line in the short term with Managed Realignment of cells B and C thereafter	List of legislation, planning and policy should include PPG 16 (Archaeology and Planning)

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
3	Countryside Agency	26/09/2005	Yes		To protect and enhance the landscape, access and recreation in the area. Partly in Sussex Downs AONB and Sussex heritage coast	Agrees with all objectives	Breach Realignment (cells A, B and C) which maintains the meanders – the key landscape feature	No active intervention, due to increase in flood risk. Hold the line options lead to adverse effects on the landscape		
4	Wealden District Council	17/10/2005	Yes		Local planning authority for part of the area affected	Agrees with all objectives. Must target to reduce flood risks and improve existing outfalls to Cuckmere wherever possible	Hold the line- maintain existing defences – recognised the effect of climate change/sea level rise will gradually reduce this standard over time Managed realignment – subject to results of further analysis of potential flood risk, particularly to people, property and assets	No active intervention – council would be concerned about health and safety risks to the public from flooding upstream of Exceat bridge, traffic disruption on the A259 and loss of access to property Hold the line-sustain existing defences – considered uneconomic with unacceptable landscape and transport implications	At this stage to maintain the existing defences until further information is available following more detailed flood risk assessment in order to ensure flood risks will not be increased and reduced wherever possible	No mention of Seven Sisters Marine Conservation Area. Any impacts upon this non-statutory area should be included in the EIA
5	Lewes District Council									
6	East Sussex County Council	10/10/2005			Rights of Way, footpaths, historic environment,	Agrees with all objectives	The County Councils general position is to support sustainable management of			No mention of requirements

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
7	National Trust	11/11/2005	Yes	No	Recreation and education		<p>the coast. However it reserves its views on the policies discussed within the scoping report until it has seen a detailed proposal with a relevant assessment of the impacts.</p> <p>Any diversion of the South Downs Way would require a Special Order in addition to the ordinary legal requirements concerning changes to Rights of Way. Under managed realignment there is the possibility to provide new footpaths. This should be seen as lessening the adverse effect rather than being a benefit.</p>			<p>for diverting, extinguishing or creating footpaths. Some permissive footpaths to the west of the estuary have been omitted from Figure 3. Difference between a path and a permissive path should be clarified</p>
					Landowner of most of the west side of the estuary	<p>Agrees with objectives but note that more extensive investigations are required of earth. Refer to wider landscape and multi-layer history. Should take account of PPG15 and PPG16</p>	<p>No active intervention with exit strategy – supports option which restores more naturally functioning estuary</p> <p>Managed realignment – achieves a more naturally functioning estuary whilst maximising the conservation and access benefits and mitigation risks. Neither of the two realignment schemes reconnect the meanders to the</p>	<p>No active intervention – supports option which restores more naturally functioning estuary but without increasing risks of flooding upstream, damage to A259 etc</p> <p>Hold the line – not as a long-term solution due to impact on landscape</p>	<p>Managed realignment as a strategic option but one which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -enhances wildlife and access benefits -reconnects the meanders -produces a more naturally functioning estuary -avoids increasing risks, e.g. flooding upstream 	<p>The National Trust is supported at being asked to respond to detailed options at this stage, in the absence of more detail on each and a wider spread of options</p>

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
8	Sussex Downs Joint Committee – Eastern Area Manager	1/11/2005	Yes		Purpose of the committee is to conserve, enhance and protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty within the project itself		river flow and appear to relocate defences rather than move to a sustainable system			
9	Coastguard Cottage Owner									
10	Coastguard Cottage Owner	10/10/2005	Yes	Insufficient information concerning the mitigation of energy along the sea walls of the coastguard cottages. Energy which is not absorbed into the sea walls travels along its entire length (120m) before being absorbed by the shingle bank along with incoming waves. No geo morphological studies have been addressed	Proposals need to demonstrate long term viability of an established salt marsh and mud flats whilst ensuring that the existing meanders are preserved, either through re-connection or isolation. Adequate defences to the east of the cottages is provided for in the nature of rock armour to prevent outflanking and loss of property	Report fails to identify heritage importance of coastguard cottages and the potential loss of existing meanders. As well as damages to the visual amenities Loss of properties under these proposals Loss of vehicular access to western beach will cause problems to emergency services Sustainable flood risk management must continue Address the A259 to ensure a permanent intertidal habitat	No active intervention – damage to infrastructure, property and local tourism and amenity would be unacceptable. Hold the line, maintain existing defences– will eventually result in the loss of Cuckmere Valley as we know it, although rock armour to the western beach is welcome Hold the line, sustain existing defences– concerned the large defences themselves are too intrusive	As options fail to address measures to secure the defences of the coastguard cottages therefore are unable to support any. Maintain the existing line is the only option to suggest rock armour which is essential for the future security of the cottages but under this option the rest of the valley would suffer.	Coastguard cottages are not mentioned under the environmental objectives – these cottages are iconic to the landscape and the people locally both nationally and internationally, lack of adequate provision for their protection is unacceptable	

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?	
11	Coastguard Cottage Owner	19/09/2005	Yes	Mr and Mrs Mutter felt that the Scoping Report contained too many words and technical phrases, making it difficult to comment. Their primary concern is for the safety of their property. The Cuckmere Estuary Project has rarely, if ever, concerned itself with the property of Cuckmere residents and for this reason amongst others they think the valley should be left as it is, but with a less ambitious plan for the raising of the riverbanks. A plan that could cope with changing conditions over a period, not of a hundred years but 30 or 40. Many people, families and children visit every year. They come to enjoy the beach, to paddle and swim in the sea, to walk by the view to enjoy on of the most beautiful places in the country. It would be interesting to find out how much money has so far been spent on lavish publicity on this project, enough to take care of any repairs to the riverbank? They would like to know why mudflats and birds should be considered more important than people in a place that is already rich in its natural assets. Could it be that flooding the valley would attract money from the European Union?		for the Cuckmere Valley		Managed Realignment, Cells B & C - would be fine is it included rock armour to the western end. Isolating Cell A is welcome Managed Realignment, Cells A, B & C – shingle nourishment is not sufficient to prevent outflanking to the cottages own sea defences, believes rock armour is the only solution.			
12	Coastguard Cottage Owner		Yes		If valley flooded, groynes/river trainings removed and beach moved back, increase wave action would affect sea walls and result in early demise of the Cottages. If valley flooded under extreme conditions the water processes on an out flowing tide will cause overflowing at the SW and SE corners of cells B and C. This will result in water discharging directly across the beach to the	Agrees with all the objectives.	Maintain and sustain the existing defences – Necessary to maintain this area of SSSI, AONB and HC loved by so many people and attracting visitors from all over the world. This helps sustain the economy of the area. Existing salt marsh would be lost and take	No Active Intervention – the existing riverbanks should be maintained and increased in height to give a t least a 50-year further life span. No Active Intervention with Exit Strategy Managed Realignment – removing shingle	Hold the line policy option but consider that 100-150 years time span is excessive. Three well used footpaths and Cottages rights of way to Exceat Bridge for vehicles should be retained to avoid a public inquiry and loss of human rights.	Costs of each scheme not mentioned for comparison. Are groynes/river trainings to be removed or extended? The peace and tranquil nature of the valley will be lost if flooded because at high tide it will be used by	

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
					sea at these two points.		decades to replace if at all due to current height of water.	bank northwards will reduce length of beach and so increase wave action to east end of cottage sea walls and so hasten demise of the cottages. A large section of the cut will have to be maintained. Loss of existing groynes/river trainings will result in shingle loss and increase wave action on sea walls. Oxbow meanders will be affected and flood risk to A259 will increase in severe weather conditions.		noisy jet skis and powerboats.
13	Coastguard cottage Owner				Coastguard Cottages have been in the family for many years.	No comment		No Active Intervention Breach Realignment (Cells B & C)	Hold the line or Breach Realignment with Cells A & C only.	
14	Mitchells & Butlers	21/11/2005	Yes		Mitchells & Butlers are owners of the Golden Galleon Pub. They have concerns in respect to the flood management proposals and disturbance to tourism due to disruption to transport links (either through flooding or through construction work), infrastructure aspects serving the pub which would impact upon	Agrees with all objectives. Points to note which M&B are keen to see met are: No increase in flood risk No increased risk to assets Maintain access routes from A259 to the coast Maintain circular	Managed realignment – most acceptable solution. Reduction in visual amenity due to short-term adjustment of the floodplain	No active intervention – increase in flood risk, disruption to bridge, reduction in recreational facilities and effect on landscape character	Managed realignment as reduce potential flooding and disruption to the A259, as well not resulting in a hard engineering solution	

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
15	Plan Sussex acting for Mr N Newton of the Coastguard Cottages		Yes	Report produced by Environmental assessment services in support of raising southern banks by 300mm. This includes ecological information. Baseline and scoping assessments produced as part of their planning application. Produced a further option to raise banks by 300mm	its operation, loss of public rights of ways and recreational facilities, permanent loss of visual amenity through construction of flood defence mechanisms which would discourage the use of the area by members of the public. Concern over any proposals which increase to flood risk to the public house and grounds. To retain existing landscape, and status quo so as not to adversely effect the tourism potential and economy of the area Maintain the footpath network, historic artefacts, meander pattern and the existing ecological regime, Protect the A259 and canoe centre. Maintain and supplement the existing sea defences at Cuckmere haven and the legal rights of way to the Coastguard and Foxhole Cottages. Promote sustainable solutions in a holistic way	routes (public rights of way) No fall in numbers of recreational amenities No detrimental effects on landscape character, any changes should be in keeping with qualitative targets and natural processes Concerns raised over all objectives. Some agreement with Water Resources, Landscape and Sustainable Development ,all with qualifications. Details provided of issues for each objective within Scoping Report alternative objectives proposed	Hold the line- maintain existing defences-even if no height is added, overtopping will only occur occasionally due to tidal conditions and the landscape will be unaffected Rock armour on the West Beach is unacceptable. Own Preferred option consisting of 300mm raise to existing banks proposed	term hard defences, bank and beach defence works No active intervention- maintenance is required, nature cannot be allowed to take its course Hold the line-sustain -It is unnecessary to raise existing defences by 600mm Breach realignment- would offend too many objectives, problems with replacement of footpaths and rights of way to the cottages, construction of road on higher ground to serve cottages would lead to chalk scar. Loss of meanders Does not meet policies of the AONB and	Identified their own preferred option -Sustain the existing defences by raising the banks by 300mm – low key and low cost intervention 50 year scheme	Concerned that report guides reader towards managed realignment solutions, flawed in terms of objectivity. Option of raising banks by 300mm not included. Economic approach relates only to Environment Agency and Government rules. Does not adequately assess impacts on local economy No reference to legal issues associated

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
16	Foxhole Cottage Resident	07/09/2005	Yes		Keen to see beauty of the area maintained and the most sustainable means of looking after it found. Habitat enhancement is important	Generally agrees with objectives. Except objectives 1 and 6. Feels that floodplains should be used in times of flooding for water storage. Also agrees to 'record' features, but if more sustainable to lose the feature then this is acceptable.	No active intervention with exit strategy – if no better managed solution is found	No active intervention – EA do not have a duty to maintain defences. However, it is essential to try and keep the EA involved to assist with producing a sustainable solution for the good of the area Hold the line – Waste of public money especially sustaining the existing defences as would create more of a flood risk Breach realignment – meanders are silting up and need a flow of water to survive. Level of intervention at river	If the breach realignment had an excavation pit dug as a continuation to the meander (linking cell A to B then to C) then it would be the preferred option. It would be enhanced further by removing the boathouse carpark. Otherwise no active intervention with exit strategy and defending the A259	No explanation for fig 10, appendix 3. No maps for no active intervention with exit strategy or sustain the existing defences
								proposed National Park, hence contrary to Development Plan Loss of east beach as tourism asset Flooding would create mud flats rather than salt marsh Potential legal issues		with introduction of managed realignment options. Legal challenge and public enquiries will entail significant cost. A solution avoiding these challenges may be more cost effective

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
17	Sussex Downs Joint Committee – Park Ranger & Foxhole Cottage Resident	12/12/2005	Yes	No	Living and working on site	Concerned that much of the current farmland will be lost and what will happen to the archaeological remains. All other objectives are ok	Breach realignment (Cells B & C) – is the most practical option, although has the full impact on the cottages been addressed? and access is required at all times.	No active intervention – will result in lost of farmland, footpath networks and wild space areas No active intervention with exit strategy – flood risks to cottages and park infrastructure	Managed realignment – but not fully in principle. Flooding issues may need to be further addresses	No
18	Foxhole Cottage Resident	15/11/2005	Yes	No	Concerned with sustainability. Council member of SOS Senior coordinator for SDJC	Agrees with all objectives	Managed realignment - The bunding and protection of the canoe barn and car park is not justified. This is an open landscape which contrasts with the downland – only the A259 should be protected	Hold the line – sustain existing defences – would only last a few years before sea levels start to rise and size of sea defences required would be unrealistic	None of the options are preferred but managed realignment is the best option.	Further investigation is needed to provide all the options with regards to the landscape character assessment and the South Downs Management Plan

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
19	Seaford Head LNR Committee	26/09/2005	Yes	No	Effect on the nature reserve – mainly in the west side	Agrees with all objectives	No active intervention Hold the line - maintaining the existing defences Managed realignment	Hold the line - sustain the existing defences	Breach realignment (cells A, B and C) for economic reasons and the advantage for wildlife growth	Consider diverting the A259 across a new bridge, thereby allowing the present road on the causeway to be removed so that the estuary water can flow more freely 'above' and 'below' the A259.
20	Seven Sisters Canoe Centre	10/10/2005	Yes		Viability of the Seven Sisters Canoe Centre and canoeing in general	Agrees with all objectives	Hold the line - maintain the existing defences. To be re-assessed after 10 years and thereafter at suitable intervals Hold the line - sustain the existing defences. Ideal option Breach Realignment (Cells B & C) – Fig 8 shows no western bank and without this canoeing would be difficult and impossible for long periods. Some form of compensation would need to be	No active intervention – canoeing to a great extent will cease Breach Realignment (Cells A, B & C) – the centre would still exist but canoeing would be severely restricted especially for beginners. Pollution and noise is noticeable in part of the meander left over. Compensation would be necessary. Breach Realignment (Cells B & C) – Fig 8 shows no western bank and without this canoeing would be difficult and impossible for long periods. Some form	Hold the line - sustain the existing defences. Enables canoeing to continue and increase	Seven Sisters Canoe Centre is the prime user and the Cuckmere Valley Canoe Club is the lesser

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
21	Alfriston and Cuckmere Valley Partnership						made for restricting the canoe centre's potential, present and future	of compensation would need to be made for restricting the canoe centre's potential, present and future		
22	Cuckmere Cycles Seven Sisters Country Park	22/11/2005	Yes		To sustain numbers of visitors for cyclists and continued access for them to the sea via a flat cycle way	Agrees with all objectives	Hold the line - sustain the existing defences - allows access to the sea Breach Realignment (Cells B & C) – access to the sea	No active intervention Breach Realignment (Cells A, B & C) – Canoe barn and hiring of cycles would be removed and possibly put Cuckmere cycles out of business	Hold the line - sustain the existing defences although would consider Breach Realignment (Cells B & C) as long as a new flat and interesting cycle path was designed for	Would like a flat cycle path which can be used by disabled and able users down to the beach
23	Sussex Wildlife Trust	29/09/2005	Yes	Recommends contacting Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre, Henri Brocklebank (01273) 497553	Enhancing the biodiversity and landscape of the area through the improved natural functioning of the river valley. Runs a major educational project based in the country park	Agrees with all objectives Clarification on objectives also provided	No active intervention, the more preferable option includes the exit strategy. Both options are potentially beneficial in terms of biodiversity where long-term benefits greatly outweigh short term losses. Recreation interest is likely to be improved with Exit Strategy Managed realignment (cells B and C)	Holding the line leads to continual biodiversity loss, meanders will continue to silt up, worsen flood risk upstream in the catchment, as channelised river does not allow floodwater too spread out. Poor option in terms of leisure tourism and local economy by reducing landscape quality. Sustaining existing defences even worse than maintaining them as	No active intervention with exit strategy, best for biodiversity and probably landscape, but may need to be modified to provide controlled sustainable flood management solutions Breach realignment A, B and C, needs to be modified to make better use of natural processes to create a more natural functioning habitat, but flood management is more controlled	None

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
24	South Downs Society	21/10/2005		Wish to see the existing beauty and amenities conserved to the maximum extent for as long as possible. It's an educational area used by schools and universities for its ecological and geographic interests. The site falls within the Sussex Downs AONB and will almost certainly form part of the South Downs National Park and feel strongly that it will be essential for the National Park Authority to be involved in decisions regarding the management of this estuary. Option which conserves the existing estuary for as long as possible. If a managed retreat is inevitable we would regard some form of scheme shown in fig 8 with access maintained along the eastern side of cell C and with measures to conserve the meanders.			provides biodiversity and landscape enhancement and some improvement to flood defences however the artificial straight line of the cut will remain. Beach realignment (cells A, B and C) significant biodiversity, landscape and flood defence improvement, but no re-instatement of active meanders. May be preferable to breach the northern end of the meander to restrict the flow through the cut and improve flow in the meanders, leading to a functioning meander system	results in direct loss of habitat and continual erosion of salt marsh Both options expensive and require a great deal of resources and maintain and deliver poor objectives		
25	Seaford Residents Association	24/11/2005	Yes	No	Protection of the interests of the residents of Seaford particularly – Visual amenity	Agrees with all objectives	Hold the line – maintaining existing defences – as a fall back	No active intervention Managed	Hold the line – sustaining existing defences – this will preserve the existing and visible landscape,	Section 2 omits consideration to size of local

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
					Recreational opportunities Tourist industry		<p>protection</p> <p>Hold the line – sustaining existing defences – must include consideration of Nigel Newton's proposal to raise banks by Oxe Foot</p>	<p>realignment – These options would remove level access to the beach for disabled people/ pushchairs etc</p>	<p>maintain access to the beach for disabled people/pushchairs/cycles</p>	<p>tourist industry directly and indirectly dependent on the lower Cuckmere valley and the effects of flooding. Section 2.6 omits the fact that this area of natural beauty can be seen from people travelling along the A259 – which is not too be over-estimated</p>
26	East Sussex Coastal Biodiversity Project	29/10/2005	Yes	Further information can be provided on the Seven Sisters Voluntary Marine Conservation Area and the marine Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. Some botanical information is also held on the vegetated shingle	Biodiversity project aims to protect, promote and where possible enhance rare coastal and marine habitats and species as listed under local and national Biodiversity Action Plans. The project also aims to promote a naturally functioning coastline and sustainable coastal management particularly in the light of climate change	Agrees with all objectives	<p>No active intervention with exit strategy – would be supported provided flood risk is reduced elsewhere in the flood plain and provided it was implemented in combination with a suitable management plan for recreation, tourism and farming</p> <p>Breach</p>	<p>No active intervention-requires continued intervention in the short term to prevent flooding upstream</p> <p>Hold the line-lead to loss of saltmarsh through coastal squeeze which in turn would exacerbate the erosive impact of the river on the defences. Sustaining the existing defences would require</p>	<p>Breach realignment (cells A, B & C) but without proposed bund</p> <p>No active intervention with exit strategy</p>	

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
27	Clerk Alfriston Parish Council						realignment (cells A, B & C)-Need for proposed bund and new cut should be clarified and further investigated. Results in greatest biodiversity gain. Breach realignment (cells B & C)-the gain in biodiversity would not be self sustaining and would require continued intervention	widening of them resulting in a direct loss of habitat		
28	Clerk Arlington Parish Council									
29	Clerk Cuckmere Valley Parish Council	14/09/2005	Yes	No	Original thinking behind cut was to reduce flooding upstream, new scheme could cause slower movement of floodwaters in Cuckmere. Worried about EA reducing their commitment to maintaining river and estuary in order to reduce expenditure.	Agrees with all objectives, but sustainable development not seen as applicable to flood reduction. Suggests the idea of storm drains on each side of Exceat Bridge to support the bridge, aid flow to the sea and allow some flow in	Maintaining and sustaining the existing defences – build up banks and include storm drains	No active intervention – concerned about river mouth Managed realignment – future effect	Sustain existing defences, concerned too much change could worsen the situation	Little focus on events upstream of Exceat Bridge.

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
30	Parish Clerk East Dean and Friston Parish Clerk	20/09/2005	Yes	No, but note if completed properly it could be a major stopover point for migrating birds – suggests consultation with RSPB	Long term effects are properly researched, concerned about how major the erosion will be of the river bank and the build up of shingle.	meanders. Agrees with all objectives, but loss of public areas is important and all farming needs to be organic based			Does not feel able to comment which is the best policy.	
31	Clerk Hellingly Parish Council									
32	Chairman, Planning and Highways Committee Seaford Town Council	19/10/05	Yes	- 2001 Census information provided. - Extracts from past P & H minutes dated 4/8/05 - Discussion paper Alan Edgar, Potential for a open air museum - Notes from a meeting with the EA dated 12/10/05	The Council recognises that much of the infrastructure at the Cuckmere Estuary has a limited life, although continuing regular maintenance will extend this life. However the Council recognises that climate change will put increasing pressure upon the existing defences. The major concern for the Council is not to lose the landscape of a well loved valley and the amenity it provides. The Committee was made aware that the funding regime for coastal defence has changed from local to national funding. Since this is the case, bids for funding have to be justified at local and national level. It is difficult to prepare a case which would stand up	Detailed comments received on each of the objectives. Comments summarised under 'Main interests and concerns'	No direct comments on options	No direct comments on options	No direct comments on options	

Environment Agency

Cuckmere Estuary Project Scoping Report – Detailed Summary of Consultee Responses to date 02/05/2006)

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
					against bids from other areas which may be at severe risk from flooding. However, in terms of national importance in a more ephemeral sense, i.e. in terms of vies, history and landscape as well as the wildlife, all of which contributed to the area's listing as an SSSI, part of the AONB, a Local Nature Reserve and part of the Heritage Coast, it is felt that the landscape of this estuary is worth preserving.					
33	Cuckmere Valley Canoe Club	24/10/2005	Yes	http://www.riveraccess.org Annual General meeting 26/11/2005	Protecting access to all types of water used for canoeing activities-still water, tidal river flow and access to the sea	Aggress with all objectives	Hold the line	No active intervention Managed realignment	Either maintain or sustain the existing defences as these protect the current access to still, tidal and sea water	No
34	Tea shop owners									
35	Coastguard Cottage owner	17/10/2005	Yes	Feels coastguard cottages have been overlooked	Safeguarding of property and protection of the valley environmentally and recreationally. Consider extra protection of cottages – e.g. rock revetment/armour	Agrees with all objectives	Hold the line; Maintaining the existing defences Sustain the existing defences as least damaging to the environment and properties	No active intervention Managed realignment – risk of ruining the environment and landscape without knowledge of plan succeeding	Sustain the existing defences	The cost of moving the A259 has not been considered
36	Cable hut owner		Yes		Survival of cottages and cable hut.	Agrees with all objectives	Maintaining existing defences – tourism trade from cottages is a must so wants prevention of erosion. Concerned about			

No.	ORGANISATION	Date response received by EA	To remain on list of consultees	Additional Information Held?	Main interests and concerns	Comments on Environmental Objectives	Options supported?	Options unsupported?	Preferred Option	Any errors or omissions?
37	The Ramblers' Association	14/10/2005	Yes		To safeguard and improve public access with particular reference to public rights of way. To maintain or improve the natural beauty of the area	Agrees with all objectives but option 9 which must be kept to a minimum	diminished river flow Managed Realignment - The straight cut is unnatural, detrimental to the attractions of the area and no longer serves any useful purpose	No active intervention Hold the line	Preferred option is branch realignment (cells A, B & C)	Option 1 makes no provision to safeguard the South Downs Way footpath where it crosses the valley west of Foxholes, some form of causeway will be necessary
38	Seaford town resident (not a key or stat consultee)	17/10/2005	Yes	No	Reduction in tourists Visual impact on the area Upstream flooding Impact on A259 Seaford Flooding on Exceat Bridge	Encourage use of the area in connection with South Downs National Park – area is known internationally and should remain so	Hold the line – Maintain the existing defences	No active intervention Hold the line – Sustain the existing defences Managed realignment	Hold the line – Maintain the existing defences	Missing pages 22 - 28