

enhancing... improving... cleaning... restoring...
changing... tackling... protecting... reducing...
create a better place... influencing... inspiring...
advising... managing... adapting...

Thames Estuary 2100 Flood Risk Management Plan

Phase 4 Consultation Responses Summary Report – October 2009

We are the Environment Agency. It's our job to look after your environment and make it **a better place** - for you, and for future generations.

Your environment is the air you breathe, the water you drink and the ground you walk on. Working with business, Government and society as a whole, we are making your environment cleaner and healthier.

The Environment Agency. Out there, making your environment a better place.

Published by:

Environment Agency
Rio House
Waterside Drive, Aztec West
Almondsbury, Bristol BS32 4UD
Tel: 0870 8506506
Email: enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk
www.environment-agency.gov.uk

© Environment Agency

All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of the Environment Agency.

Forward

“By working together we can rise to the challenge of climate change...”

Consultation and engagement generates understanding and breaks down barriers by engaging the community and key stakeholders in dialogue that leads to effective and achievable outcomes.

Involvement of our stakeholders has been fundamental to the development of the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan. It is crucial to the Plan’s success that the views of our stakeholders have been understood and, where appropriate, incorporated. It is for this reason that we have had not one, not even two, but three public consultations during the lifetime of the project. There have been public events, workshops, an online consultation, countless meetings and letters and emails from all over the Thames estuary and as far a field as Germany and Australia. All the information we have received has been carefully considered and helped to inform the final Plan.

The most recent consultation on our draft Plan was our most far reaching to date. We would like to thank all who responded and were particularly pleased that numerous organisations people put themselves forward as partners in the future implementation of the Plan. Its by working together that we can rise to the challenge of climate change and ensure that the diverse communities of the Thames estuary continue to thrive.

Sarah Lavery

TE2100 Project Manager

Contents

Forward	2
Contents	2
Introduction	4
Summary of responses	8
Conclusion and next steps	19
Appendix 1	
Appendix 2	
Appendix 3	

1. Introduction

1.1 Thames Estuary 2100

The Thames Estuary 2100 project (TE2100) was established in 2002 with the aim of developing a tidal flood risk management plan for London and the Thames estuary through to the end of the century. The project, led by the Environment Agency, covers the tidal Thames from Teddington in west London, through to Sheerness and Shoeburyness at the estuary mouth in Kent and Essex. The key drivers for the project were that tidal flood risk is increasing in the Thames estuary due to:

- Climate change and sea level rise
- Ageing of the current flood defence infrastructure
- More people living and working in the defended floodplain

Because of the uncertainties around how climate change may impact on the future water levels, the Plan has been designed to so that it can adapt to a range of future climate change scenarios. This means that if sea levels are found to be rising faster than currently predicted the Plan will indicate what changes will be required and when they will need to be implemented.

1.2 Objectives of public consultation

The TE2100 public consultation engaged both internal and external stakeholders. The strategy was delivered in line with the Environment Agency's Building Trust With Communities approach and was guided by the principles of consultation best practice. The objectives of the public consultation were:

- Raising awareness – an on going campaign to raise awareness of the TE2100 plan and the flood risks associated with living and working in the Thames tidal floodplain
- Refining the options – support consultation options development by ground-truthing and highlighting issues that could effect delivery
- Gaining the support and advocacy of key stakeholders – ensure that key estuary stakeholders remain informed and involved with the Plan
- Informing the appraisal – enrich and legitimise the economic, social and environmental data being used to baseline and appraise the options
- Safeguarding land for flood storage and habitat creation – build relationships with local authorities and landowners to facilitate flood storage proposals, deliver 'creating a better place' and satisfy obligations under the EU Habitats Directive
- Migrating the Plan into the business – ensure the buy-in of internal colleagues and the successful migration of the plan into the work schedules of the regional and area delivery teams
- Preparing for implementation – gain the support and buy-in of future implementation and delivery partners
- Public support – maintaining a dialogue with estuary communities providing widespread opportunities for comment on the consultation Plan

1.3 Consultation activity

The Thames Estuary 2100 Consultation Plan was launched for consultation on the 31st March 2009. The planned three month consultation period was **extended** for one month to accommodate the local election period.

Consultation on the draft TE2100 Plan was conducted in four distinct phases.

1.3.1 Phase 1: TE2100 Plan launch

The TE2100 public consultation was launched at a two day conference held at the Institution of Civil Engineers on 30th and 31st March, 2009. The launch was attended by approximately 150 of our key stakeholders including Huw Irranca- Davis, Minister for Marine and Natural Environment, who welcomed the Plan with a keynote speech. The launch event was supported with a website, which allowed stakeholders to view plan documents online, and media coverage in the national, local and regional press.

Following the launch of the TE2100 Plan for Consultation, all of those who attended the TE2100 launch were invited to submit any comments they had about the launch through a feedback form. We asked attendees to rate:

- How much they agreed that the day helped broaden their understanding of the TE2100 Consultation Plan and how it relates to their area of expertise/organisation
- How much they agreed that the presentations provided sufficient information on the sound scientific evidence base we have used to develop the Plan.

We also asked whether there is any other information they need to help them respond to the consultation and whether they are an implementation partner and if so, can we meet with them.

The feedback we received was very positive, with the majority of responses strongly agreeing that the conference had helped broaden their understanding of the TE2100 Consultation Plan and how it relates to their area of expertise/organisation. There was also a positive response confirming that the presentations provided sufficient information on the sound scientific evidence base that TE2100 used to develop the Plan, as the majority of responses agreed with this, with the rest of the responses strongly agreeing.

A full report on the TE2100 Plan launch is contained in Appendix 2.

1.3.2 Phase 2: key stakeholder meetings

Immediately after the launch event we sent written briefing materials on the TE2100 Plan and its key recommendations to our key stakeholders, many of whom are identified in the Plan as future implementation partners. Where appropriate further face-to-face briefings were held.

The communication plan for this phase was shared with Environment Agency Area and Regional communication teams in London, Kent and Essex to ensure that messages were aligned with the broader communication objectives of the Environment Agency. Where appropriate, meetings were attended jointly with representatives from Area or Regional communication teams. Relevant briefing materials were also provided to area Parliamentary and Regional Strategic Unit teams to raise the awareness of MPs and Government Officers to TE2100 consultation activities.

1.3.3 Phase 3: talking to the public

High public interest in the TE2100 project meant that a number of events were organised across the Estuary to give the public the opportunity to find out more about the Plan. Members of the TE2100 technical team were available to discuss different aspects of the Plan and specially designed public response forms were disseminated to capture the public's response to the Plan.

All public meetings were advertised through the local press and often with the assistance of local authorities and/or local interest groups. Public meetings were targeted in areas where there are particular issues with flooding or where communities have previously expressed strong interest in the TE2100 Plan.

A report on TE2100 public events can be found in Appendix 3.

1.3.4 Phase 4: talking to colleagues

To facilitate the successful migration and implementation of the TE2100 Plan into the day-to-day business of the Environment Agency we are meeting with over 20 key representatives from Area delivery teams. Teams we have targeted are Planning and Corporate Services (PACs), Flood Risk Management (FRM), Strategic Environmental Planning (SEP) and Asset System Management (ASM). These meetings are helping us to ensure that the TE2100 Blueprint for Implementation meets the operational requirements and expectation of these teams.

1.4 Communication tools

A range of tools were used during the TE2100 public consultation to meet the diverse needs of stakeholders and communities on the Thames estuary. These are described below.

1.4.1 Consultation document

The main tool for engaging with key stakeholders and the public was the TE2100 Consultation document. One thousand copies of the document were printed and made widely available at venues across the Plan area, including Regional and Area Environment Agency offices, public libraries and local authority buildings.

The document was designed to explain the key recommendations of the draft Plan and to raise awareness of key issues such as climate change, sources of flooding and how they interact, and historic flooding in London and the Thames estuary. The Plan was divided into Action Zones. Each Action Zone then had an action plan that was divided into three time horizons: short term (up to 2035); medium term (between 2035 and 2070) long term (2070-2100). There were nine Action Zones in total:

- Action zone 0 – estuary-wide
- Action zone 1 – west London
- Action Zone 2 – central London
- Action zone 3 – east London
- Action zone 4 – east London downstream of the Thames Barrier
- Action Zone 5 – middle Estuary
- Action Zone 6 – lower Estuary Marshes
- Action Zone 7 – lower Estuary urban industrial
- Action Zone 8 – Seaside/ fishermen's frontage

The high quality content, accessibility, clear language and good design of the Plan were widely commented on in responses to the consultation.

1.4.2 TE2100 consultation website

The consultation was advertised on the Environment Agency website under “current consultations”. There were links to this website from the websites of key stakeholder and estuary interest groups e.g. the Thames Estuary Partnership. The web-pages summarised the key findings of the TE2100 plan and encouraged visitors to take part in the public consultation. Also available on the website was:

- TE2100 consultation document
- summary environmental report
- a consultation response form
- dates and locations of public events.

1.4.3 TE2100 DVD

To support the TE2100 consultation we produced a short film about the project and our key findings. 1000 copies of the film were reproduced on a DVD. The DVD also held the full suite of TE2100 consultation documents including the main Technical Report and Environmental Report.

The film was shown at the TE2100 launch conference, public events and at meetings with key stakeholders. It proved an effective tool for building understanding and awareness of complex issues, such as climate change, surge tides and coastal squeeze, which have been central to the development of the Plan.

1.4.4 Public events

Eleven staffed public drop-in sessions were held across the estuary during the consultation period. Events were held at:

- Barnes, Sheen Lane Centre (London)
- Twickenham, York House (London)
- Richmond, Parkshot Studio (London)
- Barking Learning Centre (London)
- Cliffe Memorial Hall (Kent)
- Cliffe Fayre (Kent)
- Alhallows Primary School (Kent)
- Benfleet Methodist Church Hall, in partnership with Castle Point District Council (Essex)
- Canvey Island, Leigh beck Junior School, in partnership with Castle Point District Council (Essex)
- Canvey Island, Paddocks Community Centre (Essex)
- Canvey Island, Winter Gardens Baptist Church (Essex)

During the events visitors were encouraged to complete a consultation response form about their views on the consultation plan and the event. Details of TE2100 events across the Thames estuary and the key issues raised at these events can be found in Appendix 2.

2. Summary of responses

2.1 Estuary-wide stakeholders

The Plan was welcomed and supported by statutory stakeholders English Heritage and Natural England. The Department for Communities and Local Government and Homes and Communities Agency indicated that the TE2100 Plan largely fits with their ambitions for developing the Thames Gateway as an eco-region and the Parklands programme. The Port of London Authority has also expressed support and the insurance sector has welcomed our long-term approach to flood risk management planning and climate change adaptability.

2.2 Stakeholders in London

In London we have received responses from:

City of Westminster	Greater London Authority
City of London	Thames Water
London Borough of Barking and Dagenham	City Property Association
London Borough of Newham	Transport for London
London Borough of Havering	Institution of Civil Engineers London
Wandsworth Council	Government Office for London
Lewisham Borough Council	Tilfen Land (development and investment)
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	Eel Pie Island Association
London Borough of Richmond	Residents of Trowlock Island
Greenwich Borough Council	NHS Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	London Borough of Bexley
London Borough of Bexley (Cllr John Davey)	Bexley LA21 Natural Environment Focus Group

Key themes raised in consultation responses were:

2.2.1 Managing flooding from other sources

Raised by: London Borough of Richmond, City of Westminster, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, Transport for London, Eel Pie Island Residents Association, Residents of Trowlock Island, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.

Though the strategic approach to managing tidal flood risk was welcomed, stakeholders urged that a similar approach should be taken to managing fluvial flood risk and also flooding caused by drainage issues caused by heavy rainfall. It was also highlighted that it is often the combined effects which present the most threat to communities by the river.

Concern was expressed regarding TE2100 finding that peak fluvial flows on the Thames and tributaries could increase by 40% by 2080. It was emphasised that the TE2100 project and the Lower Thames Strategy should work closely together to ensure the cumulative impacts of tidal and fluvial flooding are fully taken into account.

TE2100 response: Although the TE2100 Plan is primarily concerned with tidal flooding, fluvial flooding has been investigated. Our recommendation that a local flood risk management approach (similar to the Lower Thames Strategy) is taken for the Thames reach downstream of Teddington. This would consider the combined effects of tidal and fluvial flows in west London in more detail.

Local strategies to manage surface water flooding are contained in surface water management plans (SWMPs). These are led by county council and unitary authorities and supported by ourselves, district or Borough councils, water companies, internal drainage boards and the Highways Agency.

2.2.2 Fluvial flooding in west London and the Thames Barrier

Raised by: Public, Residents of Trowlock Island, London Borough of Richmond.

There was widespread public concern in west London about the TE2100 recommendation to cease using the Thames Barrier to manage fluvial flooding in west London. Further engagement has been requested by the residents of Trowlock Island to help them understand more clearly what this will mean for flood risk management on the Island over this century how they can ensure they are prepared.

TE2100 response: The primary purpose of the Thames Barrier is to prevent tidal flooding of London. As the sea level rises, the barrier will need to be used more and more often against higher tides. In order to maintain the high level of reliability of the Barrier for tidal flooding, a commitment to use the barrier to alleviate frequent fluvial flooding cannot be made.

There will be further engagement with the residents of west London and Trowlock Island as part of the Lower Thames Strategy's public consultation from September to December 2009.

2.2.3 The impact of raising defences on the environment and river access

Raised by: English Heritage, City of Westminster, Greenwich Council, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, City of London, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, NHS Tower Hamlets, Royal Yachting Association, Public.

Consultation responses said that any future raising of defences through London must be sensitive to the historic riverside; preserving views and access to the river and preserving the natural environment (particularly in west London). Key sites along London riverside that were highlighted in responses include the UNESCO World Heritage sites at Kew Gardens and Greenwich and the scheduled ancient monument at Queenhithe Dock.

TE2100 response: We agree that all future works to maintain and improve flood defences should consider historic sensitivity, views, access and the natural environment, and all these aspects have been considered in our options development and appraisal of our options.

Historic views and vistas were identified within the TE2100 landscape characterisation and capacity assessment, and sensitive historic landscapes were identified in our Historic Sensitivity Study. English Heritage, Essex County Council and Kent County Council were all key partners in these studies. Both studies were used to inform the TE2100 Strategic Environmental Assessment and multi-criteria analysis (MCA) appraisal of our flood risk management options.

Continued over...

Further to this, our desire to maintain and improve access to the riverside as part of the TE2100 Plan led us to conduct a recreation sensitivity study. This assessed the sensitivity of recreation to the impacts of different ways of managing flood risk. Again, this was used to appraise our options and develop the Plan.

Historic sensitivity, views, access and the natural environment will all be considered in more detail at scheme level in localised Environmental Impact Assessments and as part of local riverside strategies. We recommend that these strategies are delivered over the next 25 years alongside partners such as English Heritage, Natural England and district/borough/county councils, to guide future improvements to the defences.

2.2.4. Potential flood storage areas

Raised by: London Borough of Bexley, London Borough of Havering, RSPB, Natural England.

The following concerns were raised about using undeveloped areas of the Estuary for flood storage:

- That inundation of predominantly freshwater areas with saline/brackish water would be harmful to their ecology and in some areas there are issues with land contamination
- The cost of flood storage will fall on a small number of local authorities while the benefits will be felt by many
- Flood storage on Erith Marshes could put key infrastructure at risk. Sites at risk would include: Thames Water's sewage treatment facility at Crossness, RRRL's Energy from Waste Generation Station (currently under-construction), Thames Innovation Centre and the Eastern Way
- Danger to people and wildlife, especially on Erith Marsh which is close to the communities of Slade Green, Erith, Belvedere and Thamesmead
- Loss of public space and obstruction of views by new defence lines around storage areas. It was also highlighted that Slade Green, Erith, Belvedere and Thamesmead are socially and economically deprived areas, and that loss of public space and access to the riverside would be a further burden on these communities
- Threat to economy, particularly with reference to the potential threat flood storage could pose to the Darent Industrial Estate on Crayford Marshes.

TE2100 response: Tidal flood storage is part of an estuary-wide option to manage the tidal flood risk from the estuary. It is not a preferred option for a number of reasons including costs and potential adverse impacts on human safety, contaminant release and damage to habitats.

TE2100 studies also indicated that there were some serious issues regarding the reliability of flood storage using current forecasting technology. The concerns centred on accurately forecasting the timing and surge shape – both essential factors in managing flood storage. Nevertheless, we appreciate that forecasting technology may well improve in the future and for this reason we have not rejected flood storage as an option. All our options, including flood storage, will be reviewed regularly throughout the Plan's life.

If flood storage were to be progressed at any of these sites there would be a thorough investigation of the impacts on the environmental and historic features, the infrastructure, and how to avoid or minimise any impact. Flooding would occur very occasionally and the ecosystems would recover. However, there would be a recovery period of several years.

Continued overleaf...

It is not anticipated that the direct costs of flood storage areas would be incurred by the local communities, but would be centrally funded. Sources of funding are however outside the scope of TE2100.

We are aware of the various developments on Erith Marshes, and the outline designs for flood storage take these into account. However, the continued development of hitherto undeveloped marsh has reduced the viability of tidal flood storage in this area. New development is also reducing the potential for future fluvial flood storage on the marshes.

Whilst it is agreed that new defences would have a visual impact on both views and landscape, they also present opportunities for landscape and viewpoint improvements.

2.2.5 Funding

Raised by: London Borough of Bexley, Wandsworth Council, Transport for London, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, City Property Association and Association of British Insurers.

Several local authorities expressed concern about what financial commitments would be required from individual boroughs to deliver TE2100 actions. Further to this it was highlighted that the Environment Agency should do everything in its power to ensure adequate funding is put in place to take forward the agreed proposals of the TE2100 Plan and that long term strategic planning must be backed up with long term commitment to investment in order to maintain the confidence of insurers.

TE2100 response: Funding is an issue for wider government, in liaison with the Environment Agency and key stakeholders, to agree as part of approving the TE2100 Plan. The Environment Agency will naturally be urging government to identify clear funding streams.

2.2.6 End of the century options

Responses in London were broadly supportive of the TE2100 Plan and its recommended actions, however, most stakeholders reserved judgment on the end of the century options as it is thought that new options and/or proposals may emerge over time. Due to the environmental and aesthetic impacts, some stakeholders felt that defence raising should only be brought forward when all other options have been exhausted. The importance of monitoring and reviewing the TE2100 actions in light of future climate change science was also emphasised.

TE2100 response: We recommend that the TE2100 plan should be reviewed every 5 – 10 years against our 10 indicators for change described in Chapter 5 of the TE2100 Plan. This review process will inform the future decision on which option is preferred. This decision will have to be made by approximately 2050.

2.3 Stakeholders in Kent

In Kent we have received responses from:

Kent County Council	Royal Yachting Association
Medway Council	Land Securities
Canterbury City Council	Lafarge Cement UK
Gravesham Borough Council	Inland Waterways Association: Kent & East Sussex
Dartford Borough Council	RWE Npower
London Borough of Bexley (Officers)	Kent Wildlife Trust
London Borough of Bexley (Cllr John Davey)	RSPB
Bexley LA21 Natural Environment Focus Group	Sustrans
Swale Borough Council	Countryside Properties
Medway Internal Drainage Board	Cliffe & Cliffe Woods Parish Council
Ministry of Defence	Friends of North Kent Marshes

Key themes raised in consultation responses were:

2.3.1. Intertidal habitat creation

Raised by: RSPB, Friends of North Kent Marshes, Kent Wildlife Trust, London Borough of Bexley

Responses are supportive of designated habitat being replaced but some expressed concern that intertidal habitat creation has been proposed at some designated freshwater sites. St Mary's Marsh is favoured as a site for intertidal habitat creation over other designated sites.

There were particularly concerns from some local authorities about loss of intertidal habitat in their area and their lack of space to recreate it. The impact of realignment on critically important infrastructure was also highlighted.

TE2100 response: 1200 hectares of intertidal habitat will be lost this century as it gets squeezed between rising seas and our fixed flood defences. We have identified seven sites across the estuary, including three in Kent, where intertidal habitat could be recreated. However, some of the land identified in our Plan is already designated freshwater grazing marsh. We are using responses to our public consultation to identify two preferred intertidal habitat creation sites to come forward in the first 25 years of the Plan period (up to 2035).

We are looking wherever possible to create intertidal habitat on land that is undesignated. However, where this is unavoidable, the designated freshwater habitat must be recreated elsewhere. A number of sites have been identified for potential freshwater habitat creation in the TE2100. More information can be found in Chapter 9 of the Plan.

2.3.2 The impact of raising defences on the environment and river access

Raised by: Kent County Council, English Heritage, Royal Yachting Association, Cliffe Parish Council, Friends of North Kent Marshes

Responses were generally supportive of improving the current defences but some concerns were raised over the effect this might have on the natural and historic environment; river views and connectivity to the riverside. Key natural and historic sites along the Kent riverside identified in consultation responses include Shorne and Cliffe Marshes, Cooling Castle, Cliffe and Shorne Forts and Cliffe Cement Works.

TE2100 response: We agree that all future works to maintain and improve flood defences should consider historic sensitivity, views, access and the natural environment, and all have been considered the development and appraisal of our options.

Historic views and vistas were identified within the TE2100 landscape characterisation and capacity assessment and sensitive historic landscapes were identified in our Historic Sensitivity Study. English Heritage, Essex County Council and Kent County Council were all key partners in these studies. Both studies were used to inform the TE2100 Strategic Environmental Assessment and multi-criteria analysis (MCA) appraisal of our flood risk management options.

Further to this, our desire to maintain and improve access to the riverside as part of the TE2100 Plan led us to conduct a recreation sensitivity study. This assessed the sensitivity of recreation to the impacts of different flood risk management options. Again, this was used to appraise our options and develop the Plan.

Historic sensitivity, views, access and the natural environment will all be considered in more detail at scheme level in localised Environmental Impact Assessments. These will be delivered alongside partners such as English Heritage, Natural England and district/borough/county councils.

2.3.3 Flood Storage

Raised by: RSPB, Kent County Council, Kent Wildlife Trust, Dartford Borough Council and London Borough of Bexley.

The following concerns were raised about using undeveloped areas of the Estuary for flood storage:

- That inundation of predominantly freshwater areas with saline/brackish water would be harmful to their ecology and could lead to land contamination issues
- The cost of flood storage will fall on a small number of local authorities while the benefits will be felt by many
- Flood storage on Erith Marshes could put key infrastructure at risk.
- Potential danger to people and loss of habitat for wildlife. Dartford BC feel it could jeopardise the 'Managing the Marshes' project at Dartford Marshes
- Loss of public space and obstruction of views by new defence lines around storage areas. It was highlighted that Slade Green, Erith, Belvedere and Thamesmead are socially and economically deprived areas, and that loss of public space and access to the riverside would be a further burden on these communities.
- Threat to economy, particularly with reference to the potential threat flood storage could pose to the Darent Industrial Estate on Crayford Marshes.

- There were concerns about the effect of flood storage on the historic environment.

TE2100 response: Tidal flood storage is part of an estuary-wide option to manage the tidal flood risk from the estuary. It is not a preferred option for a number of reasons including costs and potential impacts on community safety, contaminant release and damage to habitats.

TE2100 studies also indicated that there were some serious issues regarding the reliability of flood storage using current forecasting technology. The concerns centred on accurately forecasting the timing and surge shape – both factors in managing flood storage. Nevertheless, we appreciate that forecasting technology may well improve in the future and for this reason we have not rejected flood storage as an option. All our options including flood storage will be reviewed regularly throughout the Plan's life.

If flood storage were to be progressed at any of these sites there would be a thorough investigation of the impacts on the environmental and historic features, the infrastructure, and how to avoid or minimise any impact. Flooding would occur very occasionally and the ecosystems would recover. However, there would be a recovery period of several years.

It is not anticipated that the direct costs of flood storage areas would be incurred by the local communities, but would be centrally funded. Sources of funding are however outside the scope of TE2100.

We are aware of the various developments on Erith Marshes, and the outline designs for flood storage take these into account. However the continued development of hitherto undeveloped marsh has reduced the viability of tidal flood storage in this area. The new development is also reducing the potential for future fluvial flood storage on the marshes.

Whilst it is agreed that new defences could have an impact on both views and landscape, they also present opportunities for improvements.

2.3.4 The location of a potential new barrier

Raised by: Kent County Council, London Borough of Bexley, Dartford Borough Council, Swale Borough Council, Canterbury City Council, Gravesham Borough Council.

Preferences for the location of a new Barrier were evenly split between the local authorities; some preferred the location at Long Reach while others preferred Gravesend and Tilbury, or more eastern location. Responses were supportive of opportunities to lower walls upstream of a new barrier.

Concerns were expressed about the impact of a barrier on water levels around the Kent coast, as well as the potential impact on navigation, both commercial and recreational.

No local authority responses noted support for a new barrier integrated with a lower Thames crossing.

TE2100 response: The preferred location for a future barrier is currently Long Reach, although this will be subject to future review. A key issue in the decision on whether and where to build any new barrier will be balancing the costs to port operators against the wider economic, social and environmental impacts.

By the end of the century any new barrier could be closing up to 50 times per year. A new barrier at Tilbury could therefore have significant impact on shipping into Tilbury Port. It is for this reason that Long Reach is currently the preferred location.

TE2100 studies show that a new barrier located at either Tilbury or Long Reach would not have significant effect on water levels in the River Medway, Swale or the Kent coast.

2.3.5 Funding

Raised by: Kent County Council, London Borough of Bexley, Dartford Borough Council, Gravesham Borough Council

Several local authorities expressed concern for what financial commitments would be required from their organisations to deliver TE2100 actions.

TE2100 response: Funding is an issue for wider government, in liaison with the Environment Agency and key stakeholders, to agree as part of approving the TE2100 Plan. The Environment Agency will naturally be urging government to identify clear funding streams.

2.4 Stakeholders in Essex

In Essex we received responses from:

Basildon District Council	English Heritage
Essex County Council - Historic Environment Branch	Anglian (Eastern) RFDC
Essex County Council	RSPB
Castle Point Borough Council	Thurrock Thames Gateway Development Corporation
Southend-on-Sea Borough Council	Sustrans
EERA	Thurrock Council
PDE Consulting Limited	A. G Young (Landowner)

Key themes raised in consultation responses were:

2.4.1 Intertidal habitat creation

Raised by: RSPB, Essex County Council, Castle Point Borough Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Thurrock Council, Basildon District Council, EERA, A.G Young (Landowner)

There was little support for any of the sites coming forward in the first 25 years of the Plan. However, an opportunity has been highlighted to create 100ha of intertidal habitat as part of an RSPB scheme on Bowers Marsh. These discussions have been handed over to the Regional Habitat Creation Programme. There may be opportunities to revisit

opportunities to create intertidal habitat on West Canvey Marsh in the medium term (2035-2070).

There was general support for habitat creation; however, the need to maintain a balance between productive agricultural land and preserving biodiversity was highlighted. One stakeholder suggested that areas for habitat creation may need to be found outside the Thames estuary.

Habitat creation on West Canvey Marshes was fiercely opposed by Canvey Island residents.

TE2100 response: 1200 hectares of intertidal habitat will be lost this century as it gets squeezed between rising seas and our fixed flood defences. We have a legal obligation under the European Habitat and Birds Directives to replace this habitat. Under the Habitat Regulations Guidance, and as agreed by Natural England, we cannot look outside the Plan area (Thames estuary) for opportunities to replace designated sites until all opportunities within the Thames estuary have been exhausted.

We have identified seven sites across the estuary, including four in Essex, where intertidal habitat could be recreated. Approximately four of these sites will be needed to replace what will be lost. The priority for the TE2100 is to identify two preferred sites for intertidal habitat creation over the next 25 years. We are using responses to the public consultation to help us identify these sites.

Our aspiration is to work with partner organisations across the Thames estuary to create a rich mosaic of intertidal and freshwater habitats that can be enjoyed by people and wildlife.

2.4.2 Contaminated land

Raised by: Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Essex County Council, Basildon District Council, RSPB, Natural England, East England Regional Assembly

A number of responses expressed concern that the abandonment of flood defences on Two Tree Island and reduced maintenance of the flood defences on Hadleigh Marsh would lead to contaminants leaching into the Estuary. It was also highlighted that contaminated land issues at both sites could jeopardise successful creation of freshwater habitat on Hadleigh Marsh.

Additionally, it was suggested that the presence of contaminated land on areas of Bowers, Vange and Fobbing Marsh could be an obstacle to successful intertidal habitat creation.

TE2100 response: Contaminated land in the Thames estuary is a serious barrier to the adaptation of flood defences to climate change.

Following Government guidance, TE2100 has developed flood risk management policies to guide future local strategic flood risk management planning throughout the estuary. Our recommended flood risk management policy for Hadleigh Marsh and Two Tree Island is to do less than we do currently to manage the flood defences.

This is based on an economic and environmental assessment of what is at risk behind the flood defences.

+This does not mean allowing the defence to crumble into the sea but a managed reduction in the way we maintain the defence. This would lead to a moderate increase in the risk of inundation over time.

We are aware of contaminated land issues on Hadleigh Marsh and Two Tree Island. Therefore Action 6.4 of the TE2100 Plan recommends that land contamination issues are further investigated and better understood. Further information on land contamination on Hadleigh Marshes and Two Tree Island has been provided through the public consultation. We are using this information to revisit our policy for the area and inform a decision on the most appropriate future approach to flood risk management. Our final policy decision will be described in the Plan that we submit to DEFRA in early 2009. Whatever the outcome we will not allow the future management of flood risk to result in the release of toxic or polluting material to the Estuary

2.4.3 Historic Sensitivity

Raised by: Essex County Council, Thurrock Council, English Heritage although stakeholders largely agreed that the historic sensitivity has been comprehensively dealt with in the Strategic Environmental Assessment, a number felt that the historic sensitivity of key sites in Essex is not reflected in text within the draft Plan. Key sites and features which stakeholders felt should be more prevalent in the Plan text were Coalhouse Fort, buried remains, Tilbury Fort and other historic features such as buried Neolithic forests and peat deposits.

TE2100 response: TE2100 notes these comments and will better reflect the historic value and sensitivity of key sites in Essex within the final TE2100.

Additionally key historic sites, views and vistas and their sensitivity to changes in the flood defences have been evaluated and recorded by TE2100's Landscape Characterisation and Capacity Assessment, and Historic Sensitivity Study. Both these studies were used to inform the development and appraisal of our flood risk management options.

2.4.4 Outer Estuary Barrage

Raised by: RSPB, PLA, Thames Water, Thurrock Council, Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Castle Point Borough Council, Renewable Energy Systems Ltd, public.

Some consultation responses welcomed the exclusion of an outer-estuary barrage from the TE2100 Plan, either due to the environmental damage or impediment to shipping it would cause. Others accepted that it had been "parked" but felt it should not be ruled out

as an option, especially if it provided additional benefits such as a lower Thames crossing or power generation.

TE2100 response: An outer-estuary barrage has been “parked” as an option for future flood risk management because its substantial costs and environmental impacts are unlikely to be offset by the fairly modest extra flood risk management benefit over other options (given the range of sea level rise envisaged).

We have engaged with other parties who are investigating proposals to combine a new outer-estuary barrage or barrier with energy generation and transport, but our view at this stage is that such benefits are not sufficient to swing the economic case in favour of an outer-estuary structure. Nevertheless, the TE2100 Plan is adaptable to this situation changing in the future.

2.4.5 Barrier location

Raised by: Southend-on-Sea Borough Council, Essex County Council, RWE Npower
There were mixed views on the proposed location for a new barrier, some stakeholders preferring Long Reach others Tilbury. Future monitoring of the conditions affecting the choice of preferred barrier location was highlighted as important.

It was suggested that a new barrier should provide access for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled access wherever possible.

TE2100 response: The preferred location for a future barrier is currently Long Reach, although this will be subject to future review. A key issue in the decision on whether and where to build any new barrier will be balancing the costs to port operators against the wider economic, social and environmental impacts.

By the end of the century any new barrier could be closing up to 50 times per year. A new barrier at Tilbury could therefore have significant impact on shipping into Tilbury Port. It is for this reason that Long Reach is currently the preferred location.

2.4.6 Funding

Raised by: Basildon District Council, Essex County Council, East England Regional Assembly

Several stakeholders wanted further information on funding sources for TE2100 actions. Implementation partners requested early communication of further information relating to financial contributions they may be expected to make.

TE2100 response: Funding is an issue for wider government, in liaison with the Environment Agency and key stakeholders, to agree as part of approving the TE2100 Plan. The Environment Agency will naturally be urging government to identify clear funding streams.

3. Conclusion and next steps

3.1 Incorporating responses into the final TE2100 Plan

It is essential to the success of the final TE2100 Plan that stakeholders' views are understood and incorporated. To facilitate this, a working group has been set up, chaired by the TE2100 Communications Manager, to discuss the consultation responses and agree necessary changes to the final Plan. Important changes are being made to the Plan as a result. These include:

- The schedule of intertidal habitat creation sites is being reviewed
- The flood risk management policy for Hadleigh Marshes and Two Tree Island is being re-appraised in light of further information provided on contaminated land during the consultation
- Additions and amendments are being made to the indicators for change
- Text is being added to more fully describe the historic significance and sensitivity of key sites in London, Kent and Essex
- A glossary of key terms and abbreviations will be added.

More detail on how the TE2100 Plan has been amended to reflect and incorporate responses to the public consultation will be found in Chapter 1 of our final Plan. This can be available early 2010.

3.2 What happens next?

We are currently changing the TE2100 Plan using the results of our public consultation. It will begin the process of internal Environment Agency approval in November 2009 and be submitted to DEFRA and the Treasury in early 2010. At this time the final TE2100 Plan will be available on the Environment Agency website.

Appendix 1

List of respondents to TE2100 consultation.

PLA	ICE London
RSPB	GOL
Natural England	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Thames Water	London Borough of Newham
CLG	Swale Borough Council
RYA	London Borough of Havering
JBA Consulting	London Borough of Havering
RES	TTGDC
KCC	Medway Council
Land Securities	Countryside Properties
Canterbury City Council	Gravesham Borough Council
Ministry of Defence	LAFARGE CEMENT UK
London Borough of Bexley - Cllr John Davey	Kent Wildlife Trust
IWAKES	Sustrans
CPRE Kent	English Heritage
Medway IDB	Wandsworth Borough Council
RWE Npower	Thurrock Council
Dartford Borough Council	L.B of Lewisham
London Borough of Bexley - Clare Loops	Friends of North Kent Marshes
Bexley LA21 Natural Environment Focus Group	EERA
Southend Borough Council	ABI
City Property Association	Essex County Council
Natural England SEA response	Cliffe & Cliffe Woods Parish Council
TFL	Eel Pie Island
Metrotidal Integration	PDE Consulting Limited (on behalf of S Walsh & Sons Ltd)
British Property Federation	Castle Point Borough Council
HCA	Basildon District Council - Environmental Health team
Anglian (Eastern) RFDC	Greater London Authority
FRB	The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea
Bowers Parish Council	LB Richmond
Essex County Council - Historic Environment Branch	London Fire Brigade
Basildon District Council	Greenwich Council
NHS Tower Hamlets	City of Westminster
London Borough of Tower Hamlets	City of London
Tilfen Land	
Public responses - 57	

Appendix 2

TE2100 conference report



CONFERENCE REPORT

TE2100 Plan for Consultation Launch & Technical Conference

The TE2100 Plan for Consultation was launched on 31st March 2009 with a high profile two-day conference event held at the Institution of Civil Engineers in Westminster, London. This event was preceded with a pre-launch reception for MPs and Executive members of the Environment Agency and key stakeholder organisations to preview the TE2100 Plan for Consultation.

The launch of the TE2100 Plan on 31st March was followed by an evening dinner for 100 invited guests and the TE2100 Technical Conference on 1st April 2009. An event website was set up for the purpose of delegate registration with pre-event information.

Tuesday 31st March 2009 TE2100 Plan for Consultation Launch

Morning Session:

The launch of the TE2100 Plan was a very successful day and attended by approximately 150 delegates. Key stakeholders attended from organisations such as DEFRA, Department for Transport, CLG, local authorities, PLA, Government Office for London, Natural England, Transport for London, London Wildlife Trust, Met Office, Homes & Communities Agency, Thames Estuary Partnership and Environment Agency members of staff.

The aim of the day was to launch the TE2100 Plan, gain high level advocacy and bring to the attention of key stakeholders how they can help shape the TE2100 Plan, as well as considering their role as future implementation partners.

The morning session focussed on the Government's strategic aspirations for climate change adaptation and flood risk management; the Environment Agency's challenges for climate change and the launch of the TE2100 Plan Consultation.

This session was chaired by Robert Runcie (Director, Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management, Environment Agency) and opened with a speech from **Huw Irranca-Davies** (Minister for Marine and Natural Environment). In his speech, the Minister welcomed the TE2100 Plan and highlighted Government policy and priorities for climate change and flood risk management.

“... we are currently facing up to our biggest environmental threat, that of climate change. It is no longer a future scenario, it is already here and it is happening right now. So we need to make sure we can put in place measures to help us adapt to these future challenges. Even with substantial cuts in carbon emissions, it will not be possible to avoid some of these challenges. No matter what action we take to mitigate the impacts of climate change, we must also adapt to the changes that are going to happen, and they are happening right now. This was recognised by the Climate Change Act – a groundbreaking piece of legislation, which created the legal framework for building the UK’s ability to adapt to climate change.”

“... Climate Change is not only a threat to our environment. It is also a threat to our security, to our prosperity, and even to our future development. In summer 2007, the floods showed the simply devastating cost that severe weather can inflict on our environment, and on our economy, and on people.”

“Adaptation underpins TE2100. We want you to apply this approach to managing flood risk on the ground by identifying the risks posed to your business and your area and your neighbourhood, and then developing a risk-based, proportionate response. It’s so important that you use your local skills and your knowledge to ensure that the plans you have in place fit with your particular circumstances. The “one size fits all model” simply won’t work. So we need your help and leadership. You have quite a unique role to play, in the long term management of flood and other Climate Change risks.”

Next **Lord Chris Smith** (Chairman, Environment Agency) gave a speech about the challenges of climate change for the Environment Agency and how we are responding to both national and regional impacts of climate change. He highlighted Thames Estuary 2100 and how it is a groundbreaking project, which has been examining scenarios and what impacts climate change is going to have on the entire estuary and river over the next ninety years. He emphasised that it is the first major flood risk project to put climate change adaptability at its core and that it gives us the best information and the best policy tools to know what we should be doing now and what we may need to do in the future.

“...Thames Estuary 2100 tries to look at an entire estuary and river and say what is going to happen over the next ninety years, what are the likely scenarios, what impact is Climate Change going to have, and what should our responses be both now and in the future. I think this is really groundbreaking work because what it does is set up a number of possible responses and gives us the best information, the best policy tools to know what we should be doing now and what we may need to do in the future, but perhaps need to prepare the ground for now. We do need to be flexible in our response partly because of the science of climate change, and we know that some of these dramatic things are going to happen, but what we don’t know is precisely when and precisely in what form. We don’t know exactly what the level of sea level rise is going to be, and we need to have policy that is able to adapt as we begin to see how serious and fast these effects are happening. And that is what this strategy enables us to do”.

Following this, **Paul Leinster** (Chief Executive, Environment Agency) officially launched the TE2100 Plan. In his speech, he provided the background and drivers for the

establishment of the TE2100 Project and its aim of producing a long term flood risk management plan adaptable to future changes on the Thames estuary. He talked about the Environment Agency's foresight to begin planning ahead for a tidal flood and the fact that if climate change happens faster than we thought, TE2100 provides a plan that enables us to bring investments and schemes forward. He also talked about the project's engagement with organisations across the estuary and development of new methods of appraising the costs and benefits of these options, which take into account wider environmental and social needs.

"We want to ensure that future flood risk management systems not only protect people and property, but also improve and enhance the environment." ... "In the Thames Estuary we are fortunate to have the current system of tidal defences that we have, which provide greater levels of protection than are provided anywhere else in the country. And we need to ensure that as areas are regenerated and redeveloped, we use the opportunity to factor in flood risk management in the design of those; and in the construction and implementation. So that in the event of a flood, people are safer and that we have the right emergency planning in place to deal with any consequences. At present we spend around £55 million per year on the estuary's tidal flood management system and it's crucial that we continue to invest and plan for the future."

Following on from this, to help put the issues raised during the conference into context, the TE2100 Consultation film "Living with a Changing Estuary" was shown to delegates.

The film was followed by the final presentation of the morning session by **Howard Davidson** (Thames Regional Director, Environment Agency). He presented an overview of the content of the TE2100 Consultation Plan, concentrating on the key findings, recommendations along with short, medium and long term actions through this century.

"...Now it's very important that we hear your views on that, during the three month consultation, that we're going out to. So that we can get... agreement on these action plans, because we would like in the end to hand this over to government, and then start to do work to put this in place. Because if we as a community can get this right, then we're going to build confidence from all those that live and work and use this fantastic river system here - that we have thought this through together. And for me, this is one of the first times I have really seen climate adaptation working in practice.... Here, I think we have a proposal that starts to lay out not just the threat we're facing, but also proposed solutions. So I would commend the plan to you."

Afternoon Session:

The aim of the afternoon session was to present examples of some of the key stakeholder organisations that will be working with us to help shape the final plan and deliver the many actions in the future as implementation partners. We wanted to highlight to delegates how they too have a role to play in shaping the future of tidal flood risk management and the importance their involvement in the consultation to help shape the final TE2100 Plan.

Peter Bye (Board Member, Environment Agency) chaired the afternoon session and began by stating how flood risk management is not just a role for the Environment Agency. It needs multi-agency working and the sharing of information.

He introduced a short TE2100 film "Different People, Different Places, Different Issues", which presented a series of interviews with people working and living in the estuary; who are either involved in managing flood risk, are affected by flood risk, or could be affected by the recommendations in the TE2100 Plan.

Following on from this, **Joe Montgomery** (Director General, Regions and Communities, CLG) gave a speech highlighting how future flood risk management is a cross-government priority.

“The real challenge here is for Local Government, to step into its leadership role, to corral other public service providers together, and to make sure there’s proper understanding.”

This was followed by the **“Whose Plan Is It Anyway?”** session. This featured six short presentations from a cross-section of estuary stakeholders who will have a role in shaping the final TE2100 Plan and assisting in its future delivery. Each speaker focussed on the role of their organisation in terms of what they see as the future challenges and opportunities. Speakers for this session were as follows:

Alex Nickson (GLA):

‘Safeguarding & Reducing Risk: The Role of the Government’

“... I think the Thames Estuary 2100 actually is a world leading example of a flexible adaptation pathway. And I know this because I’ve been looking at who else has been doing adaptation strategies around the world, and TE2100 is internationally recognised as the best of the best.”

Alan Clark (Emergency Planning and Business Continuity Manager, LB Havering):

‘Managing Incidents: The Role of Local Resilience Fora’

“... Finally, it’s already been said, Emergency Planning Business Continuity is a team effort. There’s no ‘I’ in ‘team’, but there is me at work. That is what team-work’s all about. Partnership working – that’s what resilience is all about. That is what this consultation TE2100 is all about. It’s all about partnership working, irrespective of where it actually goes. If we want to do it, we’re not going to do it in five minutes. We will do it over the next three months, three years, thirty years. And when we all come back, in 2100, no, make it a little bit earlier – see how it’s going on, then we can actually discuss and see what we did, and whether planning has actually been put in place.”

James Trimmer (Port of London Authority):

‘Commercial Aspects in the Estuary Community’

“... The future challenges, as we see them in terms of going forward with this project – what impact will increasing closures of the Thames and importantly the Barking Barrier have in terms of freight movement on the Thames – the ferry services, or bulk carriers – clearly it’s complicated but it’s something that we look to protect the long-term viability of the Port. What will increasing the height of flood defences have – in terms of cargo handling, but also in terms of general access to the river – for leisure, for recreation, and indeed for enjoying the river, and it’s something that we need to consider certainly as a Port authority – just as much as we do in terms of other commercial uses. We look forward to working with the Environment Agency on the project and with a number of other stakeholders.”

Peter Massini (Natural England):

‘Wildlife in the Estuary Community’

“... The Thames Estuary is an important focus for Natural England’s work. Several million people live along its banks. And those people want to, or have the right to,

enjoy the recreational opportunities and health benefits of the national environment, not least those living in London. It's also one of the biggest regeneration areas in Europe. And provides opportunities to embed green infrastructure in to the way we build communities for the future."

Bill Gloyn (Chairman, British Property Federation Insurance Committee):
'Business in the Estuary Community'

"... from what we've heard today, and what we know in our hearts, this is no longer a risk exposure purely for the public sector. We all have a duty to mitigate. Property owners, who perhaps have thought it's up to the Local Authority or Government or somebody else to do something, they're going to have to face up to the fact that there are things that they have to do. Perhaps temporary emergency measures, resilience, disaster recovery plans which are generally put in the bottom drawer, and left there. There are many things that have to be done."

Helen Woolston
(**Environment & Climate Change Co-ordinator, Transport for London**):
'Infrastructure in the Estuary Community'

"We've definitely seen an improved and more targeted reporting, and relationships with the Met Office, and also with the Environment Agency. And we can see the improved multi-agency partnership working which we need, although I think that will continue to improve as well. But finally I guess the biggest opportunity for us has been to just raise this up the agenda, internally, to board level – wherever we need to send it, people are taking notice of us now when we talk about the need to adapt to Climate Change."

After the successful day's launch, TE2100 gave an evening dinner to 110 selected guests, which included key stakeholders from key organisations across the Thames estuary from London, Kent and Essex. The dinner was hosted by Howard Davidson with an after dinner presentation from archaeologist, Gustav Milne, from the Thames Discovery Programme. Sir David Attenborough was also present as an honorary guest at the dinner and had attended the earlier launch event from as a member of the public.

Wednesday 1st April 2009 **Technical Conference**

The TE2100 Technical Conference was held on 1st April 2009 and chaired by Jean Venables OBE (President of ICE). It was a full day of presentations of the TE2100 team's evidence base for the Plan, which involved the TE2100 team and consultants who were involved in supporting studies. The aim of the day was to detail the work and studies involved in compiling the TE2100 Plan and to help key stakeholders, future implementation partners, understand the Plan in more depth.

Over 150 delegates attended which included consultant staff and key stakeholders such as local authorities, CLG, English Heritage, Defra, Government Office for London, London Wildlife Trust, RSPB, Thames Estuary Partnership, Met Office and more.

Post Event

After the event, we set up a post event website with a summary of the two day conference, a photo gallery and uploaded all available presentations for further viewing. We also sent out a thank you letter to all attendees.

Feedback

Following the launch of the TE2100 Plan for Consultation, all of those who attended the TE2100 launch were invited to submit any comments they had about the launch through a feedback form. We asked attendees to rate:

- How much they agreed that the day helped broaden their understanding of the TE2100 Consultation Plan and how it relates to their area of expertise/organisation
- How much they agreed that the presentations provided sufficient information on the sound scientific evidence base we have used to develop the Plan
- We also asked whether there is any other information they need to help them respond to the Consultation, whether they are an implementation partner and if so, can we meet with them

The feedback we received was very positive, with the majority of responses strongly agreeing that the conference helped broaden their understanding of the TE2100 Consultation Plan and how it relates to their area of expertise/organisation. There was also a positive response confirming that the presentations provided sufficient information on the sound scientific evidence base TE2100 used to develop the Plan, as the majority of responses agreed with this, with the rest of the responses strongly agreeing.

Appendix 3

Area	Action Zone	Date	Venue	Nos. of attendees	Issues raised
LONDON	1: West London				
	Barnes & Kew	10.06.09	Sheen Lane Centre, East Sheen	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Can we have a new barrier now? * New developments and flood risk management * Climate change * Flood plains * Concerns regarding Thames Barrier not being used to protect West London from flooding, especially Trowlock Island * TE2100 appraisal include money to be spent by riparian owners of flood defences? * Tideway Tunnel * Review of the TE2100 Plan
	Twickenham	11.06.09	York House, Twickenham	25 signed + more in attendance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concerns for Trowlock Island and Eel Pie Island over Thames Barrier not being used in the future to protect them from fluvial flooding * How will insurance policies be affected for residence in a flood plain? * Planning applications and new developments in the flood plain areas. * Macro-modelling - is TE2100 joined up with Lower Thames Strategy? * Flood map information * Geological enquiries and has river dredging been considered? * Funding and expenditure - what are choices regarding a barrier for fluvial flooding? * New barrier and impacts on society in the future on spending public money

	Richmond	17.06.09	Parkshot Studio, Richmond	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Flood risk management policies. West London not being considered regarding putting plans in place for fluvial flooding. TE2100 plans says it's a P3, but it should be P5. * Funding and expenditure * Developments in the floodplain areas, such as Thames Gateway * Programmes for tributaries. * No confidence in the detail produced from modelling
LONDON	4: East London				
	Barking & Dagenham	21.07.09	Barking Learning Centre	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concerns with local authority emergency planning. * When Thames Barrier is closed, does it affect Barking? * Information available to the public. * New developments in floodplains and EA's involvement in approvals. * Why is there an aversion to higher defence walls?
KENT	6: Lower Estuary Marshes				
	Cliffe evening meeting	14.07.09	Cliffe Memorial Hall, Church Street, Cliffe, Kent, ME3 7PU	6	<p>Strong feeling against using designated areas for intertidal habitat creation</p> <p>Concern for a weak point in the defences at Cliffe Creek</p> <p>Concerns that North Kent Marshes will be one of the first places to disappear as sea level rise.</p> <p>Note the importance of the area for recreation</p>
	Cliffe Fayre	18.07.09	The Buttway, Church Street, Cliffe, Rochester, Kent ME3 7PY.	30	<p>Protecting local designated habitats</p> <p>Interest in local flood risk</p> <p>Querying how TE2100 plans will fit with local RSPB projects</p>

	Allhallows	21.07.09	Allhallows Primary School, Avery Way, Rochester, ME3 9HR	3	Strong feeling against using designated areas for intertidal habitat creation
ESSEX	7: Lower Estuary, urban/industrial and marshland				
	Benfleet Neighbourhood meeting, in partnership with Castle Point Borough Council	17.06.09	Benfleet Methodist Church Hall (Wesley Hall), Hall Farm Road, South Benfleet	37	The need to facilitate future development on Canvey Island
	Canvey East Neighbourhood meeting, in partnership with Castle Point Borough Council	01.07.09	Leigh Beck Junior School Point Road Canvey Island SS8 7TD	42	A strong feeling against intertidal habitat creation on West Canvey Marshes
	TE2100 Public exhibition	09.07.09	Paddocks Community Centre, Long Lane, Canvey Island	120	A strong feeling against intertidal habitat creation on West Canvey Marshes The need for an effective emergency Plan in the event of a flood Preference for an outer-estuary barrier or barrage Canvey West should be preserved as one of the only open green spaces left on the Island

	Canvey West Neighbourhood meeting, in partnership with Castle Point Borough Council	22.07.09	Winter Gardens Baptist Church Hilton Road Canvey Island SS8 9QA	40	A strong feeling against intertidal habitat creation on West Canvey Marshes

**Would you like to find out more about us,
or about your environment?**

Then call us on

08708 506 506* (Mon-Fri 8-6)

email

enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk

or visit our website

www.environment-agency.gov.uk

incident hotline 0800 80 70 60 (24hrs)

floodline 0845 988 1188

*** Approximate call costs: 8p plus 6p per minute (standard landline).
Please note charges will vary across telephone providers**



**Environment first: This publication is printed on paper made from
100 per cent previously used waste. By-products from making the pulp
and paper are used for composting and fertiliser, for making cement and for
generating energy.**