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1. Introduction

This report summarises the Hill Head public exhibition events, held to present the preferred seawall and promenade replacement option at Hill Head to the public. Various potential defence options were originally assessed from a wide ranging long list to the shortlist. The shortlist of options was appraised by our engineering consultant Arup, who recommended the preferred option. Subject to separate funding and consents approvals, construction of the preferred seawall replacement option could begin as early as summer 2017. The project is being delivered by the Eastern Solent Coastal Partnership (ESCP) on behalf of Fareham Borough Council (FBC).

1.1. Reason for project

The coastal defences at Hill Head consist of the beach, groynes and a seawall. In recent years beach levels have fallen, exposing the sea defences to additional and increased wave action. The promenade seawall is in poor condition and frequently deteriorates to very poor condition during storm events. The seawall at Hill Head has reached the end of its serviceable life and is at high risk of significant failure during future storm events. At risk from seawall failure is the public promenade which sits on the seawall and 39 beach huts adjacent to the promenade. Other related long-term risks including erosion to the cliff, and potential loss of Cliff Road and residential properties. To address these issues the Hill Head Coastal Protection Project was initiated by the ESCP & FBC.

1.2. Project Delivery

The Hill Head Coastal Protection Project proposes to address the frontage issues through the delivery of two phases of works. Phase 1 of the project was completed in early October 2016 and saw the re-nourishment of historically low beach levels with 4000 Tonnes of marine sourced shingle, similar to that which naturally occurs at Hill Head. Extensive timber groyne refurbishment was also implemented which will help sustain healthy beach levels and control movement of the beach shingle along the shoreline.

Phase 2 will replace failing sea defences and promenade. Following option engineering in collaboration with Arup, we have identified the leading option to construct a new seawall. If the necessary funding and consents can be secured, this could see the construction of a new seawall in summer 2017.

This report provides an overview of the publicity carried out prior to the event and a summary of the feedback received on the day from the attendees.
2. Exhibition Event

2.1. Overview

A public exhibition was held on the 10th November at Holy Rood Church in Stubbington. The exhibition was followed by two further drop in events on the 11th and 14th at Titchfield Haven Visitor Centre, Hill Head. The aim of the events were to present the preferred option to the public to allow better understanding of the proposal, get feedback from the public to help inform the detailed design and for the public to understand timescales and restraints applicable to the project.

Holy Rood Church in Stubbington was selected due to the success of previous exhibitions held at this venue. It is located in close proximity to residents and an easy to find landmark for non locals. Following feedback from the previous information event, a lot of people were unable to make it due to the shorter consultation hours. Taking this into consideration, public engagement opportunities were improved by extending the time of the main exhibition for an additional hour in the evening, from 1pm – 8pm. In addition to this two further drop-in events were held at Titchfield Haven Visitor Centre between 12pm – 3pm, again increasing the opportunity for the public to attend.

Just over 200 people attended the three public events, with a total of 81 questionnaires completed. A further 2 questionnaires were completed and submitted via email. In summary:

- 96% either strongly or mostly supported the overall leading option across the scheme area.
- 99% of those visiting the exhibition said the information presented helped their understanding of the scheme.

A more detailed summary of the results is found on page 7 and the full questionnaire answers are available in Appendix A.

2.2. Advertising and Publicity

The events were widely advertised to local residents, local businesses and beach hut owners with a comprehensive letter drop carried out around the local area before the event. The leaflet provided the public with key information about the Phase 2 project and the details of the events (Appendix B). Posters were put up at key community areas in Hill Head and Stubbington, including A1 poster displays at Titchfield Haven Visitor Centre and Stubbington Community Library.
In addition, the exhibition events were advertised on the ESCP website, and received 370 additional webpage views in the two week lead up to the exhibitions. Furthermore, the events were advertised through ESCP social media accounts. A post advertising the events on Facebook reached just under 500 people, with the links further shared by Fareham Borough Council. A press release was also sent out which reached local newspapers (The News, Daily Echo), websites, as well as radio stations (BBC Solent, Sam FM) and TV channels (Solent TV). Figure 1 shows a variety of different media advertising the event.

![Figure 1: Poster display, news coverage and social media advertising the events.](image)

### 2.3. Event Content

In total, just over 200 people attended the exhibition events. On arrival, visitors were asked to mark on a map where they came from. The spread of visitors is shown in Figure 2. The majority of visitors were from the Hill Head and Stubbington area. There were also a number of visitors from the wider area, including Wallington, Catisfield, Warsash and Locks Heath. This was due to a significant number owning beach huts in the area of the Phase 2 works that live outside the immediate area.
The content of the exhibitions was designed to communicate the development of the Phase 2 scheme, through a series of poster boards detailing:

- **Roles and responsibilities** of the ESCP, exploring flood and coastal erosion risk management and the impact of climate change,
- **why the project is needed** detailing key reasons for the works, displaying past damage,
- **project introduction** of the recently completed phase 1 works, and the proposed phase 2 works including project objectives,
- **background and historical issues** showing a timeline of problems from early 1900s to present day. Photos showed construction works from the 1920’s through to the promenade closure and seawall failure in 2015,
- **story so far** showing other works carried out since the last exhibition in August, including ground investigations, appointment of designer, phase 2 design and licenses and consents,
- **completion of Phase 1** summarising the recently completed beach renourishment and timber groyne maintenance works,
- **preferred option** showcasing artist impressions of proposed works, as well as describing what, why and the key advantages of the preferred option,
- **project constraints** of the proposed phase 2 works, including environmental restrictions, licenses, approvals and funding,
• **collaboration with the community** showing other works proposed in the local area that are due to be incorporated into the phase 2 works,

• **project timeline** for Phase 2 works of sea wall replacement, detailing every key stage.

Examples of the posters used at the event can be seen in *Appendix C.*

In addition, a flythrough visualisation of the proposed leading option was displayed on a projector throughout the event. This enabled the public to gain an interactive perspective on the option. The project team were also on hand to answer any questions and there were refreshments available for visitors to enjoy. Photos from the exhibitions can be viewed in *Appendix D.*

### 2.4. Feedback from results

Each visitor was asked to fill in a feedback form to share their views on the preferred coastal defence options and the exhibition. A summary of the 83 questionnaire results are displayed in this section, with a full list of results detailed in *Appendix A.* Overall the results and feedback gained from the exhibition have been very positive.

In summary:

• **96%** either strongly or mostly supported the overall leading option across the scheme area.

• **94%** supported or did not mind the proposed concrete finish to the promenade.

• **94%** agreed with the proposal to keep the shingle strip in front of the beach huts.

• **93%** agreed with the proposal to straighten the ‘Kink’, with **47%** of visitors wanting to see benches in the space created.

• **55%** supported or did not mind if a handrail was added to the seawall for health and safety reasons.

• **99%** of those visiting the exhibition said the information presented helped their understanding of the scheme.
2.5. Comments received

Table 1 below displays a sample of further comments received from the public on the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘At last a serious solution which looks as though it will be fantastic. Congratulations - just hope it goes ahead successfully’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I’ve been really impressed with the level of communication with the public. Thank you’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘It has long term security for the area. As local residents we have confidence in the plan and the team responsible for its implementation. We appreciate the ongoing involvement’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Would have preferred that the widening of the promenade to have continued through to the wider area at the Eastern end. Thank you for what you are doing’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I would like to convey my appreciation to all those who have worked to bring the preferred option to this stage. So much has been achieved since the last presentation and the local community has been kept informed by well presented and clear information. Everyone involved is to be congratulated’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Thank you - phase 1 has been excellent. Your engagement with the community has also been excellent’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I agree that the beach needs protecting but I don’t want to see it too built up. The charm of this beach is its simplicity, and lack of man made interference. I oppose the steel wall idea!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ideally the promenade in front of the unaffected beach huts should be widened as it sometimes becomes congested. An impressive exhibition, thank you’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We wish you success, and for taking the time to listen to local people, Thank you. It means a lot to us’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – A sample of further comments received from the public

For those residents that were unable to attend, the questionnaire feedback form was made available at Titchfield Haven Visitor Centre for a week afterwards, as well as uploaded to the project webpage. To accompany this, the posters that were presented were also made available on the project webpage for review, along with other supporting information.
APPENDIX A - Summary of questionnaire answers

Q1: Why are you interested in the Hill Head Coastal Defence Project?

- Beach hut owner: 31%
- Leisure: 49%
- Resident: 18%
- Other: 2%

Q2a: Please indicate your support for the preferred option

- Strongly Support: 58
- Mostly Support: 19
- Do not support: 3
- Undecided: 1

Support for the preferred option
Question 2b allowed people to expand their answers from question 2. Below show a summary of the key points raised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would like to see a wave re-curve wall considered together with a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>straight wall during</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>detailed design.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The widening of the promenade could attract increased users such</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>as cyclists, skateboarders, which as a result would increase conflict. Measures should be considered to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>discourage these users.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The water tap at the ‘kink’ would like to be kept and improved.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage needs to be considered in the detailed design. Shingle build up behind wall a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>concern may also block drainage hole.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The possibility of widening the entire length of promenade to as</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>far as Giblet Ore.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of access to the public toilet block during construction.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to groyne bays as issue if beach level drops – steps on beach over groynes?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seawall is a big seat. Design it so it discourages people from sitting on it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional access point to the beach to improve access.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Better colour finish then concrete.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3: Do you agree with the proposal to straighten the 'kink'?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4: We are proposing to finish the promenade surface with concrete, similar to the existing surface. Would you be supportive of this?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Do not mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5: If additional funding can be obtained what alternative finish would you like to see on the exposed steel wall?

- None: 47%
- Timber Cladding: 25%
- Concrete façade: 23%
- Painted finish: 5%

Q6: We are proposing to keep the existing shingle strip in front of the beach huts. Do you support this?

- Yes: 60 responses
- No: 5 responses
- Do not mind: 18 responses
Q7: If a handrail was needed to the new seawall for health and safety reasons would you support this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mind</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8: Please tick the extent to which you agree with the following statement: "The information presented today has helped my understanding of the scheme".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9: How satisfied are you that your feedback has been, or will be, considered?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10: We hope you enjoyed this exhibition, which is the third for this project. Did you attend our previous community exhibitions held earlier this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11: How did you hear about the exhibition event?

- Leaflet through door: 58%
- Local newspaper: 25%
- Poster: 7%
- Website: 5%
- Facebook/Twitter: 4%
- Other: 1%
APPENDIX B – Hill Head Project Leaflet

**What could Phase 2 look like?**

- The beach huts can remain in place for the duration of the works.
- This option has the least environmental impacts.
- Shortest construction duration, minimising impacts to the local area.
- Simplicity in construction methods.
- The sheet pile wall is the most cost effective option.
- The existing seawall can be partially encapsulated within the new seawall.

**Completion of Phase 1**

The beach has been re-nourished to replenish historically low beach levels at Hill Head and extensive maintenance repairs have been carried out to Fareham Borough Council (FBC) owned groynes.

The work completed included:
- Renourishment of the beach with 4,000 tonnes of shingle to protect the fragile seawall.
- Repairs to 10 FBC owned groynes, this involved replacing 416m of timber planks and replacing 38 piles.

**Timeline**

**Keep Updated**

For more information and to keep up to date with the progress of the project please visit

- FBC’s website: [www.fareham.gov.uk/hs](http://www.fareham.gov.uk/hs)
- Social media: Twitter, Facebook

**Exhibition**

Holy Road Church, Stubbington, Fareham
PD1 Zone 4
10th November 2016 1pm-8pm
Drop in Events:
-itchfield Haven
11th & 14th November
12pm-6pm

**Feedback from previous exhibition:**

Should the council replace the sea wall? 

- Yes: 47%
- No: 33%
- Don’t know: 20%

**Why are we doing Phase 2?**

- The existing gabion basket and concrete bagwork seawalls are unsuitable defences for an exposed coastal location.
- The seawalls have reached the end of their serviceable life and cannot withstand exposure to storm wave action.
- Increased storminess over the last 3 years has contributed to beach erosion and seawall deterioration.
- Deteriorating rock cliffs of the much loved promenade and beach huts in the short term and Cliff Road and residential properties in the long term.

**Phase 2 draft preferred option**

- The preferred option is to build a sheet pile wall with concrete capping beams.
- Widens the promenade by approximately 1.5 metres (5 feet), improving public access along the frontage.
- Straightens out the “kink” in the promenade.
- Provides an increased wall height by 0.6m (2 feet). This will address the current wave overtopping which has made the promenade impassable in previous storms.
APPENDIX C - Samples of exhibition posters

EXAMPLE OF EXHIBITION POSTERS

Completion of Phase 1
The beach had been stabilised to replace naturally low
beach levels at the current site and at the same time
levels to 15ft GC (FSC 305m) to allow safe

Phase 1: Construction Projects
- The new seawall was constructed to enhance the
  coastal protection of the area.
- The work included the installation of new
  rock piles and revetments along the shoreline.
- The project also involved the construction of
  new access roads and pathways for public use.

Phase 2: Preferred Seawall Replacement Option
What is the preferred option?
- The preferred option is to build a concrete wall with a
  concrete capstone on top.
- The wall will be 2.5m thick and will extend along the
  shore for approximately 500m.
- The location of the wall will be determined after
  further studies.

Why is the promenade and raise the seawall?
- To provide a safe and sheltered promenade for
  visitors.
- To protect the existing buildings from coastal
  erosion.

The Story So Far...
In this section, we discuss the progress made in the
project and the challenges faced so far.

Phase 2: Preferred Seawall Replacement Option
Key advantages of the preferred option:
- The new seawall will provide a more
  secure and stable coastal protection.
- The wall will be more resistant to
  natural elements such as storms and
  waves.
- The new promenade will enhance the
  aesthetic appeal of the area.

Phase 2: Project Constraints
Key Project Constraints:
- The project is subject to environmental
  regulations and approvals.
- The project must comply with
  local planning laws and regulations.
- The project must be completed within
  the specified timeframe.

Collaboration with the community
Gilbert Ditch Cleveland House project:
- The project is expected to benefit the
  local community by providing new
  facilities and services.
- The community is involved in the
  planning and implementation stages.

Phase 2: Preferred Seawall Replacement Option
Key Project Constraints:
- The project is subject to environmental
  regulations and approvals.
- The project must comply with
  local planning laws and regulations.
- The project must be completed within
  the specified timeframe.

Collaboration with the community
Gilbert Ditch Cleveland House project:
- The project is expected to benefit the
  local community by providing new
  facilities and services.
- The community is involved in the
  planning and implementation stages.
APPENDIX D - Photographs of exhibition

| Photo 1: Main exhibition set up | Photo 2: Visitors discussing the scheme constraints and collaboration with the community |
| Photo 3: Visitors viewing and discussing the visualisation of the preferred option with ESCP staff | Photo 4: Drop-in event set up at Titchfield Haven Visitor Centre |