

Appendix C – Consultation

Appendix C1 – Comparison of long list of options against LORP objectives

Appendix C2 - Feedback from the Stakeholder Group on LORP's components

Appendix C1 - Comparison of long list of options against LORP objectives

A version of this table was presented to the Stakeholder Group. The table presented included brief option descriptions; a fuller description is added to this table. The views of the Otter Valley Association are also added to the table.

KEY

Baseline
 Current management
 Restoration
 Large-scale restoration

Compensatory habitat	Flood risk	Landowner support	EA Funding potential	Consider further?	Option	Description	EDDC Raleigh Ward	Granary Lane	South Farm	Otterton PC	Otter Valley Association
No	No	No	N/A	No	DN	Do Nothing (No active intervention) - no further intervention including clearing culverts or repairing breaches to embankments. Required as a baseline for appraisal.	No	100% against	-		-
No	No	No	No	No	DM	Do Minimum – continue with current maintenance regime, for example, clearing culverts, maintain embankments, repairing breaches when it is safe and financially viable to do so.	No	92% for	-		-
No	No	No	No	No	1	Creation of a freshwater reservoir in embanked area in floodplain of southern Big Marsh, changing to lower and upper salt marsh in a few decades. (Haycock report Option E)	No	73% against	-	No in principle objections to flooding of Lower Otter	-
Yes	Yes	Possibly	Yes	Yes	2	Floodplain restoration across southern Big Marsh (Managed realignment) - breach south of the tip would create intertidal (lower saltmarsh and mudflat) habitat. Tidal barrier at South Farm Road – flap valves to exclude tidal flooding upstream into northern Big Marsh.	Maybe	92% against	Support if access maintained		Support if access maintained
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3	Floodplain restoration across Big and Little Marshes (Managed realignment) - breaches in embankment along River Otter. Breach north of South Farm Road would create freshwater habitat, and breach south of the tip would create intertidal (lower saltmarsh and mudflat) habitat (LORP website – Lower Otter Public Consultation Map)	Maybe	92% against			
No	No	No	No	No	4	Partial realignment of the Little or Big Banks (Managed realignment) to achieve some floodplain restoration	Maybe	69% against	-		-
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5	Large-scale restoration of the River Otter (Managed realignment) - returning channel to a more historic form and alignment, partially or completely removing embankments, landfill area and outfalls	No	92% against	No		Possibly
No	Yes	No	No	No	6	Raising and strengthening existing embankments (Holding the line). Embankment to west of river and/or Big Bank and/or Little Bank and/or Granary Lane defences.	?	?	?	?	?
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	Assisted natural recovery - removing features that prevent the River Otter and its floodplain from responding naturally to river and tidal flows, potentially including rock armour, embankments, culverts	?	?	?	?	?
No	Yes	No	No	No	8	Improved Do Minimum - including improvements to outfalls to beach and/or estuary; improved maintenance of drains; spillway in Big Bank	?	?	Support	?	?

Appendix C2 - Feedback from the Stakeholder Group on LORP's components

Feedback from the Stakeholder Group on LORP's components

Option	Description	EDDC Raleigh Ward	Granary Lane	South Farm	Otterton PC	Potential to be funded by EA, CDE or other funds LORP could access	LORP project team propose to consider this option further
	Purple – added by project team since January long list sent round Blue – suggested by members of the Stakeholder Group						
A	New creeks created south of landfill to help tidal flooding and drainage	Agree if natural	19% for 27% neutral 54% against	No clear view/ consensus		Yes	Yes
B	Upgrade of culverts to increase conveyance of flows from northern Big Marsh to southern Big Marsh. Realign left embankment to landfill boundary, and increase culvert capacity at White Bridge (part of Haycock report Option C)	Agree	16% for 34% neutral 50% against	Supported		Yes	Yes
C	Drainage improvements of northern Big Marsh, to outfall into the estuary close to White Bridge, with reduced overtopping of the Otter upstream. (Haycock report Option F)	Agree	16% for 42% neutral 42% against	Some support		Yes	Yes
D	Migrate Big Bank westwards to create an 85m wide corridor to allow floods to pass through this section. Assumes woodland corridor is maintained, and allows a 1 in 10 year flood to pass. Reduces flood frequency into Little Marsh and northern section of Big Marsh. (Haycock report Option K)	Maybe	4% for 30% neutral 66% against	Some support		Possibly	Yes
E	Little Bank swale – redirect floodplain flow back to the Otter embanked section, reduce pooling of water behind (and eventual overtopping of) Little Bank. Requires increased conveyance downstream. (Haycock report Option G)	Avoid pooling water without flow	16% for 27% neutral 57% against	Supported		No	No
F	Little and Big Banks breached to improve drainage	Agree	8% for 16% neutral 76% against	Some support		Yes	Yes
G	Remove/ disconnect Budleigh Brook aqueduct and reconnect flow to River Otter via relic channels in Big Marsh. Would require breaches in Big Bank to allow flow to enter Big Marsh	Agree	0% for 19% neutral 81% against	No clear view/ consensus		Yes	Yes
H	Localised works to reduce flood risk, as necessary, if the main option chosen would otherwise increase flood risk	Undertake whole scheme	54% for 23% neutral 23% against	Supported	Flooding above Otterton road bridge needs to be addressed No property in Otterton Parish to be put at risk	Yes	Yes
I	Relocate South Farm Road to higher land in landfill area, with new footpath adjacent to the road. (Haycock report Option C)	Yes, could be less cost	16% for 19% neutral 65% against *	Best option	Access to S Farm top priority	Yes	Yes
J	Raise or 'bridge' low parts of South Farm Road on its current alignment.	Yes, least visual impact	34% for 39% neutral * 27% against *	Best option	Access to S Farm top priority	Yes	Yes

Option	Description	EDDC Raleigh Ward	Granary Lane	South Farm	Otterton PC	Potential to be funded by EA, CDE or other funds LORP could access	LORP project team propose to consider this option further
	Purple – added by project team since January long list sent round Blue – suggested by members of the Stakeholder Group						
K	Relocate South West Coast path to west of floodplain and along South Farm Road (and abandon bank along River Otter)	Path through centre of reserve would be missed	4% for 0% neutral 96% against	No clear view/ consensus	River footpath Budleigh to Otterton preserved and enhanced	Yes	Yes
L	Footbridges built over breaches in embankment to ensure continuity of access along South West coast path	Agree. All access, as natural as poss, no steel girders	35% for 23% neutral 42% against	Supported		Yes	Yes
M	Bund around cricket ground at its existing location, pumped discharge to estuary via modified EA outfall. Big Marsh drained into estuary via new outfall north of cricket ground. (Haycock report Option A)	No	35% for 54% neutral 11% against	No clear view/ consensus		Possibly	No
N	Raise the level of the cricket ground at its existing location	No, substantial land fill	19% for 35% neutral 46% against	No clear view/ consensus		No	No
O	Relocate cricket ground to landfill area. (Haycock report Option B)	No, content of landfill unknown, intrusive	0% for 31% neutral 69% against	Some support		Possibly	No
P	Relocate cricket ground to land outside of River Otter floodplain.	Yes, must be done	8% for 42% neutral 50% against	No clear view/ consensus		Yes	Yes
Q	Install new, flapped outfalls in the Otter embankments to southern Big Marsh to drain this area more effectively	No, water out but not in. Against project principles	50% for 50% neutral 0% against	Supported		No	No
R	Dredge part of the river or estuary channel	No, does not allow estuary to be natural form	58% for 19% neutral 23% against	Supported		No	No
S	New hide/educational center on southern edge of old landfill site	Traffic issues, will need car park, highly visible	27% for 73% neutral 0% against	No clear view/ consensus		Possibly	Yes
T	Unconstrained breach or breaches	-	-	-		Yes	Yes
U	Regulated Tidal Exchange	-	-	-		Yes	Yes
V	Car parking	Yes	-	-	Yes, needs to be addressed	Possibly	Yes
W	Cycle way	✓	-	-		Possibly	Yes
X	Park and walk	✓	-	-		Possibly	Yes

Option	Description	EDDC Raleigh Ward	Granary Lane	South Farm	Otterton PC	Potential to be funded by EA, CDE or other funds LORP could access	LORP project team propose to consider this option further
	<p>Purple – added by project team since January long list sent round</p> <p>Blue – suggested by members of the Stakeholder Group</p>						
Y	Improved Do Minimum: Larger outflow pipe or sluice gate at point C between cricket pitch and river	-	-	✓	-	No	No
Z	Improved Do Minimum: Improved maintenance of Kersbrook Brook and Trunk Drain	-	-	✓	-	No	No
AA	Improved Do Minimum: Add concrete spillway on top of Little Bank and Big Bank	-	-	✓	-	No	No