

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (7)
At Town Hall, Bournemouth.
Monday 25th February 2008, 1400

AGENDA

1. Apologies
2. To approve minutes of the last meeting, 14th January 2008
3. Action Items arising from previous minutes
4. To receive NFDC's progress report on OJEU advertising procedure; and responses.
5. To receive NFDC's progress report on the Scoping Report.
6. Elected Members Group - proposed date for first meeting
7. To receive PBC's report on progress developing the website www.twobays.net
8. NFCDD
9. AOB
10. Date of Next Meeting

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 25th FEBRUARY 2008**

Present:	Steve Cook(SC) Peter Ferguson (PF) Geoff Tyler (GTy) Andrew Gill (AG) Steve Woolard (SW) Tony Flux (TF) Helen Powell (HP) Sarah Austin David Robson (DR) Dick Appleton (DA) Andrew Ramsbottom Mike Goater (MG)	New Forest District Council(Chair) New Forest District Council Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes) Environment Agency Christchurch Borough Council National Trust Natural England Poole Borough Council Poole Borough Council Poole Harbour Commissioners Poole Harbour Commissioners Purbeck District Council
Apologies:	Andrew Bradbury (AB) Dave Harlow (DH)	New Forest District Council Bournemouth Borough Council

Item No.	Action	
1	Minutes of Last Meeting on 14th January 2008	
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed with the following amendments:-	
1.2	The first line of Item 2.2 was amended to read 'Membership of both the Client Steering Group and the Key Stakeholder Group was discussed and the following was agreed'.	
1.3	The reference to 'the key stakeholders' in the first line of Item 4.2 was amended to read 'all stakeholders'.	
2	Matters Arising	
2.1	It was noted that the invitation to the County Councils (Item 2.2) and preparation of a press release (Item 6.6) had not yet been actioned.	DH
2.2	TF said that Dorset Coast Forum's website had been subsumed into Dorset County Council's website and was more difficult to find (Item 6.5).	
3	Procurement Report	
3.1	SC reported that 14 expressions of interest had been received. Following detailed consideration of the pre-qualification questionnaires by SC and DH six companies had been short-listed and three of these are to be invited to tender subject to satisfactory references and financial clearance. The decisions are to be notified once DH has the obtained the necessary references.	DH

4	Scoping Report	
4.1	SC said that everyone had commented on the questionnaire and leaflet. Printing costs would be in the region of £600 and as there was little difference in the quotations obtained it was agreed that this should be carried out by Poole Council.	
4.2	A list of stakeholder organisations is to be put on the website. Individual's names will not appear however because of data protection considerations. It was also agreed that all elected members should be included not just those with coastal responsibilities. An up to date list of members from each authority is to be supplied in hard copy to NFDC. Environment Agency committee members and Parish councillors are to be included. It was hoped that the leaflet and questionnaire would be sent out in within three weeks.	local authority reps
4.3	A list of designated sites, details of any studies, reports and local authorities' management plans should be made available to the consultants for the SMP. Consideration should also be given to the use of stability analyses and flood risk reports linked to planning applications. The provision of this pre-collected information should be reflected in the quotation.	
5	Elected Members Group	
5.1	It was noted that Councillor representation for the EMG was in the process of being finalised and a date of the end of April/early May was suggested for the first meeting. It was pointed out that if local Council elections are to be held in some areas in May, the date of the EMG meeting would have to be deferred. Details are to be provided of the authorities affected in order to decide on the timing of the meeting. There was also a need to determine whether the EMG is to be supported by officers and if so who should attend.	local authority reps
6	Key Stakeholder Group	
6.1	The composition of the KSG was discussed. The need to avoid making it too large and unmanageable was highlighted. It was suggested that approximately fifteen fields be identified (such as landowners, industry, commerce, recreation and conservation) and that one representative from each area be invited to join the KSG. Stakeholders could be asked to indicate on the questionnaire if they wished to be considered for membership of the Group.	
7	Website Update	
7.1	The first registration as a stakeholder had been received from the Stanpit and Mudeford Residents' Association. There had so far been 520 visits to the website and 300 megabytes of the available 500 megabytes are currently in use.	
7.2	SA said that the conservation maps were too large to download. AG said he would endeavour to get some smaller maps. Finalisation of the leaflet is awaited.	AG
7.3	It was noted that the other authorities' websites should have a link to the 'twobays.net' website.	

8	<p>National Flood Coastal Defence Database</p>	
8.1	<p>PF said that he had met with AG to get data into the NFCDD. He had sent out a questionnaire some time ago and whilst there had been some set backs he was hoping that the work could now be progressed. The residual life data would be used to assess where the money for maintenance should be allocated. The data would be important for SMP2 and will include third party assets and private defences.</p>	
8.2	<p>TF confirmed that the National Trust's coastal defences were mapped and although there was sensitivity to some of the data which needed to be considered this would not prevent its inclusion. PF said that he was already populating the database for Christchurch Bay. DR said he needed to correct Poole's data. Once all the data had been updated in a reasonable format it could be made available to the consultant. SW pointed out that guidance may be required from the Environment Agency.</p>	
8.3	<p>PF said that detailed discussions were required and further work is to be carried out. The exercise should be properly resourced and given appropriate priority. PF said that all the inspections should be in a standardised format and that the data should include the description, location and condition of the coastal defence works.</p>	
9	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
9.1	<p>AG pointed out that the exercise cut across other EA regions and that it may be necessary to bring in representatives from other areas. MG asked if a planner needed to be brought in to the CSG. DR said he would like their strategic planners to attend. SC said that once the contract is let and the policies are looked at more closely other planners could be included. They also might need to be involved in the scoping work because of their role in relation to the local development framework.</p>	
10	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p>	
	<p>The next meeting is to be held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday 6th May 2008. Venue to be advised.</p>	