

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (9)  
At Dorset House.  
Monday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008, 1400

AGENDA

1. Apologies
2. Jane Phipps of Capita Symonds re Frome & Piddle CFMP
3. To approve minutes of the last meeting, 6<sup>th</sup> May 2008
4. Action Items arising from previous minutes
5. NFDC - Stakeholder Questionnaires
6. NFDC - Draft Tender Document
7. NFDC - Scoping Report - Management Plans list
8. NFDC - Scoping Report - Description of coastline
9. NFDC - Erosion Risk Mapping
10. NFDC - NFCDD
11. BBC - Press release
12. BBC - Invitation to County Councils
13. BBC - Elected Members Group - proposed date for first meeting
14. BBC - Surf Reef update
15. BoP - website - [www.twobays.net](http://www.twobays.net) - content
16. BoP - website - hits
17. AOB
18. Date of Next Meeting

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING  
DORSET HOUSE - MONDAY 16<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2008**

**Present:**

Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Andrew Gill (AG)	Environment Agency (South West)
Ken Tatum (KT)	Environment Agency (South West)
Jane Phipps (JP)	Capita Symonds
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Richard Caldow (RC)	Natural England
Sarah Austin (SA)	Poole Borough Council
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR)	Poole Harbour Commissioners

**Apologies:**

Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council

Item No.	Action
1	<b>Frome and Piddle CFMP</b>
1.1	Ken Tatum, who had been project managing the Hampshire Avon, Piddle and Stour CFMP, and Jane Phipps, the consultant working on the Frome and Piddle CFMP, were introduced to the Group.
1.2	JP explained that the CFMP had been through a quality review and was now out to consultation. Before finalising policies for the CFMP she wished to join up as much as possible with the SMP.
1.3	JP said that the reviewer had expressed concerns about Policy Unit 10 in that future flooding of Wareham had not been properly addressed. In order to respond to the reviewer's concerns a study is to be carried out to understand possible future flooding within the Policy Unit. The study is to take account of the options for the Wareham Tidal Banks considered under the SMP as well as an assumed 20% increase in river flows and one metre sea level rise in the next 100 years.
1.4	AB said that interaction of the two management plans is important. Both are broad brush high level strategies. As a policy document, the SMP should draw attention to the issues to be investigated and pick up the findings of the CFMP in relation to both the fluvial and tidal impacts. The implication that fluvial studies will be undertaken as part of the SMP is incorrect however and the wording of the action plan will need to be revised accordingly.
1.5	RC drew attention to the Wareham fresh water grazing meadows.

1.6	The Group discussed the respective boundaries of the CFMP and SMP. It was agreed, subject to MG's approval, that the boundary should be the South Bridge at Wareham. It was noted that Iford Bridge is the boundary on the Stour and the .....weir, north of the A35, is the boundary on the Avon.	DH/MG
1.7	DH queried whether separate strategies were needed for Poole Harbour and Poole Bay. It was agreed that the strategies should be integrated.	
1.8	KT explained that the Policy 4 actions for the Stour and Hampshire Avon required the formulation of a strategy plan which took account of climate change and removed inappropriate development from flood risk areas. The SFRA data is also to be taken into consideration.	
2	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2008</b>	
2.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed with alterations to the misspelling of Richard Caldow in the list of 'Apologies' and Ken Buchan in Item 3.2.	
3	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
3.1	DH confirmed that he had spoken to Ken Buchan of Dorset County Council but had not yet written to Hampshire County Council or Ian Tripp (Item 3.2).	DH
3.2	SA said the maps for SMP1 did not appear to be on the disc and she had therefore asked Halcrow for the information (Item 3.4). A copy of the disc is to be sent to RC.	
3.3	PF confirmed that he had received contributions from CSG members and various stakeholders for inclusion in the Management Plans document (Item 5.3). AB said it was important to include all reports and plans in order to avoid criticism at the consultation stage that material had been omitted. RC said he would forward archive information for PF and AB to consider.	RC
3.4	DH said that he had not as yet pre-booked the Cabinet date for the approval process or sent the revised timetable to Jim Hutchinson at DEFRA (Item 5.6 and 5.7).	DH
4	<b>Erosion Risk Mapping</b>	
4.1	AB presented a paper to the Group proposing the use of the Channel Coastal Observatory (CCO) to develop the activities required in sections 2.2 and 2.5 of the tender documents i.e. the development of baseline scenarios and identification of flood and coastal erosion risks.	
4.2	AB explained that the CCO's extensive knowledge of the coast within the SMP would be of considerable benefit in the development of policy options by the consultants.	
4.3	AB pointed out that National Erosion Risk Mapping project only looked at cliffs and not lowland areas where cliffs do not provide the frontline defence.	
4.4	It was agreed that CSG members would consider the information and refer any queries to AB. Comments on the proposal are to be forwarded to DH by the middle of next week so that he can co-ordinate the views expressed.	All/DH

4.5	PF said that his checking of the baseline and listed erosion revealed significant lengths which had been incorrectly located and a lot of work had been required to re-position them. In addition, old data had been used and some areas, such as Hurst Spit, had been omitted entirely.	
4.6	AB said he had made a presentation at the EA Bournemouth Conference but had received no feedback.	
4.7	The ERM was far from being finalised. Completion of the project had slipped and it was highly unlikely that it could be finished by March 2009.	
5	<b>Stakeholder Questionnaires</b>	
5.1	SC said that more than 500 stakeholder questionnaires were sent out on 15 <sup>th</sup> May 2008 through a mass mailing exercise and so far there had been about an 8% response. A few completed questionnaires are still being received. Approximately three quarters had been returned in hard copy and the rest returned electronically. Fourteen Councillors had responded with the remainder being spread across industry, commerce, environmental groups and private individuals. SC said that the press release might stimulate further interest.	
5.2	AR said he had circulated questionnaires to the Harbour Commissioners.	
5.3	SW had distributed 800 leaflets, including 10 to each school in Christchurch, and said he would give his distribution list to PF.	
6	<b>Draft Tender Document</b>	
6.1	SC said that the draft tender document was nearly completed. The programme was based on the assumption that the tender would be issued by 25 <sup>th</sup> July 2008 with a deadline of mid-October for the award of the contract.	
6.2	RC queried the Quality Criteria rankings proposed for the tender evaluation in that 'Staff CVs' were being given too high a weighting. It was suggested that these may have been set to comply with DEFRA guidance. AB supported RC's view and pointed out that the 'Proposed method and programme' had been set too low. It was agreed that both criteria should carry a weighting of 15.	
6.3	It was agreed that the final scrutiny of the revised tender documents should be undertaken by SC and DH.	SC/DH
7	<b>Scoping Report</b>	
7.1	SC said that the scoping report is also to be circulated and a final check made of SMP1 to see what studies should have been undertaken.	
7.2	The 'Description of the Coastline' document, which incorporates the alterations, is to be re-circulated by PF by the end of the week so that CSG members can provide comments by the end of next week.	PF

8	<b>Press Release</b>	
8.1	DH said that he had not yet prepared the press release but would circulate one for comment by the end of the week.	DH
9	<b>Elected Members Group</b>	
9.1	It was agreed that the Elected Members Group meeting would not be required before September/October by which time there would be something significant to report.	
9.2	It was noted that Councillor Fran Carpenter would be representing New Forest District Council.	
10	<b>Surf Reef Update</b>	
10.1	DH updated the meeting on the surf reef.	
10.2	SA said she had received a call from David Weight requesting an information pack which DH said he would send.	DH
11	<b>Website Update</b>	
11.1	SA said that the next item to go on the website would be the description of the coastline and management plan.	
11.2	SA reported that the number of hits on the website had increased in May to 1100. So far in June, 588 hits had been made. SA pointed out that approximately half of all hits will be spurious but to date a total of 5,000 genuine hits had been received.	
12	<b>National Flood Coastal Defence Database</b>	
12.1	PF said that he was awaiting data from the Poole Harbour Commissioners. HR Wallingford is looking into this. AR said he would also investigate the position.	AR
12.2	AG said that the questionnaire produced by Natural England, Dr Cope and the EA contained some huge questions and that more background information was required.	
13	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
13.1	Attention was drawn to the need to keep the planners involved in the SMP. AB suggested a special meeting be convened to bring in all the planners together. It was important that the SMP linked in with planning policies such as the Local Development Framework. The meeting could be held after Christmas once the baseline information was available and the 'do nothing' scenario is known.	
13.2	DH had contacted the Dorset Coast Forum and they would be asked to put a link on their website.	

13.3	<p>DH had attended various meetings and provided the following feedback:</p> <p>a) The South West Regional Maritime Task Force meeting attended last week had little relevance to coast protection as it concentrated mainly on ports, tourism and fishing.</p> <p>b) DH found a Flood Risk Management meeting he had attended in May to be very interesting but too few local authorities had been invited.</p> <p>c) National Trust meeting this morning had considered scenarios for the future of Studland and Brownsea Island.</p>	
13.4	<p>Bournemouth Council is to complete the statutory aspects of the tender process and then email the five authorities and the Environment Agency for their comments. This will enable selection of the successful tenderer to be finalised at a meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008.</p>	
14	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	
14.1	<p>It was felt that a meeting on <u>Monday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2008</u>, a few days before the issue of the tender document, would be beneficial with the further meeting on <u>Monday 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008</u> referred to at 13.4 above.</p>	
15	<p><b>Post Meeting Note</b></p>	
15.1	<p>Both meetings are to be held in Room 5 at <u>Bournemouth Learning Centre</u> at 2.00 pm.</p>	