

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#16)
At Bournemouth Town Hall (Willows)
Monday 16th March 2009, 13:30 for 14:00

AGENDA

(Light refreshments available from 13:30 to 14:00)

1. Apologies

2. To approve minutes of the last meeting

CSG Minutes 15 - 09 02 09 (Christchurch Civic Offices)

3. Action Items arising from previous minutes

4. Matters Arising since 9th February.

5. Royal Haskoning - progress report

6 CCO/NFDC - progress report

7. BoP - website - www.twobays.net - content & hits

8. AOB

9. Date of next meetings:

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #16
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 16TH MARCH 2009**

Present:

Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency (South East)
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency (South Western Region)
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Richard Caldwell (RC)	Natural England
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Steve Woollard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council
Andrew Ramsbottom	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Apologies:

Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Justin Ridgewell (JR)	Royal Haskoning
Sarah Austin (SA)	Poole Borough Council

Item No.	Action
1	Minutes of Last Meeting on 9th February 2009
1.1	The minutes of the meeting were agreed with the deletion of "an overarching agreement" in item 2.5 and its replacement by "a memorandum of agreement".
2	Actions Arising from Previous Minutes
2.1	Item 2.5. TE expressed concern that no timescale had been set for the resolution of the contractual difficulty. GT confirmed that a contract did in fact exist with Royal Haskoning (RH).
2.2	Item 2.6. DH confirmed that Bournemouth Council's Legal Services had been informed of the CSG's decision regarding the contract.
2.3	Item 2.13. DR had provided his response to the Estuaries Report.
2.4	Item 2.19. Poole Council and New Forest District Council (NFDC) had provided the required cost figures.
2.5	Item 4.2. The questions and answers from the two public meetings were now on the website.
2.6	Item 5.10 & Item 6.5. The agendas for the two meeting had been circulated.

2.7	Item 7.3. TE had submitted the new programme as agreed.	
2.8	Item 7.5. TE explained that the Theme Review had been delayed but it was hoped that it would be ready by next week. The Hengistbury Head report was expected to be completed this week.	
2.9	Item 10 5. TF and GT had both attended the meeting on 12 th February about the proposed off-shore wind farm and TF had circulated notes of the meeting	
2.10	Item 10.2. The report on Brownsea Island had been sent last week as agreed.	
3	Matters Arising since 9th February 2009	
3.1	DH said that Dick Appleton had asked if the CSG could make a presentation to Poole's Institution of Civil Engineers Club. It was agreed that AB and a member of the RH team would prepare a presentation based on the material presented at the public forums and that TE or Justin Ridgewell would attend the meeting on 18 th June 2009.	
3.2	DH said that Councillor Roger West had received a response to a letter he had sent to the Environment Agency (EA). In their reply, the EA said that they regarded the improvement of the coast for all users and the protection of people and property as a priority. The general view was that this advice required due diligence but that the SMP should not be unduly influenced by it. It was felt that it was likely to add to the complexity of the Strategy Study rather than the SMP policy which did not focus on this level of detail. AB also pointed out that it highlighted the key drivers and confirmed the existing DEFRA guidance. It was agreed that the CSG should note that the EA letter had been seen and had received due attention.	
4	Royal Haskoning - Progress Report	
4.1	TE presented the RH progress report:	
4.2	<p>Stage 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal Processes Report - Draft completed and internally reviewed. Comments received back from most CSG members. • Defences Shapefile - Completed and reviewed by CCO. Some minor errors / anomalies identified. Errors have been rectified. • Estuary Processes Report - Draft completed. All comments received back from CSG. Final version for Appendices received from ABP and posted on the webpage. • Theme Review Report - First draft completed. Undergoing internal review. Anticipate re-drafting w/c 16/03 prior to dissemination to CSG. • Features and Issues Tables - Tables completed apart from Poole Harbour. Environment Team have reviewed and added issues/objectives from environmental point of view. • Definition of objectives - Initial identification of objectives done on the completed tables. • Assess objectives - High-level objective setting and internal review of how specific objectives are set. 	

4.3	<p>Stage 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define Policy Scenarios - Commenced with full-day workshop on 6-03-09, identifying high-level management intent and key policy drivers. • Policy Scenario Assessment - To commence. • Preferred Scenario Identification - To commence. • Confirm preferred Scenario - To commence. • Produce Draft SMP document - Appendices are now starting to be assembled using the Finalised Reports from Stage 2. 	
4.4	<p>Additional task:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hengistbury Head Assessment Report - Draft report being internally reviewed prior to dissemination to CSG during w/c 16/03. Comments required back within one and a half weeks. 	
5	<p>Water Framework Directive</p>	
5.1	<p>It was noted that the EA had decided that the Water Framework Directive is to be part of the SMP. AB said he had spoken to Gary Lane at the EA about this and TE confirmed that she had also carried out some investigation. NW and TK said that they would obtain some feedback and that it is likely that additional grant support will be made available. There was a question of whether this new requirement could be accommodated in the programme.</p>	NW/TK
6	<p>Frequency of Meetings</p>	
6.2	<p>TE said she had provided DH with a budgeted spreadsheet of the meetings attended and scheduled. TE said this did not correspond with the meetings tendered for and RH have therefore budgeted for an additional six meetings.</p>	
6.3	<p>In the discussion about the frequency of the meetings, AB commented that they should possibly be event driven. TE suggested that written reports from RH might be appropriate rather than attendance at every meeting. DH urged adherence to the agreed schedule and suggested that RH be invited to every other meeting. The need for the six scheduled Key Stakeholder Group meetings was also queried. TE said she would let the CSG know the cost of RH's attendance at the additional meetings. NW advised that a variation order be submitted to the EA.</p>	TE
7	<p>SMP Programme</p>	
7.1	<p>TE said that due to delays in Lidar and SAR data, the final SMP would now be published on 26th February 2010 extending the expected delay from the original three weeks to four weeks. The policy would be developed during the Spring and Summer months with the public examination in September.</p>	
7.2	<p>AB was concerned that the 10 days allowed for RH to fine tune the report after the consultation response closing date would be insufficient. TF pointed out that to avoid criticism the public consultation period has to be seen to be realistic. NW suggested running some of the processes in parallel</p>	

	<p>in order to speed up the programme. TK said that there is some flexibility on the timescale but that the EA will not wish to relax the deadline date as they will want to look at the completed SMPs together. MG said that the quality should not be compromised by shortening the programme.</p>	
8	Public Consultation	
8.1	Management of the public consultation exercise was discussed and it was noted that neither NFDC nor Sarah Austin could take on the work. TK pointed out that the process is complicated involving the production of leaflets, website information, exhibitions and press releases. TE said that RH could provide a cost for undertaking the consultation. RC stressed the need for a communication strategy rather than a piecemeal approach. DH said there was a need to focus on the policies once they have been developed and to have five meetings - one for each authority. NW enquired whether members were required to report back on the availability of their resources for the consultation work. DH said that the matter should be included as an agenda item for a future meeting.	DH
8.2		
8.3		
9	NEASS Officer	
9.1	It was noted that a National Environmental Assessment (NEASS) Officer, whose role it is to protect the environment, has to be assigned to each SMP. It was agreed that the NEASS officer should be invited to future meetings. NW said he would check to see if she wished to attend but was unsure whether she would have time to become involved as she is extremely busy.	NW
10	CCO/NFDC Progress Report	
10.1	AB presented the Flood & Erosion Risk Maps report. A number of considerations had been taken into account including the robustness of the source data, geology of the coastline, residual life of existing defences and predictions of sea level rise. AB said he would email RE for access to PlanWeb GIS information. TE drew attention to the potential for breaches at Double Dykes in the third epoch and the need to clarify the position before the Key Stakeholders meeting.	AB
11	Website Report	
11.1	DR said there had been 18,048 unique visitors to the website since it was established in April 2008 with 2065 visits in February and 1064 so far in March. A large percentage of these however are likely to be spurious visits by commercial companies abroad. The main Google searches are for Swanage Bay and Hurst Spit.	
11.2	DR confirmed that two of the recent presentations are on the website and that two more reports will be put on within a few days.	
11.3	DH said that the website had been complimented at the Strategy Study meeting and that they had said they would like to use the facility.	

12	Any Other Business	
12.1	TF flagged up SEA concern that the mapping for Poole Harbour assumed Brownsea Island was merely a unit whereas both the Brownsea and probably the Fursey Island locations needed to be considered in SMP terms in their own right. TE said she would raise the matter with Justin Ridgewell.	TE
12.2	RE said that Imperial College approached Dorset County Council about the mapping process and wanted to make a geological map of the sea bed. AB said he would provide this through the Channel Coastal Observatory.	AB
12.3	TE thanked everyone for their input and stressed the importance of keeping to the agreed time frames.	
13	Date of Next Meeting	
13.1	The next meeting is to be held at 2.00 pm on Monday 20 th April 2009 at the Bournemouth Learning Centre.	