

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#18)
At Bournemouth Learning Centre
Monday 18th May 2009, 13:30 for 14:00

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. To approve minutes of the last meeting

CSG Minutes 17 - 20 04 09

3. Action Items arising from previous minutes

4. Matters Arising since 20th April

DH - compliance with deadlines

NW - SMP Lessons learnt at National Review.

NW - WFD developments

SA - A "family style" for documents based on Twobays website -options for consideration.

SC - Communications plan and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

TE - Meeting, Friday 15 May at Exeter

5. Documents status

Estuary Processes Assessment- published

Coastal Processes and Geomorphology v9

Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report - 5 weeks consultation closed on 5th May

Assessment of Breaching Risk at Double Dykes, near Hengistbury Head

Appendix D Natural and Built Environment Baseline (Thematic Studies) -

Consultation Period closed on 20th April

Issue Tables v1

High Level Objectives and Policy Development Zones - send to KSG after 18 May?

6. Royal Haskoning - progress report

- Programme

7 CCO/NFDC - progress report

8. AOB

9. Date of next meetings:

CSG: meet on Mondays at 13:30 for 14:00 at Bournemouth Learning Centre, (light refreshments available from 13:30 to 14:00)

EMF: meet on Mondays at 1730 for 1800 at Bournemouth Learning Centre, (light buffet available from 17:30 to 18:00)

18 May 2009	<u>CSG#18 + EMF#3</u>	Room 1
22 June 2009	<u>CSG#19</u>	Room 4
20 July 2009	<u>CSG#20</u>	Room 4
24 August 2009	<u>CSG#21 + EMF#4</u>	Room 4
28 September 2009	<u>CSG#22</u>	Room 4
2 November 2009	<u>CSG#23</u>	Room 5
7 December 2009	<u>CSG#24</u>	Room 4
11 January 2010	<u>CSG#25 + EMF#5</u>	Room 4
15 February 2010	<u>CSG#26</u>	Room? ** Possible new date due to delays

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #18
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 18th MAY 2009**

Present:

Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency (South East)
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency (South Western Region)
Malcolm Brushett (MB)	Environment Agency
Lynn Park (LP)	Environment Agency
Gemma Sweet (GS)	Environment Agency
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Richard Caldow (RC)	Natural England
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Justin Ridgewell (JR)	Royal Haskoning
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Steve Woollard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Sarah Austin (SA)	Poole Borough Council
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR)	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Apologies:

Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Vanessa Straker (VS)	English Heritage

Item No.

Action

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1 | Minutes of Last Meeting on 20th April 2009 | |
| 1.1 | The minutes were agreed with the following amendments:-
In Items 8.1 and 8.2 - delete 'RC' and insert 'RH' (for Royal Haskoning). | |
| 2 | Action Items Arising from Previous Minutes | |
| 2.1 | Item 2.2 AB had followed up the Dorset Coastal Archive information and some progress had been made. Dr Sam Cope was currently pursuing the matter. AB said that there could be a cost implication. | |
| 2.2 | Item 5.1 SC confirmed that New Forest District Council (NFDC) did not have the resources to undertake the consultation work. | |
| 2.3 | Item 5.7 NW had met with GT to discuss the funding situation. | |
| 2.4 | Item 6.2 Various proposed logos had been circulated for consideration. | |
| 2.5 | Item 8.5 It was noted that GG would be addressing the question of the Policy Development Zones later in the meeting. | |

2.6	Item 10.2 NW had discussed the erosion mapping with Environment Agency colleagues. GG said that it should be made clear that the information had not originated from the SMP. AB said the data could be shown with an inforamatory note and he would ask Sam Cope to forward the flood risk data to MG.	
3	Matters Arising since 20th April 2009	
3.1	Compliance with Deadlines	
3.2	DH emphasised the importance of adhering to the deadlines set because of the tight timescale for completion of the programme.	All to Note
3.3	TE queried whether late responses should be accepted in view of the fact that their inclusion would inevitably delay the programme.	
3.4	JR suggested there was a need to identify within the comments received those critical issues which should not be omitted.	
3.5	It was agreed that a second spreadsheet should be prepared showing the comments received late so that these could be taken into account subsequently along with the comments received at the consultation stage.	TE
3.6	It was also agreed that in view of the technical nature of AB's comments these could be accommodated as track changes in a word or adobe format rather than on the agreed form.	TE
3.7	NW and RC said that it would be helpful to have an indicative time when documents will be issued so that the need to comment can be programmed into diaries. TE said that a new programme is about to be issued.	TE
	CSG/EMF Meetings	
3.8	DH explained that the DEFRA guidance gives the CSG sovereignty over the SMP and asked whether it would be beneficial to hold the meetings of the CSG and EMF on different days rather than on the same day as at present. DH also pointed out that it might be necessary to move the EMF meeting scheduled for 24 th August 2009 forward to September.	
3.9	RE provided advice on the involvement of elected members in Devon and Dorset and pointed out that the higher level strategic view needs to be agreed beforehand so that the discussion on lower level local issues are discussed within this framework.	
3.10	TE suggested an elected members' workshop on 23 rd August to enhance their involvement and influence on decisions.	
3.11	MG queried whether the elected members' role was clearly defined. MG also pointed out that there had been a change of member in Purbeck and that the District Council's future representation on the EMF needed to be clarified.	MG
3.12	DH said it was important for officers to brief their elected member before the meetings. AB confirmed that this was already happening in NFDC.	

3.13	TF pointed out that the elected members' perspective was often driven from below by the general public rather than by central government and they were very cognisant of how information should be presented to the public.	
3.14	It was agreed that the arrangements should not be changed and that the EMF should follow the CSG meetings on the scheduled dates.	
3.15	Because of the extent of the work to be covered, TE proposed an earlier start of 9.30 a.m. for the next three meetings of the CSG on 22nd June, 20 th July and 24 th August 2009.	All to Note
	SMP Lessons Learnt at National Review	
3.16	<p>NW said that he wished to highlight a few points from the 'Lessons Learnt' paper circulated recently to the CSG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 3 draws attention to the engagement with planners regarding the relationship between the SMP and other statutory plans (e.g. Regional Spatial Strategy and Regional Economic Strategy); • Page 5 explains the significance of local social factors in relation to the selection of policy options; • Page 7 contains information on the Water Framework Directive and the new National Indicator 189 on flood and coastal erosion risk management. <p>Water Framework Document</p>	
3.17	DH said he had located a document confirming that Royal Haskoning would undertake the work in relation to the WFD.	
3.18	TE said she would check with colleagues that the original offer still stands.	TE
3.19	GG said that the WFD should not be too onerous if the SEA and Appropriate Assessment have already been completed. The work could be carried out in parallel with other tasks although the programme is likely to be affected.	
3.20	NW said that a great deal of guidance is available. Once the work has been scoped, a variation order to the contract with Royal Haskoning should be issued. RH can be instructed to proceed once approval has been received.	DH
3.21	<p>NW said he had put down a marker with Jim Hutchison to slip the programme by 3 to 4 weeks but had not heard back.</p> <p>'Family Style' for Documents on the Website</p>	
3.22	Drafts had been circulated and SA explained the different options. Various views were expressed and it was agreed to adopt option 1 with the six operating authorities (including the EA) appearing on the front of the documents. All 12 members of the CSG would then appear on the inside of the front cover with a note of their respective roles.	
3.23	SA said she would prepare revised versions of the front covers and logos for the plans and documents for further consideration by the CSG.	SA

	Communications Plan and Stakeholder Engagement	
3.24	SC said that the main issues for discussion are who is to do the consultation, which documents are to be consulted on and by whom.	
3.25	It was noted that the EA could provide some resources and Bournemouth Council half a day a week.	
3.26	NW said that a lot of the consultation work falls on the EA and is not for the consultants to undertake as made clear in the guidance. He had circulated some notes based on SC's very good paper and had highlighted various sections. Stage 2 was coming to an end and there was a question about who would be producing the series of briefing notes required for Stage 3.	
3.27	NW said that the Issues and Objectives table was ready to go and that it posed various questions which needed to be decided. GG said that the table was a good basis for consultation but that it was important to understand what the local issues are and to explain why the preferred scenarios are being pursued.	
3.28	During the general discussion that followed, it was suggested that five public consultation meetings should be held. The need to keep elected members and key stakeholders informed was also highlighted.	
3.29	MG drew attention to the importance of involving the planners. AB pointed out that a meeting with the planners should focus on a specific planning issue such as the Local Development Framework. TF said that the vision for the area should come from the planning policy managers.	
3.30	It was agreed that a Comms Sub-Group was required and that the operating authorities should bring their specialist communications officers with them to the meeting.	DH
3.31	LP said she had someone available to assist with the project but was concerned about the timescale and volume of work involved which needed to be divided up. Clear objectives also needed to be agreed.	
3.32	It was suggested that NW, SC, DH and SA were the key members and that the meeting could take place on 4 th June. DH queried whether the local authorities would want to charge for their time.	
	Environment Meeting	
3.33	It was noted that the Environment Meeting in Exeter postponed from 15 th May would now be held on 1 st June 2009.	
4	Document Status	
4.1	It was reported that the Halcrow Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was at the final draft stage and had a number of new maps in it. SW said it was being referred to elected members at Christchurch. TE felt that it was too late to include the information in SMP2. GG drew attention to the need to avoid possible differences in the two documents and also highlighted the fact that the fiscal mapping needed to be taken into account.	

4.2	MB drew attention to several other documents that were in the pipeline including Poole's strategic flood risk management document and the Purbeck level 1 update.	
4.3	It was agreed that any new information that became available to the CSG should be referred to Royal Haskoning and that future changes to mapping would have to be included as an appendix.	
4.4	TE confirmed that the Estuary Processes Assessment had been published and that the Coastal Processes and Geomorphology Review is also on the website.	
4.5	SC said he had sent out the SEA Scoping Report and would re-circulate it with the latest comments so that further responses can be co-ordinated and the document forwarded to Royal Haskoning within the next 10 days. Attention was drawn to the need for an audit trail and for a response to each of the comments made. It was noted that the public would get another opportunity to comment in due course.	SC
	Hengistbury Head	
4.6	TE explained that the review of the Hengistbury Head document captured all the information.	
4.7	TF suggested the heading 'Coastal Processes Impacting on Hengistbury Head' would be more appropriate.	
4.8	AB said that the definition of breach and overtopping needed to be clarified, and that it would be valuable to give the scope of future action required. HENRA and local councillors would want recommendations and to know the likelihood of a breach occurring.	TE
4.9	DH said it was a very good summary and pointed out that Bournemouth Council were both the coastal authority for Hengistbury Head as well as the landowner and wanted a policy of hold the line.	
4.10	TF felt there was a danger of pre-empting SMP policy.	
4.11	TE said that version 2 can be re-circulated incorporating the comments made and confirmed that individuals will be able to check from the table how each comment has been dealt with. TE said she would let DH know when the document would be available	TE
4.12	In reply to a query from NW, GG said that the information is evidence to be used in developing the policy and could be circulated to elected members before being made public.	
	Appendix D	
4.13	TE explained that a meeting had been arranged for 1 st June which English Heritage is to attend to go through Appendix D.	
4.14	TE said that she had received the final deliverables from Sam Cope and that the CCO were working as hard and as fast as they could.	
4.15	TE had circulated the revised programme for consideration and said that June and July would be a very busy period. Items 60 and 62 provided an	DH

	indication of what could be considered at the next two CSG meetings.	
4.16	NW said it was possible to slip by 3 to 4 weeks but that the document needed to be signed off by every Cabinet.	
4.17	TE said the draft should be ready by mid-August (item 64). GG confirmed that it should then be taken to Cabinet to seek approval to go out to public consultation but not for approval of the SMP itself.	
4.18	MG said that the stakeholder review should be as long as possible.	
4.19	TE said she would tidy up version 4 of the programme and forward to DH. It was noted that tasks are having to be run in parallel in order to deliver the programme on time.	TE
	High Level Objectives & Policy Development Zones	
4.20	GG explained that there was a need to be clear about the differences between SMP 1 which looked forward 50 years and SMP 2 which covers a 100 year period. It was also important to approach the formulation of policies in a structured manner in accordance with the guidance. In order to facilitate this it was necessary to break the coastline down into manageable units. This would enable the SMP take account of local characteristics as well as looking at the coastal processes. GG made the point that the policy development zones provided a convenient means of analysing objectives but were not policy units.	
4.21	DR expressed concern about the split of Poole Bay and queried the relationship between the PDZs and the existing management units. AB said he was in favour of larger scale units but was concerned about the hard lines. GG confirmed that the document would be written on the basis of linkages between the PDZs and would include appropriate caveats.	
4.22	There was general agreement on using the four boundaries but it was felt that an explanatory note should be provided confirming the rationale.	
4.23	GG asked whether the main drivers and objectives had been captured. The CSG considered that in some cases the key features and objectives had become slightly muddled. JR said he had revised the document to take account of the comments made.	
5	Any Other Business	
5.1	NW distributed a leaflet on the South Devon & Dorset SMP Review Consultation Summary.	
6	Date of Next Meeting	
6.1	The next meeting is to be held at 9.30 a.m. on Monday 22 nd June 2009. Venue to be decided.	