

**SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#19)**  
**At Bournemouth Library Main meeting room 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**  
**Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2009, 0930**

**AGENDA**

**1. Apologies**

**2. To approve minutes of the last meeting**

CSG Minutes 18 - 18 05 09

**3. Action Items arising from previous minutes**

**4. Matters Arising since 18<sup>th</sup> May**

Environment Meeting, Monday 1<sup>st</sup> June at Exeter  
Communications team inaugural meeting, Friday 5<sup>th</sup> June  
Hengistbury Head- review

**5. Royal Haskoning - progress report**

- Programme
- Documents update

**6 CCO/NFDC - progress report**

**7. AOB**

**8. Date of next meetings:**

22 June 2009	<u>CSG#19 0930</u>	+ EMF#4 @1300	Bournemouth Library Main meeting room 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor
20 July 2009	<u>CSG#20 0930</u>		Bournemouth Library Main meeting room 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor
24 August 2009	<u>CSG#21 0930</u>	+ EMF#5 @1400	Bournemouth Learning Centre
28 September 2009	<u>CSG#22</u>		BLC Room 4
2 November 2009	<u>CSG#23</u>		BLC Room 5
7 December 2009	<u>CSG#24</u>		BLC Room 4
11 January 2010	<u>CSG#25</u>	+ EMF#6	BLC Room 4
15 February 2010	<u>CSG#26</u>		Location to be determined

**NOTES:**

The Library does not open to the public until 1000; please wait at the main door to be admitted.

A light lunch will be available at 1230.

The EMF meeting will commence at 1300 in the same venue.

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #19  
BOURNEMOUTH LIBRARY - MONDAY 22<sup>nd</sup> JUNE 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 West)
Greg Guthrie (GG)	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

**Apologies:**

Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Vanessa Straker (VS)	English Heritage
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Richard Caldwell (RC)	Natural England
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR)	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Item No.		Action
1	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009</b>	
1.1	The minutes were agreed with the following amendments:-	
1.2	The first sentence of Item 3.19 was amended to read "GG said that the WFD should not be too onerous if the SEA and Appropriate Assessment have already been completed."	
1.3	Item 3.25 was amended to read "It was noted that the EA could provide some resources and Bournemouth Council half a day a week."	
2	<b>Action Items Arising from Previous Minutes</b>	
2.1	Item 3.5 The second spreadsheet of comments had been prepared.	
2.2	Item 3.6 Arrangements had been made to accommodate AB's comments as agreed.	
2.3	Item 3.7 The new programme had been issued.	

2.4	Item 3.11 Purbeck Council's membership of the EMF had been clarified.	
2.5	Item 3.15 The starting time of the EMF meeting scheduled for 24 <sup>th</sup> August 2009 is to be clarified at this afternoon's meeting.	
2.6	Item 3.20 It had been agreed that the Environment Agency would undertake the work arising from the Water Framework Directive rather than Royal Haskoning and therefore a variation order would not be required.	
2.7	Item 3.23 DH said that he would circulate the version of the front cover and logos that had been selected by the CSG for the documents and plans.	DH
2.8	Item 3.30 The first meeting of the Comms Group had taken place and further meetings are being arranged.	
2.9	Item 4.5 SC said he was still awaiting comments from one or two CSG members on the SEA Scoping Document and that those comments that had been received had been incorporated in the spreadsheet. SC agreed to email the document to everyone for response by the end of the week.	SC
2.10	Item 4.8 It was confirmed that the necessary action had been completed.	
2.11	Item 4.11 DH had received the revised document and circulated it late on Friday.	
2.12	Item 4.15 & 4.19 It was noted that the necessary action had been completed.	
3	<b>Matters Arising since 18<sup>th</sup> May 2009</b>	
	<b>Environment Meeting</b>	
3.1	DH said that TE had written the minutes of the Environment Meeting which were circulated to those who had attended. DH read out the minutes for the benefit of those who were not at the meeting.	
3.2	On the question of 'removal of issues' GG said that it was important to identify the issues and include them but to indicate whether or not they were relevant to the SMP.	
3.3	TF said that the idea of a glossary was discussed at some length at the meeting as it was evident that there were different understandings of the terminology. It is important that doubt is removed and that there are clear and consistent definitions for terms such as "coastal squeeze" and "loss" which could otherwise be open to interpretation.	
	<b>Communications Team Meeting</b>	
3.4	DH said that he had circulated the minutes of the inaugural meeting of the Comms Group and confirmed that the next meeting was currently being arranged. DH said it was important that a CSG member from each local authority attended together with their communications officer. If the comms	

	<p>officer was unavailable, the CSG member should still endeavour to attend.</p> <p><b>Hengistbury Head - Review</b></p>	
3.5	<p>The Hengistbury Head document is to be placed on the website once it has been seen by the elected members.</p>	DH/SA
4	<p><b>Royal Haskoning - Progress Report</b></p>	
4.1	<p>JR said he was pleased with the progress on the programme. The Theme Review and tables had been released and the Hengistbury Head document had also been completed. There were no outstanding documents from Stage 2 of the programme.</p>	
4.2	<p>DH pointed out the SEA document was no longer on the website. SC said that it had been to all the key stakeholders and comments had been received. It could go back on the website as a draft for further comment.</p>	
5	<p><b>Document Status</b></p>	
5.1	<p>GG introduced the 'Section 4' document explaining that there may still be some track changes on the version circulated and that it was very much a document for discussion. GG confirmed that the presentation would also be used for the EMF meeting in the afternoon although it could be amended if there was too much detail.</p>	
5.2	<p>GG said that the document recognises the need to look at the whole coastline whilst also giving careful attention to local issues. It is necessary to look forward 100 years and decide where we want to be and then look back at how we want to get there. A number of overall objectives are identified in the document. Natural processes are important in this particular SMP and are something to be valued. The document tries to unpack some of the overall objectives and to look at the inter-dependencies and the independencies.</p>	
5.3	<p>The importance of Hengistbury Head to the Poole Bay processes is also carefully considered in the document. GG said that very little would be left of Christchurch Harbour in 150 years if we do not defend Hengistbury Head. Christchurch Bay is quite a stable coast however and not particularly reliant on Hengistbury Head.</p>	
5.4	<p>GG said he would not be concentrating on the economic aspects at this stage and that SMPs should not be driven by how much could be afforded but should be a vision of what is required. TF pointed out that where there are major conurbations some awareness of cost benefit should be part of the rationale.</p>	
5.5	<p>GG outlined the high level approach assuming that Hengistbury Head and Mudeford Spit are defended and explained that the fundamental control features of Hurst Spit and the shingles bank are unlikely to change.</p>	
5.6	<p>NW said that the focus so far has been on erosion but sea level rise and</p>	

	flooding within the harbours is also a factor.	
5.7	GG said that a prime objective is to maintain the sustainability of Poole Harbour. It is felt that a major breach at Studland would be unlikely but the formation of a more northerly channel across the Sandbanks Peninsula could occur in time.	
5.8	DH pointed out that Poole Harbour Commissioners' borehole records show 30 metres of soft deposits which suggest that such a channel could have existed in the past in this position on the peninsula. A check needed to be made therefore on whether Poole has any borehole logs.	GG/JR
5.9	TF drew attention to the river flood attenuation aspects if there were a bridged channel which could accommodate excess fluvial flooding.	
5.10	GG said that there were many interactive issues and that the Sandbanks peninsula was fundamental to interests within the harbour quite apart from the peninsula itself. The geomorphology would also be looked at.	
5.11	GG explained that the document included an example in section 4.3 of how a PDZ is managed. An overview map is provided and key points and key values identified. The section also contains a detailed description of the area together with assessments of objectives and potential losses.	
5.12	For each management area there is an example of how the area is divided up in order to scrutinise specific sections without losing sight of the bigger picture.	
5.13	TF asked what methodology had been used to assess properties that may exist in 15 years time and also whether information is required on what properties will be built and what properties will be removed.	
5.14	TF also queried the figure for the number of properties lost at Barton on Sea which is the same for both 'no active intervention' and 'with present management'.	
5.15	NW questioned the effect of creeping regeneration with the replacement of individual properties with larger multi unit residential developments.	
5.16	GG said that the economic assessment assumed no further development in accordance with the DEFRA guidance.	
5.17	AB pointed out that planning guidance was very important.	
5.18	DH said that the term "with present management" needed clarifying as it was not clear whether it meant until the end of the natural life of the existing facility. The term "with present policy" might be more appropriate. GG confirmed that clarification would be provided in the document.	
5.19	AB was concerned that there were too many policy units.	
5.20	NW pointed out that the categories were fairly crude and the adopted policy might need to support something that isn't funded.	

5.21	TK drew attention to the need to identify the aspirational aspects in order to go back to Government for funding.	
5.22	TF felt that the hard lines on maps were not helpful and that less rigid boundaries should be used to allow overlap.	
5.23	GG explained that the feeling in PDZ4 is generally to hold the line in Swanage but allow the coast to function naturally with managed re-alignment on the northern section of the Durlston Bay coastline.	
5.24	GG pointed out that the Coast Protection Act is about managing for communities rather than for individuals.	
5.25	RE said that the SMP should be giving notice that properties will be lost.	
5.26	AB queried whether, once protection is introduced, there is a legal duty to maintain it as there is an expectation that it will be continued. AB felt that it was important to be clear about the legal position before policies are developed. GG said this could be highlighted as a potential issue.	
5.27	GG said he would look at whether Durlston Castle is affected by erosion in the southern part of PDZ4 as there is no economic argument for holding the line.	
5.28	RE said he had given some very good data on erosion to TE.	
5.29	GG said that a major issue for Poole Harbour is flood risk. Hold the line and managed re-alignment needs more consideration and Royal Haskoning are still looking at the overall policy.	
5.30	GG said that for PDZ2 he was using work done previously by Nick Cooper on recharge rates which indicate that the recharge becomes more frequent. DH said that the rapid early loss hasn't occurred because overfill has been avoided. GG agreed that more detailed investigation was required.	
5.31	AB felt that ground instability on the New Forest coastline could affect the existing defences rather than the sea.	
5.32	GG said the cliff in PDZ1 at Hurst Spit is a stable structure but is rolling back.	
5.33	AB agreed the need for some re-alignment but pointed out that it would not be a trivial matter to re-align and that it had been considered previously.	
5.34	GG confirmed that protecting all properties would require a massive commitment and at SMP level some of the measures would be longer term.	
6	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
6.1	NW said he had met with Tobias Ellwood MP who was very keen to have early sight of documents and wished to join the EMF. It was agreed to raise the matter with the EMF at the afternoon's meeting.	

6.2	NW said the Strategy Study for Poole and Bournemouth went to the National Review Group which challenged it on the basis that there was too much modelling and therefore it was too costly. The launch has been put back as a result.	
6.3	SA distributed the beachfront signage she had drafted and asked for comments to be forwarded to her.	All
7	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
7.1	The next meeting is to be held at 9:30 on Monday 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2009 at Bournemouth Library.	