

**SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#30)**  
**At Bournemouth Town Hall- Council Chamber**  
**Monday 6<sup>th</sup> September 1300 lunch for 1330 start**

**AGENDA**

**1. Apologies**

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

CSG Minutes 29 - 05 07 10

**3. Action Items arising from minutes**

DH attended WRFDC on 12 July

**4. Matters arising**

Steve Jenkinson requires re-consultation on SEA

Results of re-consultation on SEA

Information required by NQRG

Progress of formation of contract, BBC/RH

IROPI letter

Website future - SCG or EA?

Tara to update on RH activities

**5. AOB**

**6. Dates of next meetings**

CSG#31 ???- Date and Location to be confirmed

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #30  
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 6th SEPTEMBER 2010**

**Present:**

|                         |                                       |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Dave Harlow (DH)        | Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)   |
| Geoff Turnbull (GT)     | Bournemouth Borough Council           |
| Geoff Tyler (GTy)       | Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes) |
| Peter Ferguson (PF)     | New Forest District Council           |
| Dave Robson (DR)        | Borough of Poole Council              |
| Mike Goater (MG)        | Purbeck District Council              |
| Steve Woolard (SW)      | Christchurch Borough Council          |
| Tim Kermode (TK)        | Environment Agency (South East)       |
| Neil Watson (NW)        | Environment Agency                    |
| Tony Flux (TF)          | National Trust                        |
| Richard Edmonds (RE)    | Dorset County Council                 |
| Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE) | Royal Haskoning                       |

**Apologies:**

|                        |                             |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Andy Bradbury (AB)     | New Forest District Council |
| Steve Cook (SC)        | New Forest District Council |
| Sue Burton (SB)        | Natural England             |
| Vanessa Straker (VS)   | English Heritage            |
| Andrew Ramsbottom (AR) | Poole Harbour Commissioners |
| *Nick Reed (NR)        | Environment Agency          |

*\*(It was noted that Nick Reed had returned to his substantive post and that the Environment Agency was not looking to replace him in his previous role.)*

**Item No.**

**Action**

**1 Minutes of Meeting on 5<sup>h</sup> July 2010**

1.1 The minutes of the meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2010 were agreed.

**2 Action Items Arising from Last Meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2010**

2.1 2.2 DH said that the proposed meeting with the Planners was cancelled and that it had been rescheduled for 29/09/10 when the Dorset Planning Group would be meeting at Christchurch Borough Council's offices. NW said he would send DH a brief email to cover the Government's NCERM policy statement and the coastal erosion map

NW

2.2 3.3 DH confirmed that the SMP had been adopted by Bournemouth at the full Council meeting on 27/07/10. DH explained that Cllr Robert Lawton was no longer the Environment and Transport Portfolio Holder for Bournemouth and had been replaced by Cllr Michael Filer who will attend future meetings. Cllr Filer will sign the SMP but will delegate what issues he can to Cllr Lawton.

2.3 5.3 PF said he had not drafted the statement about the key stakeholder's contributions to the consultation process as further advice was awaited from Simon Hills.

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 2.4 | 7.2 DH said that Cllr Lawton did not attend the Strategy Study Steering Group meeting on 27/07/10 having accepted that his involvement would not be appropriate. TE did attend however. NW said he had met with the Chief Executives of the local authorities involved and had received their agreement in principle. NW said he would circulate the working arrangements prepared by Fiona Geddes.   | NW  |
| 3   | <b>Matters Arising</b>  |     |
| 3.1 | <b>Final SEA - Document Review</b>  |     |
|     | DH said that he had written to Jim Hutchinson on 26/07/10 explaining that he did not want to re-consult on the SEA. However, Steve Jenkinson had phoned DH on 04/08/10 to confirm that the consultation needed to be carried out. The SEA had therefore been re-issued and the consultation had closed on 31/08/10 with three responses having been received. DH circulated the comments last week and said that CSG members should look at them carefully and decide whether any changes were required to the SMP. DH then read out the comments for the benefit of the meeting. | All |
| 3.2 | TF expressed concern about the comments from Douglas Whyte on behalf of the National Trust which he said were made without his knowledge. The status of the comments was also queried by TE and it was agreed that in the circumstances DH should write to the Trust's Purbeck Office Property Manager, Laurie Clark, to ask whether the comments represented the Trust's formal response to the SEA.   | DH  |
| 3.3 | DH said that the option of HTL at South Haven Point implies that only the slipway will be protected. His response will be that the comments have been noted and the issue will be picked up in SMP3. MG pointed out that the level of detail was inappropriate. The important point is that the transport link needs to be maintained. TF agreed that a sub-cellular set of policies for Shell Bay was not appropriate.   |     |
| 3.4 | TE suggested that the response to the second comment from Douglas Whyte, about the risk to Studland in the third epoch, should be that "it is noted that this has been taken into account by the CCO". TE said she did not think that the policy needed changing but would check that the Halcrow study referred to by Douglas Whyte was in fact available when the SMP was drafted.  | TE  |
| 3.5 | The second response to the consultation had been received from TF. TE said that she would investigate the issue and action accordingly.   | TE  |
| 3.6 | TF said that his first observation just required a formatting change and he was happy to retract his second comment in the light of TE's explanation.   |     |
| 3.7 | TF said it was not worth re-writing the document in respect of his comment about replacement habitat for the lagoon. DH said that it might be appropriate to use the wording "may be" rather than "will be". MG pointed out that in view of the current government funding position the issue needed careful consideration. TE said she would look at it further.   |     |
| 3.8 | It was agreed that the document should be changed in regard to the IROPI and that the points should be listed and sent to Liz Galloway.   |     |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 3.9  | DH said that the third response had been received from the Hengistbury Head Residents Association and that the issues raised had been discussed at the Strategy Study meeting. HENRA feel that the managed re-alignment policy should be to advance the line in order to adequately protect the Hengistbury area.  |    |
| 3.10 | In regard to the comments received from Liz Galloway, TE said she had an action plan for these and would be working on it shortly. The extra comments about the Statement of Particulars can be produced by Royal Haskoning who will deal with Steve Jenkinson's email of 31/08/10. NW said that the feedback and Liz Galloway's comments should be dealt with together. Clarification was required on the template to be used for the response. |    |
| 3.11 | RE said he had emailed DH in relation to allowing Durlston to fail. NW explained that the options for decommissioning should be put into the Action Plan and be carried forward to the next stage.   |    |
| 3.12 | TF said that consideration should be given to how exit studies are written in Action Plans as there is a need to be pro-active rather than just monitoring the situation. DH commented that NAI is not a "no-cost" option.   | TE |
| 3.13 | It was agreed to put the issue into the shadow Action Plan so that it can be included in the final Action Plan after the SMP has been adopted.   |    |
| 4    | <b>Information Required by the NQRG</b>  | TE |
| 4.1  | TE said that she had heard back from the NQRG and pointed out that the items raised by Steve Jenkinson are to complete the SEA rather than the SMP. DH said that the SMP did not need to be changed but that the points raised should be properly recorded.  |    |
| 4.2  | TE confirmed that this had already been done and that she would chase the NQRG concerning the <b>outstanding issues</b> .  |    |
| 5    | <b>IROPI Letter</b>  | TE |
| 5.1  | A letter had been received from DEFRA dated 09/08/10 stating that the SMP should not be adopted until written agreement had been received on the IROPI.  |    |
| 5.2  | NW said that this conflicted with the advice he had received and that the operating authorities should adopt the document as Richard Creswell's response can be regarded as the agreement.   |    |
| 6    | <b>Progress of Formation of Contract</b>   |    |
| 6.1  | DH said that he was close to forming the contract with Royal Haskoning.  |    |
| 7    | <b>Update on Royal Haskoning Activities</b>  |    |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 7.1  | TE said that the SMP is to feature in a RH publication called 'The Range'.  | TE |
| 7.2  | TE said that Royal Haskoning's coastal conference is to take place on Wednesday and places are still available.   |    |
| 7.3  | The Isle of Wight's SMP road show is to be held next week.  |    |
| 7.4  | In response to TE's query about the number of copies of the SMP that are required, it was agreed that 12 hard copies should be produced - one for each CSG member. Electronic copies are also to be provided.   |    |
| 7.5  | TE said she would draft the front page document and circulate it to the CSG. Letters of approval could be issued by the operating authorities and the scanned letters can be added to the document as a free standing appendix and placed on the website.   |    |
| 7.6  | The document will say 'Final' rather than the version number and will feature a picture of 'Old Harry Rocks' on the front cover.  |    |
| 7.7  | TF enquired how close to the budget was the final outturn. TE said that Royal Haskoning had made a very small profit but the project had been very successful and RH had learnt a great deal about the section of the coastline.  |    |
| 7.8  | DH said that the final bill was about £208,000 and the accounts had been very easy to administer. A further small Variation Order may be required. NW said it was appropriate for the statement to be submitted as a compensation event.  |    |
| 7.9  | DH confirmed that all CSG members could see the accounts if they wished.  |    |
| 7.10 | TF commended the successful completion of the project.  |    |
| 8    | <b>Website Future</b>   |    |
| 8.1  | DR distributed a statement about the website and confirmed that the domain name had been funded until 2014.   |    |
| 8.2  | The CSG asked for their appreciation of Sarah Austin's work in providing such an excellent website to be recorded.  |    |
| 8.3  | In discussing the future of the website, it was suggested that it could be passed to the Southern Coastal Group and SCOPAC and be maintained at minimal cost through the Coastal Group's budget when the SMP was closed down. TE suggested quarterly refreshing of the website to lead into SMP3. |    |
| 9    | <b>Project Closure</b>  |    |
| 9.1  | DH said that Royal Haskoning's involvement in the project would cease by the end of September and the SMP therefore needed to be adopted. DH asked whether another meeting of the EMF would be required but it was agreed that this would not be necessary.                                       |    |
| 9.2  | It was noted that the aim was to close the project by the end of December 2010 and financially by 31/03/11 after which date no budget would be  |    |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | available. NW said that 31/03/11 would be the most appropriate date for the close down.  |    |
| 9.3  | TE pointed out that the Regional Director's agreement was required.  |    |
| 9.4  | DH said that the final leaflet will be produced after adoption but will be drafted now by the five operating authorities. A press release will be issued with the launch of the leaflet when the SMP is finished.  |    |
| 9.5  | The need for a Comms. Team meeting was raised and also a photo shoot to show how the local authorities had worked together on the project.   |    |
| 9.6  | DH said that he had been in touch with Bournemouth's Communications Officer about the article in 'The Range' publication and that if he heard nothing further he would use the information produced previously.  |    |
| 9.7  | An email had been received from Charlotte Millerchip of the CCO requesting the changes document. DH said that he would take the table off the back of the letter and send it to her.   |    |
| 10   | <b>Any Other Business</b>  | DH |
| 10.1 | RE updated the meeting on the Coastal Pathfinder project and explained that the small team of three will start this month. Six sites are to be scrutinised. Halcrow have been employed to produce the models and feedback will be provided to DEFRA at the end of the project. |    |
| 10.2 | TF said that the National Trust are working on a project in which a catastrophic 1 in 200 year storm has been invented to produce a 'what if' scenario.  |    |
| 10.3 | TK said that adoption had been agreed by Wessex Regional Flood Defence Committee.  |    |
| 10.4 | NW circulated a progress report on the Poole and Wareham Strategy Study and said that he would like another meeting of the Steering Group in mid-October.  |    |
| 11   | <b>Date of Next Meeting</b>  |    |
| 11.1 | It was agreed that a further CSG meeting was required in order to discuss the shadow Action Plan, the leaflet and any other minor points concerning adoption of the SMP. It was also felt that feedback to DEFRA about the SMP should be included as an agenda item.           |    |
| 11.2 | The next meeting is to be held at Bournemouth Town Hall at <u>1.00 pm on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> November 2010.</u>  |    |