

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #26
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 22nd FEBRUARY 2010**

Present:

Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Simon Hills (SH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency (South East)
Sue Burton (SB)	Natural England
Vanessa Straker (VS)	English Heritage
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning

Apologies:

Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Andy Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Stuart Terry (ST)	Borough of Poole Council
Dave Robson (DR)	Borough of Poole Council
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR)	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Item No.		Action
1	Minutes of Meeting on 18th January 2010	
1.1	The minutes of the meeting on 18 th January 2010 were agreed.	
2	Minutes of Last Meeting on 19th February 2010	
2.1	The minutes of the meeting on 19 th February were not available but the comments and decisions arising from consideration of the public consultation are to be entered on the spreadsheet.	
3	Action Items Arising from Last Meeting	
3.1	It was agreed that each officer would look at the public comments relating to his own area.	
3.2	It was also agreed that an appropriate message would be put on the website to forewarn those who had submitted comments that the information is to be put on the website and that they should advise the CSG if they don't want their comments to appear.	DH
3.3	DH explained that the NRG comments will be looked at today and details published on the website where appropriate.	DH

<p>4</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>4.6</p> <p>4.7</p> <p>4.8</p> <p>4.9</p> <p>4.10</p> <p>4.11</p> <p>4.12</p>	<p>Action Plan</p> <p>TE asked for comments on the action plan having received feedback to-date from only two of the CSG members.</p> <p>NW pointed out that the Quality Review Panel is likely to want between 15 and 20 pages in a hierarchy with the plan-wide actions at the top rather than a 150-page document detailing every issue.</p> <p>GG said that the panel will expect their template to be used and that it was necessary to get the Action Plan approved in a format that enables it to be developed.</p> <p>NW said that the CSG need to sign up to an agreed version. An MS Word document is less versatile but to put the plan into the EA's template will require a variation order.</p> <p>TF said that the CSG should not be taking on more work and overstepping its remit. Most of the actions involve the EA and Natural England and therefore it was up to the EA to take responsibility and to articulate the action.</p> <p>TK pointed out that the CSG is a subgroup of the Coastal Groups and NW confirmed that local authorities are responsible for carrying out the actions identified. NW said that the actions need to be sharp and focused so that they can be monitored and should not be over simplified. They should also be staged in a logical way with the time and sequence indicated.</p> <p>GG said it was necessary to get the SMP completed. DH suggested it could be signed off with a simple Action Plan which could be developed with a variation order later.</p> <hr/> <p>Lytchett Bay</p> <p>TE drew attention to an error in the mapping for Lytchett Bay which indicated that properties will be lost at Upton and Turlin Moor where it was thought there were defences.</p> <p>DH read out an email exchange with Jenny Buffrey concerning the error. It was decided to resolve the issue within the SMP2 rather than pass it on to the Strategy Study. TE said she thought the cost would be less than £10K.</p> <p>SB said that it is important for the unit to be subdivided. There is a need to take account of the Habitat Regulations Assessment in order to minimise coastal squeeze and the impact on the salt flats. There is also a need to mitigate the effects. The same situation applies to areas J2 and J3. SB explained that Natural England will object if 'Hold the Line' is the policy for the whole unit.</p> <p>GG said that he could see the benefit in breaking Lytchett down as there is more flooding at the northern end but said he was concerned about breaking J3 down further. The policy intent is to defend the railway line which is the key asset and one or two industrial units but not to put defences in front of the salt marsh which can perform naturally.</p>	
---	--	--

4.13	TK pointed out that managed re-alignment refers to the re-alignment of the defence line not the shoreline which will evolve naturally.	
4.14	GG said he didn't see any significant pressure to cause squeeze but that there is uncertainty whether it will accrete or erode and the key thing is to monitor it.	
4.15	DH asked whether it was appropriate to deal with the matter in the SMP or pass it to the Strategy Study. NW said it was important to consider the issue of J2 in the SMP and to take account of SB's comments. The text should be reviewed and a steer included in the Action Plan.	
4.16	SB said that J3 was exactly the same as J2 with the Habitat Regulations not being taken on board.	
4.17	GG said he would look at how a new unit for J2 could be developed and would clarify the text in respect of J3.	
4.18	SB said that the policy lines should reflect the defence line at the railway, rather than the line of the saltmarsh. They require a letter in respect of J2, J3 and the peninsula and I3 with more explanation in relation to the Habitat Regulations and confirmation that the policy mitigates the effects as much as possible.	
4.19	DH said that a meeting with NE is needed to explore both areas in detail.	DH/SB/
4.20	TE said that I3 should also be looked at in more detail and GG pointed out that the north western corner may need to become another unit.	TE
4.21	Christchurch Bay mapping	
4.22	SC said that the erosion mapping had been adjusted and the correction for the upper erosion risk for Barton was being addressed in the SMP.	
5	Consideration of NRG Comments	
5.1	DH said it was necessary to record our agreement of the NRG comments which would then be circulated. Comments received from the RSPB and the Poole Harbour Commissioners were also included.	DH
5.2	DH read out a late comment received from Purbeck District Council which the CSG agreed to accept and which SH will add to the spreadsheet.	
5.3	Item 1 - Confirmation had been sought as to whether SMP1 policies are in place until SMP2 is approved. It was agreed that an introduction was needed to explain how the PDZ is set out with a text stating the SMP1 policies. Confirmation could also be provided that the SMP2 policies have been accepted but not yet formally adopted. TE said she would include a statement explaining the position.	
5.4	Item 2 - TF said that he was concerned that in respect of the 'Action Required' the CSG were being pressed to go beyond the remit of the SMP. TF pointed out that the workability of the policies will evolve and timescales	

	<p>should not therefore be imposed. It was agreed that if a policy is found to be unworkable there should either be an interim stage for a policy change or for the issue to be picked up in SMP3. GG suggested that the response could be that the policy is management intent and the comment is how the policy is to be delivered.</p>	
5.5	<p>Item 19 - It was agreed that Royal Haskoning will write a paragraph confirming that coastal erosion mapping has been used and that local planning authorities will work closely with the CSG member for the coastal change management area.</p>	
5.6	<p>Item 25 - Boundaries have been changed to reflect the boundaries with the CFMP. It was agreed to ensure that SMP policies are not contradictory. NW and TK said they would give TE a contact and that Royal Haskoning will check compatibility with the CFMP and include an appropriate note in the PDZ.</p>	
5.7	<p>Item 27 - TF questioned the appropriateness of the NRG seeking qualitative data. TK said that this is legitimate in relation to the national supply of beach recharge material but queried its relevance to the SMP. TF said that if the assessments are widely erroneous the policies can be revised under SMP3. NW suggested that the text could indicate that the Strategy Study will consider the issue. TE agreed to produce a response for changes to the table document but not the SMP.</p>	
5.8	<p>Item 28 - TE said she could include some information in Appendix B and make reference to the website showing when the EMF and KSG meetings have taken place. GG pointed out that every preferred policy has had a political input. Details of the KSG involvement, public meetings and letter drops can be provided. The information should show job titles rather than names.</p>	
5.9	<p>Item 35 - SB said that the Habitat Regulations figure of 500ha has changed as the figure was based on the unconstrained scenario. Discussions with Natural England to finalise the document are on-going. The question of compensatory habitats is to be taken forward in the Strategy Study.</p>	
5.10	<p>Item 51 - TF said that the role of the SEA has to be national and generic and separate from the SMP. Royal Haskoning will revisit the document and do the three omissions.</p>	
5.11	<p>Item 52 - Royal Haskoning will go through the document and provide clarification. SB said she would also have another look at it.</p>	
5.12	<p>Item 54 - TF pointed out that it was impossible to gauge the economic effects 70 years hence in epoch 3. GG said that Royal Haskoning will insert a short paragraph on management over three epochs.</p>	
5.13	<p>Item 64 - The Action Plan will be included. The second version Action Plan will be added when the CSG's comments are received on the first draft.</p>	
6	<p>Consideration of QRG Comments</p>	
6.1	<p>Item 3 - It was noted that the issue had already been picked up and Royal Haskoning will discuss it with the CCO and add an appropriate statement to</p>	

	the appendix.	
6.2	Item 4 - It was confirmed that the SMP has the remit and will consider the policy beyond 100 years.	
6.3	Item 5 - The issue was considered in considerable detail by the CSG and the spit should be regarded as one morphological unit with a process of managed re-alignment over 3 epochs.	
6.4	Royal Haskoning will produce the responses which DH will circulate. TK pointed out that some comments will require a change to the SMP.	
6.5	Item 9 - The policy of defending landfill sites in Christchurch Harbour and Poole Harbour does not comply with sustainable policies. GG said the starting point for both was 'Hold the Line' while the areas are investigated further. SB said she was happy with this approach.	
6.6	Item 10 - Agreed to review and add text confirming that there is property at risk.	
6.7	Item 11 - Royal Haskoning will clarify the position.	
6.8	Item 12 - Royal Haskoning will review and clarify.	
6.9	Item 13 - GG said he did not feel that there should be any change to the PDZs and will produce a statement and refer the ORG to the existing text.	
6.10	Item 14 - GG said that an appropriate statement can be included in Appendix C about climate change. TK said that the ORG just wanted clarification. SC pointed out that the information is presented in the Christchurch Bay flood assumptions.	
6.11	Item 15 - GG confirmed that every item of information had been included in the analysis.	
6.12	Item 16 - Agreed that clarification will be provided.	
6.13	Item 17 - It is not clear what is required and clarification is to be sought.	
7	Comments from English Heritage	
7.1	VS explained that she had some general and some specific points relating to the data collection. TE said that some were considered at Friday's meeting.	
7.2	VS said that English Heritage were unable to support the response and that it was necessary to get the principles right. National monuments records and other data are missing. Scheduled monuments have been taken account of but listed buildings and archaeology, etc, have not. As a result, English Heritage will be unable to sign off the document until this is addressed. TE pointed out that data was in fact requested approximately 18 months ago.	
7.3	VS said that issues need to be noted now in order to be taken forward in the Action Plan and Strategy Study. The historic environment is finite and not renewable. It therefore needs to be taken throughout and linkages clarified. Because data is missing it did not give the organisation confidence.	

7.4	GG said that the data would be progressed and asked if there were any policies of particular concern.	
7.5	VS said that the policies can be strengthened and that it would be beneficial to meet once the data had been obtained. VS said the policies for Hengistbury Head and Hurst were satisfactory but pointed out that Double Dykes is a scheduled monument and English Heritage legally would have to give their consent.	
7.6	It was noted that managed re-alignment for coastal erosion for archaeological reasons does trigger funding and attract grant aid.	
7.7	GG said that the data issues would be resolved and that they would go through each area to ensure that additional lines are included to strengthen the report and that it will be sent to English Heritage. GG said that it will be necessary to rely on English Heritage if the data gaps are significant. TF pointed out that the mapping for Hampshire can be obtained from the National Monuments records at Swindon.	
7.8	It was noted that the SEA could not be changed but that it should be possible to include any additional information as an addendum. Any policy implications not picked up can be included. The concerns can be captured although the policies are unlikely to change.	
7.9	Two changes were agreed on Page 1.3: i) "to avoid damage to" the historic environment ii) change "where possible" to "where practical"	
7.10	The Theme Report is felt to be satisfactory but slightly inconsistent.	
7.11	TE said that more maps are to go in the Environment Report.	
7.12	VS pointed out that different legends are required to denote whether something was a listed building, etc, as dots on maps are not sufficient for the assessment.	
8	Additional Meetings	
8.1	DH felt that two more meetings would be required and said that he would circulate the draft Cabinet report he had prepared for the Cabinet meeting on 28/04/10.	DH
8.2	It was noted that the document needed to be signed off by two Flood Defence Committees.	
8.3	TE said she would take away the QRG comments and include a technical response for the CSG and track the changes in the SMP document.	
8.4	DH said that at the next CSG meeting every comment will be considered and the agreement reached will form the minutes.	

9	Any Other Business	DH/TE
9.1	DH said that he and TE would take part in a teleconference with Jenny Buffrey and Jim Hutchison of the QRG.	
9.2	NW pointed out that it is necessary to put something in writing to Poole to say that they have missed meetings. It was agreed that whilst the document cannot be changed, their comments will be made available to the Strategy Study.	DH
9.3	In response to a query from SW, it was agreed that the information boards should be taken down as soon as possible.	All op. auth.
9.4	TE said that the content of the Action Plan can be completed by the time of the next meeting.	All to coment
10	Date of Next Meeting	
10.1	The next CSG meeting is to be held at 1.30 pm on Monday 29th March 2010 in 'The Willows' Room at Bournemouth Town Hall . (A buffet lunch will be available at 1.00 pm following the Strategy Study meeting in the morning.)	