

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #03  
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 18<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2009**

**Present:**

Councillor Mark Anderson (MA)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Councillor Fran Carpenter (FC)	New Forest District Council
Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Mike Duckworth (MD)	Christchurch Borough Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Justin Ridgewell (JR)	Royal Haskoning

**Apologies:**

Councillor Peter Adams	Poole Borough Council
Councillor Andrew Starr	Purbeck District Council

Item No	Action
---------	--------

1	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting</b>	
1.1	The minutes of the last meeting on 16 <sup>th</sup> March 2009 were agreed.	
2	<b>Actions Arising from Previous Meeting</b>	
2.1	Item 5.3 - Documents are now being emailed to elected members 7 days before being put on to the website.	
2.2	Item 6.2 - It had been agreed not to shorten the 60-day public consultation period.	
3	<b>Dates and Times of Future EMF Meetings</b>	
3.1	MA had asked for an item to be added to the agenda concerning the timing of the EMF meetings in relation to the CSG meetings. MA felt that it would be helpful to have the meetings on different days to allow sufficient time for officers to brief their elected members beforehand. There was concern however about possible slippage in the timetable if the meetings programme was altered and it was agreed therefore to keep to the existing schedule.	
3.2	MA queried the date of the next meeting on 24 <sup>th</sup> August 2009 because it fell within the summer holiday period.	
3.3	It was noted that the draft of the final report is expected to be ready for stakeholder review on 14 August and for public consultation on 28 September.	

4	<b>Document Status</b>	
4.1	TE confirmed that the Estuaries Report had been published as well as the Coastal Processes and Geomorphology report. The Strategic Environmental Assessment report had been on the website for five weeks. Version 2 of the Hengistbury Head report is to be ready by the end of the week for officers to consider and forward to elected members. The theme review will be placed on the website as soon as one or two issues have been resolved. TE will email elected members when it is ready to go on.	TE
4.2	It was noted that a new programme for the SMP had been issued and that Royal Haskoning are still intending to deliver the final document by March 2010. Time has been built into the programme to enable elected members to see the draft document before it goes into the public domain and to allow for any extra work that may be required before publication.	
4.3	DH said that approval to go out to public consultation would be sought from elected members in mid-August but stressed that this would not be approval for the document itself.	
4.4	TE suggested a half-day workshop be held for elected members at the end of June to highlight areas of contention, etc. The CSG will run the meeting which will be hosted by Royal Haskoning. The afternoon of 22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2009 was proposed for the workshop - commencing at 1.00 p.m. This would follow the CSG meeting which would be moved to the morning of 22 <sup>nd</sup> June with a new starting time of 9.30 a.m. The date and venue for the workshop to be confirmed by email.	DH
5	<b>High Level Objectives and Policy Development Zones</b>	
5.1	GG explained that the SMP1 looked forward 50 years - about the time a structure would survive - whereas SMP2 required an assessment over a 100 year period. The task of capturing the individual objectives was very difficult given the multitude of issues identified and the range of aspirations for the area. It is impossible to consider the whole frontage in its entirety and it is necessary therefore to break it down into manageable units. Policy Development Zones (PDZs) had been created as a result in order to develop the policies. Following the discussion at the afternoons CSG meeting, it had been agreed that the boundaries should not be considered as hard lines but that there should be linkages between the zones and consideration given to their inter-action.	
5.2	It was important to establish why a particular feature should be managed. In PDZ1 the objective would be to deliver the value of the saltmarsh and access to Hurst Castle. At Hengistbury Head, erosion with no intervention would be unacceptable therefore some sort of control would be required.	
5.3	MD queried the relationship with the Solent SMP and MA pointed to the historical and geological value of Double Dykes.	
5.4	AB drew attention to the need to capture high level objectives as well as identifying hotspots to focus people's attention.	

5.7	<p>MD said that they had just received the results of the flood risk undertaken by Halcrow. This suggested that Christchurch Harbour was facing fluvial and tidal risk and that, whilst the current defences are good, some sort of hard engineering is likely to be required in 20 years.</p>	
5.8	<p>MD also pointed out that unbuilt properties could be blighted in planning terms until 2026 and queried the different time horizon. MG said that it probably resulted from Planning Policy Statement 25. GG said that Royal Haskoning would be looking at this.</p>	
5.9	<p>In response to a query from MA, GG confirmed that Hengistbury Head is currently being protected by the long groyne and pointed out that the Barton coastline is very important for its natural geology. GG explained that Government policy is to protect internationally recognised sites through natural processes. A sustainable coastline is a key driver and the consequences of no active intervention will be carefully considered.</p>	
5.10	<p>FC asked how the economic value of different areas is to be assessed and also how planning policy would be affected by the SMP. GG said that the Regional Spatial Strategy will have to include the SMP as material evidence and AB pointed out that it is necessary to involve the planners in order to inform the Local Development Framework.</p>	
5.11	<p>In reply to a question from MD, it was confirmed that the SMP will extend to the tidal limit of the rivers and that there will be an overlap between the flood plans and the SMP.</p>	
5.12	<p>DH distributed South Devon's consultation leaflet and asked if something similar should be produced. TE was of the view that a smaller less wordy version would be more appropriate. GG pointed out that most people will want to know that the SMP is being prepared and what effect it will have on them presented through simple non-technical summaries. TE said that the Communications Sub-Group will have to decide if and how best to publicise the PDZ concept.</p>	
6	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	
6.1	<p>There was no other business.</p>	
7	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	
7.1	<p>The next meeting of the EMF will take place at 6.00 pm on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2009 and the workshop will be held at 1.00 pm on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2009.</p>	
8	<p><b>Post Meeting Note</b></p>	
8.1	<p>The Members workshop on 22<sup>nd</sup> June will be held in the main meeting room on the second floor of Bournemouth Central Library.</p>	