

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #05  
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 24<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2009**

**Present:**

Councillor Robert Lawton (RL)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Councillor Eddie Coope (EC)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Lisa Northover (LN)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Carly Earnshaw (CE)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Magda Czwarno (MC)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Fred Neale (FN)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Ray Nottage (RN)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor John Lofts (JL)	Christchurch Borough Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Alex Brenton (AB)	Dorset County Council
Ken Buchan (KB)	Dorset County Council
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency
Tim Kermod (TK)	Environment Agency
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Sue Burton (SB)	Natural England
Councillor Tony Swain (TS)	New Forest District Council
Councillor Fran Carpenter (FC)	New Forest District Council
Councillor Derek Tipp (DT)	New Forest District Council
Edward Gerry (EG)	New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Councillor Peter Adams (PA)	Borough of Poole
Councillor David Gillard (DG)	Borough of Poole
Councillor Ann Stribley (AS)	Borough of Poole
Councillor Nigel Jacobs (NJ)	Borough of Poole
Dave Robson (DR)	Borough of Poole
Councillor Paul Johns (PJ)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Gloria Marsh (GM)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Nick Cake (NC)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Martyn Colvey (MC)	Purbeck District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning

**Apologies:**

Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Mark Anderson (MA)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Basil Ratcliffe (BR)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Allister Russell (AR)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Douglas Spencer (DS)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Mike Duckworth (MD)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Mike Lovell (ML)	Dorset County Council

Item No		Action
1	<b>Introduction</b>	
1.1	Councillor Lawton opened the meeting by outlining the importance of the SMP and drawing attention to the fact that the document would soon be made public.	
1.2	An Elected Member asked about the process of moving from the current position to the next stage.	
2	<b>SMP - Presentation by Royal Haskoning</b>	
2.1	Greg Guthrie (GG) provided a brief introduction to the work being undertaken by Royal Haskoning.	
2.2	Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE) explained that a number of the reports produced to date were available for Elected Members to see on the www.twobays.net website and that comments arising from today's meeting would be taken into account in finalising the documents.	
2.3	TE clarified the next stages of the programme including the stakeholder reviews, public consultation exercise intended for early December and completion of the SMP with its publication in April next year.	
2.4	TE explained that an SMP is produced in partnership with a range of agencies and that the following four options are considered for each of the 20, 50 and 100 year epochs: No Active Intervention; Hold the Line; Managed Realignment; Advance the Line.	
2.5	TE pointed out that Hurst Spit had been looked at as a single entity and the proposed policies developed in conjunction with the North Solent SMP.	
2.6	GG drew attention to the complexity of managing the coastline and said that whilst the SMP is primarily about coastal defence it also supports a number of other interests. The plan aims to deliver policies over three epochs designed to meet various high level generic objectives.	
2.7	GG stressed the importance of Hengistbury Head which provides a fundamental control to both Poole and Christchurch Bays.	
2.8	In reply to a question from an Elected Member about the long groyne, GG confirmed that it would be discussed in more detail later in the meeting and that it was constructed in order to maintain the stability of the beaches.	
2.9	The engineering aspects of the decisions taken on Hengistbury Head were queried and an Elected Member gave an example of the rapid changes that had taken place in a section of the coastline as a consequence of removing structures.	
2.10	Councillor Lawton gave a re-assurance that funding was available from central Government for the replacement of the long groyne and that the work would be undertaken in due course.	
2.11	GG clarified the need for Policy Development Zones (PDZs) in order to break a long coastline down into manageable areas whilst at the same time recognising the interactions between the PDZs.	

3	<p><b><u>Policy Development Zone 1</u></b></p>	
3.1	<p>An Elected Member expressed concern that Barton on Sea had been identified in the document as less important than Milford on Sea.</p>	
3.2	<p>In reply to a query from an Elected Member about sea level rise projections, TE said that these were based on DEFRA guidance.</p>	
3.3	<p>GG said that a Managed Realignment policy with two possible scenarios were proposed for Hurst Spit although moving the line forward would require collaborative funding streams.</p>	
3.4	<p>Peter Ferguson (PF) said that moving the line backwards would also be very expensive to undertake as defences would need to be decommissioned and reconstructed. There is little detail of the cost of implementing either scenario in the economic assessment. PF also pointed out that if the seafront at Milford-on-Sea was realigned landwards it is likely that this would destabilise the proximal end of Hurst Spit.</p>	
3.5	<p>It was noted that a paragraph was required in the report discussing how the three policies recommended for Solent Spit, Hurst Castle and Hurst Spit would work together.</p>	
3.6	<p>An Elected Member drew attention to the folly of permitting a new residential development close to a vulnerable section of the coast.</p>	
3.7	<p>In reply to a question from an Elected Member about whether the report would include figures and the financial arguments for not making a change, GG said that it was possible to include 'ball park' figures but not feasible to provide accurate costings.</p>	
3.8	<p>GG explained that the Naish Bank had been subject to heave and that the structure's integrity had been damaged by the shifting ground. GG said he did not believe it was sustainable to protect the northern section of Naish Bank and that this needed to be recognised. It was necessary to look at how we manage the retreat.</p>	
3.9	<p>An Elected Member asked whether the consultation would give people various options with the arguments for and against. In reply, GG explained that the initial consultation had identified people's interests and that this had fed into the process.</p>	
3.10	<p>GG confirmed that if the wider consultation produced a view contrary to the professional recommendations expressed in the report and funding is found then the SMP would be changed to reflect this.</p>	
3.11	<p>An Elected Member queried whether protection of the coastline was all about sea level rise and as only so much money is available it was a matter of priorities. GG pointed out that the processes of coastal evolution are already occurring and that sea level rise makes matters worse.</p>	
3.12	<p>An Elected Member expressed apprehension about the effect of climate change which he felt had been encouraged by the text but that the text had not spelled out the basic point that the coastline is currently subject to pressure naturally without future sea level rise. GG agreed that too much emphasis could be placed on climate change in this context.</p>	
3.13	<p>An Elected Member was concerned that the Hold the Line (HTL) policy for 2025 for Barton on Sea West could give the impression that the coast is to be protected and that properties would continue to be built. She said that she wished to discuss the policies</p>	

	recommended for Barton on Sea in more detail.	
3.14	GG said that detail would be included in the report to clarify the position but if it was felt that the HTL policy gave the wrong impression, the policy could be changed to one of Managed Realignment.	
3.15	In reply to a query about providing the time constraints, GG said that the document showed the 20, 50 and 100 year projections.	
3.16	Councillor Lawton stressed the need for the operating authorities to work together even though the policies for each area would be different and drew attention to the importance of having a unified approach managed through the respective Communications Teams.	
3.17	An Elected Member suggested that the maps were a good starting point but that there was a need to show the current policies of SMP1. GG agreed that the changes from SMP1 and options for SMP2 needed to be shown.	
3.18	An Elected Member pointed out that most people would not be too interested in a situation 125 years in the future and also questioned the feasibility of such long term predictions which could have the effect of alarming people.	
3.19	GG said that the erosion rates were based on current projections and did not take account of sea level rise. There was a need to look at the short term, 25 year, situation whilst also having a clear plan of the transition to the longer term situation.	
3.20	Neal Watson (NW) said that the SMP was intended to inform decision making and the spatial strategies.	
3.21	Tony Flux (TF) said by providing protection during the first epoch, it buys time for communities to prepare for, and to move to, the new era in which the defences are no longer available. This approach had proved successful with the National Trust.	
3.22	GG confirmed that the SMP would explain the engineering factors behind the decisions taken and in response to a query about the political and democratic processes GG said that the intention was to undertake the stakeholder reviews and seek Cabinet approval before going out to public consultation in late November/early December.	
3.23	Councillor Lawton said that the report would go to the Bournemouth Council Cabinet, and presumably the other authorities' Cabinets, in October or November and following which it would become a public document. The importance of managing the communications aspect would be crucial. Councillor Lawton went on to point out that the report would be a real consultation document and that the views of the public would be given the utmost consideration.	
3.24	Carly Earnshaw (CE) explained the role of the Communications Group which she was leading and which had been established to manage the public consultation exercise. CE queried whether the intention was for consultation or engagement with the public and drew attention to the importance of managing people's expectations. An Elected Member agreed with the view about managing expectations and the importance of effective public relations.	
4	<b><u>Policy Development Zone 2</u></b>	
4.1	GG outlined the justification for maintaining the management of Hengistbury Head in	

	relation to Christchurch Harbour and Poole Bay.	
4.2	An Elected Member queried the long term management of the coastline from the long groyne to Southbourne and in particular the section of coastline in the middle where there was no protection.	
4.3	GT confirmed that there were no plans to introduce more groynes in this area and that there had in fact been no change in the policy of the last 10 years which was for no active intervention. A bid for funding had been made but it had been unsuccessful.	
4.4	In response to a query from an Elected Member about whether Bournemouth Council proposed a different approach from the SMP, Councillor Lawton explained that the SMP concluded that the long groyne should be extended and enhanced. TE confirmed that no decisions would be taken independently.	
4.5	An Elected Member asked if the SMP would become the new policy and enhance the existing policies when each authority adopts it.	
4.6	TE explained that the SMP is not a statutory document but that it is essential in order to secure government funding.	
4.7	The affect of the surf reef on sediment transfer was queried.	
4.8	An Elected Member said that Southbourne East and Double Dykes have been identified by the Hengistbury Head Residents Association as breach points.	
4.9	GG said that some critical decisions needed to be taken in respect of the area at the end of the housing and pointed out that the long groyne should not be seen as a long straight hard structure but should be aligned to re-establish a more natural bay. The SMP recommends changing the length and structure to better protect the sustainability of Solent Beach.	
4.10	An Elected Member pointed out that the bigger and longer the long groyne was made the more sediment would be transported northwards up into Christchurch Bay.	
4.11	An Elected Member said that he had already raised with Royal Haskoning the fact that a problem at Double Dykes, which produces ingress in Christchurch Harbour, would affect salinity of the Harbour and its ecology and that this needed to be mentioned in the report.	
4.12	GG said that the intention is to allow an adaptive system and that the change in salinity would not necessarily be a bad thing if it resulted from natural processes.	
4.13	Sue Burton (SB) said Natural England supported this view as it is part of a natural system and commended the approach taken so far in this respect. It was important that the Communications Teams conveyed the message that the focus of attention should not be on one individual aspect of the proposed policies.	
4.14	An Elected Member expressed concern that increased salinity in Christchurch Harbour could bring increased pollution from landfill sites including mercury and sewage and that simplistic statements about natural processes may not be appropriate in these circumstances.	
4.15	SB explained that Natural England provide advice on the nature conservation aspects and would not be able to object to increased salinity either as an organisation or in relation to their statutory function but agreed that pollutants would need to be	

	investigated.	
4.16	GG clarified in reply to a question from an Elected Member that beach recharge does not occur naturally but that sediment is brought in from another source. Sea level rise would require bigger groynes and more recharge.	
4.17	Councillor Lawton said it was important to demonstrate that we are looking after people's interests by showing both the active intervention position as well as the no active intervention position.	
5	<b><u>Policy Development Zone 3</u></b>	
5.1	GG explained that the PDZ for Poole Harbour could be split into three distinct areas: the open coast, main harbour and upper estuary.	
5.2	In reply to a question from an Elected Member, GG confirmed that Poole Harbour Commissioners were involved in the SMP process.	
5.3	In introducing the afternoon session, Councillor Lawton reiterated the fact that the report would go to Cabinet in October. TE added that the end of September was a key date when the draft report would be given to the Client Steering Group for circulation to the Elected Members Forum.  (Councillor Lawton left the meeting at this point and advised that GT would field any questions in his absence.)  <i>Main Harbour:</i>	
5.4	In reply to a query from Mike Goater, GG said that a no active intervention policy did not preclude local management, such as repairing a wall, provided it did not materially affect the overall policy for the area.	
5.5	An Elected Member pointed out that the Brownsea Island lagoon wall was critical. The view of local fishermen was also queried.	
5.6	Tony Flux said that the cottages could be flooded and that from the National Trust's point of view their protection was unsustainable.	
5.7	GG explained that in this area the issue of long term flooding was more important than wave action and that the local consequences needed to be thought through as well as the interaction of the policies.  <i>Upper Estuary:</i>	
5.8	Richard Edmonds (RE) said that a Pathfinder bid would be made after the SMP and asked if there were cases where it would be appropriate, for example, to relocate a caravan park.	
5.9	RE also pointed out that the risk mapping is suggested as a gradual process whereas the Dorset Council coastline is more likely to be affected by dramatic individual events.	
5.10	GG said that the Arne Peninsula had a no active intervention policy but with a caveat for local management where appropriate and that this would not have a detrimental effect on the Poole Harbour system.	

6	<p><b><u>Policy Development Zone 4</u></b></p>	
6.1	GG clarified the overarching objectives of PDZ4 and explained how the area moved outside of the influence of the two bays to what was a quite different system.	
6.2	An Elected Member, commenting on the beach recharge at Swanage, said that it had produced an excellent amenity but that the fishermen had found it had produced a duning effect after storms and boats had run aground. An Elected Member also pointed out that people’s historical perspective was important.	
6.3	MG questioned the view that beach recharge at Durlston was not possible pointing out that this would depend on the type of material used.	
6.4	GG said that the policy recommended for the northern section was one of no active intervention but that it may be important to retain an element of flexibility.	
6.5	MG asked if it was the intention to include in the document reference to the relocation of facilities and re-designation of SSSI sites where policies of managed realignment and no active intervention are recommended for areas such as Studland.	
7	<p><b>Any Other Business</b></p>	
7.1	In reply to a question from an Elected Member about the movement of the increased sediment caused by erosion, GG presented a diagram and explained the process of sediment transfer. GG said that the collection of data is done very well and the accumulation of information enables models to be calibrated.	
7.2	An Elected Member pointed out that the dredging south west of the Needles for construction was not mentioned in the report’s figures.	
7.3	RE suggested that a lot more information on geomorphology needed to be provided to the public.	
7.4	In reply to a question from an Elected Member on how one SMP’s managed realignment compared with another’s, GG said that there were very specific definitions in the DEFRA guidance on this aspect. TE added that managed realignment was very often associated with a retreat the line policy rather than one of advancing the line.	
7.5	PF made a point relating to the policy of managed realignment, which is proposed for a number of the Policy Units. At present, other than for realigning defences for habitat creation (in flood areas), little guidance exists on how managed realignment should be put into practice (in management terms) along eroding coastlines. It also follows that the SMP review should convey a clear sense of what managed realignment would mean, how it would be managed for each Policy Unit & how this can be presented to the public.	
7.6	In response to a question about the effect of reefs on the shoreline, GG said they take out the energy and cause diffraction but do not change the direction of the waves.	
7.7	In reply to a comment from an Elected Member that the report included no reference to the possibility of tidal back-up, TE pointed out that the joint possibility of river flows and high tides was not looked at.	

8	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
8.1	<p>The following meetings have been scheduled:-</p> <p>Client Steering Group - 1.00 pm 28<sup>th</sup> September 2009 - Bournemouth Learning Centre Client Steering Group - 1.00 pm 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2009 - Bournemouth Learning Centre Client Steering Group - 1.00 pm 7<sup>th</sup> December 2009 - Bournemouth Learning Centre Client Steering Group - 1.00 pm 11<sup>th</sup> January 2010 - Bournemouth Learning Centre Key Stakeholders Group - 6.00 pm 28<sup>th</sup> September 2009 - Bournemouth Town Hall Elected Members Forum - 6.00 pm 11<sup>th</sup> January 2010 - Bournemouth Learning Centre</p>	