

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #08
BOURNEMOUTH CENTRAL LIBRARY - MONDAY 5TH JULY 2010**

Present:

Councillor Robert Lawton (RL)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Councillor Fran Carpenter (FC)	New Forest District Council
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Dave Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency
Nick Reed (NR)	Environment Agency
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council

Apologies:

Councillor Mike Duckworth (MD)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Andrew Starr (AS)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Peter Adams (PA)	Poole Borough Council
Stuart Terry (ST)	Poole Borough Council
Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council

Item No	Action
1.	Minutes of the Last Meeting
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting on 29 th March 2010 were approved with the change of the next meeting date from 7 th June to 5 th July 2010.
2.	Action Items Arising from the last Meeting on 29th March 2010
2.1	2.2 It was noted that a reply had been sent to the letter from Chris Chope MP.
2.2	6.5 It was confirmed that the necessary action had been taken concerning the Strategy Study.
3	Matters Arising Since 29th March 2010
3.1	DH explained that Version 1 of the SMP had been used for the public consultation and Version 2 had been used for the teleconference with the National Quality Review Group. Version 3 had been submitted to the NQRG on 23/06/10 but this was still not the final layout.

3.2	DH had spoken to Jim Hutchinson of the Environment Agency who thought that only a very few points were still to be resolved and that there would be no changes to the SMP itself. There was a need for a clear audit trail and for robust information to be provided. DH said it was important to progress the SMP and to complete the work as quickly as possible.	
3.3	DH said that he would be attending the Wessex RFDC meeting on 12/07/10 and that Bournemouth's Cllr Wakefield would also be attending.	
3.4	DH confirmed that the SMP had been considered by the Bournemouth Cabinet which had agreed that the document could go to full Council on 27/07/10.	
3.5	It was considered helpful that Bournemouth as lead authority would shortly be adopting the SMP. However, owing to the Committee programmes of the other operating authorities, it was unlikely they would be in a position to adopt the SMP before September. RL said it was important for the SMP to be adopted as soon as possible and we should therefore be aiming for completion in September.	
3.6	NW said that the local authorities should book a slot in their Cabinet programme in anticipation of Environment Agency approval.	
3.7	RE asked if a letter of support was required from the bodies not directly involved in the SMP.	
3.8	TK suggested that a signed sheet is likely to be necessary recording the appropriate committee minute to confirm that the SMP has been adopted by the local authority concerned. NW said he would put the suggestion forward.	NW
4	Strategy Study	
4.1	The Strategy Study technical team had visited the area on 06/07/10 and 15/07/10 and Cllr Lawton had written to Fiona Geddes of the Environment Agency about the lack of Elected Member representation.	
4.2	It was noted that the visits were technical fact-finding events and were not appropriate for Elected Members. RL stressed however the importance of Elected Members attending the forthcoming Strategy Study meeting and said he would email all the Members concerned, or their deputies, to remind them about the meeting. RL said that officers should also remind their Elected Members of the importance of their being actively involved.	All
4.3	In discussing the scope of the draft collaborative agreement, NW said there were a number of issues. The intention was for it to be a partnership and this needed to be emphasised at the meeting. It was important that the current momentum is not lost.	
4.4	MG said that as the Strategy Study was 100% funded by the Environment Agency less importance would be given to the democratic input.	
4.5	DH pointed out that coast protection schemes with a low benefit/cost ratio may not attract 100% government funding in future and may therefore require a contribution from the local authority.	

5	National Coast Erosion Risk Mapping Update	
5.1	NR provided an update on the National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping (NCERM) and said it was important for Elected Members to be advised of the current position. 'Making Space for Water' had widened the publicity available on the risk and probability of flooding.	
5.2	NR said that the scope of the NCERM is to display the direct risk to properties. The NCERM is based on the best available science and data from SMPs and local authorities. A nationally consistent approach has been adopted and the RACE methodology used.	
5.3	NR explained that when the SMP has been finalised, the NCERM will be published but will not be shown as lines on maps. An interactive web tool will be used with the information being presented through pop up boxes. The first information will go live in September but the format has to be agreed with the Minister before it is released.	
5.4	RL said it would be helpful to have a NCERM presentation to Bournemouth Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Panel.	
5.5	In response to a query from FC, NR explained that the pop up box will appear when the cursor is placed on the area. The box will contain the SMP policy and the erosion rates based on that policy. Local Authorities will get a professional version of the data.	
5.6	TF was concerned that the insurance companies and mortgage companies would soon acquire the professional version and felt that the implications had not been properly thought through. There is a need to be ahead of what insurance companies will be asking us.	
5.7	Concern was expressed about the fact that the information will be presented through pop up boxes whereas the SMP has lines on maps. It was also pointed out that whilst the EA have customer advice lines, enquiries from the public will have to be dealt with locally. RE said that it would be clearer to have both text and lines. NR said that there had been a great deal of user testing on the proposed format.	
5.8	TF commented that average erosion rates were meaningless as erosion is affected by catastrophic events. NR confirmed that the model is plugged into climate change.	
5.9	It was queried whether there was a need for local authorities to contact people whose properties were at risk in the first epoch.	
5.10	FC said there was a requirement to be open about the information and honest about worst case scenarios.	
5.11	PF said it was necessary to have contact with individuals in order to give balanced and informed advice.	
5.12	MG said that PPS25 sets out the planning perspective which town planners will have to take into account. NR said that planners will have detailed information on GIS layers.	

5.13	<p>In summing up, RL said that the NCERM had generated a lot of discussion and that once ministerial approval has been received it was important that NR provided a future presentation on the project.</p>	
6	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
6.1	<p>There was no other business.</p>	
7	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p>	
7.1	<p>To be advised.</p>	