

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING #02
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - THURSDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2009**

Present:

D Harlow	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
R Lawton	Bournemouth Borough Council
M Holmes	Bournemouth Borough Council
Chris Saunders	Bournemouth Borough Council
G Tyler	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
S Hills	Bournemouth Borough Council
D Robson	Poole Borough Council
B Ezzard	Purbeck District Council
S Cook	New Forest District Council
A Gill	Environment Agency
S Burton	Natural England
T-L Eggiman	Royal Haskoning
G Guthrie	Royal Haskoning
D J Bird	Alum Chine Residents
L Bourne	PHA
D Chaffey	SAMRA
K Chick	Hamworthy
M Goulding	P&DFA
R Goulding	P&DFA
P Henderson	RSPB
M Hodges	Highcliffe Res Assoc/Christchurch Local History Society
D J Hull	Local Resident
B Hurley	Branksome Residents Association
B Montgomery	Bourne Leisure (Rockley Park)
R Pointer	Branksome Park Residents Association
D Weight	Wessex Surf Club

**Item
No**

Action

1 Introduction

1.1 David Harlow (DH) opened the meeting and drew attention to the Consultation Response Forms which he requested key stakeholders to complete and return so that their views could be taken into account in the SMP.

1.2 Cllr Robert Lawton welcomed everyone and emphasised the importance of their contribution to the development of the Plan. He explained that the SMP sought to establish policies for protecting the coastline over the next 100 years and stressed the legacy of the SMP to future generations. Cllr Lawton outlined the four policies that could be recommended for each section of the coast:-

- Hold the line - maintain or upgrade the level of protection provided by defences.
- Advance the line - build new defences seaward of the existing line.
- Managed realignment - allow retreat or advance of the shoreline, with management to control or limit movement.
- No active intervention - no investment in providing or maintaining defences.

2	<p>Presentation by Royal Haskoning</p> <p>2.1 Greg Guthrie (GG) provided a broad overall summary of SMP2 and explained that it was concerned with managing defence of the coastline and coastal erosion risk.</p> <p>2.2 GG said that a weakness of the previous SMP (SMP1) was that it was too focussed on defence and took insufficient account of the relationship with all the other inter-related factors. An environmental assessment had been undertaken for SMP2 and planning authorities and stakeholders had also been consulted. The timescale had also changed from SMP1 which looked at only a 50-year time span being linked very much to the expected life of the defences.</p> <p>2.3 GG explained that SMP2 had considered where communities wanted to be in a 100 years. Short, medium and long term policies had been developed for 20, 50 and 100 year epochs. The policies were designed to reflect the intent to manage the coastline and the likely impacts. It was also important to be clear about what was valued on the coast. All the policies were underpinned by sustainability factors to avoid building in stresses and presenting future generations with problems.</p> <p>2.4 GG outlined the processes and pressures on the coast and pointed out that the aim was to deliver a plan in which the principles were captured in high level objectives. For the purpose of the SMP2, the coastline had been broken down into manageable units - policy development zones (PDZs) - and the interaction between the various units had been carefully considered. Sea level change predictions had been based on DEFRA guidance.</p> <p>2.5 GG described the characteristics of each PDZ and explained the reasons behind the policy proposals. A significant feature of PDZ1, for example, was the instability of the cliff which made it very difficult to manage the natural processes of the frontage. GG drew attention to the map that had been produced denoting the policies for the three epochs by colour coded lines along the coastline.</p>	
3	<p>Question and Answer Session</p> <p><i>In the general session that followed various views were expressed, comments offered and questions posed. The following summary seeks to capture the essence of the discussion. Questions and comments from Key Stakeholders are preceded by the initial KSG and responses from members of the Client Steering Group are preceded by the initials CSG:</i></p>	
3.1 Q	<p>KSG - An off-shore reef at Hengistbury Head 150 years ago caused a lot of erosion and accelerated long shore drift but reefs can act as very good hard points. Have the important coast protection properties offered by reefs been considered in the SMP?</p>	
A	<p>CSG - The SMP is setting policies on whether or not to protect the coastline not on how this will be carried out. This is for the Strategy Study which will look at ways of holding the line including the use of breakwater reefs.</p>	
3.2 Q	<p>KSG - An advantage of the SMP is that parochial interests do not dominate but there are ways of managing without groynes. It is predicted that sea levels could rise by 3 metres as a result of ocean expansion due to global warming?</p>	

A	CSG - Coastal engineering has many uncertainties but this does not mean that we shouldn't plan. DEFRA guidance has been used in trying to put robustness into the policies.
3.3 Q	KSG - Planning permission in Poole does not allow for a 3 metre sea level rise. Consideration should be given to the installation of a barrage at the entrance to Poole Harbour.
A	CSG - The worst scenarios predict a 7 metre rise. Even at 3 metres such fundamental changes would require national strategic planning. Sea level rises will be closely monitored over the next 10 years and the next SMP can if necessary modify the policies. The SMP is there for guidance and will provide a framework for the planners but is not a statutory document.
3.4 Q	KSG - The inner reaches of Poole Harbour cover a considerable distance and the area is in greatest danger of flooding and should be looked at now.
A	CSG - The Environment Agency (EA) have responsibility for managing flood risk but cannot defend everywhere.
3.5 Q	KSG - The EA are doing some small flood risk schemes but these would not be necessary if a substantial defence was introduced at the entrance to Poole Harbour as previously suggested.
A	CSG - A breach at Sandbanks would have a serious effect on navigation. Installing a barrage would change the beauty of the natural environment. We have a responsibility to protect designated sites. If there were to be a catastrophic rise in sea level, we would need to look at the way we live rather than fighting impossible natural processes in an unsustainable way.
3.6 Q	KSG - The value of Sandbanks is now enormous. Would it be viable to reclaim land in these circumstances?
A	CSG - The cost of defences will outstrip the value of the land and the use of coast protection funds for this purpose may be inappropriate.
3.7 Q	KSG - The beach recharge work already completed has had an effect on sea life covering rocks with sand. When the sediment washes back into the sea it causes the bay to be silted up.
A	CSG - It does not appear to be the beach recharge that is causing this to happen and nothing has been found to suggest that this is the case. This matter is earmarked to be investigated in the Strategy Study. There are good commercial reasons for not using very fine material.
3.8 Q	KSG - Stanpit amenity area is built on a former refuse tip and is vulnerable to erosion and sea level rise which would cause an awful pollution problem.
A	CSG - It is important to investigate the risk of contamination fully although there can be a natural diffusion of contaminates. The next stage of the SMP, which is the action plan, is not yet completed but it would be inappropriate to be forced into protecting an area just because it is a rubbish dump.
3.9 Q	KSG - Whose job is it to carry out the sampling?

A	CSG - It is between the local authority and the EA. The EA is aware of the problem which will be addressed in the Strategy Study. There is a lot of expertise within the EA to investigate and respond to this problem.
3.10 Q	KSG - Isn't DEFRA involved with this problem?
A	CSG - The local authority is responsible for coast protection and the EA is responsible for both coastal and fluvial flooding. DEFRA sits above both organisations and allocates funds nationally, via the EA, based on the effectiveness of the SMP's policies.
3.11 Q	KSG - What is the policy of advance the line?
A	CSG - Typically it is the reclaiming of land and could be environmentally benign.
3.12 Q	KSG - What will be the effect on the section of the coast at Barton denoted with a green line on the policy summary map indicating no active intervention?
A	CSG - It will mean that some of the golf course area will be lost.
3.13 Q	KSG - How do you reconcile the two policies shown for Christchurch Harbour on the map with a red line behind a blue line?
A	CSG - They represent different epochs. The policies allow the private defences that are there at present to work with intervention later with more substantial flood defences when the wider community starts to be affected. The cost benefit ratio needs to be considered hence the significance of the wider community aspect.
3.14 Q	KSG - There could be conflict between the two regions with Hampshire not having previously defended its coastline?
A	CSG - The money is part of a national fund and discussions take place between the two County Councils and the two EA regions. The SMP should prevent any conflict in the adopted policies of neighbouring authorities.
3.15 Q	KSG - When describing beach renourishment it is important to define whether fine sand or shingle is used.
A	CSG - Bournemouth beach has been renourished with a sand and shingle mixture which matches the native beach. There is no indication that the particle size of the beach has changed since 1974.
4	Close
4.1	DH thanked both Greg Guthrie for his very interesting presentation and the key stakeholders for their questions and comments which were extremely helpful in informing the SMP.
4.2	DH reminded everyone of the series of roadshows being held the following week and outlined the remainder of the programme leading up to the adoption of the SMP in February 2010.