

## Appendix A SMP Development



## Contents

The Supporting Appendices .....	1
A1 Introduction .....	3
A1.1 What is the Shoreline Management Plan? .....	3
A1.2 Background to the Poole & Christchurch Bays (Sub-cell 5f ) SMP .....	3
A1.3 The SMP Review .....	3
A2 Project Information .....	4
A2.1 SMP Background .....	4
A2.1 Client Steering Group .....	4
A2.3 The Consultant.....	5
A3 SMP Programme.....	6
A4 Stage 1: SMP Scope.....	7
A4.1 SMP Boundaries .....	7
A4.2 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.....	7
A4.3 Data Collection .....	8
A5 Stage 2: Assessments to Support Policy Development .....	9
A5.1 Baseline Understanding of Coastal Behaviour and Dynamics.....	9
A5.2 Baseline Scenarios .....	9
A5.3 Definition of Features, Benefits and Issues .....	10
A5.5 Definition of Objectives .....	10
A5.6 Identification of Flood and Erosion Risks .....	11
A5.5 Assessment of Objectives.....	11
A5.6 Characterisation of the Coast.....	12
A5.7. Mapping .....	12
A6 Stage 3: Policy Development.....	13
A6.1 Definition of Policy Scenarios .....	13
A6.2 Policy Scenario Assessment .....	13
A7 Stage 4: Public Examination.....	14
A8 Stage 5: Finalise Plan .....	14



## **The Supporting Appendices**

This appendix and the accompanying appendices provide the supporting documentation for the Shoreline Management Plan. These documents illustrate the process undertaken in development of the final management policies and are included to ensure that there is clarity and transparency in this process. The appendices include:

### **Appendix A – SMP Development**

This reports the history of development of the SMP, describing more fully the plan and policy decision-making process.

### **Appendix B – Stakeholder Engagement**

This outlines the various stages of stakeholder involvement in the SMP process and summarises the findings of the stakeholder consultation at each stage.

### **Appendix C – Baseline Process Understanding**

Includes baseline processes report, defence assessment and explanation of how sea level rise and climate change have been accommodated within these assessments.

### **Appendix D – Natural and Built Environment Baseline**

This report identifies and evaluates the environmental features (human, natural, historical and landscape).

### **Appendix E – Issues and Objective Evaluation**

This provides the table of issues and objectives identified through the consultation process and describes how these were used in developing the SMP.

### **Appendix F – Strategic Environmental Assessment**

Provides a systematic appraisal of the potential environmental consequences of high-level decision-making.

### **Appendix G – Scenario Testing**

Presents the results of the No Active Intervention scenario and the Preferred Plan in terms of achievement of objectives.

### **Appendix H – Economic Appraisal**

Presents the economic analysis undertaken in support of the preferred plan.

### **Appendix I – Estuary Assessment**

This provides the Estuary Assessment prepared by ABP Marine Environment Research Ltd (ABPmer) to determine the need (or otherwise) for the inclusion of the estuaries in the study area within the SMP process.

### **Appendix J – Appropriate Assessment**

The appendix sets out the findings of the Appropriate Assessment of the Plan.

### **Appendix K – Metadatabase and Bibliographic database**

All supporting information used to develop the SMP is referenced for future examination and retrieval. This information is also provided as layers within a GIS.

### **Appendix L - Water Framework Directive (WFD)**

Presents the Water Framework Directive assessment as developed by the Environment Agency with respect to the SMP2 policies.

**Appendix M - Review of Coastal Processes and Associated Risks at Hengistbury Head**

**Appendix N – Client Steering Group Approvals**

## A1 Introduction

This appendix provides a full explanation of the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) process adopted and description of the policy decision-making process and outlines the chronology of the SMP development.

### A1.1 What is the Shoreline Management Plan?

A Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) provides a large-scale assessment of the coastline, including the risks to the developed, historic and natural environment associated with coastal evolution. This presents a policy framework to address these risks in a sustainable manner.

The SMP is a non-statutory, policy document for coastal defence management planning. It takes account of other existing planning initiatives and legislative requirements, and is intended to inform wider strategic planning. It is important to note that it does not set policy for anything other than coastal defence management. However, from this perspective, it aims to provide the context to, and consequence of management decisions in other sectors of coastal management.

### A1.2 Background to the Poole & Christchurch Bays (Sub-cell 5f ) SMP

The coastline between the Hurst Spit and Durlston Head was previously assessed by Halcrow, during the first review of SMP's in 1999. Based upon the guidance at the time, policies were defined for a 50 year period.

### A1.3 The SMP Review

Recognising the need for review of the existing SMP policies, the leading Hampshire and Dorset authorities formed a Client Steering Group (CSG) comprising representatives from the six operating authorities (voting members) and five associate partners (non-voting members). The operating authorities include; Bournemouth Borough Council (BBC, Lead Authority), New Forest District Council (NFDC), Christchurch Borough Council (CBC), Borough of Poole (BoP), Purbeck District Council (PDC) and the Environment Agency. The associate partners include Natural England (NE), National Trust (NT), Dorset County Council (DCC), Hampshire County Council (HCC) and Poole Harbour Commissioners (PHC). In addition to the above organizations, English Heritage (EH) has also contributed through the CSG. This CSG commissioned consulting engineers Royal Haskoning to revise the SMP for the Sub-cell 5f. The review was commissioned to take account of:

- Coastal strategies and studies undertaken since the previous SMP;
- Revisions to the Defra Procedural Guidance for SMPs (including the need to define policy for 20, 50 and 100 year timeframes); and
- Changes in legislation such as the Water Framework Directive and the Habitats Directive.

## A2 Project Information

### A2.1 SMP Background

This SMP is an update of the SMP1 originally produced by Halcrow. The plan has been developed and produced in accordance with the latest Procedural Guidance (PG) for the production of SMPs (Defra).

### A2.1 Client Steering Group

The coastline covered by this plan comes within the boundaries of five local authorities. They and the Environment Agency have certain permissive powers for defending the coast. The local authorities generally deal with defences that protect the coast from erosion by the sea and the Environment Agency deal with flood risk management. Together they are required to produce an SMP for sustainable coastal defence management. This is achieved through the SMP CSG comprising representatives from the five local authorities, the Environment Agency and other key bodies. The key bodies included Natural England, who provide guidance on nature conservation, National Trust and English Heritage, who provide guidance on heritage issues, and Defra, together with the Environment Agency, have overall policy responsibility for flood and coastal risk in England including producing guidance and grant aid funding of the SMP.

The SMP was procured and lead by Bournemouth Borough Council and the following representatives made up the core members of the CSG:

Name	Representing
Dr David Harlow	<b>Bournemouth Borough Council</b>
Tara-Leigh Eggiman Gregor Guthie Hamish Hall Justin Ridgewell	<b>Royal Haskoning</b>
Steve Cook Peter Ferguson Professor Andrew Bradbury	<b>New Forest District Council</b>
Steve Woolard	<b>Christchurch Borough Council</b>
Dave Robson	<b>Borough of Poole</b>
Mike Goater	<b>Purbeck District Council</b>
Andrew Ramsbottom	<b>Poole Harbour Commissioners</b>
Neil Watson Andrew Gill Carolita Wilson	<b>Environment Agency</b>
Richard Edmonds	<b>Dorset County Council</b>
Tony Flux	<b>National Trust</b>
Richard Caldow Dr Sue Burton	<b>Natural England</b>
Rachel Gallagher	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>


It was agreed that Bournemouth Borough Council (BBC) would be the lead authority on behalf of the Client Steering Group (CSG) and as such were responsible for the financial management of the project, including grant aid submission and overall project administration. It was also agreed that BBC would take on the responsibility of coordination of consultation activities. The CSG had overall responsibility for the delivery of the SMP and were involved throughout the development of the plan through review



and guidance of work undertaken. The group will also oversee implementation of the SMP.


### A2.3 The Consultant

Royal Haskoning was commissioned by BBC to undertake the preparation of the SMP. Royal Haskoning's team structure is set out below. There was a core team of two to ensure continuity and coherence throughout the project. Around this team, and incorporating as appropriate the specific skills of this core team, is the project management team, the review group and specialist groups.



### A3 SMP Programme

The following figure illustrates the different stages of the SMP process and indicates in bold where stakeholder consultation and contribution occurs.



## **A4 Stage 1: SMP Scope**

### **A4.1 SMP Boundaries**

This SMP relates to Sub-cell 5f covering the Dorset and Hampshire coast on the south coast of England, from Hurst Spit to Durlston Head.

### **A4.2 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy**

The stakeholder engagement for the SMP was coordinated by the lead authority Bournemouth Borough Council (BBC). The stakeholder group comprised representatives from groups with local, regional and national interest in addition to site specific interests. Such a group was selected to try to achieve a 'holistic' consultation approach, taking consideration of all interests in the coast:

Stakeholder representatives included:

- County Councils
- Town Councils
- Parish/Ward Councils
- Residential Interest Groups
- Commercial interests eg. Poole Harbour Commissioners
- Conservation bodies eg. National Trust
- Recreational groups
- Cultural and historic interest groups eg. English Heritage

The first generation of SMPs identified most of the key stakeholders and these were collated into a database of names, organisations, positions and contact details.

Stakeholders were then invited to the first round of consultation which was held in 2008, to obtain the features that key stakeholders regarded as valuable assets to the Dorset and Hampshire coast.

Two public seminars were held in February 2009, an afternoon session in Mudeford, Christchurch and an evening session in Poole. These were well attended and raised awareness of the SMP as well as encouraging members of the local communities to register as key stakeholders.

The second stakeholder consultation meeting was held in March 2009 to ensure that the CSG had captured the key features from the first consultation period. Questionnaire responses and comments made during consultation were collated and recorded within a database.

Throughout the SMP process the webpage [www.twobays.net](http://www.twobays.net) has been established. All documents have been posted on this webpage with feedback forms (see below) for all members of the public to provide comments.

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review								
Document Title:		Appendix A - SMP Development		Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:		
<b>General Comments:</b>				Reviewer:		Organisation:		
Comments								
Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	RH Response	Name	Date

### A4.3 Data Collection

Data collection was undertaken by Royal Haskoning. Data was collected from a variety of sources including stakeholders, local authorities, literature searches and web searches.

Key data sources included:

- Data from existing SMPs
- Sediment Transport Study (SCOPAC, 2004)
- Future Coast

Base data:

- OS data

Defence data:

- Coastal Protection Survey
- Strategy Studies
- National Flood and Coastal Defence Database

Thematic data:

- Natural England
- English Heritage
- Nature Conservation Designation information
- Historic Environment Records
- Studies/reports
- Site visits
- LGA Local Plans

Local and regionally specific data:

- Strategy Studies
- LGA Local Plans
- Stakeholder questionnaires and supporting information
- Technical reports

All of the data used in developing the SMP is referenced and recorded in the bibliographic database in Appendix K.

## A5 Stage 2: Assessments to Support Policy Development

### A5.1 Baseline Understanding of Coastal Behaviour and Dynamics

#### (a) Assessment of coastal processes and evolution

A desktop baseline review of coastal processes was produced using existing data (refer Appendix C). The baseline review includes statements on sediment sources, transport and sinks control and hydrodynamic interactions, shoreline movement and predictions of shoreline evolution. It underpins coastal process understanding of the study area and is the basis for the development of the baseline scenarios.

#### (b) Assessment of coastal defences

Coastal defence data was collated from the National Flood and Coastal Defence Database and updated where data from more recent Coastal Strategy studies and inspections were available (refer Appendix K).

### A5.2 Baseline Scenarios

To assist in the development of future policy, future coastal response was assessed, assuming the following two baseline scenarios:

- 'No Active Intervention' (NAI) for which it is assumed that existing defences are no longer maintained and will deteriorate and fail with time or undefended frontages will evolve naturally; and
- 'With Present Management' (WPM) for which it is assumed that defences are maintained to provide a similar level of protection and defence to that currently provided. These assessments provide an understanding of the influence of defences on coastal behaviour and evolution.

These findings of the baseline scenarios were developed from the baseline processes report and the defence data. In addition, key references included Futurecoast, strategy studies, coastal protection survey and the existing SMP.

- The study frontage was divided into a number of areas, based on coastal processes and shoreline position was estimated for the three epochs of 20, 50 and 100 years (taking sea level rise into account).
- The predicted shoreline positions for the three epochs were mapped on GIS.
- Summary statements were produced for both 'No Active Intervention' and 'With Present Management' outlining the estimated erosion rates and the residual life of the defences that the estimated shoreline position was based upon. The summary statements are connected to the GIS mapping via the database system.
- The mapped shoreline positions show the estimated maximum extent of change and are a combination of evidence from monitoring or comparison of historical maps together with geomorphological interpretation.

### **A5.3 Definition of Features, Benefits and Issues**

#### **(a) Natural and Built Environment Baseline (Theme Review)**

In the first instance, many of the important features along the coastline were identified during the theme review. The theme review involved drawing information from the existing SMP and the newly procured data regarding the following themes:

- Landscape and nature conservation;
- Historic environment; and
- Current and future land use.

The full Natural and Built Environment Baseline is included in Appendix D.

From this baseline, features of historical, cultural, recreational and environmental value were identified and mapped on GIS. For the purposes of the SMP a feature was defined as:

*Something tangible that provides a service to society or benefits society by its existence.*

It was essential to first identify the features on the coast in order to be able to then identify the 'issues' or concerns relating to these features and subsequently develop 'objectives' or what we are aiming to achieve or support through the development of shoreline management policies.

#### **(b) Stakeholder Consultation**

The first round of stakeholder consultation was utilised to not only inform the stakeholders of the what the SMP process entailed, but also to find out from them what 'features' they valued on the coast and any 'issues' or concerns they had. This was undertaken by handing out and collecting responses to a question sheet at the consultation meetings (refer Appendix B).

#### **(c) Issues Table**

From the theme review and the stakeholder consultation, the Issues Table was developed (refer Appendix E). The Issues Table outlined the following elements:

- Location
- Feature
- Issues associated with feature
- Is it a flood and coastal defence issue?
- Does this issue affect policy?

The Issues Table was issued to the CSG, KSG, EMF and open public for review.

### **A5.5 Definition of Objectives**

The next stage was to use the features, issues and benefits identified to define objectives within the context of the characterisation of the coast. The objectives were aimed to state simply and succinctly what we aimed to achieve with regard to each feature through the coastal defence management policies.

Further consultation with English Heritage and planning officers from Local Authorities was undertaken in determining the objectives to ensure that the SMP objectives were consistent with other planning documents and aspirations for the coast.

Objectives are used in two ways within the development of the SMP; first to guide the selection of policy options (the reasons for management), the second at the end of the process to assess the degree to which any SMP policy scenario delivers aim of the SMP.

#### **A5.6 Identification of Flood and Erosion Risks**

The mapping of predicted shoreline change for the 'No Active Intervention' scenario along with the Environment Agency's IFM data, was used as a baseline against which features at risk, from coastal flooding and erosion, were identified. This approach highlighted what features were potentially at risk in 0-20 years, 20-50 years and 50-100 years.

#### **A5.5 Assessment of Objectives**

To gain further appreciation of the priority level of the objectives generated, six fundamental questions were addressed:

- What are the Benefits? / Why is the issue important?
- Scale of importance? Local, regional, national or international.
- Who are the beneficiaries?
- What could affect the features value /sustainability? What threats are there?
- Is there enough of this benefit? The scarcity of the benefit at the scale at which it is important.
- Is there potential for substitution of the benefit?

The answers to these questions were determined from the theme review and were taken back to the Stakeholders in the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of consultation for review, discussion and confirmation.

While it is clearly possible to prioritise objectives in certain ways within themes, such as in the effective hierarchy defined by international, national or local environmentally designated site, due to the nature of the coast; its relatively distinct nature, such a crude reflection of priority was not fully helpful. Such an approach, it was felt would not give due weight to the often quite local issues on the coast.

Such weighting was also found to be difficult in assessing objectives across themes.

*"i.e. one town can be compared to another town, but the importance of a town can not be directly compared to that of a designated conservation site."*

In many ways, such a strict approach could engender conflict rather than attempt to resolve issues to mutual benefit. This was discussed with the Project Group and it was agreed that there was this close interaction between themes. For example, natural eroding cliffs provide sources of sediment to the coastal system and maintain geological exposures. However, if properties, business or listed structures are at risk from such erosion, a conflict between two themes may arise. To address this the development of policy needed to be taken from a very holistic attitude; one that could only really be achieved through considering an area's values and aims in a complete way, before examining how different policies might be applied to deliver that overall value. This also implied that consideration of policy needed to be taken to a relatively high level of detail. At the same time it was essential that the overall broader picture was maintained.

### **A5.6 Characterisation of the Coast**

An important step in this development was to gain an appreciation of the overall character of different areas of the coast. This would then set the broad context or overarching principles within which more specific objectives for coastal defence management could be sensibly developed and considered. A characterisation of the coast was, therefore, prepared on the basis of local planning documents, the theme review, discussions with RMF members and the consultation responses. The characterisation of the coast comprised a general description and derivation of key values for an area. In addition, the key environmental designations were identified, together with an initial identification of features at risk based on a policy of no further intervention. A brief assessment was also considered as to the degree to which the coast wishes to change; the inherent pressure any intervention on the coast would bring about. The characterisation was reviewed by the project partners and commented upon during the consultation period. Refer Appendix D for the Characterisation of the Coast.

### **A5.7. Mapping**

Figures produced in the SMP2 are derived from mapping within the GIS. Current mapping available to the study partners was provided in 2009. Some areas of baseline maps may have been updated since that time, during the preparation of the SMP2.

The GIS presents data at different scales of mapping, appropriate to the scale being viewed. However, for consistency all mapping of information has been carried out based on the 1:10,000 baseline maps.



## **A6 Stage 3: Policy Development**

### **A6.1 Definition of Policy Scenarios**

In developing policy, a nested approach was taken, maintaining the overview, while still addressing usefully the more local issues in setting policy. The approach looked to define overarching aims, in part from the characterisation, over certain sections of the coast through which more detailed policies may be developed for shorter sections of the coast.

The two baseline scenarios of no active intervention and that of present management were used to explore where specific issues and objectives were not being addressed. This consideration being undertaken at a relatively high level within relatively long sections of the coast (called for convenience Policy Development Zones).

From this initial analysis primary drivers or controls were identified; where evident, and the basic interactions established. In many cases this then allowed quite obvious policies to be derived. However, where this was less clear, specific alternative scenarios were considered often at a more detailed level. Consideration of these scenarios has then been argued such that a preferred approach to management of the coast emerged. From this individual policy units were then defined.

The approach applies the basic principles set out in the Guidance:

- The process is clearly objective led.
- That the definition of policy and policy units is taken at the end of the analysis process, not predefining units at the start.
- That distinction is made relevant to each specific area of the coast as to prioritising objectives and that an initial screening process was undertaken at a high level to ensure essential objectives were considered initially.
- That, while able to consider the detailed issues important to direct coastal management, the broader picture of how the coast functions was maintained.

### **A6.2 Policy Scenario Assessment**

The final stage of the policy development was a detailed assessment of the policies in relation to the individual objectives. In association with this, economic data was obtained using the MDSF system and this together with information from various strategy studies was assessed to consider the economic cost effectiveness of the preferred policies.

The whole process maintains the broader awareness of how the coast as a whole is behaving and how policy may be used to develop a sustainable shoreline management in the future.

## **A7 Stage 4: Public Examination**

Following the preparation and initial agreement to the Draft SMP2, the public consultation process will commence on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009 for a period of 3 months, ending on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2010.

The draft plan together with supporting information will be established on the SMP2 website.

All stakeholders will be notified of the consultation process and, following notices in the local press, meetings will be held to allow discussion of the plan. Presentations of the draft plan will be given at the following locations.

Christchurch Borough Council, 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009  
New Forest District Council, 1<sup>st</sup> December 2009  
Bournemouth Borough Council, December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2009  
Purbeck District Council, December 3<sup>rd</sup> 2009  
Borough of Poole, December 4<sup>th</sup> 2009

Responses will be collated at these road shows and during the consultation period.

The consultation report will form part of Appendix B.

## **A8 Stage 5: Finalise Plan**

The issues raised through the consultation on the Draft SMP2 are to be identified in the consultation report. These issues and further information will be assessed and revisions made. These revisions will be identified in the consultation report to be included in Appendix B.

With these amendments made, the SMP2 will be finalised in agreement with the CSG. A final dissemination of the findings of the plan is to be undertaken and the SMP2 will be taken forward to each Council for adoption.