

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review



Document Title:	Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report	Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:	
-----------------	---	--------------	--------	--------------------	--

General Comments:	Reviewer:	All
Comments:- 1. Need to protect high value intensively occupied properties near coast and flood plains of rivers (Stour, Avon, Mude, Bure, Chew) 2. Particular risks are : Hengistbury Head becoming an island, breach of Mudeford Sandspit, erosion of Stanpit Marsh; so that sea can directly attack: Christchurch Harbour, Stanpit, Mudeford Haven, Christchurch quay (Place Mill scheduled ancient building). 3. Danger of rubbish tip under Stanpit Recreation ground being affected by sea level and consequent health dangers. 4. Danger from hydrological effects of gravel extraction e.g River Mude effected by Roeshot in Hants & Dorset with consequences in Christchurch Harbour (tidal). 5. Risks of further erosion at Chewton Bunny and at Naish and Barton-on-Sea		
Organisation:		

Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	SC Response	Name	Date
Mr Hodges - Highcliffe Residents Association								
1	1.1.1	10	Include reference to economy & tourism protection			Needed?		
5	2.1.1	4	as between Highcliffe (Christchurch) & Chewton (New Forest)			Noted. Change not required.		
5	2.1.5	9	Advance defences at Hengistbury & Naish			Will be determined in policy setting. This table is purely a description of the different policy options.		
6	2.2.3	3	Correct name of Walkford Brook is River Chew			Change spelling of Beckton to Becton. Becton Bunny and Walkford Brook discharge into Christchurch Bay not harbour. Need to ensure consistency over names, Walkford Brook is also known as Chewton Bunny, change references to Chewton Bunny (walkford Brook). River Chew is in Somerset.		
6	2.2.3	4	Original name of Bure Stream is Hob's Bourne			Noted, is this correct? CSG to comment		
6	2.2.4	3	Frome & Stour originally formed River Solent (when IOW, the Needles linked to Isle of Purbeck, Old Harry			Noted no change required.		
9	Fig 2.2	4	Mouth of Mude not shown, tidal flood plains at risk of sea level rise			Noted no change required.		
9	2	5	Mouth of Bure not shown, tidal flood plains at risk of sea level rise			Noted no change required.		
15	Q3.1		Archeology - Dorset Coast Forum, Christchurch Local History Society			Are there any documents from these organisations that need to be included? CSG to comment.		
17	3.3.5	1	Christchurch Harbour is a ria			Noted no change required.		
17	3.3.6	1	Include reference to archeology as well as N.S.			N.S?		
20	3.4.10	6	Hengistbury as an island means sea attacking Stanpit directly			Reference needed to Stanpit? CSG to comment Low lying properties around the northern edge of Harbour would be in direct line from wave attack.	SNW	26-May-09
21	3.2		River Mude, Bure, Chew not shown			Only major rivers shown. Figure is not intended to show all of the rivers/brooks		
24	3.4.14	1	RIA not estuary in both cases			Ria or estuary not a crucial point. No change required.		
24	3.4.15	1						
25	3.4.18	3	Due to roads runoff and sewage works effected by heavy rain			Not relevant to this section		
26	3.6		Mudeford Spit, Avon Beach, Friars Cliff. Steamer Point, Highcliffe Castle, Highcliffe, Chewton Bunny beaches			Figure shows the recognised bathing sites as mentioned in 3.4.18		
29	3.4.28	4	Mudeford Quay is a registered sea fishing harbour royalty in Avon, Throop in Stour, River Fisheries in harbour			Any change required? CSG? No comments required.	SNW	26-May-09
29	3.5.3	4	Erosion due to hollowings from stone quarrying in 1840s			Any comment CSG? Historically we know that mining for iron ore in the soft cliffs of HH did have a detrimental effect on erosion rates.	SNW	26-May-09
30	3.9		Original name of Beaulieu River is River Ex			Outside of study area. Not relevant.		
31	3.5.8	5	delete estuary insert ria			Ria or estuary not a crucial point. No change required.		
32	3.5.11	10	Give examples of inappropriate management			Do we want to do this? May be considered as putting the blame on an organisation. CSG to comment? Is the reference to figure 3.6 in this section correct?		
35	3.6.1	4	Include salt extraction and archaeology			CSG		
						P36 fig 3.11 There is no seawall at Barton. Should be a rock revetment		
37	3.6.8	2	Include Christchurch in consultation of Poole - Bournemouth			?		
38	3.12		SSSIs, nature reserves etc on coast not shown			Shown in figure 3.15		

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review



Document Title:	Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report	Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:	
-----------------	---	--------------	--------	--------------------	--

General Comments:

Reviewer: All Organisation:

Comments:- 1. Need to protect high value intensively occupied properties near coast and flood plains of rivers (Stour, Avon, Mude, Bure, Chew) 2. Particular risks are : Hengistbury Head becoming an island, breach of Mudeford Sandspit, erosion of Stanpit Marsh; so that sea can directly attack: Christchurch Harbour, Stanpit, Mudeford Haven, Christchurch quay (Place Mill scheduled ancient building). 3. Danger of rubbish tip under Stanpit Recreation ground being affected by sea level and consequent health dangers. 4. Danger from hydrological effects of gravel extraction e.g River Mude effected by Roeshot in Hants & Dorset with consequences in Christchurch Harbour (tidal). 5. Risks of further erosion at Chewton Bunny and at Naish and Barton-on-Sea

Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	SC Response	Name	Date
39	3.13		Not shown: Steamer Point, Chewton, Highcliffe Golf, Nea Meadows			Not relevant to this figure		
40	3.14		Map does not show Hoburne as urban			It does		
41	3.6.14	5	No mention of Holden Hurst major sewage works on Stour			Need to be included?		
44	LNR		No mention of Nea Meadows, Steamer Point, Stanpit Marsh etc			Stanpit March is on the list. Nea Meadows not on the coastal frontage. Is Steamer Point a LNR YES	SNW	26-May-09
49	3.8.2	4	Include Christchurch Harbour			Include Yes	SNW	26-May-09
51	3.8.3	4	Include Christchurch			CSG comment? Yes, as Christchurch has the third highest population in the UK for retirement aged people.		
51	3.8.4	1	Include Christchurch			Should this be? Yes, Christchurch is promoting coastal walks and keep fit campaigns for the elderly.		
51	3.8.5	3	Include Highcliffe Castle			Include Yes	SNW	26-May-09
51	3.9.3	2	Include Christchurch (Grange Ward)			Should this be included? CSG to comment I would remove	SNW	26-May-09
51	3.9.2	11	Highcliffe has the highest proportion of retirement age in Europe			Include if true Can't be sure if this is true	SNW	26-May-09
54	3.9.5	9	Bournemouth Airport is within Christchurch Borough			Noted no change required.		
56	Q3.2		Speed of run off from roads and roofs, diameter of drains			Noted		
57	4.2.1	10	Include effect on former refuse dumps on coast e.g. Stanpit Rec			CSG comment? Yes particular refuse sites which will be effected by coastal erosion and sea level rise (eg:Stanpit and Christchurch Quay)	SNW	26-May-09
58	Picture		This is not Bournemouth (Purbeck?)			Correct photo or title		
59	4.5.1	3	Include Christchurch Harbour			CSG comment? Yes, include Christchurch Harbour	SNW	26-May-09
59	Q4.1		Peace Mill, Christchurch Quay, Domesday Site, not mentioned (defend or demolish or rebuild inland?)			CSG comment? It should read PLACE MILL	SNW	26-May-09
64	Q5.1		Respect, conserve heritage, sense of identity, pride, mental health			CSG comment?		
76	Q6.1		Yes			Noted		
75	Q6.2		Not all targets can be met in all places - some hard decisions required			Noted		
75	Q6.3		Specify tourism, heritage			CSG comment?		
77	Q7.1		Dorset Archaeology Committee, Dorset Coast Forum, Dorset History Forum, Dorset Wildlife Trust, Sea Fisheries in area e.g Mudeford, New Forest Association, New Forest National Park Authority, English Heritage to provide a schedule/map of historical wreck in Christchurch & Poole Bays, Council for British Archeology, Christchurch Local History Society			A number of these organisations have been consulted through the SMP.		
			Land drainage is key issue, including dia of drains to get heavy rainfall away fast			Noted		
			Protect highways along coast and watercourses of use for flora and fauna			Policy development will determine		
			Take account of historic coast defence site e.g.					
		1	Iron Age Hill Forts e.g. Hengistbury Head, Promontary Fort, Christchurch Harbour, Dudsbury Hill fort on Stour			Historic sites will be considered. English Heritage ar on the KSG		
		2	Roman Forts e.g. Hamworthy, Poole Harbour, St Catherines Hill, Christchurch					
		3	Saxon Boroughs - Christchurch, Wareham					
		4	Medieval Castles - Christchurch, Corfe					
		5	Henry VIII Artillery Forts e.g. Hurst Castle, Brownsea Castle, **** at Poole and Hamworthy, blockhouses at Bournemouth (1539-1664)					
		6	Napoleonic Forts e.g. RN and revune vessels at Poole barracks at Christchurch					
		7	WWII defences on coast and in harbours (e.g. see Christchurch in WWII) includes coast batteries, Hurst, Steamer Point, Hengistbury, Brownsea, Durlston					
Mr Hoodless - HENRA - 1st May 2009								
			It is a major issue that this paragraph refers to the breach at Hengistbury by Double Dykes operating in					

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review



Document Title:	Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report	Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:	
General Comments:		Reviewer:	All	Organisation:	

Comments:- 1. Need to protect high value intensively occupied properties near coast and flood plains of rivers (Stour, Avon, Mude, Bure, Chew) 2. Particular risks are : Hengistbury Head becoming an island, breach of Mudeford Sandspit, erosion of Stanpit Marsh; so that sea can directly attack: Christchurch Harbour, Stanpit, Mudeford Haven, Christchurch quay (Place Mill scheduled ancient building). 3. Danger of rubbish tip under Stanpit Recreation ground being affected by sea level and consequent health dangers. 4. Danger from hydrological effects of gravel extraction e.g River Mude effected by Roeshot in Hants & Dorset with consequences in Christchurch Harbour (tidal). 5. Risks of further erosion at Chewton Bunny and at Naish and Barton-on-Sea

Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	SC Response	Name	Date
20	3.4.10		such a fashion that there would not be enough local sediment to seal it. The disturbing prospect of the rivers flowing out through the breach emphasises the merit of our wish to see improved coastal defences at that position. An established tidal stream would be a danger to Christchurch.	W A Hoodless on behalf of HENRA	01-May-09	Hengistbury Head is being considered in an additional report being prepared by RH. Any further comments from the CSG?		
36	Fig.3.11		This drawing shows extremely well just how the great majority of Poole Bay is protected, but that such measures come to a stop at Double Dykes. Most sections have seawalling, beach replenishment, groynes, static holding structures and cliff engineering. Yet once past the Dykes, there is nothing at all until Long Groyne. HENRA feel that since a breach past the Dykes is inevitable one day, at the very least, a policy of "hold the line" is needed along the whole length of Poole Bay.	W A Hoodless on behalf of HENRA	01-May-09	The policy for this section will be considered through the policy development stage. Taking account of all the necessary information.		

Dudley Hull - 1st May 2009

Comments:- Lots of good physical stuff, but somehow forgets about people and creatures that have an impact on the outcome. I feel that butterfly conservation should be on the KSG list.

15	Q 3.1	7	Include Poole Nature Conservation Strategy	DH	01-May-09	Should be included		
18	3.4.7		This item is one of the key problems, particularly Poole and Xchurch. These figures are a bit lower than the ABP Mer Estuaries Report and do not agree with para 3.10.10. Also no mention of land sinking - another 50mm in 100 years.	DH	01-May-09	Check and consider for consistency		
16	3.2.6		- The "official" guidance on CHaMPS "Living by the Sea" in Appendix 1, lists likely sites among which is "Poole & Studland"	DH	01-May-09	Noted		
41	3.6.16		Quality of the sand?	DH	01-May-09	Material quality is determined through site investigations to determine suitability		
44	LNR list		Broadstone Heath LNR should be included	DH	01-May-09	Outside of the SMP area being considered.		
48	National List		Only mainland sites for Granville Fritillary butterfly on cliffs between Barton on Sea and Milford on Sea	DH	01-May-09	Add to the list?		
51	3.9 Community & Assets	15	Pressure on coastline - Government pushing for 10-15% population/housing growth in Poole/Bournemouth. More pollution problems, sewage outfalls etc	DH	01-May-09	Include comment on this		
56	Seabed Rise		Does not match 3.4.7 figures. Why have 2080 date?	DH	01-May-09	Check for consistency		

Ian Legge Hobourne Ltd

Question 4.1 - Under 4.6 Community and Assets there must be a further emphasis on the risk to private residential and commercial assets and not just so called community assets.

Question 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 - Whilst not disagreeing with Objective A it is surely prejudging the outcome by suggesting that the only target is to reduce the number of properties for example within 500m of the cliff edge. In the Highcliffe and Barton area this is completely unrealistic and ignores one of the possible policy options of holding the existing defence line. Objective H makes a similar assumption that anything that slows down cliff erosion rates is unacceptable when maybe it is the status of a SSSI that should be questioned or at least the attitude to it where the preservation of private assets is concerned.

6	2.2.3		Does Beckton Bunny and Walkford Brook discharge into Christchurch Bay and not the Harbour.			Noted on previous commnets		
33	3.5.11		This paragraph wrongly assumes that the requirements of an SSSI must always take precedence over the retention of peoples homes and businesses. Also it is not proven that in all cases reduced erosion rates necessarily decrease the quality of SSSI units. What may be inappropriate for SSSI units may not be so for people working and living in close proximity to a cliff and a balanced view must be struck. Increasing cliff stability must remain an option at this stage.			Any further CSG comment?		

R Stride MDFA

Comments: As a fishermen's organisation MDFA has focused on matters relating to fisheries. In particular we have looked for some indication that the accumulation of fine sediment in Poole Bay as a result of Poole Harbour dredging and beach replenishment schemes has been taken into account in the scoping report. The Poole Harbour dredging EIA found that the disposal of dredgings on the Swanage dumping ground and beaches would not result in a significant deposition of fines in Poole Bay and that the impact on habitats and associated species and fisheries would be negligible. Contrary to the modelling results, there was a significant fall out of fines in the inshore areas of the Bay and instead of dispersing as was predicted by the model this material has accumulated, particularly in the western part of the bay and is already having an impact on habitats and fisheries livelihoods. Whilst fishermen's evidence is largely anecdotal, no attempt has been made to verify our observations and what monitoring was done was not capable of determining whether the model used was correct or not. We would now like to see this addressed by the SMP2 SEA process.

6	2.2.3	3	"Christchurch Harbour" should read "Christchurch Bay"			Noted on previous commnets		
22	Fig 3.3		Does not include significant sediment nourishment 2005-09			Does the figure need to be updated?		

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review



Document Title:	Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report	Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:	
-----------------	---	--------------	--------	--------------------	--

General Comments:

Reviewer: All Organisation:

Comments:- 1. Need to protect high value intensively occupied properties near coast and flood plains of rivers (Stour, Avon, Mude, Bure, Chew) 2. Particular risks are : Hengistbury Head becoming an island, breach of Mudeford Sandspit, erosion of Stanpit Marsh; so that sea can directly attack: Christchurch Harbour, Stanpit, Mudeford Haven, Christchurch quay (Place Mill scheduled ancient building). 3. Danger of rubbish tip under Stanpit Recreation ground being affected by sea level and consequent health dangers. 4. Danger from hydrological effects of gravel extraction e.g River Mude effected by Roeshot in Hants & Dorset with consequences in Christchurch Harbour (tidal). 5. Risks of further erosion at Chewton Bunny and at Naish and Barton-on-Sea

Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	SC Response	Name	Date
58	Photo		Photo not as captioned. Beach west of Durdle Dor			Noted on previous commnets		
59	Q4.1	Add	Deterioration of habitats and associated species due to accumulation of fine sediment in Poole Bay introduced through successive beach replenishments			Need to consider		
77	Q7.1		DEFRA/MFA			Can be done if considered necessary.		
Dorset Wildlife Trust								
45-46	Fig 3.15 & new para needed before 3.7.8		We note that the map does not include Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs). The boundaries of these Local Wildlife Sites are available from Dorset Environmental Records Centre and include substantial areas of coastal habitat from Sandbanks, Bournemouth Cliffs to Mudeford. In contrast, Fig 3.10 on p.34 includes RIGS, the Local Geological Sites. Both SNCIs and RIGS are covered by Defra Guidance on Local Sites, and by PPS9 Paragraph 9 which states that they "have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets". A section on Local biodiversity designations is needed, to follow that on national designations.			Include on figure 3.15		
48	New para needed (before 3.7.13?)		DWT is a partner (with the Maritime & Coastguard Agency and Channel Coast Observatory) in a project to map the Dorset Seabed (titled DORIS). It does not cover this whole area but there is a small part between Durlston and Studland and the data would we imagine be extremely useful to the SMP process. Remote sensing data is currently being analysed and this summer a ground truthing biological survey is being carried out with the aim of producing a biotope map of the seabed. For further information please contact Peter Tinsley ptinsley@dorsetwildlife.co.uk.			Talk to Travis at CCO regarding this data		
58	4.4.1		To the list for biodiversity we'd add: · Lack of suitable places for replacement habitats to be created as sea level rises · Changes in land use due to changes in crops or development pressures – either directly affecting wildlife habitats or by indirect effects from adjacent land · Increase in extreme weather events causing increased erosion, drought, flash flooding Changes in weather patterns affecting water availability for wildlife			Add to the list		
62	Table 5.2	Biod	'Implications' column should refer to Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species, as well as to designated habitats and protected species. Public bodies have a duty under Section 40(1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. Biodiversity South West recently published guidance for public authorities on marine, coastal and estuarine biodiversity in South West which will be useful. http://www.biodiversitysouthwest.org.uk/docs/WorkingForMarineWildlife.pdf			Action comment		
75	Table 6.3	k	As above this should refer to Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species as well as those sites and species listed.			Action comment		
Mike Goater								
3	Fig 1.1		Suggest reference point is changed to Ballard Point rather than Penfield Cove which does not appear on O.S. sheet			Agree make change		
6	2.2.4		I think Swan Brook should be included here in view of flood risk			Agree make change		
15			Amend to read Frome and Piddle Catchment Flood Management Plan			Agree make change		
17	3.3.7	last	I do not think it is reasonable to say the SSSI's are in unfavourable condition because of inappropriate coastal defences when the SSSI designation was post the defences. It could be argued that the SSSI designation was inappropriate in view of the existance of the defences			Vaild point. CSG to comment		
17	3.3.7		I don't think the coastal frontage is well developed at Durlston Bay.			Agree		
20	3.4.8	2	Not only the Dorset coast			Should also be Hampshire coast		

Client Steering Group and Interested Parties Document Review



Document Title:	Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report	Project No.:	9T2052	To be returned to:	
General Comments:		Reviewer:	All	Organisation:	

Comments:- **1.** Need to protect high value intensively occupied properties near coast and flood plains of rivers (Stour, Avon, Mude, Bure, Chew) **2.** Particular risks are : Hengistbury Head becoming an island, breach of Mudeford Sandspit, erosion of Stanpit Marsh; so that sea can directly attack: Christchurch Harbour, Stanpit, Mudeford Haven, Christchurch quay (Place Mill scheduled ancient building). **3.** Danger of rubbish tip under Stanpit Recreation ground being affected by sea level and consequent health dangers. **4.** Danger from hydrological effects of gravel extraction e.g River Mude effected by Roeshot in Hants & Dorset with consequences in Christchurch Harbour (tidal). **5.** Risks of further erosion at Chewton Bunny and at Naish and Barton-on-Sea

Page No.	Paragraph	Line	Comment	Name	Date	SC Response	Name	Date
20	3.4.7	1	ditto			Should also be Hampshire coast		
20	3.4.11	last	How can Hook Sands be feed by material entering Poole Harbour			needs to be checked		
20	3.4.12		This section on Christchurch Bay follows the section on Poole Bay. The initial part of this document goes from east to west and I think a consistane method should be adopted.			Agree		
24	3.4.16	1	As above, going east to west it should read "Studland, Swanage and Durlston"			Agree		
24	3.4.16		General comment. I think this section is very confused and has combined three bays with very different characters, I think its sub dividing.			CSG to comment		
25	3.4.21	last	I do not understand most "having poor to good classification" or is this part of 3.4.22 below?			Check and make clear		
28	3.4.25		I was not aware that Wytch farm is also called Kimmeridge Bay Oil Field. Is this correct?			Needs to be checked		
	3.5 etsec		I find the un-numbered sub-headings rather confusing. I would have thought it would be useful to have them numbered so they can appear in the index. Why have a section on "Geomorphology and Geology" followed by sub-heading "Geomorphology and Geology"			Any CSG comment		
	3.5.4		Inundation and erosion was not to isolate the IOW. It was an effect not a goal!			Noted and amend		
	3.5.9	6	Should be Handfast but this sentaence does not grammatically make sense			Change and amend		
33	3.5.11		First sentence does not make sense.			Agree		
		7	Remove "and"			Amend		
			see comment re page 17					
35	3.6.2		Include the legal proves of the EA - under which Act?			Change and amend		
36	fig 3.11		Needs updating re Swanage & Bronsea and around harbour			Change and amend		
45	Fig 3.15		I found this difficult to understand with reference to the key			Check and make clear		
47	Fig 3.17		and this almost impossible (but reading paper copy - might be ok on screen)					
51	3.9.3		I think you should put a reference date in the text I know it is on figure but I think it needs it in text as well.					