

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#20)  
At Bournemouth Library Main meeting room 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Monday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009, 0930

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. To approve minutes of the last meeting

CSG Minutes

3. Action Items arising from previous minutes

4. Matters Arising since 22<sup>nd</sup> June

5. Royal Haskoning - progress report

- Programme (time for tasks 4 & 5)
- Documents update
- Electronic delivery of Draft SMP
- Electronic recording of comments

6 CCO/NFDC - progress report

7 Contract with Royal Haskoning

8. AOB

9. Date of next meetings:

24 August 2009	<u>CSG#21 0930 + EMF#5 @1400</u>	Bournemouth Learning Centre
28 September 2009	<u>CSG#22</u>	BLC Room 4
2 November 2009	<u>CSG#23</u>	BLC Room 5
7 December 2009	<u>CSG#24</u>	BLC Room 4
11 January 2010	<u>CSG#25 + EMF#6</u>	BLC Room 4
15 February 2010	<u>CSG#26</u>	Location to be determined

NOTES:

The Library does not open to the public until 1000; please wait at the main door to be admitted.

A light lunch will be available at 1230.

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #20  
BOURNEMOUTH LIBRARY - MONDAY 20<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

**Present:**

Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency (South West)
Carolita Wilson (CW)	Environment Agency
Fiona Geddes (FG)	Environment Agency
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Hamish Hall (HH)	Royal Haskoning
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Steve Woollard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Richard Caldown (RC)	Natural England

**Apologies:**

Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Sarah Austin (SA)	Poole Borough Council
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency (South East)
Justin Ridgewell (JR)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR)	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Item No.		Action
1	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2009</b>	
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting on 22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2009 were agreed.	
2	<b>Action Items Arising from Previous Minutes</b>	
2.1	Item 2.7 .....	
2.2	Item 2.9 .....	
2.3	Item 3.5 .....	
2.4	Item 5.8 DR is to check whether Poole have any borehole records which could assist with the assessment of the Sandbanks Peninsula.	DR
2.5	Item 6.1 The question of the local MPs involvement in the EMF had been discussed and whilst their interest was welcomed it was felt more appropriate for NW and DH to meet with the MPs separately.	

2.6	<p>Item 6.3 The beachfront signage had been distributed for comment by SA and was being looked at in more detail by the Communications Sub-Group.</p>	
3	<p><b>Policy Objectives</b></p>	
3.1	<p>HH explained that the SMP was now at a critical stage and that some meetings had taken place with councillors. The erosion mapping and economic assessments had now been received.</p>	
3.2	<p>GG pointed out that the EA's tidal mapping had also been received and that it had been possible to extend the impact and test the sensitivity of the flood mapping using the Defra 75 year projections.</p>	
3.3	<p>GG said that comments had been received back on the documents produced on the Policy Development Zones (PDZs) and the objectives. The initial document set out the high level principles and from that for each PDZ a set of more specific objectives had been developed. Discussions had been held with Natural England in order to encapsulate the very many objectives and identify the core aims. It was also the intention to capture specific issues to enable a Yes or No response from the CSG.</p>	
3.4	<p>GG introduced the presentation by listing a number of key objectives required for the analysis of, and specific to, the particular PDZ. A colour coded table illustrated how the two baseline scenarios of No Active Intervention (NAI) and With Present Management (WPM) impacted on the overall objectives. The table provided an initial high level assessment highlighting potential areas of conflict under the sub-headings of 'Neutral' (blue) 'Fails' (red), 'Partial' (yellow) and 'Positive' (green).</p>	
3.5	<p>RE pointed out that the interests of the site are in fact maintained by erosion and that protecting the designated area implies protecting the geographic boundary from erosion.</p>	
3.6	<p>TF pointed out that the issues needed teasing out from the general statements and that the SMP was one document working at all sorts of levels which made it difficult to meet the needs of all concerned. HH said that he had met with Jim Hutchinson of Defra and was aware that the document would be very wordy in order to fulfil these requirements and also that there were important social issues to be met within the set timeframes.</p>	
3.7	<p><b>PDZ1:</b> NW asked how a particular area was defined as a 'community' and what features were taken into account in making this judgement. GG said that the features critical to the community would be looked at such as the loss of the local post office or access to the beach. SC drew attention to the need to get the local planners involved.</p>	
3.8	<p>TF said that in calculating the cost of moving a building such as a post office it was essential to take account of all the associated public utility infrastructure costs which would be extremely expensive. The cost benefit analysis comes far more into question in these circumstances. GG said that the government guidance requires SMPs not to be driven solely by economics.</p>	

3.9	<p>In reply to a question from RE about the difference between Milford on Sea and Barton on Sea, it was noted that the Local Plan indicated that Milford was very much a village community with a high street and easier access to the beach whereas the core of Barton was back from the cliff. It was also the case that Naish cliff defences had already moved and extended defences in the area would be unsustainable.</p>	
3.10	<p>RE asked if the cliffs had not been protected for purely geotechnical issues or whether the old local authority boundary had an implication. It was noted that the cliff top was a caravan site and there was no cost benefit in carrying out any work.</p>	
3.11	<p>Attention was drawn to the importance of explaining to councillors, and also through the consultation process, why decisions were being taken in respect of a particular section of coastline. The narrative needed to bring out the feasibility and the concept of sustainability as well as the fact that inappropriate policies would not attract government grant. NW confirmed that it was necessary to go into detail and clarify the wider implications of the policy decisions.</p>	
3.12	<p>HH confirmed that he would be writing a short section on funding which would include a socio-economic assessment as well as an economic assessment. GG pointed out that the outcome values at a regional level may be different from those at a national level or local level. TF drew attention to the fact that the value to the community of existing structures, such as a church or a car park, could change over time.</p>	
3.13	<p>In response to a question from NE about the significance of Hengistbury Head, GG confirmed that maintaining Hengistbury Head as a control point had been considered in more detail in PDZ2.</p>	
3.14	<p>TF asked if the interpretation of NAI meant that there was no exit strategy for the removal of material from the beach. MG pointed out that there would be a need to remove structures before they were lost and that some of the redundant defences would not be aesthetic. HH confirmed that health and safety would be taken into account.</p>	
3.15	<p>RC pointed out in relation to the objective concerning minimising the loss of species or habitats, that it would not be sufficient merely to identify compensatory habitat in the event that net loss occurs. Rather, the objective should be to secure IN ADVANCE compensatory habitat BEFORE any predicted net loss arising from the preferred management option actually occurs. The wording of the objective needs changing to reflect this.</p>	
3.16	<p><b>PDZ2:</b> In respect of PDZ2, DR said that the western boundary needed to be moved from Flaghead Chine to Shore Road.</p>	
3.17	<p>GG outlined the main objectives of PDZ2 and asked if they broadly met the requirements of the SMP. These included protecting the economic viability of Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch and reducing the flood risk to Christchurch and Mudeford.</p>	

3.18	GT asked whether the flood risk to Bournemouth had also been considered particularly in respect of areas such as Wick. GG said he would amend the objective to include “in and around Christchurch Harbour”.	
3.19	GG pointed out that the abandonment of defences could create the potential for contamination from landfill sites.	
3.20	RC expressed concern about the assumed impact of the NAI & WPM options on the natural habitats and said that the target should be to “minimise loss of these habitats <b>subject to natural change</b> ”. The point being that the loss of some habitats to natural coastal processes is inevitable and should be accepted. RC said he would prefer the colour coding to be changed to yellow to reflect this concern and that the narrative needed to explain the thinking behind this.	
3.21	GG said that heritage considerations had been included within Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch whereas Bournemouth should have a separate section on heritage which would reflect the heritage value of Hengistbury Head. TF said that English Heritage would look at rarity value and if there was only one of a particular feature left in the Country its scarcity would increase its importance. RE pointed out that heritage was extremely difficult to value.	
3.22	<b>PDZ3:</b> GG said that Poole Harbour was very complex but did not consider that the objectives were too difficult. NAI would impact significantly on the use of the harbour whereas WPM was not felt to address the environmental considerations. RC asked if Royal Haskoning had had clarity on environmental aspects through working on other SMPs. GG explained that the Habitats Directive had been used.	
3.23	RE queried whether Wareham should be indicated on the table by a red box. MG pointed out that ‘WPM’ increases the fluvial flood risk at Wareham because the existing tide bank restricts the evacuation of fluvial floodwater into Poole Harbour, and causes the floodwater to back up. HH said that the risk to Wareham was quite small compared to Poole.	
3.24	In reply to a question from MG concerning the lagoon at Brownsea, GG said he assumed it would be a NAI policy.	
3.25	<b>PDZ4:</b> In formulating the overall objectives for Swanage, Royal Haskoning had identified the protection of the town’s economic viability, its core values and character of the centre as particularly important. The objective of maintaining the natural landscape had been classified as an area of potential conflict indicated in the table by a red box.	
3.26	RC queried the linking within a single objective the goals of maintaining people’s access to the beach with the protection of the landscape in a naturally evolving environment. RC stated that the two are not necessarily compatible, if maintaining access entails the re-construction of hard engineered access points (walkways, steps etc) on a coastline that is naturally eroding. They are both fine as objectives but ought not to be lumped together.	
3.27	TF said that most people are likely to be concerned only about epoch 1 and	

3.28	<p>asked therefore whether it would be helpful to introduce a third column on the table to indicate graphically the changes between SMP1 and SMP2. GG said that this would be included in the report but could be given more prominence in order to demonstrate the transition to the end product.</p> <p>TF pointed out that Members were more likely to find favour if the information presented showed a move to a more positive outcome.</p>	
4	<p><b>Flood and Erosion Risk Mapping</b></p>	
4.1	<p>RE asked what information would be provided in respect of risk mapping. HH said he was generally satisfied with the erosion mapping and that there could be more certainty regarding the cliffs. The softer coastline was more difficult however and the data would be more subjective.</p>	
4.2	<p>SC drew attention to the importance of thinking carefully about the release of the maps and how the information was to be presented.</p>	
4.3	<p>NW explained that the Environment Agency were not intending to issue national maps but would provide them to the individual SMPs. It had also been decided that the information must be made available to the public in context and be accompanied by appropriate ancillary information.</p>	
4.4	<p>TF said that research suggests that the public want maps but don't like hard lines on the maps which could give an unrealistic impression of certainty and imply that erosion is linear.</p>	All
4.5	<p>HH said that it was important to show the maps embedded in the report with supporting information. GG added that the SMP has to be in a layered format</p>	
4.6	<p>RE pointed out that the maps should show recession with intervention to avoid this being exploited by the media.</p>	
4.7	<p>Following further discussion, it was agreed to present the maps in the document but not to make them available to the public at the present stage.</p>	
5	<p><b>Delivery of Draft SMP and Recording of Comments</b></p>	
5.1	<p>HH said that it was necessary to deliver longer sets of documents and it was agreed that this should be done electronically using the website. HH asked for comments to be returned electronically in the document review form.</p>	
5.2	<p>SC said that the comments received from the public had been combined in one document which had been circulated. The audit trail must show how comments had been dealt with. It was agreed that the consultation report would be included as an appendix but that it would not show the names and addresses of individual members of the public.</p>	
5.3	<p>NW said that the Review Panel would want to see the draft SMP when it goes to the public and also when the final document is produced.</p>	

6	<b>Programme</b>	
6.1	It was noted that there was already some conflict regarding Task 4 - Public Examination - and that meetings separate to the SMP process were being held with elected members. The question was raised whether the SMP was being rushed too much as the process should be about engaging with people.	
6.2	The first draft of PDZ1 had been completed and discussed with elected members from New Forest District Council. It could be circulated to the CSG next week.	
6.3	SC said that it was necessary to have sufficient time to discuss the issues with councillors to get them on board. RE asked whether it was possible to meet with the councillors to deal with the challenging areas of the report. GG pointed out that the CSG needed to present a document to the elected members that they were comfortable with.	
6.4	HH said that the document that goes out for public consultation would be extremely thick and that the actual SMP would be 200 to 300 pages and would go down to a fine level of detail.	DH
6.5	GT said that reports are required for Bournemouth's Cabinet four weeks beforehand and that he had provisionally booked a place for the September meeting which meant that the policies had to be agreed in the near future.	TE
6.6	RE said that he was looking at October meetings and that the areas of concern for DCC would relate mainly to people and their houses.	
6.7	It was agreed that the CSG and EMF meetings on 24 <sup>th</sup> August should be a full day's combined meeting and workshop to consider all the issues. It was important to ensure that the elected members were available for a full day. It was agreed that invitations should be issued by Bournemouth and that other elected members with an interest should also be invited. The morning would be an overall session with a split into PDZ areas in the afternoon.	GTy
6.8	HH said that Royal Haskoning would send the Section 4 policy document to the CSG on 17 <sup>th</sup> August so that they have it a week before the meeting. After the meeting, two weeks could be found in the programme to review the comments which would take it to the first week of September and enable the operating authorities to report to their respective Cabinets in October.	
6.9	The need for another Key Stakeholders Group meeting was raised and it was agreed that this should be held in the evening on 28 <sup>th</sup> September at Bournemouth Town Hall. A suitable room is to be booked.	
6.10	RE asked if Royal Haskoning could provide a representative to attend the briefing sessions within Councils. HH said this would be possible but that it had not been priced in the programme. RE said it would also be helpful to have someone from one of the other operating authorities at the briefings to demonstrate that it is an integrated process.	

7	<b>Water Framework Directive</b>	
7.1	NW said that a regional workshop had trialled the South Devon and West Dorset Plan. It is an in-house exercise and tables will be produced which will be an appendix. It needs to feed into the Environment Agency's WFD process. Early sight of the document is required.	SW
8	<b>CCO/NFDC</b>	
8.1	HH said that the issues table and themes document went out to consultation and one set of comments had been received. A letter had been received from Christopher Chope MP which supported the proposals but asked how they would be achieved. It was agreed that Christchurch Council should respond with GT and DH being copied in for information.	SC/SW/ MG/DR
9	<b>Contract with Royal Haskoning</b>	
9.1	GT confirmed that Bournemouth's Legal Section had been dealing with the contract and that a draft overarching agreement had been sent out to the operating authorities. Only one reply had been received so far and the outstanding responses are to be chased by the officers concerned.	
10	<b>Poole Bay Strategy Study</b>	
10.1	FG provided an update on the Poole Bay Strategy Study and said that she had replaced Steve Rendell.	
10.2	FG explained that the tender for the work had been issued with a closing date of 10 <sup>th</sup> August 2009 and that it would be helpful if any CSG members were available to assist with the tender assessment process. This could be arranged either via a telephone conference or a meeting. A client brief detailing the main issues would be provided so that a proper assessment could be made.	RC
10.3	FG said that it had been to the National Review Group and was to be re-submitted in more detail in November. The start date for the study will be January 2010.	TE
11	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
11.1	RE pointed out that there were some lessons to be learnt from the South Devon and West Dorset Plan about how to get Councillors involved in the process.	
11.2	RC said he was likely to be unavailable for the next four weeks but would arrange for a colleague from Natural England to cover for him.	
11.3	PF confirmed that Sam Cope had made all the changes requested by the CSG and that she had been in touch with DH.	



11.4	<p>SC said that venues are currently being booked by the Communications Sub-Group for the road shows during the first week of December. NW asked that an updated version of the programme be produced, showing the week of exhibitions, which he could send to the National Review Group.</p>	
11.5	<p>RE said that Bournemouth University were developing a satellite enabled mapping change facility and would be holding a workshop on the project around the end of September. There will be two presentations which could be very useful. The facility will provide laser measurements every 46 days and the resolution will be very large detecting moves of up to one centimetre. Any one who is interested should contact RE who will provide further details of the event in due course.</p>	
12	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p>	
12.1	<p>The next meeting which will be a combined meeting and workshop with the EMF is to be held at <b>9:30 on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> August 2009</b> at the <b>Bournemouth Learning Centre</b>.</p>	