AGENDA

1. Lead Authority

Bournemouth is listed by DEFRA, after acting as lead Authority in SMP1. Confirmed at meeting on 16th June 2006.

2. Membership of Steering Group:
   - Bournemouth Borough Council
   - Christchurch Borough Council
   - Environment Agency
   - New Forest District Council
   - Poole Borough Council
   - Purbeck District Council

Should any other bodies be invited to join?

3. Structure of SMP2 group.
   - Member’s steering Group
   - Officers’ steering group (this group)
   - Stakeholder’s group

4. Budget

Previously reported to DEFRA:
   - 2007/08 £50,000
   - 2008/09 £100,000
   - 2009/10 £200,000
   - Total £350,000

5. Timetable

- Budget available from 1/4/07
- DEFRA high level target for completion by 31/3/2010

6. Appointment of Consultants

- Bournemouth form a select list of interested Consultants
- Bournemouth commission own Partnering Consultants (Mouchel Parkman) who have already tendered for all Bournemouth’s engineering support
- Should we deliberately include/exclude SMP1 consultant (Halcrow)?

7. Other matters to be addressed by SMP2

- Breakthrough at Hengistbury Head - HENRA concerns Tobias Ellwood involved
- Boscombe Surf reef - effects on coastline

8. Date of next Meeting
Present: Dave Harlow (DH), Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Andrew Bradbury (AB), New Forest District Council
Peter Ferguson (PF), New Forest District Council
Andrew Gill (AG), Environment Agency
David Robson (DR), Poole Borough Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT) Bournemouth Borough Council
Steve Woolard (SW) Christchurch Borough Council
Geoff Tyler, Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)

1. Lead Authority

1.1 DH explained that Bournemouth had been listed by DEFRA as the lead Authority for SMP2. DH recognised the workload implications but felt they could be contained. Nick Lyness had offered to assist.

2. Membership of Steering Group

2.1 DR queried whether Poole Harbour Commissioners should be included as a key stakeholder group, rather than having full inclusion, on the grounds of consistency with other Authorities and also because they have no powers under the Coast Protection Act.

2.2 It was pointed out that the National Trust is a key stakeholder as the biggest land owner.

3. Structure of SMP2 Group

3.1 Views were sought about the need for elected Members to be included in the Steering Group. AB pointed out that those groups with Member involvement tended to be more successful. It was considered sensible to get Members involved from the outset rather than bringing them in at a late stage particularly where there were difficult decisions to be made. Each Authority will therefore need to identify an appropriate Member who is prepared to stand. A meeting can then be arranged for September as it was felt advisable to get some projects underway and to have clear guidance and a framework in place to present to them.
4. Budget

4.1 DH said that the total budget of £350,000 became available from 1st April 2007 and whilst the budget profile provided for an increase in each year’s allocation, there was likely to be a need for more funds earlier rather than later in the programme.

4.2 It was noted that, generally, lower budgets had been agreed for other Authorities.

5. Appointment of Consultants

5.1 DH explained the options for appointing consultants which could either be arranged through a select list or by utilising Mouchel Parkman who are currently contracted to Bournemouth Council through a five-year engineering services partnering agreement.

5.2 It was acknowledged that Mouchel Parkman had undertaken SMPs in other areas but some reservations were expressed about their strength in depth and a query raised concerning their knowledge of environmental issues. It was pointed out that whilst the Steering Group had detailed knowledge of the local coastline, Mouchel Parkman could offer experience on a national dimension. It was agreed that a list of their clients should be requested in order to obtain references.

5.3 AB suggested an integrated approach to SMP2 with some work being carried out by the in-house teams and some by the consultants. It would be necessary therefore to identify clearly what could be done in-house.

5.4 DR said he would need to check whether under Poole Council’s standing orders it was it was permissible to use a company contracted to another Authority.

6. Other Matters to be Addressed by SMP2

6.1 It was considered that there is a need to treat Poole Bay as a holistic unit rather than looking at it in small sections. It might be necessary to change the management unit boundaries.

6.2 It was noted that Halcrow were not clear on the risk of a breach at Hengistbury Head and there was a need to clarify whether this was above or below 1%. Halcrow had been asked to look at the consequences.

6.3 Nick Lyness is to be reminded about the Christchurch Harbour plan.

6.4 Queries were raised about the inclusion of harbours and determination of boundaries.
7. Action Plan

7.1 It was noted that the P.A.R. needed to be sent to DEFRA by September otherwise it would have to go through the EA route. It was suggested that the consultation model was worth further scrutiny and that draft guidance was available. The current template also looked relatively straightforward.

7.2 Attention was drawn to the fact that a brief had not yet been prepared for SMP2

7.3 It was agreed that:

a) A brief should be prepared by DH within two weeks for Mouchel Parkman and circulated to members of the Steering Group for comment. SMP1 should be used as the starting point plus all the guidance issued since in order to produce policies for SMP2. A short definition clarifying what SMP2 is seeking to achieve is required and a series of steps identified which would deliver the desired outcome.

b) Members of the Steering Group are to advise what resources they can offer. (SW pointed out that his resources are limited as recent staff changes at Christchurch had left him as the only person with coastal knowledge within the Council.)

c) Mouchel Parkman should be asked to provide details, as a matter of urgency, of all their recent jobs, previous schemes and experience, and to give a presentation to Steering Group officers around 11th July 2007. A presentation to Members is to be arranged later as a separate exercise.

d) There is need to involve Planners in the strategy and to hold a specific meeting relating to planning issues. Each member is to advise their Planning Department about SMP1 and to invite their involvement in SMP2.

8. Next Meeting

8.1 Date of next meeting to be arranged for mid-July.