

SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#17)
At Bournemouth Learning Centre
Monday 20th April 2009, 13:30 for 14:00

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. To approve minutes of the last meeting

CSG Minutes 16 - 16 03 09 (Bournemouth Town Hall)

3. Action Items arising from previous minutes

4. Matters Arising since 16th March.

RH Contract update

EMF Meeting of 16th March

Number of meetings & RH attendance at Meetings

KSG meeting of 23rd March

5. Documents status

- Use of RH SMP Document Review Form.
- Use of Bournemouth & RH logos on documents.
- A "family style" for documents -use of Poole's website style?

Estuary Processes - Published on website

Coastal Processes - corrections BY RH

SEA Scoping Study - 5 weeks consultation closes on 5th May

Hengistbury Head Review- corrections by RH and possible expansion of scope of work

Theme Review Document and Tables - Consultation Period will close on 20th April 2009

6. Royal Haskoning - progress report

- Programme
- Early warnings & Compensation events: summary
- Geodatabase Presentation
- General Policy Discussion Update

7 CCO/NFDC - progress report

8. BoP - website - www.twobays.net - content & hits

9. AOB

10. Date of next meetings:

CSG: meet on Mondays at 13:30 for 14:00at Bournemouth Learning Centre,
(Light refreshments available from 13:30 to 14:00)

EMF: meet on Mondays at 1730 for 1800 at Bournemouth Learning Centre,
(Light buffet available from 17:30 to 18:00)

18 May 2009	<u>CSG#18 + EMF#3</u>	Room 1
22 June 2009	<u>CSG#19</u>	Room 4
20 July 2009	<u>CSG#20</u>	Room 4
24 August 2009	<u>CSG#21 + EMF#4</u>	Room 4 (DH apologies)
28 September 2009	<u>CSG#22</u>	Room 4
2 November 2009	<u>CSG#23</u>	Room 5
7 December 2009	<u>CSG#24</u>	Room 4
11 January 2010	<u>CSG#25 + EMF#5</u>	Room 4
15 February 2010	<u>CSG#26</u>	Room? ** Possible new date due to delays....

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #17
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 20th APRIL 2009**

Present:

Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency (South East)
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency (South Western Region)
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Richard Caldwell (RC)	Natural England
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning
Justin Ridgewell (JR)	Royal Haskoning
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Steve Woollard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council

Apologies:

Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Sarah Austin (SA)	Poole Borough Council
Peter Ferguson (PF)	New Forest District Council
Andrew Ramsbottom	Poole Harbour Commissioners

Item No.		Action
1	Minutes of Last Meeting on 16th March 2009	
1.1	The minutes were agreed.	
2	Actions Arising from Previous Minutes	
2.1	Item 6.3. Royal Haskoning had provided the costing of the additional meetings and this had been agreed in principle.	
2.2	Item 10.1. AB said he had received a detailed response from Prof. Vince May and that he would forward the information to DH and GT so that they could request the information on the Dorset Coastal Archive.	AB/DH
2.3	Item 12.1. JR said the significance of Brownsea Island and Fursey Island had been dealt with in the Estuaries Report but that it was important to bring this out in the Strategy Report as well. TF pointed out that quite a lot of remedial work is to be carried out on Brownsea Island over the next 18 months and the findings of the SMP will be material to this. TF confirmed that he had forwarded some more archaeological information to TE in the last week.	
2.4	Item 12.2. AB said he would provide the information requested by Imperial College when the data has been processed over the next year.	

3	<p>Matters Arising since 16th March 2009</p>	
3.1	<p>GT said he had spoken to Bournemouth Council's Legal Services who have drafted the Memorandum of Understanding. This is to be forwarded to the operating authorities for approval this week. GT suggested that the CSG members concerned give their legal departments advance warning.</p>	
4	<p>Elected Members Forum</p>	
4.1	<p>TE said that DH had issued a post-meeting note following the last EMF meeting in order to increase elected member involvement. Royal Haskoning (RH) had made two reports available but had only received comments back from Cllr Carpenter. GT emphasised the need to address the request for better Councillor involvement.</p>	
4.2	<p>AB said that Cllr Duckworth was concerned that elected members were consulted before information was made public. A joint New Forest District Council and Christchurch Council members meeting had taken place to keep them fully involved and avoid any surprises. A further meeting is planned and AB said he would report back on any relevant issues arising from the meeting</p>	
4.3	<p>NW drew attention to the importance of getting the right people involved in the process in the right sequence which he felt needed to be carefully planned and covered in detail.</p>	
4.4	<p>TE queried whether elected members will want to alter the documents before they are issued. AB reiterated the expectation that elected members will wish to see documents before they go to a wider audience. TF said that all parties have to buy in to the SMP and elected members are the most important element. NW was concerned about the difficulty of trying to accommodate every individual issue.</p>	
4.5	<p>AB said that NFDC had established meetings which included the Portfolio Holder and Chief Executive in order to get elected members input. Problems are likely when controversial issues arise. GT confirmed that meetings are arranged with Cllrs Lawton and Anderson to ensure that they fully understood the issues, and recommended that the other operating authorities adopt the same approach.</p>	
4.6	<p>MG pointed out that councillors could become overwhelmed with the volume of material they had to read and that it was important for officers to highlight the significant issues. JR confirmed that councillors will have to rely considerably on officers to identify the appropriate areas that required more detailed scrutiny. The need for Ward Councillor involvement was also raised.</p>	
5	<p>Consultation Process</p>	
5.1	<p>AB said that although NFDC would help in any way they could, they did not have the capacity to undertake the consultation work. AB felt that the resources required could equate to 0.75 FTE for several months. AB will investigate further to see what assistance could be offered and report back but was not optimistic.</p>	<p>AB</p>

5.2	TE said that RH could do the work but that there were sound reasons for keeping the technical aspects separate from the consultation work. TE pointed out that Bournemouth had knowledge of, and access to, the local authority processes and, as lead authority, should co-ordinate the consultation work.	
5.3	MG stressed the importance of adopting effective ways of putting the information across.	
5.4	NW said this was a considerable commitment and drew attention to the existence of the communications strategy. NW explained that the Environment Agency (EA) had a lot of expertise in this area and could assist but that it would be inappropriate for them to take the lead. NW advised that a variation would have to be submitted to the EA with details of the programme and the bid.	
5.5	TE pointed out that the stakeholder consultation strategy was generic and not sufficiently detailed.	
5.6	GT said the problem needed to be resolved at the earliest opportunity and asked that Royal Haskoning re-circulate the communications strategy.	
5.7	It was agreed that TE would send the information to SC tomorrow and NW would discuss the funding situation with GT with a view to clarifying the position by the end of the month.	TE NW/GT
6	Documents Status	
6.1	GT confirmed that the RH document review form should be used to ensure that comments are returned in a standard format. NW asked that the form be attached to the email when comments are invited.	
6.2	The use of the local authorities' logos was discussed and it was agreed that these should appear on the front page but no where else in the document. Drawings/plans within documents will only have the consultant's logo and the Two Bays logo. TF drew attention to the need for consistency. GT said he would ask SA to draft a suitable reference which, when agreed, RH would add to the documents.	GT
6.3	TE confirmed that the Estuaries Report and the SEA Scoping Study are on the website and that the Coastal Processes Report is ready to be published. More work is being undertaken on the Hengistbury Head Review.	
6.4	NFDC's comments on the Theme Review Document and Tables are to be submitted tomorrow. TE said once all the comments are received, the document would be sent to the elected members. JR pointed out that the tables were based on SMP1 and that the process involved capturing all the information including some that was possibly irrelevant.	
6.5	RC said he would be commenting within the next two days and suggesting minor changes designed to protect species and habitats whilst maintaining the natural processes. MG drew attention to the need to separate flooding problems from erosion problems as the responses to each could be quite different. RE queried Halcrow's risk erosion mapping and predictions. AB said	

	<p>that he had made some revisions and felt that the information was sufficiently accurate for judgements to be made. GT advised keeping to the table as it stood.</p>	
7	<p>Royal Haskoning - Progress Report</p>	
7.1	<p>TE said that there had been delays in the programme and that she would produce a programme update. Compensation events 1 and 2 had been agreed with GT.</p>	
7.2	<p>TK said he was awaiting guidance on the Water Framework Directive which should be available very soon and that it would be advisable to hold on until then. NW said that it was unlikely that the work can be done internally because of a lack of resources and that Royal Haskoning should be prepared to undertake the work. NW acknowledged that there is a problem and that national funding would be required.</p>	
7.3	<p>TE said she would email the Geodatabase Presentation and asked CSG to let her have any questions. TK suggested putting the presentation on the website and sending CSG members a link.</p>	TE
8	<p>Presentation on High Level Objectives and Policy Development Zones</p>	
8.1	<p>TE said that they had met with Greg Guthrie and that Royal Haskoning had developed a presentation with a view to establishing the high level objectives and some initial policy development zones.</p>	
8.2	<p>Royal Haskoning outlined the objectives for the Poole and Christchurch frontages and explained that they were proposing four policy development zones.</p>	
8.3	<p>Attention was drawn to the need to 'adapt to' and 'manage' flood and erosion risk and also to the fact that flooding was a far more short term problem than erosion which could not be predicted with any degree of confidence beyond 50 years.</p>	
8.4	<p>The rationale for the zones was subject to much discussion by the CSG. The reasons for not using the existing management units was queried and also the decision to place the PDZ1 & PDZ2 boundary at Highcliffe rather than Hengistbury Head.</p>	
8.5	<p>The relationship between the high level objectives and the numerous low level objectives was raised. Attention was also drawn to the need for the rationale behind the key drivers to be clarified so that the concepts could be easily understood by the public. JR explained that the presentation had been provided to stimulate discussion and that the document would be revised to reflect the views expressed. JR said he would report back with agreed objectives which could be presented to the public.</p>	JR
9	<p>Hengistbury Head Review</p>	
9.1	<p>TE asked if the review was sufficient for the SMP. JR said that all the comments had been collated and were entirely valid but questioned whether there was room within the budget and the programme to go into further</p>	

9.2	<p>depth. JR said that the review needed to be good enough to present to the public and stakeholders within the boundaries of the SMP.</p> <p>MG queried whether there was sufficient information to make a policy decision. AB pointed out that an assessment is required on whether a breach is likely to occur and that there would be political pressure on this aspect. RC suggested that the review concentrated too much on the risk of a breach at Double Dykes but didn't take account of other possible occurrences. NW drew attention to the importance of producing the right policy in order to support the subsequent document.</p>	
9.3	<p>It was agreed to delay publication for a month in order to address the comments made.</p>	
10	<p>CCO/NFDC Progress Report</p>	
10.1	<p>AB confirmed that the erosion mapping had been completed and submitted to Royal Haskoning who had commented on it. The methodology was based on the national erosion risk mapping which, with the exception of two areas, was sufficiently accurate for Royal Haskoning to work on.</p>	
10.2	<p>AB said that the current and interim epochs were now completed and that some properties in Swanage were subject to tidal risk. The information is to be forwarded to NW and MG. NW will check whether it is compatible with the EA website.</p>	NW
11	<p>Website Report</p>	
11.1	<p>The item was deferred as no report was available.</p>	
12	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
12.1	<p>RE distributed some leaflets on the Jurassic Coast website.</p>	
12.2	<p>TE said that if the CSG wanted the Theme Review and High Level Objectives Report to be forwarded to the elected members, comments would be required as soon as possible so that the members could have the documents in good time in written form.</p>	
13	<p>Date of Next Meeting</p>	
13.1	<p>The next meeting is to be held at 2.00 pm on Monday 18th May 2009 at the Bournemouth Learning Centre.</p>	