SMP2 Meeting of Client Steering Group (#23)
At Bournemouth Learning Centre
Monday 14th December 2009, 1300 lunch for 1330 start

AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. To approve minutes of the last meeting
   CSG Minutes 22 – 2 11 09

3. Action Items arising from previous minutes

4. Matters Arising since 2nd Nov

   Tues 3 Nov Bournemouth Planners
   Tues 24 Nov VO to PAB
   Wed 9 Dec HENRA

   Public meetings
   • 30 Nov. Christchurch
   • 1 Dec. New Forest
   • 2 Dec. Purbeck
   • 3 Dec. Bournemouth
   • 4 Dec. Poole

   “Scores on the doors” & photos on website...

   Mike Goater - Proposal to move boundary between N1/N2 in Swanage bay
   Mike Goater - policies in Lytchett Bay & Sherford River
   National Trust - Studland: proposal to change policy from MR/NAI
   Borough of Poole - extended domain name for 5 years - annual costs involved.
   NE NT PHC BOP - Discussion and final agreement of the management intent for Brownsea at SMP level.
   English Heritage - comments

5. Royal Haskoning - progress report

6. AOB

   Overarching legal agreement.
   Proposal to renumber groyne field.
   EA second package of SMP documents.....

7. Dates of next meetings (changed details are highlighted):

   14 December 2009        CSG#23        BLC SCITT Room
   18 January 2010          CSG#24        Bournemouth Town Hall “Willows” Room
   22 February 2010         CSG#25@0930, EMF#6@1400 BLC Room 4
   29 March 2010            CSG#26        Location to be determined
   3 May 2010               CSG#27        Location to be determined
MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #23
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 14th DECEMBER 2009

Present:

Dave Harlow (DH) Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Geoff Tyler (GTy) Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Simon Hills (SH) Bournemouth Borough Council
Steve Cook (SC) New Forest District Council
Mike Goater (MG) Purbeck District Council
David Robson (DR) Poole Borough Council
Steve Woolard (SW) Christchurch Borough Council
Neil Watson (NW) Environment Agency (South West)
Tim Kermode (TK) Environment Agency (South East)
Nick Reed (NR) Environment Agency
Richard Edmonds (RE) Dorset County Council
Tony Flux (TF) National Trust
Sue Burton (SB) Natural England
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE) Royal Haskoning

Apologies:

Vanessa Straker (VS) English Heritage
Geoff Turnbull (GT) Bournemouth Borough Council
Peter Ferguson (PF) New Forest District Council
Andrew Bradbury (AB) New Forest District Council
Andrew Ramsbottom (AR) Poole Harbour Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Introduction**

1.1 DH explained that the meeting would be devoted mainly to consideration of the comments received from the public consultation. This would also be the main business of the meeting on 22nd February 2010 with any contentious comments being referred to the Elected Members Forum in the afternoon meeting on 22nd February.

1.2 DH said that the decision to accept or reject each comment should be recorded with the reasons for the decision. TE suggested that the term ‘noted’ should be used rather than ‘rejected’ and said that it was important to indicate why the document had been altered and to ensure that any policy changes were carried throughout the document.

1.3 DH said it would be advisable to record the decisions on the spreadsheet under three headings: comments that can be resolved, comments that are irrelevant and contentious issues that are for referral to the EMF with guidance from the CSG. DH said that it may be necessary to vote on some of the more difficult points.

1.4 NW said that comments would need to be carried forward to the Strategy Study where appropriate.
Minutes of Key Stakeholders Meeting on 26th November 2009

The following changes were agreed:

2.1 Item 1.2 - The word “would” in line five was amended to “could”.

2.2 Item 3.3 - The wording “or SEA LOG” was deleted.

2.3 Item 3.8 - The wording “salt marsh” was amended to “amenity area”

2.4 Item 3.15 - The item was deleted.

2.5 Item 3.16 - The CSG reply was inserted, and renumbered Item 3.15.

2.6 DH said he would make the necessary changes and re-circulate the minutes.

Minutes of Last CSG Meeting on 2nd November 2009

3.1 The minutes of the meeting on 2nd November 2009 were agreed.

Action Items Arising from CSG Meeting on 2nd November 2009

4.1 Item 4.2 - DH confirmed that the late comments received from Stuart Terry had been circulated to CSG members.

4.2 Item 4.6 - TE said that the document had been distributed as agreed and that there were two extra CDs available. SB requested one of these for English Nature. DH said it would be useful to record on the website where the hard copies of the document are being held by each local authority. A list is to be circulated for this purpose.

4.3 Item 5.11 - It was noted that the proposed meeting of the Comms Team with Natural England did not take place.

4.4 Item 6.2 - DH confirmed that the letter to the MPs had been drafted and circulated as agreed.

4.5 Item 9.1 - NW said that the budget needed to be re-profiled and an invoice submitted. DH agreed to action this.

Matters Arising since the previous Meeting

5.1 DH said that he had provided a short presentation for the Bournemouth planners on 3rd November which the Director had attended.

Public Meetings

6.1 DH gave the attendance figures for the Roadshows and explained that the numbers were likely to have been under-counted at the meetings with the highest attendance: New Forest 168, Poole 137, Christchurch 92, Purbeck 80, Bournemouth 48, Key Stakeholders meeting 20.
6.2 The Roadshow display boards had been put on the ‘TwoBays’ website and it was agreed that Greg Guthrie’s presentation should also appear on the website. TE said she would arrange this but pointed out that the information needed to be put in context with an accompanying note explaining that the presentation was delivered at the public meetings with a verbal explanation.  

6.3 It was also agreed that appropriate photographs taken at the public meetings, which did not identify members of the public, should also be put on the website. 

7 Proposal to move the boundary between N1/N2 in Swanage Bay 

7.1 MG explained that the boundary should be moved further north to align with Tanville ledges. TE said that Greg Guthrie could see the benefits and could see no reason not to change the boundary which made the area of managed re-alignment slightly smaller. TE pointed out that the change would have to be carried through to the supporting documents such as the SEA and Appropriate Assessment. The proposal was accepted by the CSG.  

8 Policies for Lytchett Bay and Sherford River 

8.1 MG said that he could not understand why the policies for this area would be different from the area around Wareham. It was agreed to consider the matter in more detail later in the meeting. 

8.2 MG explained that when considering the policies for the harbour, the report did not cover the area up to the tidal limit of the River Frome which was denoted by the bridge. DH said that the notice for the tidal limit was in fact 300 metres further up river and that it was necessary to establish exactly where the tidal limit was. NW said that it should be the Schedule 4 boundary. TE drew attention to the Estuaries Report. It was pointed out that there should not be a gap between the CFMP and the SMP and that there ought to be some overlap to ensure that the two policies were integrated. There was a need to see that the matter was adequately covered in the flood plan. NW said that he would follow this up and it was agreed to discuss the issue further at the next meeting. 

9 Studland: Proposal to Change Policy from MR/NAI 

9.1 TF explained that the problem concerned Knoll Beach in Epoch 1 and that a more flexible policy was required for the beach frontage. There would only be marginal intervention from the National Trust and the area would therefore flood frequently in the first epoch. There were financial and environmental constraints and the objective was principally to try to look after the infrastructure a bit longer. Moving boundary H6 to H5 a 100 metres north of the car park - so that the car park would then be located in H6 rather than H5 - would not require a change in the policies with H5 staying as NAI and H6 as MR. TE confirmed that Greg Guthrie was happy provided Natural England were in agreement. NW said that it was important to be clear whether it was the coast that was being protected or what was behind it. It was agreed to defer the matter to the January meeting.
10  Extension of Domain Name

10.1  It was noted that the domain name for the ‘TwoBays’ website had been extended for a further five years.

11  Management Intent for Brownsea Island

11.1  TF explained that the infrastructure on the quay was part of the defences and that the building was the sea wall. The National Trust accepted that the buildings were not going to be viable for much more than 35 years and the policy therefore is to buy time in the knowledge that in the longer term the infrastructure would be lost.

11.2  TF said he was happy with the proposed policy but pointed out that the Dorset Wildlife Trust should be brought into the discussion. It was slightly misleading to describe the infrastructure as significant environmentally as it was man-made and MR was therefore the most appropriate and flexible policy.

11.3  SB said that it was an internationally important site and that we were legally bound by the habitat regulations and the Special Protection Area directive. Consideration needed to be given to the bird population as the area was highly important for roosting. If the wall were to be removed now, it would have serious consequences for the SPA. Its sustainability in the longer term also needed to be considered. Natural England would hope to see some patching up and maintenance but it was important for there to be a project to look at the Brownsea Lagoon. DH said the need for the study should be included in the action plan.

11.4  TF reiterated that it was not sustainable in the longer term and that the policy of MR for each of the three epochs provided a period of over a 100 years in which to determine mitigation.

11.5  The policy of MR for each epoch was agreed with the insertion of text about repairs to the sea wall. It was also agreed that that the matter needed to be looked at in more detail and referred on to the Strategy Study.

11.6  It was noted that comments had not been received from English Heritage. DH and TE said that they would be willing to meet with Vanessa Straker.

12  Royal Haskoning - Progress Report

12.1  TE said that Royal Haskoning had attended the public consultation and that Greg Guthrie would attend the meetings on 22nd February 2010. TE asked to be advised if there were any other issues before then.

12.2  TE confirmed that she was implementing the agreed changes and developing the action plan which could be on an ‘Access’ database or in a simple ‘Word’ document. It was agreed that the action plan should be uploaded to the section of the website available only to the CSG. It was pointed out that the document should be in a ‘Word’ format as it had to be signed off. TK said it would be very helpful to link the information to National Indicator 189.
12.3 TE said she would email the database to Sarah Austin at Poole Council and would present it in more detail by providing a demonstration at the next meeting. In response to a question from RE about maintenance of the action plan, TE agreed that it would be a live document and would need to be managed. TF drew attention to the need for an action plan overview.

12.4 It was noted that copies of the SMP CD had been sent to the RSPB and to Hampshire County Council and that DH had three spare copies.

13 Any Other Business

13.1 DH confirmed that he was still progressing the overarching legal agreement and would send a copy to NW to have a look at. DH said that he would circulate the quotation.

13.2 DH said that the RNLI and Coastguard had suggested the renumbering of the groyne field as the sequence of the Poole groynes went in the opposite direction from the groyne numbering in Bournemouth. It was agreed that Bournemouth and Poole would meet at a future date to undertake this task.

13.3 DR said that he had re-circulated the website comments document which included two further comments concerning erosion rates in Holes Bay and sediment movement which would be picked up in the later discussion.

13.4 RE said that a steering group had been established to consider the allocation of the ‘Pathfinder’ funding.

13.5 TF drew attention to a project entitled ‘Living with a Changing Coastline’ and said that the Environment Agency had decided to put the Poole Harbour project on hold while a new partner is found.

14 Public consultation

14.1 After a short break, the comments received from the public consultation were discussed. A record of the decisions made is available on the spreadsheet “Public Consultation Responses”.

15 Date of Next Meeting

15.1 The next CSG meeting is to be held at 1.00 pm on Monday 18th January 2010 in the ‘Willows’ Room at Bournemouth Town Hall.