AGENDA

1. Apologies

2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting
   CSG Minutes 27 – 29 03 10

3. Action Items arising from minutes

4. Matters arising
   NQRG Teleconference, 26 May
      Additional details of CSG response to be added to spreadsheets.

   SMP v3 to be created by accepting changes to v2
   SMP v3 to use track changes to record future changes.

   Bournemouth wishes to take cabinet report on 23 June - needs to publish v2 - other authorities views.

   SMP v1 is still on Twobays - leave in place?
   CCO to release Defence shapefile data to NE?
   IROPI progress.
   Formation of contract, Bournemouth / Royal Haskoning.-
      Completion date/programme
   Variation Order #2 - approved by EA?
   WRFDC 12 July 2010

5. Mike Walkden to give a 30 minute presentation on coastal erosion/modeling techniques/sea level rise and how this is used in SCAPE:

   Between 1999 and 2008 a series of research projects funded by EPSRC, the Defra/EA Managed Research Programme and the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research focussed on the problem of how to predict coastal change over the medium to long term (i.e. above one year).

   A key product of this research is a numerical model named SCAPE, which was specifically designed to address engineering and management issues, and is proving very useful in real life applications. SCAPE has been used to inform a strategy study, a Coastal Process Study, SMPs and to provide a key element of the Environmental Safety Case of the UK's Low Level Nuclear Waste Repository in Cumbria.

   The presentation will describe SCAPE and draw on these examples of its application to illustrate its range of applicability and the information it can provide for coastal management.

6. AOB

7. Dates of next meetings
   CSG#29 - ? Monday 5 July 2010 (FCRM10 is 28 June to 1 July; WRFDC is 12 July)
   CSG#30  ? Tuesday 3 August?
   CSG#31  ? Monday 6 September?

8. 1500 Elected Members Forum - POSTPONED to later date
# MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
## CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING #28
### BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 7th JUNE 2010

**Present:**
- Dave Harlow (DH) Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
- Geoff Turnbull (GT) Bournemouth Borough Council
- Geoff Tyler (GTy) Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
- Peter Ferguson (PF) New Forest District Council
- Dave Robson (DR) Borough of Poole Council
- Mike Goater (MG) Purbeck District Council
- Steve Woolard (SW) Christchurch Borough Council
- Nick Reed (NR) Environment Agency
- Neil Watson (NW) Environment Agency
- Tony Flux (TF) National Trust
- Richard Edmonds (RE) Dorset County Council
- Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE) Royal Haskoning
- Mike Walkden (MW) Royal Haskoning

**Apologies:**
- Andy Bradbury (AB) New Forest District Council
- Steve Cook (SC) New Forest District Council
- Stuart Terry (ST) Poole Borough Council
- Sue Burton (SB) Natural England
- Vanessa Straker (VS) English Heritage
- Tim Kermode (TK) Environment Agency (South East)
- Andrew Ramsbottom (AR) Poole Harbour Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Minutes of Meeting on 29th March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The minutes of the meeting on 29th March 2010 were agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Action Items Arising from Last Meeting on 29th March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.11 TE said that an appropriate comment had been inserted in the Action Plan concerning Blue Lagoon &amp; Poole Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.12 DH confirmed that the boundaries map had been included in the Action Plan as agreed and that the NRG had been informed accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.14 SW said that the letter had been sent to the MP but no response had been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.4 In SB’s absence it was not known whether the reply had been sent to the RSPB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8 It was noted that the information had been placed on the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>DH confirmed that the actions in items 6.1, 6.2, 6.6, 6.7 and 6.11 had all been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.3 It was confirmed that an IROPI was required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.6 The Action Plan had been circulated with all the track changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9 9.2 The list of resources had not been circulated.

**Matters Arising**

**NQRG Comments**

3.1 DH explained that the NQRG had made 67 comments in their review and 50 on policy and presentation to which the CSG had responded after the last meeting. However, the NQRG’s feedback on the responses was only received on Thursday and circulated by DH this morning giving insufficient time before the meeting to consider their further comments.

3.2 Another telephone conference had been held with the NQRG on 26th May at which they agreed the presentational changes. The NQRG said that it was important to ensure that the responses to their original points were comprehensive in order to satisfy the audit trail.

3.3 NW suggested that a more pragmatic response was required to demonstrate progress on the work rather than trying to re-write the document.

3.4 MG confirmed that he had responded to the comment made by the person from Purbeck.

3.5 DH said that some of the CSG’s responses were brief because of the Group’s prior knowledge of the topic whereas the NQRG required more detailed explanations. CSG members should draft responses to their own sections and return them to TE by early next week so that they can be considered by the CSG before being returned to meet the NQRG’s deadline of 25th June 2010.

3.6 TE said that the NQRG’s agreement to the teleconference responses is implied by the reduction in the number of comments in the spreadsheet. These comments had apparently been hidden in the document but should in fact have been made available to show how the policies had developed.

3.7 DH said that the NQRG want us to demonstrate that the local authorities’ planners have been involved in the process. It was suggested that this could be achieved through a one off meeting with the planners from each of the five operating authorities.

3.8 NR said he had arranged a meeting with planners from the wider Dorset area for the 21st July 2010 and that it may be possible to get all the planners together at this one event.

3.9 SW said he had attended a coastal planning conference at the RNLI at which Atkins had given an interesting talk about SMPs in other areas.

3.10 MG drew attention to the publication of PPS 25 supplementary guidance which set out a planning framework for the continuing economic and social viability of coastal communities.

3.11 DH said that the NQRG want the SMP’s GIS data to be held for all time and that either the Coastal Group or Bournemouth Council could hold it.

3.12 TE said that Royal Haskoning archived their documents for a long period for contractual purposes.
3.13 NW suggested that the CCO could retain the information.

3.14 RE suggested that a copy could be sent to the DCC GIS team.

3.15 RE suggested that the NQRG would also like the coastal groups to collate all the SMP Action Plans.

3.16 NW said that the next SMPs are likely to be broader and the neighbouring Action Plans should be scrutinised to ensure that they are compatible.

4 SMP Adoption

4.1 DH said that Bournemouth Council’s procedures required papers for Cabinet meetings to be available on their website. In order for the SMP to be taken to Bournemouth’s Cabinet on 23rd June 2010 therefore the draft of version 2 would have to be published on the Council’s website beforehand.

4.2 NQRG have indicated that the SMP cannot be adopted until all the changes have been agreed.

4.3 NW explained that the Wessex RFDC could still sign off the SMP on 12 July as an endorsement that the CSG has gone through the appropriate process. The main impediment to local authority sign-off is final NQRG satisfaction with the CSG’s responses which are due at the end of June. The Natural England sign off is likely via the HRA document, and this should not prevent local authority adoption subject to approval of this aspect and IROPI (Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest). The IROPI issue would go to the Secretary of State in due course but the timescale for this was not known.

4.4 DH said that another Variation Order would have to be applied for if the adoption process is delayed any further.

4.5 SW said that he had arranged for the SMP to go to Christchurch’s September committee meeting.

4.6 DH pointed out that version 1 of the SMP was still on the twobays website, and it was agreed to leave it there.

4.7 It was discussed whether version 2 should be placed on the website (as well as version 1) as there was ample capacity on the site and the changes from version 1 could then be viewed. TF said that the changes should be highlighted to make it clear where the document had been changed, and that it was an interim document.

4.8 However, it was decided to publish v2 on Bournemouth’s website, and to publish v3 on the twobays website only when it is finally approved.

4.9 TE explained that the second draft IROPI had been sent to SB and had been returned with her comments. Royal Haskoning were doing the necessary edits based on SB’s response and the revised version would be forwarded to SB on her return from leave.

4.10 NW pointed out that the document had to be signed off by the Environment
4.11 It was agreed that the ‘shapefile’ data could be released to Natural England.

4.12 DH said he would circulate the Habitats Directive with SB’s comments and each CSG member should read their own section. DH felt that there was nothing contentious in the document.

4.13 DH said he was still pursuing the contract formalisation process.

5 Royal Haskoning Progress Report

5.1 TE reported version 12 of the programme had been produced with the insertion of a few more lines in section 5 and inclusion of the date for submission of the document to the South Western and Southern branches of the Environment Agency.

5.2 TE confirmed that the IROPI had been included in the SMP.

5.3 TE asked if once NQRG approval is obtained, Royal Haskoning should print off the SMP in hard copy. It was agreed not to produce the hard copy until the local authorities had taken it through their internal approval processes.

6 Strategy Study

6.1 NW reported that Atkins had made a good start on the Poole Bay Strategy Study. They were working on data collection including maps and aerial photographs and were using HR Wallingford for the modelling.

6.2 Scenarios were being looked at and particular areas such as Hengistbury Head, Studland and Sandbanks. Flood cells were also being worked on. The good steady progress included the setting up of a website in June and a public exhibition in September to introduce the study.

6.3 DH drew attention to concern expressed by Cllr Lawton about the lack of councillor involvement in the Strategy Study particularly if a public meeting is to be held. Cllr Lawton felt that the Chair of the EMF should be on the project board.

7 Any Other Business

7.1 DH explained that he had to seek funding approval through Bournemouth Council’s Gateway Board for the timber groyne replacement programme and the Board had asked if the SMP would have a project appraisal report. NW and DH agreed to discuss the matter further at a separate meeting as this was more an issue for the Strategy Study.

7.2 DH confirmed that variation Order No. 2 had been approved.

7.3 NR explained that the first four area coastal erosion maps are to be published in late July and the map for the SMP’s area is to be published in November. The checking exercise is proving more complex than envisaged. The main issue for the CSG to consider is the validation of the maps.
7.4 RE reporting on the progress of other SMPs in the region, said that the Devon and Dorset SMP is at a similar stage and the North Devon and Somerset SMP is going to their EMF for adoption sometime between July and September. The SMP for Cornwall is unlikely to be adopted until early next year.

7.5 RE confirmed that two of the three new Coastal Pathfinder posts have been filled and that there is a great deal of work to be undertaken.

7.6 DH said that a closure date is being considered for the website domain. The cost for a further 4 years will be £1,000 per year. However, if necessary, it could be passed over to the Environment Agency to maintain for the Strategy Study, or to the Southern Coastal Group.

7.7 TE said she would be away for most of August and drew attention to the coastal conference in Exeter on 8th September 2010, organised by Royal Haskoning, which she felt could be of interest to CSG members.

7.8 TE advised that the Isle of Wight SMP consultation opens on 23rd July and closes in October 2010. Public meetings would be taking place in October.

7.9 In response to a query about the SMP2 leaflet, DH said that this would be a negative compensation event as it had been agreed that the CSG would produce it rather than Royal Haskoning. The situation could change however, because of the delay in NQRG approval.

7.10 SW said that an application for funding had been made for the Christchurch Bay Strategy Study which will be undertaken by New Forest District Council.

7.11 NW said that some simple guidance will be available shortly on grant eligibility for unstable land and that this will have benefit for the SMP. NW said he would circulate the guidance in draft form.

7.12 In reply to a query from DH about Government cuts, NW explained that the EA had worked on budget cuts of 5% which translated into £30M for coastal projects. The outcome of the emergency budget measures was not yet known.

8 Date of Next Meeting

8.1 The date of the next meeting was agreed for 1.00 pm on Monday 5th July 2010 at Bournemouth Town Hall. This was subsequently amended to Bournemouth Library.

8.2 It was decided that a meeting was no longer required in August and the next meeting after the July meeting would be on Monday 6th September 2010.

9 Presentation by Mike Walkden

9.1 Mike Walkden of Royal Haskoning gave a presentation on how to predict coastal change using a numerical model named SCAPE. Any questions arising from the presentation are to be forwarded to TE.