

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #02
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 16TH MARCH 2009**

Present:

Councillor Mark Anderson (MA)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Turnbull (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GTy)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Councillor Fran Carpenter (FC)	New Forest District Council
Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Councillor Nick Cake (NC)	Purbeck District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Councillor Mike Duckworth (MD)	Christchurch Borough Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
David Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Richard Edmonds (RE)	Dorset County Council

Apologies:

Councillor Peter Adams	Poole Borough Council
Steve Cook	New Forest District Council

Item No	Action
1	Minutes of the Last Meeting
1.1	The minutes of the last meeting on 24 th November 2008 were agreed.
2	Actions Arising from Previous Meeting
2.1	Royal Haskoning's presentation had been placed on the 'TwoBays' website. (Item 2.1)
2.2	The press release had been prepared and circulated to the five authorities. (Item 5.5)
3	Progress report on the SMP by Royal Haskoning
3.1	DH presented Royal Haskoning's progress report:
3.1.1	Stage 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal Processes Report - Draft completed and internally reviewed. Currently with CSG for comment.
3.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defences Shapefile - Completed and reviewed by CCO. Some minor errors / anomalies identified. Errors have been rectified.
3.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estuary Processes Report - Draft completed. All comments received back from CSG. Final version for Appendices received from ABP and posted on the webpage
3.1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theme Review Report - First draft completed. Undergoing internal review. Anticipate re-drafting w/c 16/03 prior to dissemination to CSG.

3.1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Features and Issues Tables - Tables completed apart from Poole Harbour. Environment Team have reviewed and added issues/objectives from environmental point of view. 	
3.1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of objectives - Initial identification of objectives done on the completed tables. 	
3.1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess objectives - High-level objective setting and internal review of how specific objectives are set. 	
3.1.8	<p>Stage 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define Policy Scenarios - Commenced with full-day workshop on 6-03-09, identifying high-level management intent and key policy drivers. 	
3.1.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy Scenario Assessment - To commence. 	
3.1.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preferred Scenario Identification - To commence 	
3.1.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm preferred Scenario - To commence 	
3.1.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce Draft SMP document - Appendices are now starting to be assembled using the Finalised Reports from Stage 2. 	
3.1.13	<p>Additional task:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hengistbury Head Assessment Report - Draft report being internally reviewed prior to dissemination to CSG during w/c 16/03. 	
3.2	<p>MD asked whether the work being undertaken by the Dorset Coast Forum on Hengistbury Head was being taken into account and similarly the bi-modal study presented at a recent SCOPAC meeting.</p>	
3.3	<p>AB said that the study was at an early stage, was very detailed and that it might be more appropriate for it to be considered in the Strategy Study</p>	
4	<p>Dr Andrew Bradbury - Flood & Erosion Risk Maps Progress Report</p>	
4.1	<p>AB explained that a wide range of variables had to be considered in relation to flood risk and that it was necessary to work within the Defra framework which is quite prescriptive. The data presented had been sourced from Future Coast/National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping and showed erosion rates over a 100 year period.</p>	
4.2	<p>AB said that it was possible to measure historical rates in Christchurch Bay which is subject to land sliding and that a high level of recession is predicted with no intervention.</p>	
4.3	<p>AB emphasised that it is necessary to look at the systems broadly and not just in individual units. A systematic approach is required to what is a long stretch of coastline.</p>	
4.4	<p>All the maps used in the presentation had been circulated to the five authorities. AB pointed out that the data sets were satisfactory although the data was less dense and less robust as it moved to the west.</p>	

4.5	Sea level rise considerations were based on Defra's published figures and the flood event simulations shown used Lidar data. A table was provided which showed the properties at risk from tidal flooding.	
4.6	In response to a query from MA about Hurst Spit, AB confirmed that the Spit is very vulnerable and had been heavily recharged in the past. It is due for a top up but the sustainability of this approach needs to be reviewed.	
4.7	FC enquired about the next stage and how it would be decided by Royal Haskoning.	
4.8	AB explained that Royal Haskoning will look at the key drivers in order to make decisions. In certain areas it will be quite easy to recommend that no action be taken. In other areas however potential losses will mean that active intervention is essential. In formulating policies Royal Haskoning must also look at the impact on neighbouring areas.	
4.9	AB said that engineers can look at the technical aspects but that the Elected Members Forum has an important part to play in deciding on the social aspects.	
4.10	FC queried planning policies and the fact that it is still necessary to build in areas at risk. DH said that the Local Development Framework is a statutory plan. The SMP is not a statutory document but will feed into the LDF.	
4.11	DH clarified that SMP2 is a review of SMP1 and that each management unit already has a policy. The process involves looking at existing policies and checking their applicability.	
4.12	MA drew attention to the Hengistbury Head area and Barton frontage. AB said that there is strong pressure not to intervene as they are geological SSSI sites. Both are very difficult sites to make decisions on and it is inappropriate to predict the outcome of the SMP in this respect.	
4.13	MA said that the cost benefits have to be taken into account in the allocation of government grant. DH confirmed that Bournemouth is in the top Defra category for benefit/cost ratio and this is without including amenity benefits.	
4.14	RE drew attention to the effect of sea level rise. SW pointed out that the SMP is considering dynamic processes and that different policies may apply in 50 years time. AB confirmed that there is provision in the SMP for changes in policy.	
4.15	In response to a query from FC, DH explained that a 100% grant is available for capital schemes but that maintenance has to be funded by local councils. There is no longer a ring fencing arrangement.	
5	Borough of Poole - 'TwoBays' Website	
5.1	DR said that there had been 18,048 individual visits to the website since it was set up in April 2008. A total of 2065 visits had been made in February 2009 and 1064 so far in March. The figures were inflated however by U.S commercial companies which probably accounted for about 40% of the visits.	
5.2	DR confirmed that the questions and answers from the Mudeford presentation are on the website. DH said it had been agreed that each finalised document would be put on to the website and that they would not be password protected.	

5.3	MD said he would like to see documents before they go on to the website and into the public domain.	DH
5.4	DH said that the first public meetings on 9 th February 2009 were awareness raising exercises rather than public consultations. The turn-out was very pleasing and the feedback positive. It will not be until the preferred policies are available that the consultations will become more meaningful.	
5.5	FC said she would like to attend the Key Stakeholder Group meeting on 23 rd March 2009.	
6	Any Other Business	
6.1	In response to a query from MD, DH said that the more severe wave climate in Christchurch bay compared to Poole Bay was due to Christchurch Bay having shallower water and less protection than Poole Bay.	
6.2	FC stressed the need for Members to be consulted before the public on the preferred options identified in Royal Haskoning's study. DH said that because of the stringent Government timescale for completion of the SMP the intention had been for the political process and the public consultation to be undertaken simultaneously. The timing of the meetings had been designed to reflect this. The shortening of the 60-day public consultation period would have to be considered in order to allow time for Members to consider the recommendations in advance. DH explained that each local authority must adopt the final document for the SMP to be accepted by the Environment Agency and Government grant aid to be paid. DH said he would update the Forum at the next meeting on 18 th May 2009.	DH
7	Date of Next Meeting	
7.1	The next meeting of the EMF will take place at 6.00 pm on Monday 18 th May 2009 at the Bournemouth Learning Centre.	

**DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #02
BOURNEMOUTH TOWN HALL - MONDAY 16TH MARCH 2009**

Post-meeting Note

Item 3

Royal Haskoning (RH) has been asked to attend all future meetings of the CSG, EMF and KSG.

This involves more meetings than tendered for, and will incur **no delay** but **additional costs**.

The number of meetings to be held will be kept under review.

Item 5.3

The programmed sequence of events is in black type; **proposed changes are in red type.**

Documents were to be

- produced by RH
- proof-read by the CSG
- returned to RH for correction
- **distributed by email to the EMF, for seven days preview**
- posted on the website.

This will involve a **7 days delay** in the publication of each document, and **additional costs**.

Item 6.2

The programmed sequence of events is in black type; **proposed changes are in red type.**

The Draft SMP2 was to be

- produced by RH
- proof-read by the CSG
- returned to RH for correction
- **proof-read by EMF**
- **agreement of changes between EMF & CSG**
- **returned to RH for correction**
- posted on the website for 60 days for public consultation; consideration and adoption by each Local Authority; and approval by the Environment Agency (EA).
- final document to be produced by RH, incorporating comments from public, LA & EA
- **EMF Review**
- **agreement of changes between EMF & CSG**
- **returned to RH for amendments**
- **adoption of amended SMP2 by each Local Authority; and approval by the EA**
- Publication on the website
- Printing of hard copies.

This will involve a **further delay** (perhaps of several weeks) in the completion of the SMP, and **additional costs**

Dr David Harlow,
27 March 2009.