

**MINUTES OF DURLSTON HEAD TO HURST SPIT SMP2  
ELECTED MEMBERS FORUM MEETING #06  
BOURNEMOUTH LEARNING CENTRE - MONDAY 22<sup>nd</sup> FEBRUARY 2010**

**Present:**

Councillor Robert Lawton (RL)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Chair)
Dave Harlow (DH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Geoff Tyler (GT)	Bournemouth Borough Council (Minutes)
Simon Hills (SH)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Fran Carpenter (FC)	New Forest District Council
Andrew Bradbury (AB)	New Forest District Council
Steve Cook (SC)	New Forest District Council
Steve Woolard (SW)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Mike Duckworth (MD)	Christchurch Borough Council
Councillor Andrew Starr (AS)	Purbeck District Council
Mike Goater (MG)	Purbeck District Council
Neil Watson (NW)	Environment Agency
Tim Kermode (TK)	Environment Agency
Sue Burton (SB)	Natural England
Tony Flux (TF)	National Trust
Greg Guthrie (GG)	Royal Haskoning
Tara-Leigh Eggiman (TE)	Royal Haskoning

**Apologies:**

Councillor Mark Anderson (MA)	Bournemouth Borough Council
Councillor Peter Adams (PA)	Poole Borough Council
Dave Robson (DR)	Poole Borough Council
Stuart Terry (ST)	Poole Borough Council

Item No	Action
1.	<b>Minutes of the Last Meeting</b>
1.1	The minutes of the previous meeting on 24 <sup>th</sup> August 2009 were approved.
2.	<b>Summary of the SMP Progress since 24<sup>th</sup> August 2009</b>
2.1	TE explained that Royal Haskoning had met with Elected Members from the five local authorities and had taken account of the views expressed. A one week intensive consultation had taken place and the final amendments to the draft document had now been completed.
3	<b>Public Response to the SMP</b>
3.1	DH said that a total of 119 comments had been received and every response had been entered on to a spreadsheet. The CSG had met all day on Friday and again this morning to consider in detail the comments received including those from the National Review Group. DH said that they will draw the Elected Members' attention to where the document is changing and circulate the spreadsheet as it is important to check that the information is acceptable before it goes on to the website.

3.2	In reply to a question from RL, it was confirmed that the comments received had been generally positive although concern had been expressed about policy changes from SMP1 and Managed Re-alignment. Some of the comments received were not really relevant to the SMP.	
3.3	SH said that the only comment received about the main document concerned the need for a map showing how the SMP fits in with the national plan.	
3.4	In reply to a question from RL about acknowledging the comments, SH confirmed that it was the intention to put them on the website when the responses had been agreed.	
3.5	SH went through the spreadsheet for the benefit of the meeting and explained that the orange sections denoted the areas which required a change to the SMP document. The numbers below refer to the location and comment number in the spreadsheet.	
	<u>PDZ1</u>	
3.6	17 - It was noted that comments had been made about landfill sites and the fact that local knowledge is not captured on the mapping system.	
3.7	17 - The question of compensation for losses due to coastal erosion had been raised. It was noted that Defra are currently looking into the issue and their proposals are awaited.	
3.8	38 - SH said that the economic table is to be changed in respect of Barton on Sea to reflect the loss of some housing.	
3.9	64 - A query had been raised concerning planning applications being granted in areas of Managed Re-alignment.	
3.10	72 - It was agreed that a note should be included in the SMP about the loss of beach huts and beach access.	
3.11	85 - Concern had been expressed about further substantial beach recharge which is to be taken forward for consideration in the Christchurch Bay Strategy Study.	
	<u>PDZ2</u>	
3.12	1-5 - It was noted that name changes relating to Hengistbury Head and Mudeford Sandbank had been agreed.	
3.13	53 - Off-shore structures had been suggested for the Southbourne area which is to be forwarded to the Strategy Study.	
3.14	89 - A change in policy had been requested by Christchurch Borough Council and agreed by the CSG for Mudeford and Stanpit, and the text is to be amended to clarify the change.	
3.15	97 - Reference is to be made in the SMP to the disused landfill sites at Wick.	

	<p><u>PDZ3</u></p>	
3.16	18 - Agreed that Wareham should be included in the SMP and tidal boundaries re-established.	
3.17	60 - Natural England had confirmed that they were happy with the proposals for Brownsea Lagoon and a change in the text had been agreed.	
3.18	59 - The coastal erosion maps had been found to be erroneous in Lytchett Bay and it had been agreed to look at the area again.	
3.19	71 - SH explained in response to a query from AS that the comments concerning Wareham J4 originated from the Ridge Wharf Yacht Centre and the EA would be looking at them further in the Strategy Study.	
3.20	80 - It was noted that the effect on 300 properties on Lytchett is to be re-appraised.	
3.21	90 - The RSPB had commented on losses of habitat on the northern side of Poole Harbour.	
3.22	98 - It was noted that Redclyffe Yacht Club had expressed concern about possible breaching of the River Frome flood protection banks.	
3.23	116 - Lytchett Bay and the railway line are to be looked at in more detail following concerns expressed by Natural England.	
	<p><u>PDZ4</u></p>	
3.24	73 - It had been agreed that the N1/N2 boundary is to be moved north to Tanville Ledges.	
	<p><u>Appendices</u></p>	
3.25	108 - It was noted that Royal Haskoning are to check on all information maps to ensure that the Historic Environment data is included.	
	<p><u>Other Changes</u></p>	
3.26	TE explained that the CSG are recommending consideration of policy changes for F1. Mundeford/Stanpit, J2. Lytchett Bay and I3. Holes Bay.	
3.27	SB said that Natural England have concerns about unit J3 and the lack of clarity and understanding of the policy intentions. SB pointed out that there was a need to mitigate the effect of inter-tidal habitats by sub-dividing the units. DH said that the policy was not to hold the line on the mud flats but to hold the line to defend the railway. GG confirmed the importance of getting across clearly the intent of the policy.	

4	<p><b>Sensitive Comments Requiring a Political Decision</b></p> <p><u>PDZ1</u></p> <p>4.1 It was noted in connection with Comment 79 that the Action Plan should include a planning policy guidance which NFDC could use.</p> <p>4.2 FC said that some residents were unhappy with the policy of MR for Barton, it having been HTL previously. But they were also wary of creating too much publicity around the issue. Some residents were also concerned about what insurance companies would do with the information from the SMP.</p> <p>4.3 FC said the local MP is to raise the matter of erosion at Barton in Parliament (See Comment 79) and has spoken to AB and SC about this. FC said she believed MR to be the most honest and practical policy for Barton, given all the information available - even though she did not like the prospect of the eventual loss of properties.</p> <p>4.4 DH pointed out that we have said that we look forward to working with the MP to get more government funding.</p> <p>4.5 TF said it was important not to build up false hopes. The very large conurbations will soak up much of the resources and the time should be devoted to managing the situation rather than seeking extra funding. TF drew attention to a national pathfinder project which is looking at the idea of a local authority lease/buy-back scheme.</p> <p>4.6 RL said that managed re-alignment was probably the best option as there was no funding for a hold the line policy.</p> <p>4.7 FC said that NFDC and the local MP would continue to strive to obtain funding for a drainage syphon system to slow the rate of erosion at Barton. They would also strive to clarify the funding source for such management works in areas of coastal landslip, where erosion was not wholly due to the sea, as in Barton's case.</p> <p>4.8 AB said that a clear description is needed of what a hold the line policy actually means as there is no absolute guarantee of funding.</p> <p>4.9 NW said there had been more engagement in this SMP2, but that there had not been a great change from SMP1. Adaptive management and support were more important.</p> <p>4.10 GG said that it is an area of change that needs to be managed and that the Department for Local Government &amp; Communities had an emerging policy about how planning blight is to be addressed.</p>	DH
5	<p><b>Future Actions</b></p> <p>5.1 DH said he would circulate the information with the agreed wording for Elected Members to comment on. DH asked that Elected Members should tell the CSG if they are unhappy with any of the changes.</p> <p>5.2 RL asked the Elected Members to each look at their own areas and return their comments to the CSG.</p> <p>5.3 DH pointed out that the comments were required back within three weeks as instructions needed to be given to Royal Haskoning to make the necessary</p>	EMF  DH/TE

	changes. DH said that he and TE will be meeting with Natural England and English Heritage to consider and agree the changes.	
5.4	DH went on to explain that it was necessary to agree the final document with the Quality Review Group, who want track changes to be made, and also to complete the Action Plan that would follow on from the SMP.	
5.5	DH said that there was no further consultation process and that it was hoped to go to Cabinet on 24 <sup>th</sup> April 2010 but that this would have to be put back a month. Once the document is finalised there will still be various stages to complete.	
5.6	RL said it would be helpful if comments could be returned within about a week because of the tight timetable.	
5.7	MD said that he needed to discuss the policies for Mudford and Stanpit with his fellow Councillors.	
5.8	RL suggested that the EMF should meet again and it was agreed that the meeting could follow on at 3.00 pm from the CSG arranged for 29 <sup>th</sup> March 2010.	
5.9	TE said that the SMP will be forwarded to the Quality Review Group after 29 <sup>th</sup> March and will be taken to the various Cabinets in May. Approval will also be sought from the non-operating authorities. TE confirmed that Royal Haskoning's involvement will finish in May.	
6	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
6.1	There was no other business.	
7	<b>Date of Next Meeting</b>	
7.1	The next meeting will be held at 3.00 p.m. on <b>Monday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2010</b> in 'The Willows' Room at <b>Bournemouth Town Hall</b> following the Client Steering Group meeting earlier in the afternoon.	