

B10.3 COMMUNICATIONS GROUP MATERIALS

B10.3.1 COMMUNICATIONS GROUP MEETING No1 AGENDA

Communications Group Meeting No 1

Date Friday 30th October 2009 **Time** 09:30-12:00 **Venue** NOC, Southampton

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Apologies
3. Aims and purpose of meeting
4. SMP overview
5. The need for consultation
6. Draft consultation strategy – Discussion of methodology
 - a. Websites
 - b. Press notices
 - c. Letters to stakeholders
 - d. Advertisement posters
 - e. Hard copies of the draft SMP document
 - f. Meetings with landowners
 - g. Public exhibitions
 - h. Exhibition posters
 - i. Downloadable poster sets – SMP summary
 - j. Co-ordination of responses – Feedback forms
7. Timetable
8. Costs and responsibilities
9. Future meetings
10. Any other business

B10.3.2 COMMUNICATIONS GROUP MEETING No1 MINUTES

Project	North Solent SMP	Date	30 Oct 2009
Subject	Communications Group Meeting No 1	Ref	NSSMP/CMminutes01
Venue	National Oceanography Centre, Southampton		
Date held	30 th October 09:30		
Present	Andrew Colenutt (AC) New Forest DC/CCO Mark Stratton New Forest DC/CCO Malgosia Gorczynska (MG) New Forest DC/CCO Davina Staples (DS) New Forest DC/CCO Naomi Philp (NP) New Forest DC/CCO Tim Kermode (TK) Environment Agency Bret Davies (BD) Havant Borough Council Stacia Miller (SM) Environment Agency James Pusey (JP) Havant Borough Council Dave Hyland (DH) Chichester District Council Steve Collins (SC) Eastleigh Borough Council		
Apologies	Sue Mills Fareham Borough Council Amanda Mahoney Fareham Borough Council Brenda Brooker Gosport Borough Council John Millard Portsmouth City Council Christine Brown Test Valley Council		
			Action
Agenda <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome and introductions 2. Apologies 3. Aims and purpose of meeting 4. SMP overview 5. The need for consultation 6. Draft consultation strategy – Discussion of methodology <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Websites b. Press notices c. Letters to stakeholders d. Advertisement posters e. Hard copies of the draft SMP document f. Meetings with landowners g. Public exhibitions h. Exhibition posters i. Downloadable poster sets – SMP summary j. Co-ordination of responses – Feedback forms 7. Timetable 8. Costs and responsibilities 9. Future meetings 10. Any other business 			
1 Introduction and Apologies AC welcomed the group to the meeting followed by introductions			

<p>2 Apologies see above</p>	
<p>3. Aims and purpose of meeting AC outlined the aims of the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form a Communications Group for public consultation and delivery of the final SMP • Agree the Public Consultation Strategy for the SMP • Agree the consultation timetable, costs and responsibilities 	
<p>4 SMP Overview AC gave a brief overview of the aim and purpose of an SMP and the key points to note with regard to the North Solent SMP. In the context of the public consultation the key points to note were that approximately 60% of the North Solent is privately owned, 80% of the shoreline is defended, and 80% is covered by International and European nature conservation designations. Landowners have strong views about coastal management. The SMP needs to clearly give them the right message, which is that the SMP will not stop them maintaining their defences. TK added that it is important not to forget that the majority of the coastline is developed, with at least 50% of the developed areas also covered by nature designation.</p>	
<p>5. The need for public consultation MS outlined the need for public consultation, which will aim to give stakeholders and the public an opportunity to be involved in and understand the SMP process, even if they don't agree with the final policies. They need to understand the process by which they have been reached. TK explained that the SMP was a tool for government to show how much more money the EA needs for coastal erosion and flood risk management and defence. At present the EA have estimated that they need twice the current money available to maintain and improve the defences. So the SMP will prove more money is needed. AC stated that there is the need to re-assure landowners that the SMP will not infringe their human rights. TK highlighted the need to make them aware of the consequences of maintaining the current defences and coastline position. The public view is leave it as it is, but if we do that things will get much worse and even more difficult. JP asked if policies can be enforced. AC said that if Managed Re-alignment was on a privately owned stretch then the owners can formally object during consultation and it will be changed to hold the line, with a clear statement that no public funding would be available. Owners have the right to maintain their defences but if they want to improve or install addition defences they would have to go through the normal planning process that is currently in place. TK explained how landowners varied from single houses to large estates. DS asked what we are trying to achieve with the consultation, how we will measure its success, and what are the risks we face in consultation. Also what are the hotspots for confrontation? How much is going to be Hold the line (HTL)? AC explained that the majority of proposed policies are HTL, most are viable</p>	

<p>and funding would be likely to be available. Private frontages are not publically funded but works may be considered affordable by the landowner. There are not many No Active Intervention sites (NAI), which are mostly on undefended naturally rising land not at risk to flooding, or in areas where there was an aim to not promote improvements to defences. Frontages proposed with a managed realignment are the anticipated contentious sites, the hot topics as far as nature conservation goes and private.</p> <p>BD explained that each Local Authority Client Steering Group (CSG) member knew where their hotspot sites were.</p> <p>TK explained that this SMP is different from many others as the issues are extremely specific to small sections of the coastline.</p> <p>JP said he has spoken with BD about the issues covered in their council's coastline.</p> <p>BD stressed that before the consultation it is important that every PR representative from each council speaks with their engineer or CSG representative as they know what all the issues are going to be and where the hot spots for confrontation may be.</p> <p>SC said he was less concerned about where across the whole Solent the issues are. His job was to protect the reputation of his council, and to make sure everybody within the borough was contacted and given every opportunity to comment on the SMP and given all the information that they need to understand it.</p> <p>DH asked if during the consultation we are dealing with the public, stakeholders or landowners, all who are very different.</p> <p>AC said that we were dealing with all of those groups. Stakeholders have already been identified, contacted and involved in the SMP at various meetings and presentations; landowners will also be contacted prior to consultation with invitation to meet to discuss proposed policies.</p> <p>DH said the focus should be on landowners and the Planning Local Authority.</p> <p>TK said that the councils are already involved and formally adopt the Final SMP after revisions made following responses at consultation.</p> <p>AC said he anticipated the key influential responses would be from the Local Authorities, the Environment Agency, and landowners.</p> <p>SC said we have to make sure people are given every chance to comment. If we have done that we will be covered. We also have to be careful because with consultation always comes an expectation that things can be changed. We also need to make sure that as a group of councils, we are collectively responsible for the messages we put across.</p> <p>DS asked if people can change the policies during consultation.</p> <p>AC said yes if there was overwhelming evidence or responses and objections from private landowners. But if there were no responses the majority of the Client Steering Group would be happy with what has been proposed given the amount of background work that has gone into reaching them. A comparison of proposed policies with those in the first round SMP indicated that the majority of policies proposed had not changed since the last SMP. We need to create a greater level of understanding of climate change, sea level rise and flood and erosion risks amongst the public not necessarily support of policies.</p> <p>SC said that their council will brand the stories as tackling climate change.</p> <p>TK said to be careful because although sea level rise is happening the causes are not widely agreed</p> <p>BD understood TK's worries but his council would also be branding with</p>	<p>ACTION 1: All PR and Comms Group representatives to talk with their Local Authority CSG representative or engineer about the SMP and the proposed policies, particularly areas of potential contention in their borough.</p>
--	--

<p>climate change, as it makes it more relevant to the current media climate we live in and what people are interested in.</p> <p>SM asked if the main objective could be clarified.</p> <p>AC reiterated that the main objective of the consultation is 'Raising awareness and understanding of the SMP and valuing local knowledge'</p> <p>SM asked how we would measure the consultations success. If you get no responses has the consultation failed?</p> <p>SC disagreed. As long as everyone has had a chance to comment then that is all we can do so long as we know we have advertised, had exhibitions, written press info etc. You cannot force people to comment.</p> <p>JP suggested having a counter on the website to see how many hits were received during consultation as a measure.</p> <p>There was some discussion of the format of feedback forms which should have generic questions about how successful people thought the consultation was. The group agreed.</p>	<p>ACTION 2: AC to setup tally counters on website for SMP.</p>
<p>6. Draft Consultation Strategy</p> <p>a) Websites</p> <p>MS outlined the proposal for using websites. NFDC will be the main information source for the SMP with all the associated documents. Local Authority websites will link to the www.northsolentsmp.co.uk website. He asked how this can be done and who deals with it in each LA.</p> <p>JP said that the links could be sorted out by the IT depts. within each LA but may look stale after 3 months.</p> <p>DS suggested that the links should be at the start of the consultation, then just before each Local Authority's exhibition. The group agreed.</p> <p>BD said that the Local Authority websites should definitely advertise the exhibitions.</p> <p>SC said that the all the details should be added to the A to Z on each website for the period of the consultation. The links would just have a sentence or two about the SMP. The group agreed.</p> <p>JP said that the small logo for the North Solent would be a good link icon because it had a Solent-wide map that identified the project as cross-council boundaries. It gives a good visual message.</p> <p>b) Press Notices</p> <p>MS outlined that NFDC would be responsible for the main press releases and would send them out to the Comms Group for approval and use by their council.</p> <p>There was general discussion that the press release should comprise 2 or 3 introductory paragraphs that were generic to all councils, then a 3rd or 4th that each Comms or PR officer could change with a local quote from an engineer or councilor in their borough. The group agreed.</p> <p>SM suggested that there should be a universal quote form the EA in the generic part of the press release. The group agreed.</p> <p>There was discussion about what would happen if the press wanted to do a TV piece on the subject. Who would be the spokesperson?</p> <p>There was general agreement that local issues should be covered by local CSG members and for regional issues the CSG would need to identify a spokesperson.</p>	<p>ACTION 3: Comms Group members to speak with their IT depts. for internal and external links to North Solent SMP website and information pages.</p> <p>ACTION 4: NFDC to send SMP logo to Comms / CSG for their IT depts.</p> <p>ACTION 5: DS to draft press notice and send to group.</p> <p>ACTION 6: All to get their press releases completed with quotes and send copy to the Comms Group to keep everyone informed of what everyone was saying.</p> <p>ACTION 7: SM to issue EA quote about the SMP to the group for the press notice.</p> <p>ACTION 7: CSG to agree spokesperson.</p>

<p>c) Letters to Stakeholders MS outlined that over 250 stakeholders have already been identified and would be written to by the CSG informing them about the SMP and public consultation. The group agreed that the letter should be sent to the Comms Group for reference, and that letters to private landowners would also be sent to the group for reference. SM asked who was speaking to the Elected Members. BD explained that they have been involved since the process began and that each CSG representative was speaking to their EM all the time and will meet with them before consultation to explain in detail all of the issues. AC said that Elected Members would be invited to the exhibitions. SM asked whether MP's had been contacted or involved in SMP process and were aware of consultation JP said that MP's were included in the LA's list of recipients for all press releases. SM said EA would also write to all the MPs as they have strategic overview for coastal defence.</p> <p>d) Advertisement Posters MS outlined how NFDC would disseminate advertisement posters to each Comms Group member for placement in their region. He asked what mechanisms each council uses to place posters. There was general agreement that the poster could just be sent to the Comms Group members for placement by their teams. MS said that the Comms Group need to agree the format and content of the posters within the next 2 weeks. JP felt that there may be too much text. MS outlined how the text for the ad posters had already been substantially cut down and warned that cutting it down any further may mean that important messages were being lost. He showed example posters from the 2 Bays SMP and Beachy Head to Selsey bill for comparison, which acted to highlight how little information was on the North Solent SMP poster. AC said that certain important information such as 'the government can no longer afford to protect the entire coastline' had to be included in the poster and was not at the moment. DH said that it would be better if the posters were A4 rather than A3 otherwise they would be difficult to place in such places as Parish Council notice boards. There was a general discussion about what contacts should be on the poster. Group agreed it should be the North Solent SMP details</p> <p>e) Hard copies of the SMP MS outlined that NFDC would distribute a hard copy of the Draft SMP to the CSG organisations given the requirement for them to be available to the public. MG asked if it should be all of the appendices, because that would mean 8-10 copies of probably over 1000 pages. Group agreed that it should just be a summary document. Each council could have the full Draft SMP and supporting appendices on a DVD or CD for people to come in and access should they want to. The Local Authority could print off parts of the document should people request it.</p> <p>f) Meeting with Landowners</p>	<p>ACTION: MS to send stakeholder and landowner letters to Comms Group.</p> <p>ACTION : All to feedback comments and suggestions on how to act on comments within the next week.</p>
---	--

<p>AC talked about the need for meeting with landowners affected by proposed Managed Realignment, in advance of public consultation. Letters would be sent to them in January as previously discussed in the meeting. Comms Group to receive copies for their reference.</p> <p>g) Public Exhibitions MS outlined the background of the exhibitions as detailed in the draft strategy. Venues to be booked and paid for by the local authority. The timings suggested by the group were 2pm until 7pm. There was general discussion about who should attend the meetings in terms of CSG and Elected Members. This is to be organised by the CSG once the venues have been booked. MS briefly outlined the timetable showing only 9 working weeks before the consultation. Unfortunately the meeting had to finish before all topics had been covered and discussed. The group agreed that another meeting should be held in 2 weeks to discuss further the exhibitions and posters and feedback forms. The group agreed to review the poster content before the next meeting. MS asked everyone for comments and alternative suggestions to help speed up the process of reviewing the posters given the limited timeframe in which we have to work.</p>	<p>ACTION: MS to arrange and confirm exhibition details. CSG to agree attendance.</p> <p>ACTION : All to feedback comments and suggestions on how to act on comments by or at the next meeting.</p> <p>ACTION: MS to arrange and confirm details of next Comms Group meeting.</p>
<p>AC thanked the group for their time. Meeting Close.</p>	

B10.3.3 COMMUNICATIONS GROUP MEETING No2 AGENDA

Date Friday 13th November 2009 **Time** 10:00 – 13:30

Venue Portsmouth City Council, the Guildhall, Meeting Room 5

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Apologies
3. Minutes from meeting 1
4. Consultation strategy
 - a. Press notices - progress
 - b. Meetings with landowners
 - c. Advertisement posters
 - d. Public exhibitions
 - e. Exhibition posters
 - f. Co-ordination of responses – feedback
5. Timetable
6. Costs and responsibilities
7. Environment Agency Erosion Risk Maps
8. Next meeting

B10.3.4 COMMUNICATIONS GROUP MEETING No2 MINUTES

Project	North Solent SMP	Date	13 th November 2009
Subject	Communications Group Meeting No 2	Ref	NSSMP/CMminutes02
Venue	Portsmouth City Council, the Guildhall, Meeting Room 5		
Date held	13 th November 10:00 – 13:00		
Present	Andrew Colenutt (AC) New Forest DC/CCO Mark Stratton New Forest DC/CCO Davina Staples (DS) New Forest DC/CCO Naomi Philp (NP) New Forest DC/CCO Tim Kermode (TK) Environment Agency Bret Davies (BD) Havant Borough Council Alison Fowler (AF) Chichester Harbour Conservancy James Pusey (JP) Havant Borough Council Steve Collins (SC) Eastleigh Borough Council Amanda Mahoney (AM) Fareham Borough Council Brenda Brooker (BB) Gosport Borough Council John Millard (JM) Portsmouth City Council Hilary Makin (HM) New Forest National Park Authority		
Apologies	Sue Mills Fareham Borough Council Christine Brown Test Valley Council Malgosia Gorczynska (MG) New Forest DC/CCO Stacia Miller (SM) Environment Agency Dave Hyland (DH) Chichester District Council		
			Action
Agenda			
11. Welcome and introductions 12. Apologies 13. Minutes from meeting 1 – Action log update 14. Consultation strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Press notices - progress b. Meetings with landowners c. Advertisement posters d. Public exhibitions e. Exhibition posters f. Co-ordination of responses – feedback 15. Timetable 16. Costs and responsibilities 17. Environment Agency Erosion Risk Maps 18. Next meeting			
1 Introduction and Apologies			
AC welcomed the group to the meeting followed by introductions			
3 Apologies			
See above			
3. Minutes and Action Log			
AC asked if any one had any comments regarding the minutes of the last meeting. None had been received and none were forthcoming. MS ran through the agenda and explained how some of the points that we would be going through are updates from the last meeting. Others were points we were unable to get through at the last meeting.			

<p>MS then ran through the Actions Log to update the group. He stressed the need for Comms Group members to keep talking to their Client Steering Group (CSG) representatives leading up to and during the consultation.</p>	
<p>4 Consultation Strategy – a) Press Notices</p> <p>MS handed out the draft Press Release that DS had prepared as a template for all to use. There was discussion over who would be used for the quotes and press interviews for the whole north Solent and for the individual areas.</p> <p>AC explained that NFDC Portfolio Holder has agreed to be the Elected Member spokesperson for generic SMP statements, and Andrew Bradbury, the SMP Project Director has agreed to be the technical Officer for SMP related issues. If quotes were required on site specific issues and concerns then each Local Authority would need to put forward a representative (e.g. CSG member or their portfolio holder)</p> <p>MS asked Comms Group to speak with their LA reps and identify their portfolio holder/Elected Member to get quotes confirmed and agreed for the press releases.</p> <p>HM asked if there would be a press briefing.</p> <p>DS explained that in the Bournemouth and Poole SMP journalists had contacted the local authority representatives as and when they needed or wanted to.</p> <p>MS explained there would be an embargo date on the press notice so they were all released at the same time.</p> <p>TK said he would chase Stacia Miller for the generic EA quote to be included in the Press Release.</p> <p>MS said that he would send the Press Release out on Monday for people's comments by the end of next week (Fri 20th).</p> <p>AC said he would contact the CSG to confirm the details of who the overall spokesperson/people were going to be and let the group know.</p> <p>MS went on to talk about local level press exercises during the consultation period and asked if there was a need for a briefing pack for the group to use including background information etc.</p> <p>SC asked if that information was already on the website then there was no need to send it out as people could just use the website.</p> <p>The group agreed.</p> <p>HM asked if we would also be issuing maps of the policies to journalists.</p> <p>DS and MS said they would be available on the website.</p> <p>HM said we needed to make it easy for the press to get the information about the policies otherwise they would make up their own stories.</p> <p>TK explained it would be difficult to give the journalist just the policies without any explanation of how they had been reached. It would be difficult to give that information in a nutshell.</p> <p>JP said that there may be way too much info if you gave the journalists each policy per 3 epochs per 61 management units.</p> <p>HM explained that the press would want specific information about their own region of interest.</p> <p>TK said all the info would be on the web but understood it is not quickly accessible like the journalists may want</p> <p>SC said that the press distill the facts and this can lead to mis-information. Given the elections coming up his portfolio holder may not want to give a quote in case the whole thing was politicised.</p> <p>AM said we should focus the time to prepare for questions about the contentious sites.</p> <p>AC said it was very hard to summarise due to variables involved for each epoch</p>	<p>ACTION 1: Comms Group to liaise with CSG member and Elected Members for Press Release quotes.</p> <p>ACTION 2: TK ask Stacia Miller for EA quote for Press Release.</p> <p>ACTION 3: MS to send out Press notice for review by Fri 20th Nov.</p> <p>ACTION 4: AC to contact CSG to identify spokespersons.</p>

<p>for each site.</p> <p>BD said that a summarised report, map showing the policy units and a table of policies would be useful for each Comms Group rep to have before consultation. They can then deal with questions and liaise with their LA rep.</p> <p>SC said that it was about protecting the local authorities' reputations.</p> <p>TK pointed out that the policies we were going to propose had been approved by the Local Authorities involved and they had been fully involved in the SMP process since the start so it is their responsibility to deal with concerns raised regarding their frontage. The policies are their own.</p> <p>HM asked about a press briefing meeting for the whole area.</p> <p>AC said that would mean the entire CSG attending a meeting, which may appear excessive and defensive.</p> <p>SC went back to the point about how politically sensitive it was that the SMP was going to consultation before and possibly during elections. He would find it hard to cover the story very much, if it meant reputation would be damaged.</p> <p>JP pointed out that everyone would be part of this and it would be difficult for SC not to cover it when all the other councils would be doing so.</p> <p>AC stressed that there were no easy messages, with variables and uncertainties for many sites. People may not like messages but they are a likely reality. The SMP will propose continued defence for majority of area, but we also need to plan for change.</p> <p>JP pointed out that we need to keep in mind that we are going to consultation to inform people and ask their views and that the policies may change. This is a positive point.</p> <p>HM said we need to be proactive to prepare for what the media might say.</p> <p>MS stressed that if the Comms Group members were talking with their LA reps they would know the potential issues, be informed and prepared.</p> <p>TK said a generic explanation of what each policy is was needed, and the SMP needed to emphasise that this is a long term project planning for adaptation in the future. SMP's are being prepared nationally, to provide Defra with idea of future budget requirements for flood and coastal defences, and to identify areas where no public funding will be available. Key messages would need to include increases in potential risk of tidal flooding, erosion, climate change, sea level rise</p> <p>AF thought that a key message for the public is that public funding is not guaranteed and that there are areas where defences are required but funding is unlikely.</p> <p>AC thought that a message pertaining to rights of private owners to maintain defences would be useful and reassuring. The Solent area is unique in the UK. Other key messages were approx 60% of shoreline is privately owned. 80% of shoreline is designated for nature conservation. 76% of shoreline is defended. High proportion of Solent is developed and urbanized so options and opportunities are limited, and implications if defences fail are considerable. Due to all these constraints the policies being proposed also contain caveats and qualifying statements to provide pertinent information and for each LA to confirm them for consultation.</p> <p>SC argued that the press are only interested in the short term.</p> <p>TK stressed that we must at least try to get the long term message out there.</p> <p>AC agreed as some of the policies only become contentious as they change in the longer term.</p> <p>JP asked about a frequently asked question (FAQ) page, would that be appropriate on the website. I.e. outlining the issues.</p>	<p>ACTION 5: Comms Group members to speak to LA reps to get up to speed on contentious issues.</p> <p>ACTION 6: MS to circulate the FAQ document to the Comms Group for comment and suggestions of more questions.</p> <p>ACTION 7: MS + AC to circulate policies, summary justifications and maps to Comms Group and CSG.</p> <p>ACTION 8: Comms Group and CSG reps to prepare for possible site specific media questions and circulate to Group</p>
---	---

<p>MS pointed out that we already had some. HM said we also need some questions for ourselves that our LA reps may need to deal with from the press. AC asked then if the Comms Group could come up with some questions that they think the press will ask and get their LA reps ready to answer those questions. The proposed policies and justifications could be sent to the Comms Group and CSG members once drafts had been completed (in the next couple of weeks) MS summarised that AC / MS would send to the Comms Group and CSG reps: the proposed policies and justifications; maps of the units for each LA area; a table of proposed policies; and The current FAQ's and suggestions of further ones that may be needed. The Comms Group and CSG reps will then prepare the FAQs for their specific area in preparation for questions from the press, and circulate these to the group for information and record.</p>	for information
<p>b) Meetings with Landowners MS outlined that there would be meetings with private landowners before consultation where a policy of managed realignment was going to be proposed. These briefing meetings would aim to explain what was being proposed and why, what the implications were, highlight options, and to clarify the consultation process, i.e. if landowners did not wish to consider MR then through consultation the policy will be changed to a Hold the Line policy with a statement that no public funding would be available to maintain their defences. The SMP team had met and discussed such issues with some of the landowners during process. At the meeting there would need to be representatives from the Environment Agency, Natural England, the Local authorities and perhaps other organisations. TK suggested instead of holding 1 meeting split it between the west Solent and those in Chichester Harbour and Hayling Island. Possibly hold a morning and afternoon surgery on a single day AC said we don't have time to do one-to-one meetings and that it will be just a briefing meeting. Most of what we are telling them will be in the letter we send. He asked what the timings of the meetings should be? JP said as close to the consultation as possible. Ac asked before the press release? There was general discussion that it should be at the same time. Several dates were discussed. It was agreed that the press releases would be completed and circulated to the Comms Group before xmas. The press release date would be the Tues 6th of January and the landowner meetings would be arranged for either on the 6th or between the 5th-7th depending on staff availability. JP added that you could give them all the information that they needed in the letter and invite them to attend the meeting if they wish and to let you know if they wanted to come. If they felt they had the necessary information then they may feel that attending such a briefing was not required.</p>	<p>ACTION 9: AC to write landowner invitation and information letter for Comms Group to comment on; and to arrange meeting with landowners.</p>
<p>c) Advertisement Posters MS thanked the group for their feedback so far on the posters. We need to confirm the content today. The team has taken on board the comments received and reduced text and reformatted advert poster. He circulated 2 examples for discussion. The agreed version would then be sent to the NFDC design team for finishing touches and printing.</p>	

<p>SC said that the posters needed to be specific and not so general. MS said that the plan was Solent-wide and about broad scale policy so it was an important factor that the posters demonstrated this. TK added that the Solent was a large region and lots of people don't necessarily live on the coast but may be interested in it. JP suggested having the local poster but with the box showing the exhibitions only having 3 meetings advertised. The central one being for that council, and the other two for reference. SC added that there could be local photos. AC said that if there could be a template then the LA can add its own photos and personalise. The group agreed. TK said the posters on the website could be the overall one along with links to all the others. MS pointed out that there needed to be a certain elements of consistency between the posters as we don't want mixed messages. The group agreed that less wording was better at attention grabbing. Changes in wording were suggested to increase local relevance. The Comms Group and CSG reps could then change: the geographic area, the photos and only have 3 exhibitions listed. MS said there was no mention of consultation or commenting on it. The group agreed it should be added. TK said the word draft also needed adding. The group agreed, i.e. Draft proposals. SC said to take out 'if you would like to'. Group agreed. MS stressed the need for some consistency. The group agreed and all would send posters to the group to keep everyone informed. Each LA would be responsible for printing the posters and placing them. Dates of distribution and placement of advert posters to be confirmed, but were anticipated that it will be the first or second week in January. There was then discussion over how the names of the geographic areas should be produced. The suggestions were: Hurst Spit to Redbridge – For NFDC Redbridge to Weston Shore – For SCC Weston Shore to Warsash – For EBC Warsash to Lee On The Solent to Gilkicker point – For FBC + GBC Gilkicker Point to Port Solent – For GBC + FBC Portsea Island & Port Solent to Farlington – For PCC Hayling Island & Farlington to Emsworth – For HBC Emsworth to Selsey Bill inc East head – CDC There was also discussion of highlighting the region on the map where the exhibition was going to be for the poster. E.g. colour coding or numbering the different areas covered by each exhibition.</p>	<p>ACTION 10: MS +DS to meet with NFDC design team to create a template for the group. Comms members to edit accordingly and send final posters to the group.</p>
<p>d + e) Public Exhibitions & Exhibition boards MS outlined the background of the exhibitions as detailed in the draft engagement strategy. He said he would be contacting everyone over the next week to organise the venues for the first 2 weeks in February, with 4 exhibitions per week. Venues to be booked and paid for by the local authority The timings suggested by the Comms Group were 2pm until 7pm. There was general discussion about who should attend the meetings in terms of CSG and Elected Members. This is to be organised by the CSG once the venues have been booked. AC stressed that rep(s) from each LA must be there</p>	<p>ACTION 11:</p>

<p>for the duration who could answer or field enquiries and questions. MS outlined that there would be 6 generic exhibition boards rolled out for each exhibition then 4 – 6 site-specific boards summarising the policies being proposed pending content. He asked the group for comments on the content of the posters by Friday 20th. Once they had been received he would meet with DS and the NFDC designers to finalise and produce the poster boards. AC added that there would also need to be a section about private landowners, perhaps instead of the stakeholder engagement section. BD suggested having a PowerPoint running in the background with info about the local area, but giving presentations at these things would be unadvisable. This was agreed. AC said that a summary leaflet/booklet of the exhibition posters would also be available for people to take away and be available to download from website MS said that the full Draft SMP document would be available at the exhibitions. A hard copy would be at each local council should people wish to see it there. JP commented that the site-specific boards would be useful for the Comms Group and CSG officers in order to prepare for possible questions from the press. AC stated boards would have to be ready before xmas along with the booklets. MS gave summary of exhibitions and boards: first 2 weeks of Feb. 6 generic boards, 4-6 site specific boards. PowerPoint possibly running in the background. Reps for all groups. Booklets, feedback forms.</p>	<p>Comms group to feedback comments by Fri 20th November</p>
<p>f) Feedback forms MS outlined that feedback forms and the necessity for not only measuring the success of the consultation but also acting to help highlight any key messages that may alter the final policies adopted. There was talk at the last meeting about using 4 or 5 generic questions before a general comments box. There was general discussion of the forms and how consultation software could help speed up the process. Feedback would be encouraged online, so wording on form would need to be revised to alter emphasis options. Paper copies would be available. Freepost was discussed for hand written responses. Ideas for the form were discussed and what info would be required to provide consultation response information, such as: Geographic area of abode (making post code mandatory): drop down box Area of interest :Policy unit drop down box Do you agree with proposed policies yes or no General comment. Also, questions such as: Do you understand...?, do you agree...?, which area...?, will changes directly affect you? where did you hear about the SMP? Do you agree with the process of the SMP as a whole for prioritising defences in the face of SLR and Climate change? How did you hear about the SMP? The group agreed that these forms would need to be some reference to the consultation report. MS said this was in the posters, and would be at the bottom of the questionnaire. The group agreed that the questionnaire could go in the back of the booklet but the wording should be changed to encourage it to be done online, rather than handwritten and posted. MS and DS to meet with NFDC communication officer who will assist in making the forms and using the consultation software.</p>	<p>ACTION 12: MS + DS to meet with</p>

<p>There was then some discussion about asking people if they wanted feedback and asking them for their name and address if they did.</p> <p>MS pointed out that none of the EA Coastal Strategies he had seen or other SMP's had done feedback forms like the group was discussing. He asked TK if there was a reason for that.</p> <p>TK replied that it was not their policy and there was no specific requirement for it. So it is up to NFDC how they want to do it.</p>	<p>NFDC to organise feedback form.</p>
<p>5) Timetable</p> <p>MS ran through the consultation timetable highlighting tightness of the schedule. BD asked if it could be put on the website.</p> <p>AC said it will be put on along with the minutes and other Comms information on the password protected section of the website. He will email the group the password for the protected area of the site so they can access this.</p>	<p>ACTION 13: AC to Upload timetable etc to website and email group the password.</p>
<p>6) Costs and responsibilities</p> <p>MS ran through the costs and responsibilities of NFDC and the local authorities. BD said there was no budget from Portsmouth City Council for hiring exhibition locations.</p> <p>MS said then that the exhibitions could be held in the council chamber but this may not be ideal from the point of view of the council engaging their electorate and after all it was the council's shoreline management plan.</p> <p>Other Comms Group reps said that they would be able to cover their costs.</p> <p>TK suggested NFDC may be able to apply for more funding.</p> <p>MS asked if this had to be submitted first or could everything be organised and booked and then the VO submitted</p> <p>TK said if NFDC submitted a VO during consultation and within this financial year then he was confident that the costs would probably be met.</p>	
<p>9) Environment Agency Erosion Risk Maps</p> <p>AC said that as Stacia Miller was not here he would pursue separately, at the forthcoming National Coastal Erosion Risk Mapping meeting.</p>	
<p>10) Next meeting</p> <p>At this stage the group felt it best that everything could be done electronically as most of the details had been organised today.</p> <p>MS asked Comms Group reps to keep group updated.</p> <p>MS and AC thanked the group for coming</p> <p>Meeting Close</p>	