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The Supporting Appendices

These appendices and the accompanying documents provide all of the information required to support the Shoreline Management Plan. This is to ensure that there is clarity in the decision-making process and that the rationale behind the policies being promoted is both transparent and auditable. The appendices are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: SMP 2 Development</th>
<th>This reports the history of development of the SMP 2, describing more fully the plan and policy decision-making process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B: Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>All communications from the stakeholder process are provided here, together with information arising from the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Baseline Process Understanding</td>
<td>Includes baseline process report, defence assessment, NAI and WPM assessments and summarises data used in assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report</td>
<td>This report identifies and evaluates the baseline environmental features (human, natural, historical and landscape) and presents an overview of the environmental assessment process, showing how the requirements of the EU Council Directive 2001/42/EC (the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive) are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Issues &amp; Objectives Evaluation</td>
<td>Provides information on the issues and objectives identified as part of the Plan development, including appraisal of their importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Policy Development and Appraisal</td>
<td>Presents the consideration of generic policy options for each frontage, identifying possible acceptable policies, and their combination into ‘scenarios’ for testing. Also presents the appraisal of impacts upon shoreline evolution and the appraisal of objective achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Preferred Policy Scenario Testing</td>
<td>Presents the policy assessment and appraisal of objective achievement towards definition of the Preferred Plan (as presented in the Shoreline Management Plan document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Economic Appraisal and Sensitivity Testing</td>
<td>Presents the economic analysis undertaken in support of the Preferred Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Habitats Regulations Assessment</td>
<td>Presents an assessment of the effect the plan will have on European sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K: Metadatabase and Bibliographic database</td>
<td>All supporting information used to develop the SMP 2 is referenced for future examination and retrieval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within each appendix cross-referencing highlights the documents where related appraisals are presented. The broad relationships between the appendices are illustrated below.
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ANNEX B1 PUBLIC CONSULTATION REPORT
B.1 Introduction

B.1.1 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

The stakeholder engagement process is intended to build trust and understanding between all parties involved in the formation of an SMP 2 with the aim of being inclusive, transparent and appropriate in its methods and application.

Angus Council have taken the lead on the Stakeholder Engagement for this SMP 2.

A Client Steering Group (CSG), set up by Angus Council, provided expert knowledge and information, and has been involved throughout the development of the SMP 2. The CSG acts as a focal point for discussion and consultation throughout development of the project. The membership of the group provides representation of statutory consultees, academics, local authorities and other primary interests within the study area, ensuring consideration of all interests during review of issues. The CSG was involved through meetings at key points within the SMP 2 development process. The incorporation of this group provides direct feedback and information to the Consultant, and acts as a focal point for the consultation process. It is also possible to adopt more of a partnership approach to the CSG, by developing a more collaborative decision-making forum. Under this approach certain responsibilities may be shared by the CSG in order to increase the level of stakeholder ownership of the final decisions.

Links with local planning will be an important part of delivering the final SMP2. Local authority planning officers were invited to comment on the draft SMP2 and Angus Council planning officers were given a presentation on the draft plan during which they had a further opportunity to provide comment.

Table B.1 provides a summary of the stakeholder engagement strategy for each stage of the Angus SMP2 development.

The Consultation Report, documenting the SMP2 public consultation period is found in Annex B1.
### B.1 Summary Table of the Stakeholder Strategy for each stage of SMP 2 Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Plan Preparation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Purpose of stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
<th>Method of involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: SMP Scope</td>
<td>Initial Stakeholder contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inform interested parties that an SMP is being prepared and invite key stakeholders to join the Client Steering Group</td>
<td>Client Steering Group</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stage 2: Assessments to support policy | Client Steering Group Meeting 1 | April 2012 | Introduce the SMP process  
Request information from interested parties  
Gather views on the features and issues relating to the SMP coast  
Check that all relevant issues have been included  
Review the features identified  
Check that the benefits identified are correct and that we have included all beneficiaries  
Check that the objectives are a good representation of the requirements of the beneficiaries | Client Steering Group                  | Draft Issues and Objectives Table sent as part of briefing note by email  
A meeting involving a formal presentation followed by an open discussion. |
| Stage 3: Policy Development | Client Steering Group Meeting 2 | June 2012 | CSG members were presented with the policy options to be tested as part of the policy appraisal. The objective of the meeting was to establish:  
• The vision(s) of the various stakeholders for the whole SMP shoreline over each epoch  
• Any ‘overriding drivers’ for directing future policy, and specific future policy options that the stakeholders wish to see tested  
• Areas of agreement and conflict i.e. main flood and erosion risks  
• Potential scope for compromise and acceptance of future change | Client Steering Group                  | A meeting involving a formal presentation followed by an open discussion. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Plan Preparation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Purpose of stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>Stakeholders involved</th>
<th>Method of involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4: Public Examination</strong></td>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>To make stakeholders and the wider public aware of the draft plan To provide stakeholders and the wider public with opportunities for support and objection and moving to resolve differences</td>
<td>Wider public</td>
<td>Public exhibitions Advertisements Full document on the Council website: <a href="http://www.angus.gov.uk">www.angus.gov.uk</a> Presentation to Local Authority planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5: Finalise SMP</strong></td>
<td>Final SMP2</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Review responses from public examination Produce a Consultation Report on these findings Potential to meet with CSG to discuss the nature of feedback (amending the plan / policies if required)</td>
<td>Client Steering Group</td>
<td>Potential for a CSG meeting or correspondence via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 6: SMP Dissemination</strong></td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
<td>Disseminate to Angus, Aberdeenshire and Dundee City Councils, SNH, Historic Environment Scotland, SEPA and Defra Include the final SMP2 on the Council website Inform stakeholders of the final plan</td>
<td>Wider public</td>
<td>Hard copies and CD s. Information available to download in PDF format at <a href="http://www.angus.gov.uk">www.angus.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.2 Client Steering Group meetings

The Client Steering Group (CSG) includes representatives from Angus, Aberdeenshire and Dundee City Councils, Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), Historic Environment Scotland, the University of Dundee, Ministry of Defence (MoD), Scottish Water and the Tay Estuary Forum (TEF). The CSG has met three times throughout the SMP 2 development process to:

- Discuss issues and objectives;
- Discuss the preferred policies to test;
- Agree the preferred policy scenarios for consultation.

The locations, dates, purpose and outcome of each CSG meeting are included in the following table (Table B.2) and associated meeting materials and minutes are contained in Section B.4.

Table B2 Client Steering Group meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Locations and Dates</th>
<th>Purpose and Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CSG 1 – SMP 2 Stage 2 (Assessments to support policy development) | County Buildings, Market Street, Forfar, DD8 3WR 17th April 2012 | **Purpose:**
  - To provide an introduction to and explain the background to the SMP 2.
  - To go through stages of the SMP 2 development process.
  - To discuss and agree the issues to be dealt with in the SMP 2 and the priority of these issues.
  - To discuss and agree the objectives for the SMP 2.
  **Outcome:** Agreed set of SMP 2 issues and objectives. |
| CSG 2 – SMP 2 Stage 3 (Policy Development) | Angus House, Forfar, 12th June 2012 | **Purpose:**
  - To provide an update on SMP 2 progress.
  - To provide an overview of Coastal Risks, the Policy Appraisal process and Key Policy Drivers.
  - To discuss, identify and agree Key Policy Drivers.
  - To discuss which potential policies / scenarios they feel would be appropriate to assess.
  **Outcome:** Agreed set of SMP 2 Key Policy Drivers and potential policies to test |
| CSG 3 – SMP 2 Stage 3 (Confirm Preferred Scenario) | The Cross, Forfar, DD8 1BX 25th October 2012 | **Purpose:**
  - To provide an update on SMP 2 progress.
  - To provide an overview of the policy development process.
  - To discuss the preferred policy scenarios.
  - To gain a general consensus on the preferred policy scenarios for consultation
  **Outcome:** General consensus on the preferred policy scenarios for consultation. |

A list of CSG attendees at each meeting are included in Table B3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>CSG 1 (17.04.12)</th>
<th>CSG 2 (12.06.12)</th>
<th>CSG 3 (25.10.12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Davidson</td>
<td>Gordon Pyper</td>
<td>Gordon Pyper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(planning)</td>
<td>(planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan Inglis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City Council</td>
<td>Ross Speirs</td>
<td>Ross Speirs</td>
<td>Ross Speirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
<td>Fraser Milne</td>
<td>Fraser Milne</td>
<td>Fraser Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Environment Scotland</td>
<td>Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Rory McDonald</td>
<td>Andrew Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malcolm MacConnachie</td>
<td>Steve McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Natural Heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shona Smith</td>
<td>Mark Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willie Murdoch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Estuary Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Booth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD Barry Buddon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Graham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Commandant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joy Fotheringham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(DIO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Carr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.3 Initial Stakeholder Engagement Materials

An Initial Stakeholder Engagement letter was sent out to potential stakeholders in March 2012.

Dear Sir / Madam,

Angus Council - Shoreline Management Plan 2

Angus Council Roads Division is reviewing the current Shoreline Management Plan, which will allow the development of Shoreline Management Plan 2 (SMP 2).

Shoreline Management Plan is large-scale assessment of the risks associated with coastal processes. The aim of the plan is to reduce the risks to people, development and the natural environment. Coastal environments are inherently dynamic due to coastal processes and the constant movement of material along the beach/foreshore. SMP’s will provide a ‘route map’ for decision makers to assess the present situation and identify methods to meeting future needs through the most sustainable means.

As part of this review, stakeholder engagement is critical in the review process, to ensure all interested parties are involved in identifying and resolving issues identified in the review process. To help drive and focus the stakeholder engagement process, a steering group is proposed. The main role of the steering group will be to act as principle decision-making body for reviewing the Shoreline Management Plan 2.

Angus Council is presently assessing a list of representatives from a range of organisations to sit on the SMP 2 client steering group and cordially invite your organisation to join the Angus Council SMP 2 client steering group. As a member of the client steering group you will be invited to attend steering group meetings.

To assist Angus Council with the development of SMP 2, Halcrow consultants have been appointed to provide technical coastal support to allow the development of Angus Council Shoreline Management Plan 2.

An initial start-up client steering group meeting has been arranged for 10:00am on Tuesday 17th April 2012 at County Buildings, Market Street, Forfar, DD8 3WR. I would be very grateful if you could let me know your availability to attend this start-up meeting?

I look forward to hearing from you in due course, if you have any queries please contact me on 01307 473329 or Richard Meeson on 01307 473185, email meesonr@angus.gov.uk.

Yours faithfully

Mark Davidson
Senior Engineer
B.4 Client Steering Group Materials

B.4.1 Introduction

Below are a series of documents relating to the Client Steering Group (CSG) meetings that were held during the course of developing the Angus SMP 2.

B.4.2 Client Steering Group Meeting 1

The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the SMP process, seek information and data to inform the development of the SMP 2 and introduce and discuss the issues and objectives tables.

B.4.2.1 CSG 1: Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Client Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Introduce – parties involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Role of Client Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Shoreline Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Background information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Shoreline Management Plan 2 (SMP 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Outline SMP 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Proposed program of SMP 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Halcrow Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Next Client Steering Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>TBC – Provisionally Tuesday 19th June 2012, County Buildings, Forfar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Any Other Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANGUS COUNCIL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2

CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING No. 1 MINUTES

Date: 17.04.12
Location: County Buildings, Forfar

Present:
Richard Meeson (RM) ... Angus Council (AC)
Jackie Young (JY) ... Halcrow (HC)
Alisa Collin (EC) ... Halcrow (HC)
Sam Box (SB) ... Halcrow (HC)
Fraser Milne (FN) ... University of Dundee (UD)
(RS) ... Dundee City Council (DC)
Andrew Stevenson (AS) ... Historic Scotland (HS)

Apologies:
Mark Davidson ... Angus Council
Stuart McGovan / Malcolm MacConnachie ... SEPA
Shona Smith ... Scottish Natural Heritage
Doreen Bell ... Scottish Water
Jim Mckie ... Marine Scotland
Willie Murdoch ... Aberdeenshire Council
Laura Booth ... Tay Estuary Forum
George Chree / Gordon Pyper ... Angus Council (Planning)
Duncan Inglis ... Angus Council (Environmental Management)

1. INTRODUCTION
All parties were welcomed and introduced to the meeting.

2. CLIENT STEERING GROUP (CSG)

2.1 Introduce Parties Involved
RM introduced all parties involved with the CSG:
- Angus Council (including Planning and Neighbourhood Services departments)
- Tay Estuary Forum
- Scottish Natural Heritage
- Scottish Water
- Marine Scotland
- Historic Scotland
- SEPA
- Dundee City Council
- Aberdeenshire Council
- Halcrow – providing technical expertises and guidance

Angus Council Shoreline Management Plan 2
Role of Client Steering Group

RM outlined the role the Client Steering Group; to act as principle decision making body for reviewing SMP2 and help drive and focus stakeholder engagement.

3. ANGUS COUNCILSHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Published in 2004, in partnership with HR Wallingford
- Outlined a framework for future management of coastal policies
- Large scale risk assessment identifying the associated risks to people and environment from coastal processes

4. ANGUS COUNCILSHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2 (SMP2)

4.1 Outline SMP2

- Review Current SMP
- Recognise limitations of SMP, and identify if policies are still relevant
- Awareness of longer-term (50-100yre) implications of coastal changes
- Support the planning system, and enhance transparency of planning processes

4.2 Proposed Programme for SMP2

RM outlined the proposed programme for SMP2

- Proposed complete SMP2 – January 2013
- Proposed draft SMP2 from Halcrow – October 2013
- Proposed Public Consultation – October to December 2013
- Final examination – December 2013
- Final dissemination – January 2013
- Committee Approval – February 2013

4.3 Halcrow

SB provided a slide show; see Appendix A for copies of the slides.

The inland boundary of SMP2 is to be set as the inland boundary from the existing Shoreline Management Plan. Mark Davidson to confirm inland boundary with JY.

Halcrow are proposing to combine the policy objectives for SMP2 with the SEA receptors, see Appendix B. All members of the CSG are requested to confirm their agreement and provide feedback on the proposed policy objectives in Appendix B. All feedback is to be emailed to Richard Meeson (meesonr@angus.gov.uk) by Friday 25th May 2012. CSG to action

Angus Council Shoreline Management Plan 2
Halcrow advised the CSG that Scottish Natural Heritage, Historical Scotland and SEPA will also get a chance to comment on the objectives through the SEA Scoping process.

Halcrow asked the CSG, if any members knew of any areas within the SMP2 boundary which are classified as designated landscapes? CSG to action

RS offered Halcrow a copy of recent data from the Tay Estuary modelling, undertaken as part of the Water Front Development assessment. RS to action

Halcrow requested an update on existing coastal defences along the Angus coastline; RM to action

Condition and functionality of existing coastal defences was discussed, Halcrow will visit most defences on their site visit (16th – 20th April 2012).

AS stated Historic Scotland undertake condition reports every 2yrs and site inspections every 5yrs of their assets (monuments). FM to issue Halcrow and RM with the Scottish Coastal Archaeology and the Problem of Erosion report and University of St Andrew (The SCAPE TRUST) - Coastal Zone Assessment Survey 2009.

RM noted annual coastal inspections are carried by Angus Council.

Halcrow enquired about Local Development Plans and if there in a Angus Development Plan to assist with the development of the SEA; RM to speak to Angus Council Planning Department and action

The CSG discussed each coastal process units (CPU) from Milton Ness to Broughty Ferry (see slides in Appendix A).

- Coastal defences at the southern end of Montrose Bay were discussed, in particular defences from Splash Point to the GlaxoSmithKline. FM believes defences at Splash Point are encouraging erosion to the north of Splash Point (Golf course frontage) by starving the dunes of sand (sediment). Defences at GlaxoSmithKline are not influencing erosion at the Golf Course. Montrose Bay Phase 2 Report has been undertaken, with Phase 3 being developed.

- Coastal defences around Montrose Basin were discussed; ownership of defences and land was unclear. RM to investigate land ownership around Montrose Basin (see Appendix C).

- It was noted Arbroath Harbour requires sediment management; however analysis of this is outside the scope of this project. Further analysis of sediment is required; FM mentioned about the possibility
of sediment recharge in the area, this will be investigated by Angus Council.

- JY asked if the M.O.D could be included in the Client Steering Group. Following Halcrow's site visit to Barry Buddon with FM, FM believes the rock armour defences at Barry Buddon are possibly exacerbating erosion along the coastline at Monifieth. RM to contact M.O.D and send out invitation to Client Steering Group.

RS believes SEPA are issuing free LIDAR data to local authorities, RM to investigate. RM to action

JY enquired about the location of proposed and existing coastal paths, RM to investigate and issue Halcrow with shp file. RM to action

5. NEXT CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING (CSG No. 2)

5.1. Tuesday 12th June 2012 at 10:00, at Angus House, Forfar.

PLEASE ADVISE IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THE NEXT CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING

6. MEETING CLOSED AT 12:40
Meetings 1 minutes: Appendix A

Angus Council - Shoreline Management Plan 2
Steering Group Meeting 1
17th April 2012

Presentation Outline

- Progress to date
- Agree Objectives
- Issues and risk areas
- Next Steps

Progress to date

- Review of SMPL
- Review of new reports and information since SMPL
- Draft the shoreline coastal processes report (Dundee University inputs and review)
  - No Active intervention scenario
  - With present policies scenario
- Draft SMPL2 objectives
- Draft Thane review (CIA baseline)
- Draft issue tables
Baseline Coastal Processes Report

Coastal Processes
- We need to understand:
  - How and why the coast is changing, both in time and spatially
  - What is driving this change
  - What are the linkages and interactions along the coast
  - What may change in the future due to climate change
- The impact of human intervention
- Base line scenarios:
  - No active intervention
  - With present policies
  - Over three time periods (5-10, 50-100 years)

No Active Intervention
- Assumes no further expenditure on maintaining/improving existing defences
- Assumes all defences will eventually fail
- Rapid coastal erosion of backing dunes where presently defended
- Inundation of low-lying areas
- The shoreline will adjust to a more naturally functioning system

With Present Policies
- Assumes policies recommended in 1999 continue until technically
  impossible or when current policies become ineffective
- Loss of beaches and intertidal areas fronting defences
- Increased flooding and erosion hazards
- Need for more substantial and expensive defences... but will
  these be affordable?

SEA Environmental Baseline (Theme Review)
- The identification of key features along this coast and why these
  are important to stakeholders, i.e. the benefits that the feature
  provides, is a vital input to policy development.
  - The natural environment
  - Landscape and character
  - Historic environment
  - Current and future land use
Identification of Issues and Objectives

To develop policies we need a clear understanding of the issues and objectives which need to be addressed by future shoreline management:

- Identify features using the Thame Review
- Gather information as part of the initial consultation

Issues and Objectives Tables

- Set objectives - defines targets or goals that the SMP aspires to in delivering the plan.
- There will be conflicting objectives; therefore not all objectives will be achieved.
- The SMP needs to provide a balanced plan, considering people, nature, historic and socio-economic realities.

Objectives

Main SMP objectives...
- To reduce the risk to people and the developed and natural environment from flooding and coastal erosion by the provision of technically, environmentally and economically sound and sustainable defence structures.

Role of Issues & Objectives

- Issues are raised by stakeholders/review
- Objectives aim to resolve issues
- Policy appraisal is objective led
- Objectives are used to identify most suitable shoreline management policy

Agree Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Objective</th>
<th>Feature-level the objective including measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some risk...</td>
<td>Measures and weighing evidence and options...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card risk...</td>
<td>Measures and weighing evidence and options...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New systems

Nature, environment, etc.
Discussion of Issues

What are the main ISSUES affecting policy?

What FEATURES do these issues relate to?

Why are they important, what are the BENEFITS?

Over what TIMESCALES do these issues apply (0-20, 20-50, 50-100 years)?
Next steps

Coastal Hazard mapping
   Policy Appraisal and development of Policy scenarios
   - Hold the Line
   - Managed Realignment
   - Advance the Line
   - No Active Intervention

Do you have any data / further information that maybe useful?
   Geo LIS@ihcwy.gov.com
   mescott@ihcwy.gov.uk

Thank You
APPENDIX B

PROPOSED POLICY OBJECTIVES FOR SMP2

SMP2 / SEA Objectives

The setting of objectives helps to ensure both clarity and consistency across the SMP2 area, whilst identifying the identification of why a feature is important and any potential issues associated with coastal erosion and flooding, helps us to understand how an objective may be achieved.

An objective defines a target or goal that the SMP2 aspires to in delivering the plan. However, it is important to understand that quite commonly there are conflicting objectives for a particular stretch of coast. Therefore it is likely that not all objectives will be or can be achieved at every location but the aim of the SMP2 is to seek to provide a balanced plan, which considers:

- People
- Nature
- Historic realities
- Socio-economic realities

Using the Defra Shoreline Management Plan Guidance (2006), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) guidelines and through internal discussions, a list of objectives has been developed and, using the issues identified, appropriate objectives have been defined for each feature. Those objectives which relate to statutory requirements are highlighted in grey.

The objectives cover broad high level features that may influence policy decisions in coastal management and that can be used to adequately assess policy options.

Individual members of the Client Steering Group are to comment on and provide feedback to the CSG; feedback is requested to be emailed to Richard Meeon (meeonr@angus.gov.uk) by Friday 25th May 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Features covered by the objective (following SEA scoping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To minimise coastal flooding and erosion risk and its impact on people, coastal land use and future development plans. (Population and Human Health, Material Assets)</td>
<td>Houses, Vulnerable community facilities (e.g. surgeries, hospitals, aged persons homes, schools, churches, libraries, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To minimise coastal flood and erosion risk to critical infrastructure and maintain critical services. (Material Assets)</td>
<td>A, B and minor roads (where inlaying is a key issue), East Coast railway lines and stations, Pumping stations, sewage works and outfalls, Access for emergency services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To support natural coastal processes and maintain and enhance the integrity of internationally designated nature conservation sites and the favourable condition of their interest features.</td>
<td>Ramsar, SPA and SACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Features covered by the objective (following SEA scoping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To maintain and enhance nationally designated conservation sites and their interest features. (Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna)</td>
<td>SSSI (biological and geological) and NNPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To avoid adverse impacts on, conserve and enhance the designated interest of local conservation sites. (Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna)</td>
<td>LNR, SWT Nature Reserves, RIGs, GCRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To maintain and enhance features as a natural food defence (Water/Salt (Geology))</td>
<td>Beaches, Dune systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To enhance the aesthetic and landscape quality of the coastline. (Landscape)</td>
<td>Key landscape features including wide sandy bays, estuaries and estuarine mudflats, sand dune systems and links, and maritime cliffs and rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To minimise coastal flood and erosion risk to scheduled and other nationally, regionally or locally important archaeological and cultural heritage assets, sites and their setting. (Cultural Heritage/Historic Environment)</td>
<td>Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Non-designated archaeological sites of local importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To minimise coastal flooding and erosion risk to key recreation and tourism assets and activities. (Population/Human Health/Material Assets)</td>
<td>Recreation and amenity facilities (visitor attractions, golf courses, car park parks, building beaches, promenades, cycle routes, public footpaths, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To enhance the tourism value of the coast and aim to incorporate and improve recreation, tourism and visitor management. (Population/Material Assets/Biodiversity)</td>
<td>Businesses, factories, warehouses, areas identified for regeneration, military establishments and others: key areas of employment, MoD Exclusion Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To minimise coastal flood and erosion risk to industry and commercial activities and Ministry of Defence land. (Population/Material Assets)</td>
<td>Ports and harbours, Access to the sea and navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To minimise the impact of policies on marine operations and activities (Material Assets/Population)</td>
<td>Commercial fishing grounds and shell fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To minimise the impact of policies on fishing activity. (Water/Biodiversity/Material Assets/Population)</td>
<td>Grades 1 – 3A farmland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those objectives which relate to statutory requirements are highlighted in grey.
Meeting 1 minutes: Appendix C
B.4.3 Client Steering Group Meeting 2

The purpose of this meeting was to discuss, identify and agree key policy drivers and potential policy options to test.

B.4.3.1 CSG 2: Agenda

---

ANGUS COUNCIL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2

CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING No. 2

10:00 Tuesday 12th June 2012

AGENDA

1.0 Introduction
2.0 Update on the progress of SMP2 from Halcrow
   2.1 Scoping Report
   2.2 Proposed Policy Objectives
   2.3 Proposed Policy Scenarios
3.0 Outstanding issues from the CSG
4.0 Next Client Steering Group Meeting
   4.1 TBC – Provisionally Tuesday 14th August 2012, County Buildings, Forfar
5.0 Any Other Business
ANGUS COUNCIL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2

CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING No. 2 MINUTES

Date / Time: 12.05.12 @ 10:00am
Location: Angus House, Forfar

Present:
Mark Davidson (MD)  Angus Council (AC)
Richard Meeson (RM)  Angus Council (AC)
Jackie Young (JY)  Halcrow (HC)
Ailsa Collin (EC)  Halcrow (HC)
Fraser Milne (FM)  University of Dundee (UD)
(RS)  Dundee City Council (DC)
Rory McDonald (RD)  Historic Scotland (HS)
Malcolm MacConnachie (MM)  SEPA
Shona Smith (SS)  Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Willie Murdoch (WM)  Aberdeenshire Council (ABC)
Laura Booth (LB)  Tay Estuary Forum (TEF)
Gordon Pyper (GP)  Angus Council - Planning (ACP)
Duncan Inglis (DI)  Angus Council - Environmental Management (ACM)
Tom Graham (TG)  Commandant - Barry Buddon (CBB)
Joy Fotheringham (JF)  DIO representing the MOD (MOD)

Apologies:
Doreen Bell  Scottish Water
Jim Mckie  Marine Scotland

1. INTRODUCTION

All parties were welcomed and introduced to the meeting.

RM asked each person present to introduce themselves.

2. UP-DATE ON THE PROGRESS OF SMP2 (FROM HALCROW)

JY provided a slide show (see Appendix A).

Coastal Hazard Mapping
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2.1 Scoping Report

JY outlined the need and requirement for the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and the proposed timescale. The SEA has now been uploaded to the Gateway portal for consultation.

2.2 Proposed Policy Objectives

JY outlined the proposed key policy objectives for SMP2 (see Appendix B).

JY outlined the proposed policy objectives. GP asked if the term “land quality” could be changed to “land character”, SS agreed this would be better.

GP commented on the classification of Developed and Undeveloped coastlines in Scottish Planning Policy documents.

MM requested clarification on the wording of “minimising flood risk” or “reducing flood risk”; the later is a requirement under the flood risk management act. RM to research and clarify the wording.

Linkage to tourism value was discussed.

JF asked if wind farms would be addressed in SMP2. It was agreed within the CSG that wind farm developments are outside the remit of SMP2 and should be discussed with Marine Scotland as a planning issue.

2.3 Proposed Policy Scenarios

JY outlined the proposed key policy drivers for the scenarios (see Appendix C).

It was noted that the location of the Scottish Water Tay wastewater main could potentially impact the proposed policy scenarios. RM to issue Heriotwith location of Tay wastewater main from Scottish Water Asset Location Plans.

LB requested Network Rail be invited to join the client steering group, due to the close proximity of the East Coast Railway Line to a number of locations along the coast. RM to invite Network Rail to next Client Steering Group meeting.

MD & RS made the CSG aware of the potential for contaminated land along the frontage in Montifith and Broughly Ferry. RM to investigate known locations of buried contaminated land along the Montifith coast line. RS to email known locations of buried contaminated land along the Broughly Ferry coast line. It was also noted the previous land use at Carnoustie and Dowsire for Bitumen factories may result in contaminants being present in the ground at these locations.
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3. OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM CSG

No outstanding issues noted.

4. NEXT CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING (CSG No. 2)

RM advised the CSG that the next CSG meeting No. 3 will be early September, date and location to be issued in due course.

RM requested all members of the CSG who are unable to attend the next Client Steering Group Meeting No. 3 inform him prior to the meeting.

MEETING CLOSED AT 12:40pm
Stage 3: Policy Development

The recommended approach for development of a sustainable plan is through the assessment of policy scenarios, rather than considering locations in isolation.

**Aims:**
- The aim of this task is to identify the appropriate combinations of policies to be assessed for the whole SMP frontage.

**Involves:**
- Identification of key policy drivers;
- Identification of potential policy options;
- Development of policy scenarios for assessment.

---

**Key Policy Drivers**

- A key policy driver is a feature that has sufficient importance that it potentially has an overriding influence upon policy selection at the wider SMP scale.
- Sustaining these features and the benefits derived from them will often be a key requirement at a national or regional level.
- Those drivers will give firm direction to the choice of possible policies both at that feature location and at other locations that are in some way interconnected.

Examples may include:
- Major town centres
- Power stations
- Major ports
- International environmental designations

---

**Potential Policy options**

- In addition to the policy drivers, the local feature objectives are an important consideration in any assessment of potential policies.
- A screening process using combinations of the key policy drivers and the objectives will be used to derive which policy options should be examined at any location.

---

**Draft preferred policies for discussion**

- **NO ACTIVE INTERVENTION (NAI):** a decision not to invest in providing or maintaining defences.
- **HOLD THE LINE (HTL):** maintain or upgrade the level of protection provided by defences.
Draft preferred policies for discussion

Managed Realignment
- Allow retreat of the shoreline with monitoring and, if appropriate, management to limit coastal movement

Advance the Line (ATU)
Build new defences seaward of the existing defence line

Stage 3: Policy Development

Hold the Line
- Maintain or upgrade the level of protection provided by defences
- Benefits:
  - Protection of existing towns and villages
  - Protection of hinterland heritage features
- Issues:
  - Sustainability
  - Availability of funding for defences
  - Loss of beaches
  - Concrete coastline
  - Interruption of sediment drift
  - Impacts on adjacent areas
  - Impacts on nature conservation
- Examples:
  - Beach recharging
  - Seawalls
  - Groynes
  - Offshore breakwaters

Stage 3: Policy Development

No Active Intervention
- A decision not to invest in providing or maintaining defences
- Benefits:
  - Allows a naturally functioning coastline
  - Maintains sediment links to downdrift areas
  - Should maintain beaches
  - Some conservation gains
- Issues:
  - Failure of existing defences
  - Rapid erosion of previously protected areas
  - Loss of cliff top assets, e.g., towns and villages
  - In low-lying areas: increased risk of flooding
  - Risk of unmanaged breaching events
  - Total change to form of coastline

Stage 3: Policy Development

Managed Realignment
- Allow retreat of the shoreline with monitoring and, if appropriate, management to limit coastal movement
- Benefits:
  - Allows a naturally functioning coastline
  - Allows management of change
  - Maintains sediment links to downdrift areas
  - Should maintain beaches
  - Some conservation gains
- Issues:
  - Monitored controlled coastal damage to assets
  - Change to form of coastline
  - Cost of providing set back defences in low-lying areas
Stage 3: Policy Development

Advance the Line

- Build new defences seaward of the existing defence line
- Benefits:
  - Protection of existing towns and villages
  - Possible generation of new development areas
- Issues:
  - Cost of providing new defences
  - Increasing cost of defences in the future
  - Sustainability
  - Difficulty in maintaining beaches
  - Concrete coastlines
  - Major interruption of sediment drift
  - Impacts on adjacent areas
  - Impacts on nature conservation

Discussion

1. What are the key drivers that you feel should underpin scenario testing for each area?
   - Consider how these might differ over the three time scales:
     - Immediate (next 20 years)
     - Medium (20 to 50 years)
     - Long term (50 to 100 years)

2. What are the policy options that you feel should be included in scenario testing for each area?
   - Consider your practical vision for the coastline over the immediate, medium, and long term.
   - Consider whether there might be possible areas for compromise/appropriate changes, especially where the relative importance of issues might alter over time.

Stage 3: Policy Development – NEXT STAGES

2: Policy Scenario Assessment

Aim:
To explore how the coast would evolve under the identified policy combinations and the implications for this for important features along the coastline.

Involves:
(a) Assessment of shoreline interactions and responses;
(b) Assess the achievement of objectives;

Stage 3: Policy Development – NEXT STAGES

3: Additional Assessments

Aim:
To consider the costs/benefits as well as cumulative human and natural implications for policy scenarios.

Involves:
(a) Socio-economic assessment;
(b) Strategic Environmental Assessment;
(c) Habitat Regulations Assessment;
Stage 3: Policy Development – NEXT STAGES

4: Identify Draft Preferred Policy Scenarios

Aims:
To identify the scenario that best achieves the defined shoreline management objectives and is most sustainable, i.e., technically feasible, environmentally acceptable and socio-economically viable.

Involves:
(a) Review scenario testing to select draft preferred policy scenario and policy units;
(b) Stakeholder meeting to discuss draft preferred policies and policy units;
(c) Define Policy Units;
(d) Agree preferred policies;
# Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1 Management Area 1</th>
<th>SMP 1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 1</th>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>KEY POLICY DRIVERS?</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MU 1/1 Montrose Bay</td>
<td>No Active Intervention (&lt;5-10 years)</td>
<td>No Active Intervention If dune erosion becomes an issue the policy may need to be changed to Limited Intervention to allow dune stabilisation measures</td>
<td>MU 1/1 Montrose Bay (Milton Ness to Montrose Links)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 1/2 Montrose Golf Course</td>
<td>Limited Intervention / Managed Retreat (relocate golf holes at risk) (&lt;5-10 years)</td>
<td>No Active Intervention</td>
<td>MU 1/2 Montrose Golf Links</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 1/3 Splash and GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;5-10 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 1/3 (a) Splash (The Faulds)</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 1/3 (b) Montrose Caravan Park</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 1/4 GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1 Management Unit 2</th>
<th>SMP 1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 2 Revised Management Units</th>
<th>KEY POLICY DRIVERS?</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Long term to 2050</td>
<td>Hold the Line (≤5-10 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 2/1 (a) Montrose Port (north bank – Glaxo to A92 bridge)</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 2/1 (b) Montrose Port (south bank – A92 bridge to Ferryden)</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MU 2/2 Montrose Basin</td>
<td>Selectively Hold the Line: Hold the line (Taycock, Roosie Island, Western flank) / No active intervention (part) (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Selectively Hold the Line: Managed Realignment (part) / Hold the line (part) / No active intervention (part)</td>
<td>Railway Montrose West (A92 Bridge to the end of railway defences)</td>
<td>Monrose West SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Railway Montrose West (Railway defences to Tayock River)</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 2/3 (a) Tayock (Tayock village)</td>
<td>Monrose Basin SPA / Ramsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 2/3 (b) Tayock (Tayock Cemetery)</td>
<td>Monrose Basin SPA / Ramsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU 2/4 West Montrose Basin (west of Tayock to Old Montrose)</td>
<td>Monrose Basin SPA / Ramsar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1 Management Unit 3</th>
<th>SMP1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 3</th>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>KEY POLICY DRIVERS</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Long term to 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MU 3/1 Scurdie Ness to Ricky Craig</td>
<td>No Active Intervention (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Selectively Hold the Line: Hold the line (Railway) / No active Intervention</td>
<td>MU 3/1 Scurdie Ness to Ricky Craig</td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1 Management Unit 6</th>
<th>SMP 1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 6 Revised Management Units</th>
<th>KEY POLICY DRIVERS?</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MU 6/1 Victoria Park and Seagate</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 6/1 (a) Victoria Park</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/1 Victoria Park and Seagate</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 6/1 (b) Arbroath Seagate</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/2 Danger Point to Inchcape Park (Arbroath Harbour)</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 6/2 Arbroath Harbour</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/3 Inchcape Park to West Links</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 6/3 Inchcape Park to Westway Road</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/4 West Links to East Haven</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: No Active Intervention (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / Hold the Line (part) (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: Hold the Line (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / No Active Intervention (part)</td>
<td>MU 6/4 (a) West Links to Easthaven</td>
<td>Railway</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/4 West Links to East Haven</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: No Active Intervention (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / Hold the Line (part) (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: Hold the Line (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / No Active Intervention (part)</td>
<td>MU 6/4 (b) Easthaven</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 6/4 West Links to East Haven</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: No Active Intervention (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / Hold the Line (part) (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Selectly Hold the Line: Hold the Line (part) / Limited Intervention (part) / No Active Intervention (part)</td>
<td>MU 6/4 (c) Easthaven to West haven</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1</th>
<th>SMP 1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 7</th>
<th>Key Policy Drivers</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Unit 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Management Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MU 7/1 West Haven to Carnoustie Railway Station</td>
<td>Selectively Hold the Line: Limited Intervention / Hold the Line (&lt;10/15 years)</td>
<td>MU 7/1 Westhaven to Carnoustie Station</td>
<td>Carnoustie Railway</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 7/2 Carnoustie Bay</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 7/2 Carnoustie Station to Barry Burn</td>
<td>Carnoustie</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Scenarios for Assessment: Scenario Area 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>SMP 1</th>
<th>SMP 1 Policies</th>
<th>SMP 2 Scenario Area 8</th>
<th>Key Policy Drivers</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 1</th>
<th>Policies to test – scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Unit 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Management Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MU 7/3 Barry Sands East</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/1 Barry Sands East</td>
<td>Carnoustie Golf Course?</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU 8/1 Buddon Ness and Barry Sands West</td>
<td>No Active Intervention</td>
<td>MU 8/2 Barry Buddon &amp; Barry Sands West</td>
<td>Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>SMP 1 Management Unit 8</td>
<td>SMP 1 Policies</td>
<td>Revised Management Units</td>
<td>KEY POLICY DRIVERS</td>
<td>Policies to test – scenario 1</td>
<td>Policies to test – scenario 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Long term to 2050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/2 Monifieth</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/3 MoD Boundary to west Tayview Caravan Park</td>
<td>Monifieth landfill Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/3 Monifieth West</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/4 Monifieth West</td>
<td>Monifieth Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/4 Barnhill</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/5 Barnhill to the Esplanade</td>
<td>Railway Monifieth Broughty Ferry Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/5 Broughty Ferry East</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/6 Broughty Ferry East</td>
<td>Broughty Ferry Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/6 Broughty Ferry</td>
<td>Hold the Line (&lt;10-15 years)</td>
<td>Hold the Line</td>
<td>MU 8/7 Broughty Ferry</td>
<td>Broughty Ferry Firth of Tay and Eden Estuary SAC / SPA / Ramsar</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.4.4  Client Steering Group Meeting 3

The purpose of this meeting was to present, discuss and agree in principle, the preferred policy scenarios identified along the SMP 2 coast.

B.4.4.1  CSG 3: Agenda
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CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING No. 3

10:00 Thursday 25th October 2012

AGENDA

1.0  Introduction
1.1  Aims of today

2.0  SMP2 progress update
2.1  Overview of work undertaken to date
2.2  Where we are now

3.0  Policy Development
3.1  Outline the policy development process

4.0  Draft Preferred Policies
4.1  Unit by unit discussion
4.2  Agreement of preferred policies for consultation

5.0  What happens next
5.1  Draft SMP2 document
5.2  Public consultation

6.0  Any Other Business
B.4.4.2 CSG 3: Minutes

ANGUS COUNCIL SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2
CLIENT STEERING GROUP MEETING No. 3 MINUTES

Date / Time: 25.10.12 @ 10:00am
Location: The Cross, Forfar

Present:
Mark Davidson (MD) Angus Council (AC)
Richard Meeson (FM) Angus Council (AC)
Jackie Young (JY) Halcrow (HG)
Alisa Collin (AO) Halcrow (HG)
Sam Box (SB) Halcrow (HG)
Fraser Mline (FM) University of Dundee (UD)
(RS) Dundee City Council (DC)
Ross Speirs (RS) (Sub consultant to Halcrow)
Andrew Stevenson (AS) Historic Scotland (HS)
Steve McFarland (SM) SEPA
Mark Moore (MM) Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)
Gordon Pyper (GP) Angus Council - Planning (ACP)
Craig Carr (CC) Scottish Water

Apologies:
Joy Fotheringham MOD
Laura Booth Tay Estuary Forum
Duncan Inglis Angus Council - Environmental Management (ACM)
Willie Murdoch Aberdeenshire Council

1. INTRODUCTION

All parties were welcomed to the meeting and each person introduced themselves to the group.

JY outlined the aims of the meeting to members

2. SMP2 PROGRESS UPDATE (FROM HALCROW)

JY gave an overview of the work undertaken to date and outlined where SMP2 is presently. It was noted the economic assessment is not quite complete, but this is due to be completed shortly.
3. POLICY DEVELOPMENT

SB outlined the policy development process, it was noted that Shoreline Management Plans should be reviewed every 5-10 years. We are looking at three epochs for each of the scenario areas presented (0-20 years, 20-50 years and 50-100 years).

SB outlined the proposed management options:
- NAI – No Active Intervention
- MR – Managed Realignment
- HTL – Hold the Line

4. DRAFT PREFERRED POLICY

Some of the coastal management units have been re-defined for SMP 1, to allow for ease of use for users and greater understanding of coastal dynamics within each unit.

SB outlined each management unit and invited the Client Steering Group to comment.

Please see tables below for proposed policy scenarios, the comments below highlight discussions had on certain scenarios.

- Management Unit 1 - Montrose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 1/2</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 1/3a</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 1/3b</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 1/3c</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 1/4</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MU 1/2 – preferred option MR over all epoch (time scales). GP commented the old airfield as a potential area for development which could impact the preferred MR option.
- MU 1/3a & b – preferred option HTL over the short & medium term and MR over the long term. It was agreed that a caveat on the MR should be included, to monitor possible future change and if erosion / accretion patterns changed in the future the long term policy should be revised. The proposed MR was discussed; GP asked if the MR would impact MU1/4? FM said it was unlikely as MU 1 behaves in a cyclonic unit with periods of erosion & accretion. CC asked what type of modelling had take place at Montrose; FM responded stating sediment-logical samples had been taken, mathematic analysis was used and historic records were assessed. Further monitoring of sediment movement within Montrose Bay was ongoing. Further discussions with Montrose Port Authority regarding the beneficial use of dredged material from the South Esk Channel as part of a hold the line / managed realignment policy should continue.
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### Management Unit 2 - Montrose Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario A</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario B</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/A</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/B</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/C</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/D</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/E</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/F</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/G</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/H</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 2/I</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>HEL 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **MU 2/3b** – preferred option HTL over all epochs. It was noted by MD that it is localised HTL at the Tayock Cemetery and other sections which have man made coastal defences. The responsibility of maintaining those defences would lie with the landowner as Angus Council would not finance coastal defences on private land.
- **MU 2/8** – preferred option NAI over all epochs. CP made the Client Steering Group aware of Central Governments potential long term plan / strategy (identified within the transport strategy) to dual track the North East Coast railway line. RM stated Network Rail will be passed a copy of the meeting minutes for their comment but was not aware of any immediate Network Rail proposals on this topic.

### Management Unit 3 - Scurdie Ness to Rickie Craig

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario A</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario B</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 3/A</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 3/B</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 3/C</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 3/D</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management Unit 4 - Lunan Bay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario A</th>
<th>Policies to test - Scenario B</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 4/A</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 4/B</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 4/C</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 20-50 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 50-100 yrs</td>
<td>NAI 0.25 yrs 100-150 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MU 4/2 – preferred option put forward HTL over the short term with NAI over the medium and long term. MD stated the defences at Corbie Knowe were private and ad-hoc in nature. It should be noted that defences will fail within the next 20 years; NAI is therefore the preferred scenario in all three epochs. Halcrow are to ensure justification is stated within SMP2 for the NAI.

Management Unit 5 – Lang Craig to Whiting Ness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario A</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 5/1 Lang Craig to Whiting Ness</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MU 5/1 – preferred option NAI over all epochs. It was agreed to let natural processes continue within the unit. CC confirmed the location of the septic tank at Auchmithie (part way up the harbour access track) is to remain, but potential links to main sewage lines maybe considered in the future subject to regulatory drivers.

Management Unit 6 – Arbroath to Westhaven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario A</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario B</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario C</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
<td>20-50 yrs</td>
<td>50-100 yrs</td>
<td>0-20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/1 (a) Victoria Park</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/1 (b) Sango</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/1 North Harbour</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/1 South Harbour</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/2 Westingforth to Westhaven</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/3 Auchmithie</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 6/4a East Haven</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typo on heading of the slide, should read Westhaven not Easthaven

MU 6/4a – preferred option localised HTL over all epochs, but the majority of the coast would not require intervention under this policy, therefore letting natural processes continue; FM confirmed sediment moves south within this unit. Halcrow are to ensure justification is stated within SMP2 for the HTL scenario.
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• Management Unit 7 – Carnoustie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario A 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 7/1</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Haven to Carnoustie Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 7/2</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnoustie to Barry Burn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It was noted by FM that the cyclical movement of sand within the mouth of the river Tay, may impact this management unit. It was noted that recently the Angus coastline, has shown signs of accretion, whilst beaches in Fife are showing signs of erosion. FM commented this is a dynamic area of the coastline and requires continued monitoring.

• Management Unit 8 – Buddon Ness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario A 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario B 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/1</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn, South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 8/2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn, Buddon &amp; Barry South West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MU 1/8 – preferred option HTL, although it was noted that if the MOD vacated the site, a MR scenario over the long term would be justifiable. MD said a location within this unit is the favoured location for the landfall of the electrical cable for a proposed off-shore wind farm.

• Management Unit 9 – Monifieth – Broughty Ferry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Management Units</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario A 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>Policies to test – Scenario B 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
<th>Draft Preferred Scenario 0-20 yrs</th>
<th>20-50 yrs</th>
<th>50-100 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 9/1</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McE &amp; boundary to west Tayview Gravel Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 9/2</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monifieth West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 9/3</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnhill to the Esplanade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 9/4</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughty Ferry West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 9/5</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>HTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughty Ferry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

JY outlined the process and timescale for developing a draft copy of SMP2, by mid/end of November 2012. Hereafter, public consultation will start for at least 3 months. This will run in parallel to the SEA, HRA and WFD consultations.
JY asked the CSG for ideas and comments on methods of public consultation. CSG to put forward ideas on public consultation to RM.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

SM said it was important to ensure that linkages to the Flood Risk Management Strategies (which are required under the Flood Risk Management Act (Scotland) 2009) are made. Whilst the basic principles underlying the appraisal in the two processes are the same, in order to minimise the risk of contradiction it would be important to ensure that the full datasets used by Halcrow were made readily available to the FRM Strategy consultant when a request is made by SEPA in the near future.

SM noted that although the SMP was a strategic document and did not outline detailed plans for further projects (works and studies) it would be very useful for the Council to review the next steps and set out a programme of works and studies it hoped to promote including any that it felt might require application for central funding. These should be shared with the other stakeholders including SEPA in order to assist with gaining a better national understanding of such requirements. SB noted that this could form part of the Action Plan accompanying the SMP. (NB this will also help inform a data request from SEPA in the coming weeks concerning Local Authority programme of flood risk management works which will in turn help inform the Flood Risk Management Strategies).

SM noted that where the policy was changing from HTL to NAl or MR and where property would be adversely affected as a result, the Council should give consideration to adaptation in advance of the final SMP2 being published. This might help to answer questions at consultation stage concerning such situations.

It was noted by the CSG that the post publication and adaptation stages of SMP2 should be incorporated within SMP2. It would be beneficial if there was a general section on adaptation, which could be developed for specific sites once the policies in SMP2 had been approved. SB said this could incorporate the routing of emergency services, critical access paths - which would be used to evacuate people from potentially flooded areas and any future developments both on and off shore which would affect the Angus coastline. It was agreed with members of the CSG that by including an "Adaptation Section" would demonstrate to those people adversely affected by the policies within SMP2 had not been completely forgotten and consideration on critical access paths and emergency responses had been considered, this could be useful in the public consultation phase of SMP2. Adaptation may also be covered in local Flood Risk Management Strategies and therefore SEPA will need to keep up to date on how this progress in Angus to minimise the risk of contradictions between plans.

MD thanked everyone for their attendance at the meeting and closed the meeting.
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