

**Notes from a meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership**

**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> November 2017

**Present**

Kerry Turner (UEA – chair), Mark Johnson, Kellie Fisher (EA), Andy Millar (NE), Rob Wise (NFU), Giles Bloomfield, (Water Management Alliance) , Bill Parker, (Coastal Partnership East), Jacquie Burgess, John Ash, Simon Hooton(notes) (BA)

Observer: Louise Taylor (EA Broads Asset Team)

**Apologies:**

Sarah Dawkins (NE), Karen Thomas (WMA), Matthew Cross (BDC), Charlie Beardall (EA) Sharon Bleese (CPE), Phil Pearson (RSPB), Norfolk County Council, John Packman, Maria Conti (BA)

**Summary points:**

**ACTION**

**1. Broadland Futures Initiative**

Partnership members went through the draft document previously circulated making suggestions for improvements. The key points raised were:

- a. Area interested in: keep reference to area as Broadland, add map, explore how to show focus area and wider setting, keep references to sub-areas consistent and simple.
- b. Phasing: revise- being more realistic over timings, try and be consistent with dates looking forward 100 years, build in review with stakeholders, is dependent on resources but set aspirations over time.
- c. Objectives: avoid implying choices have been made, replace 'process' with 'structure' where possible, prime driver is to manage change, can drop C as its part of F, analysis more likely than research in the early phases, build climate change adaptation and sustainability into F and subsequent phases
- d. Saline incursion: noted issues around this in terms of viable actions but concluded it was worth retaining it within document

**ACTION:** SKH will revise the document using the detailed notes taken and circulate to ensure it reflects the points raised. This will then form the basis of the Initiative recognising that at this stage it is a generic document that might need modification to help particular audiences.

SKH  
revise &  
send to all

<p><b>2. Broadland Futures Initiative – governance structure</b></p> <p>MJ introduced the further thinking that built on the model in the communication document and suggested keeping it simpler. Discussion raised a number of points with the main conclusions being:</p> <p>Elected Members Forum (EMF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The EMF needs to be at the heart of decision making taking required actions back to their constituent bodies/ sharing with risk management authorities;</li> <li>b. The terms of reference probably needs to make reference to how the Forum would be formed and how chair is chosen.</li> <li>c. The EMF should include the Broads Authority with caveat that representation would probably come from local authority appointees.</li> <li>d. Broads Climate Partnership acts as steering body until the new structure is formed and would then step back leaving the EMF making decisions and the Initiative Project Team (IPT) coordinating the necessary work/actions.</li> <li>e. The experience of the Internal Drainage Boards where attendance from local authority members was generally good may be useful.</li> </ul> <p>Stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>f. A need for an overall stakeholder forum was considered and agreed. Although many stakeholder representatives would/could be incorporated into working and task and finish groups, there was a need for a central group to reflect all stakeholders and help with the prioritisation of issues and views to inform the IPT and where needed the EMF.</li> <li>g. The revised structure seemed to cover the necessary elements and would be used as a model to float through the stakeholder dialogue process allowing further refinements to be brought forward if necessary. This would enable an acceptable starting structure to be created although it could remain open to further refinement over time if needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. SKH to forward draft structure diagram to KF to incorporate into EA business case document.</li> <li>b. Revised diagram and description of structure would be incorporated where needed such as in Communication and Engagement Plan and the overall introductory document – SKH to tackle</li> </ul>	<p>SKH/KF</p> <p>SKH</p>
<p><b>3. Broadland Futures Initiative – Communication plan</b></p> <p>The draft document circulated had been pulled together by Emma Dixon from the Water Level Management Alliance following 2 meetings of a working group making use of communication expertise within some of the partner organisations. It was recognised that further information needed to be added on the details of how it would be taken forward once the framework suggested was refined and accepted. The following main points emerged from the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Need to review stakeholder lists and refine slightly. If they appear in more than one segment, there needs to be an explanation why.</li> <li>b. Re-connection with past stakeholders and incorporating new ones needed to get going promptly. Stakeholders would be invited to suggest any further gaps.</li> </ul>	

<p>c. Discussion around how stakeholder engagement should happen recognised different techniques had pros and cons. Conclusions were that an initial contact via letter and invitation to respond to survey questions to re-cap and check our understanding was valid would lead to one or more workshop /drop-in type events that enabled stakeholders to contribute views about priorities, governance and how best to keep in contact. The sub-group would be able to coalesce views about how such workshops would be offered (split geographically or by interest areas for example) so that as soon as sufficient officer time was available the detailed steps could be initiated.</p> <p>d. The working of the Broads Forum was under review but it was also recognised that engagement now needed to be wider to ensure relevant coastal interests were adequately incorporated. Care would need to be taken to link into pre-existing stakeholder engagement such as was happening currently in Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft.</p> <p>e. The document needed revision in light of the discussion and taking care to keep terminology consistent. Use could be made of existing planned engagement where this would be helpful. Where possible the communication expertise within each organisation would be tapped into.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> Document to be revised in light of discussions. Shared with relevant communication expertise within partner organisations. Sub-group to review action details to have as much ready for when project resources are clarified and confirmed.</p>	<p>SKH /KF sub grp</p>
<p><b>4. Regional flood and coastal committee (RFCC) visit to Broadland</b></p> <p>When MJ and SKH presented to the RFCC there was interest in visiting Broadland so its members could be more familiar with the area. It was not possible to arrange this in the autumn and so the suggestion is now to plan ahead for the spring and perhaps use the opportunity to invite along other key interests (e.g. Environment Agency's regional board member).</p> <p>The Group supported this idea. Discussion suggested that with a mid to later morning start to allow travel from all over, it was likely to take the better part of the day although there may be scope to incorporate a coastal (e.g. Bacton) or catchment visit as well.</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b> EA and BA to plan a possible visit schedule</p>	<p>MJ, KF, SKH to initiate</p>
<p><b>5. Partner updates</b></p> <p>a. BP outlined the proposals for a sand-scaping scheme at Bacton with a 7m deep/ 1.5M m<sup>3</sup> of sediment put on the beach and allowed to erode over time. This would be a partnership scheme between the site operators and NNDC coordinated by Coastal Partnership East. A wide range of private and public financial contributions would be utilised.</p> <p>b. GB informed the group that funds had been secured to replace the box culvert at Horsey which had previously failed. The work will be programmed for next year. They are also currently working up the scope for a programme of pump replacements in the Upper Thurne area. As this may be looking to set the investment for the next 50 years it was important to seek multiple benefits and recognise the changing environment.</p> <p>c. SKH outlined the approach from a consulting firm that was bidding for some work commissioned by the Committee for Climate Change that wanted to explore the relationship between Natural Capital and climate adaptation. It</p>	

was agreed that suggesting the Broads as a suitable study area would be sensible.	
<b>6. AOB</b> Nothing raised	
<b>7. Date of next meeting</b> To be determined through a doodle poll scoping later March 2018.	SKH

DRAFT