

Notes from the 26th meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership (formerly Adaptation Panel)	
Date: 28th January 2016	
Present Kerry Turner (UEA) chair, Charlie Beardall, Stuart Barbrook, Charles Schelpe (EA), John Sharpe (RSPB), Kevin Burgess, Kevin Marsh (CH2M), Bernie Harris (GYBC), Rob Goodliffe (NNDC), Matt Hullis (SCC), Jacquie Burgess, John Ash, Maria Conti, Simon Hooton {skh} (notes), (BA), Guest: Ulysse Pasquier	
Apologies: Paul Mitchelmore, Steve Hayman (EA), Rob Wise (NFU), Karen Thomas/Giles Bloomfield IDB/WMA, Andy Millar, Dougal McNeil, (NE), Matthew Cross (BDC), Bill Parker (WDC-SCDC), Jane Burch (SCC)	
Summary points:	ACTION
<p>1. Introduction to the Climate Partnership</p> <p>KT gave some background to how the Panel came about and its work so far in creating the Broads Adaptation Plan and changing into the Broads Climate Partnership. The emphasis is on ensuring new ideas dovetail into existing strategies and help develop an adaptive approach. The Partnership needed to recognise how hard it was to predict future economic situation but would always be seeking ways to spend budgets effectively. It will be important to develop clear information about barrier options to help people consider future choices.</p> <p>CB reinforced the desire to take the next steps forward in terms of coastal protection for Eccles to Winterton but with a clear recognition on how this could impact on Great Yarmouth flood walls and the future following the Broads Flood Alleviation Project (BFAP). Whatever happens there will be a need for other funding to join whatever is available through EA. This work will initiate the necessary conversations around partnership working.</p> <p>The research brief will be for the Broads Climate Partnership with EA contributing the bulk of the funding. BA have been able to confirm they can contribute £5k to this and any other contributions will be welcome. This work deals with the short term and maintaining protection but also provides the bed-rock for the longer term discussions leading to a supported way ahead.</p>	
<p>2. Research brief</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>KM and KB provided an overview of how we believed the coast had been in roman times and how through 3 existing strategies the current situation was protected. The coastal element concentrated on potential breach or inundation by the sea but was related to the on-going work needed for Great Yarmouth with the current approach starting in the early 1980s with recent updates from 2003/4 and 2007. In places the protection was in very poor condition with a number of issues to resolve to enable any raising of the protection height. One approach may need to be to re-visit the idea of creating a vision for Great Yarmouth – what people wish to see alongside a regeneration of the area to help provide motivation and a case for investment. The BFAP has invested in 235km of walls returning them to a 1995 level with an allowance for climate change. The flood standard has not necessarily been enhanced but re-modelling should make them more robust towards breaching as was demonstrated by the recent surges.</p>	

The research will draw on existing data and materials, exploring what were the assumptions at the time over ideas for protection including barriers on the Yare and elsewhere. It will look at current assumptions about sea level rise, changes in wave climates, the accelerated low water corrosion of sea walls and issues around the lack of space for easy enhancements. Being clear on what has changed since pieces of work were completed would be helpful.

As well as considering areas at risk there will be consideration of the reasons to act be they environmental (e.g. biodiversity designations) or economic (e.g. tourism considerations). This will help identify the scope for cross boundary benefits and public views and perceptions. This is likely to identify planning and political issues that would need to be addressed in the future. The current strategies such as the Shoreline Management plan and the Broads Climate Adaptation Plan provided useful parameters for going forward.

Discussion

Discussion highlighted the value of considering who would gain or lose out from proposed changes as that can direct thoughts about where economic contributions can come from. It was suggested that being clear about who are the relevant stakeholders and what they need to know to inform their choices will help in progressing the debate what options to choose.

It will be helpful to be clear about the scope of the work e.g. how much can fluvial /pluvial processes be incorporated and reference to the important ecosystem services provided by the Broads.

Although barriers were a major topic of conversation for Broads' interests it was likely there was limited clarity on what the details of such a structure were, how and who would operate it. The on-going operational and maintenance costs also needed to be highlighted as there would need to be clarity over who met those. However, it was recognised it would be important to take small steps that were understood and supported rather than jumping to long term pictures where resource need would be demanding.

Other thoughts raised included how fresh options could be related back to the 'business as usual' situation; how visual interpretation of options could be developed to help share ideas; options chosen could have differing impacts for environmentally designated areas with differing winners and losers and so when should the environmental parameters be incorporated especially as they have been the drivers for choices in many compartments for BFAP.

Great Yarmouth is becoming aware that the amount EA can contribute may be insufficient for some choices and so there are initiatives there, and elsewhere, to bring in other stakeholders to consider who is benefitting and may be willing to contribute. This was supported as a way forward but it did require clear information about costs and impacts of the options which is why the proposed research is so vital – giving real information to inform the debate and helping it achieve more. There were changes in Governmental thinking and a recognition of a move from 'public goods' to 'quasi-private goods' and that will influence future decisions.

Going forward

EA would now finalise the brief with the contractors coming back to relevant people as and when needed. Those with extensive knowledge of past approaches would help share background material as needed.

The current intention would be to bring back a draft report to this Partnership probably in June. The Broads Authority would be meeting 8/7/16 and 30/9/16

<p>and would welcome a presentation on the outcomes. The Broads Forum provided a public forum to share thinking and they meet 28/7/16 and 3/11/16 and the intention would be to report on the research to them.</p> <p>SKH would be the conduit to the Partnership and would seek to provide liaison between the different interests.</p>	
<p>3. Broads Climate Adaptation Plan</p> <p>The Full and Summary Plans were now complete and would be sent to Defra in the following week. The documents will be published on the Broads Authority's web site and can be accessed through these links:</p> <p>http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/709160/Climate-Adaptation-Plan-Report.pdf</p> <p>http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/709159/Climate-Adaptation-Plan-Summary.pdf</p> <p>Plans continue to try and find parish councils, tourism businesses and perhaps a farmer /landowner to develop some trial Climate Adaptation Plans that can be shared through the Broads⁰Community. Opportunities will be taken to engage with the public about the ideas in the Plan and help improve community understanding.</p>	
<p>4. Date of next meeting</p> <p>SKH will liaise with SB as manager of the research contract and seek to set up a suitable meeting date – likely to be early June.</p>	SKH