

Notes from the 27th meeting of the Broads Climate Partnership (formerly Adaptation Panel)	
Date: 2nd September 2016	
Present Charlie Beardall, Stuart Barbrook,(EA), John Sharpe (RSPB), Kevin Burgess, Kevin Marsh (CH2M), Cerris Jones (NFU), Andy Millar (NE), Jacquie Burgess (chair for meeting), John Ash, Sarah Mukherjee, John Packman, Simon Hooton {skh} (notes) (BA),	
Apologies: Kerry Turner (UEA) Steve Hayman (EA), Rob Wise (NFU),	
Summary points:	ACTION
<p>1. High Level Review</p> <p>The draft report was introduced by Kevin Burgess having seen some comments made by members of the partnership in advance. He stressed this was just a review of existing material along with updating of broad finances for a barrier. It was intended primarily as a report for organisations and not the general public. It also related to the existing need to refresh EA's Large Project Group and NE approval to continue work on Eccles to Winterton coast (E2W) and Great Yarmouth (GY).</p> <p>The current strategies remain valid and the review is helping to start considering the right approach to the medium and long term. The current 3 strategies have been broadly successful but looking ahead there are many things to take into account from changes in ownership of Great Yarmouth harbour to heading towards the final phase of Broads Flood Alleviation Project. The draft report does recognise the importance of bringing all three strategies (E2W GY and Broadland rivers) together. Partnership members were able to suggest changes to the content and were asked to send any final thoughts through within the next 3 weeks so the report could be finalised.</p> <p>AM raised that the natural heritage features of the coast and Broads looked at together made matters much more complex.</p> <p>It was agreed that BFAP had been a product of its times and such a private-public partnership over that period of time would no longer be high up the political agenda.</p>	ALL KB
<p>2. Next steps</p> <p>Partnership members were keen to find a way to share the final material with stakeholders. The general conclusion was that it would be important to present the dilemma of how expensive it would be to bring in a barrier or barriers and retain and maintain the associated defensive walls once you look at the medium term. The Government's approach to central grant aid would suggest substantial sums needed to be found locally to meet the costs of the existing approach.</p> <p>The short term policy would continue and proposed activity would appear not to compromise choices in the future. But a careful debate about how to proceed for the medium and long term would be needed including the timing and affordability of the work.</p> <p>The draft report also raised the question of the type of barrier and what it would be used to do making a noticeable difference in construction and operational</p>	

