

**Big Skies, Mills and Marshes: The Broads Landscape Partnership  
Stakeholder Meeting 1<sup>st</sup> October 2014  
Transcript**

The purpose of the meeting was to provide preliminary input and direction to the Broads Authority on its initial thinking in relation to the proposed application to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) Landscape Partnership Scheme in order to enable the Authority to come up with a detailed draft proposal for further discussion and consultation with stakeholders and partners.

The meeting was organised by the Broads Authority and independently facilitated by 3KQ Ltd. Invitations were sent to a range of organisations, local interest groups and individuals who are active in the area.

**Agenda**

- 10.00: - Welcome and introduction to the day  
- Introduction to the work of the Broads Authority and the plan to submit a proposal to the HLF Landscape Partnership Scheme  
- The importance of the landscape, why it is at risk, and the resulting losses  
- Aims of the Broads Landscape Partnership Scheme
- 11.25: *Break*  
- How to achieve the aims  
- Outputs
- 13.00: *Lunch*
- 13.45: - Outcomes and legacy  
- The HLF Landscape Partnership Scheme – process and opportunities  
- Agree way forward/next steps – including:  
- Project timetable  
- Who else should be involved?  
- The best way of communicating  
- Evaluation
- 15.30: Close

Andrea Long (Director of Planning and Resources) started the meeting with an introduction to the work of the Broads Authority, and the reasons the Authority has decided to submit an application to the HLF Landscape Partnership Scheme.

The discussions focused on the matrix document: *Big Skies, Mills and Marshes: the Broads Landscape Partnership (working document – see appendix A)* with each section introduced by a short presentation followed by group discussions at tables.

Questions and key comments/suggestions arising from the table discussions were shared in plenary, and more detailed feedback was recorded on table sheets and the matrix document. A graffiti wall was also available for participants to make additional comments/suggestions on any topic throughout the day.

A summary of the outputs for each session is given below.

---

**Session 1: Introduction to the work of the Broads Authority and the plans for submitting an application to the HLF Landscape Partnership Scheme**

Andrea Long – Director of Planning and Resources

**Plenary questions and key feedback from each table:**

- There were several statements of support for the bid and the importance of partnerships was noted.
- Suggestions for additional areas included:
  - Postwick Marshes.
  - Whitlingham Country Park.
  - Closing up the gap between Brundall and Whitlingham at the edge of Norwich.
  - Waveney Valley.
- The Authority explained that part of the purpose of this meeting was to get more clarity on the process and argue which areas should be included or not. There is a 200km<sup>2</sup> limit on the area that can be included in the bid although this should not be to the detriment of good projects. The current proposed area is approximately 175km<sup>2</sup> so there is some capacity for other areas/projects to be included. The Authority supports the inclusion of Postwick Marshes and, in discussion with HLF, Whitlingham Country Park can potentially be included as a satellite area. However, given the 200km<sup>2</sup> limit it is doubtful that the project can extend too far down the Waveney Valley.
- A question was asked about other projects/HLF funded schemes adjacent to this area. Examples given included:
  - Norfolk Windmills Trust has a HLF heritage grant for Stracey Arms Mill
  - There are three other HLF Landscape Partnership Schemes active in the region, Touching the Tide ( Suffolk Coast), Ouse Washes (Fenstanton to Downham Market), Breaking New Ground (The Brecks)
- It was also noted that the Landscape Partnership Scheme is a good opportunity to get funding for the hidden/undiscovered archaeology that doesn't currently get a lot of attention.

**Additional input from table worksheets and matrix document:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Re the triangle – is Strumpshaw/Buckenham included – wildlife/railway/mills resources?</li><li>• Will there be a set approach to the adjacent areas outside the triangle e.g. views in/out?</li><li>• Could Caister Roman Fort be included – because of relationship with Burgh Castle?</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project outline – aims and purpose.</li><li>• Get on with it – although some question about project benefits – added value.</li><li>• Further questions.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Could Whitlingham Country Park be included?</li><li>• Increase links to towns/villages.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A critical mass of background information already gathered.</li><li>• Area could include Lower Waveney with the prehistoric buried remains.</li><li>• Are there other nationally funded schemes in the urban areas that overlap in area or scope e.g. Great Yarmouth – coastal communities fund?</li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There seems an obvious gap near Norwich – need a connection to populace, footpaths, peri-urban communities.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was this area decided upon? What was the process?</li> <li>• What is the relationship to Norwich? Major population centre.</li> <li>• The connection to all three is pretty crucial, Yarmouth and Lowestoft look to the sea.</li> <li>• Should the area extend to Whitlingham?</li> <li>• The area skirts any areas of habitation.</li> <li>• In order for events to be funded, they need to be in the Landscape Partnership area – key observation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to fund projects looking at areas of ‘unknown’ archaeology – usually not funded.</li> <li>• Would ‘cluster’ approach for project area be of benefit?</li> <li>• Need to include upland fringe as well as low ground (marsh/estuary).</li> <li>• Transition area is very important/interesting for biodiversity and heritage/past settlement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connecting people with landscape? Low population.</li> <li>• How do we define the boundary – i.e. which mills should be included?</li> <li>• What are the main visitor community – engagement hubs of the project?</li> <li>• Strumpshaw to be included?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasons for closing the triangle and linking the urban populations to the Broads landscapes – really important to connect.</li> <li>• Want to see the Waveney Valley included – Waveney Community Archaeology have two projects planned for next year in Lower Waveney Valley.</li> <li>• The mills are iconic to the landscape – real problems in repairing and maintaining them.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of partners to engage.</li> <li>• Role of Broads Authority?</li> <li>• Geography setting needs context before comment.</li> <li>• Need to know more about Heritage Lottery and their requirements.</li> <li>• How will public access be incorporated?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Got to go for it! 100% support.</li> <li>• Consider adding Postwick Marshes.</li> <li>• Importance of partnerships.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are the audience?? Clear definition.</li> <li>• Access – provide a wider range of access not just current.</li> </ul>

---

## **Session 2: The importance of the landscape, why it is at risk, and the resulting losses**

Lesley Marsden – Landscape Officer

In addition to the presentation, an overview was also given of the thinking behind the three key strands in the matrix document (Above Ground (Mills), On the Ground (Grazing Marsh) and Below Ground (Archaeology)). Groups were encouraged to frame their discussions around these themes, although it was reiterated that feedback on the themes and suggestions for further projects were also welcome.

### **Questions:**

Q – I’m sure you’ve done this work but why bother with this work on mills – how are we going to get communities to appreciate them, visitors to visit them, make them financially sustainable in the long-term and provide help for mill owners to plan their business?

A – A lot of the work on mills has been done by Ben Hogg (Historic Environment Manager, Broads Authority). Regarding the long-term focus, we can't stop after 5 years and it all to go to waste, it must continue after that. We also need to prove the need for preservation of the mills through this kind of project.

Responses from other attendees:

- It may not be realised that not all of these mills are the same – some have technical features that are not known because they've not been studied. You can read the development of machinery through looking at these mills so they should be carefully chosen and look at specific types.
- The mills are very important – we've got the largest number in Europe. If we could plan the development of the mills into this project so that people could look at the machinery etc., it could be a worldwide thing.

Q – Regarding private ownership of mills/land, what engagement will there be with landowners and what focus on grazing land management?

A – We obviously need to engage with landowners very early on, and it's a process that will start after this meeting once we've got your input. We need landowner buy-in and we need to work very closely with them to make sure we're not doing things that they don't want to happen.

Q – Are the three strands all equally important, what is the balance between them in terms of funding, and how would financial sustainability be assured beyond the 5 years?

A – We don't know how we're going to split the funding as that work hasn't been done yet. We currently estimate approximately 20 projects, but as to what they are and how we go about it, that's partly what we want feedback on today. Whatever projects we set up throughout this project, they have to be self-sustaining at the end and that's one of the biggest challenges that we're going to face. Everything we deliver has to have a legacy and be sustainable beyond the 5 year period.

Q – How are you going to manage access? There's quite a lot of important land and if you're going to encourage people to visit how are you going to control access and footfall as it could cause quite a lot of damage?

A – There is some ongoing work already looking at this and we're going to work closely with the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. Access has to be managed and it must be sustainable e.g. not damaging to paths/nesting etc.

**Other key comments from table discussions:**

- Landscape is always changing and that was emphasised this winter with a major flood event which left areas underwater – need to acknowledge that and adapt the plans as there's not much point in spending a lot of money on an area and then public access issues meaning you can never get to it in the future.
- The distinctiveness about the Broads is the water so need to look at the language that's used in the presentation of this to make sure that's reflected.

**Input on table worksheets and matrix document:**

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What scope is there between above and below ground within the area?</li></ul> |
|---|

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritisation areas i.e. mills, grazing, archaeology.</li> <li>• How are going to manage access?</li> <li>• How are going to engage with land owners?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to bring out the distinctiveness of water landscape – “ground” – is this the right word?</li> <li>• Are all three equally important? ‘Below Ground’ needs better explanation of importance – others can be seen!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of wildlife habitats before restoration/consolidation – sympathetic restoration.</li> <li>• Subsidence a problem.</li> <li>• River-based projects – how are these connected to the categories?</li> <li>• Need for greater inclusion of local leisure groups who use the broads and farmers.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At ‘risk’ from lack of funding – main reason why neglect takes place.</li> <li>• ‘Gap’ in funding between Cap reform – farmers will plough up grass before new scheme comes in.</li> <li>• What is the link between ‘On the Ground’ and current projects i.e. HLS/ELS agreements?</li> <li>• Need to engage with ‘people on the ground’ – farmers, landowners, graziers, marsh-men.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation – understanding.</li> <li>• Should stein pump houses be included with mills (e.g. Strumpshaw)?</li> <li>• Why bother with mills?</li> <li>• Build in the long-term skills – do we have buy-in from local communities?</li> <li>• ‘On the Ground’ – what buy-in do we have from private landowners plus access on private land?</li> <li>• Can we really make many mills financially sustainable – business planning? Or prioritise, focus on a few key mills – access, uniqueness, link to other.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of linking to other areas of work (health and social inclusion etc.).</li> <li>• Non water-logged archaeology and inclusion of upland fringes.</li> <li>• Potential loss of local rural history.</li> <li>• Need to include young people in skills training (schools) – legacy and sense of ownership – good potentially in proposed projects.</li> <li>• Heritage dykes – old creek network preserved.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mills: Restoration – what is the role of respective owners, how do you get their buy-in?</li> <li>• What is the balance between the three areas, Above, On or Below Ground in terms of funding and financial sustainability in the long term?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for promotion of national and international importance of biodiversity of the grazing marshes.</li> <li>• The Broads Voice and message isn’t clearly understood – many local people haven’t been, and outside of the area just seen as a place for holidays. Not valued.</li> <li>• What are the marshes for? Economics and sustainability: pressure for landowners/farmers to drain landscape and convert grazing land to arable.</li> <li>• Facilitate easy access, without turning it into a theme park – importance of sense of place.</li> <li>• Different media to help get the message out e.g. social media, apps.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mills: existing preserved mills need to be maintained. Other deserving mills need to be restored and maintained.</li> <li>• Landscape is changing – it is about acknowledging and adapting an approach to this i.e. our marshes are fresh water systems!</li> <li>• (Below Ground) acknowledging importance of peat deposits as well as human archaeology.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Headline dynamic easily remembered descriptions in boxes. Descriptions bit too generic, key delivery outputs.</li> <li>• Such a unique unknown body research area need to understand more only 1960s known manmade.</li> </ul>

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation – live champions or ambassadors to explain how and why are more real in how we interpret the built landscape &amp; heritage &amp; economics.</li> <li>• Create legacy outcomes influence and design long-term output influencing impact.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water is the main theme.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the Ground (Grazing Marsh) – or more wider definition?</li> </ul>   |

---

### **Session 3: Aims of the Broads Landscape Partnership Scheme**

Will Burchnall – Project Manager

#### **Questions:**

Q – When developing these aims what market research will be done on what the public think of the sense of place for the Broads – wildlife, holidays etc.?

A – After submission/acceptance of the project we will have two years of development and that is when most of the public engagement will happen.

Q – Should the aims get it back to water, as water seems to underlie the aims?

A – We agree – water will be the thing that underlies all of this, it is very important. We need to find a way of graphically representing it.

Q – We can see banner projects for other streams, but with the ‘Above the Ground’ grazing marsh theme it’s difficult to see what the banner scheme might be?

A – The RSPB and the Wildlife Trust are doing some very good work on the grazing marshes at the moment and there is enough there to have some headline projects.

#### **Other key comments from table discussions:**

- Regarding grazing marshes and the ‘On the Ground’ stream/sustainability, whether you’re a farmer, a dragonfly, a tourist, everybody has an equal status. (Broads Authority response – We agree, it’s a whole system that is working together and any changes we make need to keep that or make it better.)
- The mills and grazing land seem to merge together very well but archaeology is a bit separate – maybe mills and archaeology should all go together because all archaeology isn’t necessarily under the ground.
- One of the things we need for a legacy is to involve the communities in that area and schools in particular.
- Our over-riding discussion was about engagement, particularly with local communities (e.g. Lowestoft and Yarmouth) and how you get those communities not just to academically engage but also physically.
- We support the aims but they are very broad brush at the moment – assume they will be narrowed down.
- There are other sources of funding and other work going on, and we need to mesh them all together.
- Engaging landowners is vital both in relation to access issues on the land and also as custodians of the land in the future.

- Tourism as a revenue source.
- Balance of spending – concerns re too much spending on capital structure projects instead of engagement/not spending all of the money on capital projects.
- There seems to be a lack of public engagement at this stage although it does appear later on.
- Access to mills must be a key element, and linked with that we feel there's some potential for major problems with landowners – need to consider how difficult that's going to be.
- Regarding the difficulties of access, virtual tours of the structures would be a way of engaging schools and community groups without the need for physical access to the site.
- Ideas such as run a mill for a week as a holiday for friends/families alongside the usual adopt a mill etc.
- Mills are an iconic feature of the Broads and they need to be thought about. Also consider vessels of every form from Roman times, they're part of an important timeline.
- The timeline for the area is important from Ice Age to present-day, and the Second World War in particular because of all of the pill boxes.
- Good to look back at Ice Age, but look to the future as well – what will the environment look like in years to come?

**Input on table worksheets and matrix document:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will you find out how the public perceive the sense of place? E.g. wildlife, archaeology, landscape etc.</li> <li>• What will be the measures of success?</li> <li>• How is this different from previous grants and how will you fit all the areas together?</li> <li>• How will you address the issues of apparent disconnect of how public can experience these different aspects, as many need to be experienced from the land e.g. exploring ways of accessing different areas e.g. mills, waterways?</li> <li>• Engaging with the landowners to ensure that keeping grazing and sustaining landscape is worthwhile for their business.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access – schools. Not just footpaths – dangerous/isolated structures – virtual tours – improve access. 'Virtual Tours' would be a way of improving access for many groups/people to view and understand the isolated and dangerous structures.</li> <li>• Improvements required to foot, cycle, rail and road access.</li> <li>• Criteria for work should be ease of access.</li> <li>• Wherries are just as iconic features and played a big part in development.</li> <li>• Further work on understanding the development of vessels on the Broads from Roman times to date.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to sites and biodiversity – increase in population of Norwich, improvement of access.</li> <li>• Making some places inaccessible to preserve sites.</li> <li>• Increase accessibility especially in urban areas.</li> <li>• Access to include events and activities to help make the areas sustainable.</li> <li>• Greater use of waterways.</li> <li>• Production of publicity materials for schools, public.</li> <li>• Opportunities for archaeology less tangible – need to link with HER for finds. Volunteer groups need a lot of support for training etc.</li> <li>• Archaeology – is it all below ground? Should include above ground structures, oral history, landscape history.</li> <li>• Mills and marshes are closely connected.</li> <li>• Should 'Above Ground' include more than mills?</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider including 'Above Ground' and 'Archaeology' in one theme.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic approach – prioritisation – methodology for deciding which mills, sites, assets or features are targeted.</li> <li>• Use existing resources – HER, HAR, LiDAR etc. – difficult for archaeology (Below Ground).</li> <li>• Will 'mills' include other built heritage – pump houses etc. – and buildings associated with mills (ancillary buildings, landscape channels associated with mills etc.)?</li> <li>• Is there too much emphasis on mills (Above Ground) as part of the project?</li> <li>• Aims are OK but what is the mechanism, banner project for the On the Ground strand? What is the focus?</li> <li>• Where can this strand link into HLS and ELS etc.?</li> <li>• Are the marshes and mills to dominate? Other archaeological aspects – salt marshes, buried prehistoric remains?</li> <li>• More surveys needed for archaeology? LiDAR, boreholes, field walking etc. Engagement with local landowners, marsh-men etc. are needed (for permission and as fonts of knowledge).</li> <li>• Do the aims need to be narrower – less broad brushed? Do HLF need a tighter set of aims?</li> <li>• Is there a focus for the On the Ground strand?</li> <li>• Explore the complexity of the biodiversity on the marginal parts of the Broads area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad range of aims but the overarching aim of ENGAGEMENT of local communities in the outputs of the project. Interpretation and visitors.</li> <li>• <u>Access</u> – public transport and enlivenment.</li> <li>• Caution re access – to avoid damage to landscapes and wildlife – sensitive routes.</li> <li>• Engagement should be via education and interpretation.</li> <li>• Clear aims of target audiences – local communities or tourists?</li> <li>• Who will be the custodians of the landscape? Crucial to engage and encourage landowners to conserve grazing marshes. But is tourism the revenue source?</li> <li>• Concern about the balance of spending – too much on capital construction/restoration vs engagement projects.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second World War is there to explore. Tell whole story, not only mills but other background information, 20<sup>th</sup> century archaeology. A timeline story from Ice Age to today.</li> <li>• Access for all with disability.</li> <li>• Shared ownership to include immediate high ground surrounding the old Estuary "Gamenisis".</li> <li>• Community engagement includes schools.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the aims be linked back to water as the focus underlying all aims? i.e. water trail, virtual/games/educational boats.</li> <li>• There needs to be linkage between all three and leveraging alternative funding.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Archaeology doe help us see the depth of human involvement and interaction with the landscape – likely to be public interest but could be novel, needs to be 'told' well.</li> <li>• People like discovery.</li> <li>• "Big up what we've got", "Wow factor". Scope to get people involved – community dig.</li> <li>• Give communities a sense of ownership – move away from the expert elite. Chance for real people to be part of it.</li> <li>• Wildlife is the same: but don't be too precious about it.</li> <li>• Need an 'Indiana Jones' (excitement) approach.</li> <li>• Lots of opportunity for story-telling.</li> <li>• Need to have "Getting Involved" in the aims. Hands on/doing not watching/avoid being too worthy.</li> <li>• Can we get people (youngsters) involved with animals – the livestock?</li> <li>• Apprenticeships – of the moment/new ways of doing things (but take back to the past). Employment is only a small part of people engagement.</li> <li>• Also need to go forward – relate in climate change – sense of their role in the future.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability of Farming? Landowners' role – the decisions for their future.</li> <li>• Journey – moving from one to another/between things. Follow an app – see the video.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to mills must be a key element.</li> <li>• The narrative and history of development of mills/machinery is an opportunity to build in.</li> <li>• Public engagement is missing or light at this aims stage – appears later in outcomes and legacy/should be here.</li> <li>• Relationship between people and the landscape across time – is “as interesting” as the actual structures, archaeology etc.</li> <li>• “Run a mill for a week” – action holiday opportunities, adopt a mill etc.</li> <li>• Lacking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ People engagement.</li> <li>○ Potential problems with landowners (consideration of how hard this will be).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Highlighted that a huge scope of projects possible in Below Ground.</li> <li>• Economic development – is there a sustainable career in these historic/traditional trades?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grazing marsh sustainable circle, opportunity to show that that this is a good example of how all parts are equally important – farmer, dragonfly, tourist – important to engage all landowners.</li> <li>• Maybe an extra column for People as a part of the covered topics.</li> <li>• Mills – linking up mills as well as individual sites with healthy walks etc.</li> <li>• Ensure skills are not lost with regards to millwrights by involving local colleges and working centres to maintain a sustainable future.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Matrix document ‘existing curriculum’ – “All about funding”</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Matrix document ‘Promote a better understanding and provide improved interpretation’ – local community, especially urban areas.</i></li> <li>• Tourist initiatives.</li> <li>• Training businesses.</li> <li>• Education.</li> </ul>

---

#### **Session 4: How the aims will be achieved**

##### **Questions:**

Q – We really need to understand the target audience, so how is this project going to be driven by insights from market research to determine the audience we want to work with and how we work with them?

A – We agree and this will be part of how we develop the project. Some of our partners have got really good databases/information and have run very successful schemes in the past. There is a really good baseline and we have enough information from our partners to get this round done and to at least suggest we've identified the need. The next round is where we need to go and out do a lot of this work.

Q – How are we going to engage with the people who are actively going to manage the land and the water? Water technology and how the water is managed is massively important, and managing that going forward is crucial.

A – Some of the water management groups were invited to this workshop but haven't come, and we will be following that up with them afterwards.

Q – Can't see anything here about who the audience is – is it tourists, landowners, young people, people living in Great Yarmouth? The HLF are going to ask that and I don't think it's going to progress unless you identify your audience. Do you have any figures on who your audiences are? A survey has just been completed for Museum of the Broads regarding the interest in the museum itself and the majority of people come from over 100 miles away.

A – That's right and there is further work that underpins where we are now, but it's not for the Broads Authority to say this is how we're going to progress. The purpose of today is for you to all give us your input to help us determine which way to go. We have a lot of underlying information and a lot of colleagues in the room will have other information and we will be coming to you for that.

#### **Other key comments from table discussions:**

- Some of the aspects are quite generic at the moment and there's a need to focus that from a bidding perspective, but also leave enough elbow room to develop smart links.
- The need to describe the purpose of the landscape so that people respect it, enjoy it and adventure in it appropriately – how we use different strands and active travel so that people do it sustainably.
- Engaging people:
  - Land-owner led projects as a starting point might overcome some of the access issues, and also grass roots community liaisons/enthusiasm.
  - Similar discussions around engagement with the public, I suppose from outside something quite clear to me a lot of talk about mills, three headings, mills very much on there can understand that, very visible etc. Question for us is how do we prioritise that e.g. could be good to restore but difficult to access – so ease of restoration, access etc. Will – also permission to go onsite to do the work in the first place.
- The 'On the Ground' theme:
  - Needs a bit of extra boost and could have a flagship project in there about habitat improvement and actively creating marshland landscape. It might not be a fundable tie through this but could link to other funding streams and might give a sense of unity to those schemes.
  - Regarding grazing marshes it needs some clarification e.g. is it just grazing marshes as that would reduce the area on the map, or does it also cover fens, carrs, upland?
- To get any of the projects achieved, engagement with tenants and landowners is going to be really critical and need to get that understood soon.
- Regarding access, we talked about working with existing infrastructure and transport services, cycling etc.
- Should have stipulating conditions e.g. if a landowner is given money to restore a mill they have to provide access even if only a few days a year.
- Although we have to be realistic, it would be nice to incorporate industry, archaeology and access and really make it a partnership.
- Shouldn't underestimate the difficulties.
- There are ways of using volunteers – an outcome could be legacy volunteers with a role in undertaking escorted access to some of these sites with the benefit of providing personal

interpretation. Shouldn't underestimate the importance of people on those sites as well as interpretation boards.

- We shouldn't just talk about improving understanding and access but should be looking at a range of interpretations and a range of access.

**Additional input on table worksheets and matrix document:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to separate 'above' and 'below' ground.</li> <li>• How to <u>SEE</u> the archaeology; qualities/quality so far; could bring in local groups; getting youngsters and families ACTIVE.</li> <li>• GAP in curriculum: local projects – art, history, engineering.</li> <li>• Art project in Great Yarmouth.</li> <li>• Linking into railways – look BEYOND the area's heritage to find other experiences.</li> <li>• Need to get key people involved. How will the economic case be made – some in arable and won't change. Sitting on land which has to pay.</li> <li>• <u>RISK</u> – also re public access/damage. Go through NFU and CLA.</li> <li>• <u>IDB</u> – Halvergate Water Management scheme. (£1.25m?). 36 pumping stations. How is the water managed? What are the historical? Key theme – Managing water. Engaging with the people who are actively managing the land's water.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship between <u>river</u>, marsh and adjacent upland.</li> <li>• Natural changes to landscape – background e.g. Great Estuary</li> <li>• Need to engage farming community. History of farming could be important strand – drainage mills relate to cattle farming. Also wild fowling and other industries.</li> <li>• Not just improved interpretation/access – needs to be range of interpretations/means of access.</li> <li>• Peat should be mentioned somewhere – sub-surface archaeology.</li> <li>• Adopt mills by holidaymakers/local businesses.</li> <li>• Broads Authority provide practical training, involve volunteers.</li> <li>• Survey of mills.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important that the approach is balanced – not just about mills. How will we prioritise the conservation and restoration of the mills? Balanced approach i.e. heritage importance and access issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access by public footpaths.</li> <li>○ Boat moorings.</li> <li>○ Promote public access.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• How are archaeology aims and projects going to be promoted? From early discussions today it is very clear that mills are much easier to prioritise.</li> <li>• Better understanding is very important. There is currently a lack of knowledge on what is currently available i.e. the mills you can visit by using existing public footpaths. How will local knowledge be captured?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not to forget other important built assets (houses).</li> <li>• Top billing to mills for Above Ground (possibly) – iconic.</li> <li>• Embedding skills training into curriculum.</li> <li>• Training volunteers basic maintenance – ongoing management.</li> <li>• Building capacity – train people to take people out.</li> <li>• Young people regular events out and skills.</li> <li>• Landowners/graziers on the ground – all need to be involved.</li> <li>• Localised meetings for famers?</li> <li>• Critical.</li> <li>• Work with VCS organisations in relevant areas to help get messages onto ground level</li> </ul>

(community).

- Possibly develop volunteer campaign to try to engage communities who wouldn't normally think this area would hold interest.
- Engage with young people for their views/how they develop projects and importantly be involved in production.
- Using volunteer time as match funding (have you considered this? 1 hour volunteer = £11.09).
- Link into existing work taking place (SCC) mapping footpaths from data gathered by people within their communities.
- Care farm concept.

- Better understanding and improved interpretation should apply to all three categories.
- Legacy – what happens after the project should be considered, especially physical archive.
- Mill trail.
- HES can run a number of community engagement projects based on previous LP projects incorporating mills.
- Access will be key – work with existing infrastructure and public transport. Cycling may be a good target.
- Projects should be holistic – incorporate archaeology, ecology, access etc. PARTNERSHIP!
- Learning lessons from current and past projects e.g. Ouse Washes, Brecks.
- Access – if money is given to restore a mill on private land access to the public must be a stipulated condition.
- Innovative ways of engaging more deprived communities (schools?).

- Survey and recording could be in 'On the Ground' as well as 'Below'.
- Try to increase area – Breaking New Ground were able to do this with justification.
- Reconsideration of acceptable future uses of mills in planning policy.
- Record the blank spots.
- Recognise biodiversity value of dykes alongside the landscape/heritage value.

- How is this project going to be market research insight driven? Who? Audience? To inform style of engagement, to inform how, segmentation etc. Pin down target audience and be participant/customer focused.
- Questions re urban communities travelling to sites of interest.
- Style of engagement and interpretation – water trails.
- BA survey – existing participants in BN Park.
- Integrated (informal) education offer/promotional offer.
- Water theme cross-cutting in educational and promotional offer.

- Opportunity to promote access that creates active travel and do so sustainably – bring together several strands.
- How do you target archaeological research – best use of resource. Write sustainability into the aims of the project.
- Need to reach out into socially/physically disadvantaged sections of the community/population.
- How do we structure delivery – to get the right people in the right roles to ensure good delivery and allocation of resource?
- How do we describe the significance of the landscape and its story – guided walking, cycling and canoeing?
- Need to describe and explain the fragility of the landscape and its purpose – respect it, enjoy it, have an adventure in – but do it appropriately.
- Engagement with all young people – community led to encourage enthusiasm on the asset be it a mill, a marsh full of birds, excavated archaeology.
- How do we support the cultural aspect of the landscape?

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of people present to interpret e.g. manage groups, arrange access. Including training volunteers.</li> <li>• On the Ground: need projects to (re)create landscape of marshlands = habitat improvement including management of economic landscape – environment schemes. Flagship project, linked to other funding sources.</li> <li>• Importance of all forms of access: physical, cycling, education, information and promotion, services at destinations, ferries.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very generic aims and there is a need to focus this to ensure the bid is distinctive.</li> <li>• Key focus on achieving a legacy with every project.</li> <li>• Focus on ensuring access and engagement with people.</li> <li>• Clear understanding of how access will be managed.</li> <li>• Landowner/farmer led approach to project development.</li> <li>• Put people’s relationship with the landscape as a key aim.</li> <li>• Strong support for the underlying work – better narrative to ensure the link between areas.</li> <li>• More elbow room for non-mill-related heritage.</li> <li>• Strong support for archaeology but some flexibility in approach.</li> <li>• No District Council representatives at event?</li> <li>• Grassroots community engagement to ensure ownership.</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business planning.</li> <li>• Other structures, historic pill boxes, steam pump houses.</li> <li>• Communities actively involved and supported.</li> <li>• Trails.</li> </ul>  |

---

## **Session 5: Outcomes and legacy – long-term sustainability**

### **5.1 – Outputs**

#### **Key comments from each table:**

- As a means of cutting across mills, archaeology and water there could be a number of mills to be restored with e.g. one that manages water and so on.
- The outputs need to be more measurable.
- People should be involved in every stage of the process right from the beginning and should make sure we involve everybody.
- Make sure anything regarding public access is accessible to all whatever their ability, and not just physically but also e.g. web-based so that people can understand the area without actually coming here. This would also make it more accessible for disadvantaged groups.
- Make sure we use all resources (technology, internet etc.) to get people to engage in the Broads area.
- We need to promote the identity of the Broads and the uniqueness of the Broads landscape in the wider area.
- Change the perception of it being an ‘empty’ landscape.
- Community and audience – who are we targeting i.e. is it focused on local people living in the area or people coming in from a long way away?
- Branding – water could give us the cohesion/consistency and pull everything together.

- Outputs should be led by the background evidence e.g. the mills survey etc., but it's more important to focus on getting young people out into the Broads and getting them interested/engaged with the landscape.
- The issue of land management and land owners – they are so important and significant in the Broads area so perhaps deserve their own heading i.e. land management could be a heading for this project in its own right.
- How to get all stakeholders on the same page with similar aims/outputs – different stakeholder groups are all having their own conversations about what we all want from the landscape.
- One way of helping landowners and the community as a whole to be better integrated could be some form of voluntary scheme on the farms to get people helping farmers – the funding could help with the administration side so that farmers just have to host the volunteers.
- Could have links with colleges, apprentice schemes and other training schemes that help people get out into and generate an interest in the landscape, and would also create stronger links between landowners and other parts of the community.
- An output should be to have established a strong local history, geography, arts, science strand in school curriculums from Key Stage 1 up to 6<sup>th</sup> form/university which uses this area as a resource for teaching.
- With regard to how to get young people involved, you need to get kids and teachers inspired and there's loads of things you could be doing. In Key Stage 2 there is a part of the curriculum that is about becoming involved in your own local area and we could target that.
- The outputs framework is fairly good but communities could be 'supported' as well as 'supportive'.
- Need to work partnerships into the outputs in some way.
- Engaging new audiences is important and would secure volunteer capacity for the longer term. Volunteer numbers are falling.
- One phrase that is missing is economic well-being, because unless and until we can improve the opportunity for people to make a living, the HLF scheme isn't going to achieve what it sets out to achieve.

#### Outputs – input on table worksheets and matrix document:

- Specifics.
- One aim is to bring in many different groups/audiences.  
How to target:
  - Local expert/interest groups.
  - Schools – curriculum development, INCLUDE local element.
  - Visitors.
  - The urban population –segments?
 How to measure levels of success?
- To have established key nodes for access/activities/support/people – possible for wildlife and biodiversity.
- To have established a local history/geography/art/science strand in schools curriculums through to colleges and universities. How to get them out. Provide resources to support key stages.
- Economic wellbeing – economical output.
- Must connect with other land management grant schemes. Look for connections countywide.

- Sense of ownership of project and landscape/heritage by local community – including Norwich, Yarmouth and Oulton Broad. It belongs to us all. Landscape and physical infrastructure.
  - Understood and appreciated by wide group through range of media, which should mean that it can be appreciated without needing to be accessed directly. This will increase accessibility for less mobile groups.
  - Understanding of the separate identity of the areas within the wider Broads landscape and its distinctive character.
  - Engagement of new audiences to appreciate area and secure volunteer capacity for the longer term and ensure project sustainability.
- 
- New technology – use of tablets, mobiles ..... internet coverage.
  - Inter-related.
  - Communities (and visitors):
    - Taking ownership – volunteering, community cohesion.
    - Audience? How wide is community?
    - Birdwatchers, conservationists, boaters?
    - Should we be targeting the remote (non-local) communities.
  - Womb of the Broads – very important to UK and Broadland.
  - Promoted – Increased ‘Broadland’ – Improved Identity – Uniqueness.
  - Change perception of it being ‘empty’.
- 
- ‘Outputs’ here should be ‘Outcomes’.
  - Employment? Economic viability.
  - All the different stakeholders on the same page – Broads Forum not necessarily achieving this yet.
  - Landowners are so critical they need their own line – Where do they fit? – In landscape?
  - Voluntary schemes on farms:
    - Training and community engagement.
    - Administration handled by the HLF scheme (assistance for farmers).
- 
- Landscape and heritage fine but how to involve communities is tough.
  - How to inspire, involve?
  - TV media, social media.
  - Get teachers on board, kids from a young age, fired up.
  - Part of ‘Broads Curriculum’ get resources together for education.
  - Youth activities i.e. work in mill, deliver goods via Broads.
  - Kids residential etc. (guided river trips to sites).
  - Trails, cycle routes, boat access.
  - Marketing of project.
  - Tourist information.
- 
- Should be led by the background evidence:
    - Mills audit
    - Biodiversity audit
    - Landscape character assessment
    - Audience
    - (Green infrastructure)
    - Health?
  - Young people out in the Broads.
  - Young people as ‘recorders’ – biodiversity, archaeology.
- 
- Hard counting:
    - x number of mills restored – and actually manage water.
    - More land managed for the benefit of biodiversity.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events out in the Broads.</li> <li>• Schools programme.</li> <li>• Venue for archaeological heritage e.g. a restored mill.</li> <li>• Connections measure – means of proving connections.</li> <li>• Capacity building in existing local community action/wildlife groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Training, admin support, tools.</li> <li>○ An ongoing method of engaging with the community.</li> <li>○ Link with landowners to manage land for biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People should be involved earlier.</li> <li>• Access for all – deprived areas.</li> <li>• Education/information provided for people.</li> <li>• Transport for all – cycling, water, rail.</li> <li>• Access by multimedia/apps.</li> <li>• Mix of digital plus live.</li> <li>• Journey through the landscape – themed.</li> <li>• Branding.</li> <li>• Legacy in perpetuity – ongoing revenue required.</li> <li>• Mapping the land and waterway – physical landscape interpretation.</li> <li>• One mill as focal point.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework seems right but outputs need to be structured to meet the HLF targets.</li> <li>• Partnership seems to be missing – better working between organisations and communities ongoing into the future.</li> <li>• Communities sustained/developed/supported.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not clear outputs. What are the required outputs for the bid?</li> <li>• Baseline data required.</li> <li>• People need to be a main focus.</li> <li>• Some terms seem woolly.</li> <li>• Buzz words – pride, celebrate, cherished.</li> <li>• More communities.</li> <li>• Outcomes need to be set more to this project – could be the outputs for any project.</li> <li>• Project keeps coming back to ‘water’.</li> <li>• Outputs need to be measured.</li> <li>• Link with education.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All projects should be inclusive across the themes.</li> <li>• Economic well-being.</li> <li>• Young Farmers.</li> <li>• Land management/enabling people without any input.</li> <li>• ‘Communities’: Supported partnerships – build and create.</li> <li>• People – how do you inspire and involve communities?</li> </ul>

## **5.2 – Outcomes and legacy**

Participants were asked to consider the draft Outcomes and Legacy section in the draft matrix document and discuss the following questions:

- What will be the results of the project?
- How are these results maintained after the project finishes?
- What needs to be created, changed or developed to allow this to happen?

**Key comments from each table:**

- Regarding ongoing sustainability and legacy, there is a need for some sort of trust to be established to look after this in the future across all themes of the bid. It's not sustainable to e.g. repair mills if there's no guarantee that they will be maintained in the future. Landowners can't be expected to do this so we need to have some form of agreement and establish some form of trust.
- Identify sites that achieve outcomes across all three themes to maximise all parts of the different streams e.g. refurbish something with an educational aspect in grazing marshland.
- The legacy of organisations working together and the connections that will come through this project.
- Finding advocates within communities i.e. people who are passionate about the landscape in their community and can keep things moving in the future.
- Concerns regarding over-subscription of projects and what happens with ideas that aren't taken up at this stage (but could be taken up at some point in the future).
- Need to think about the measurement of 500 volunteers, don't think this is sustainable – perhaps 50 but not 500.
- How do we connect water with the people who are walking/cycling – there used to be a lot of ferries but they've all gone bar one and we can't reach/help people on the other side of the river/water. There is the possibility of river taxis as a business in certain areas of the Broads.
- Results should be more about people understanding the landscape as a whole, better access for all, setting up community groups and training them to undertake tasks under all the headings, coordinating groups, having a well-known project that people can relate to, charitable trust funding, groups that will carry on after the projects, inspiring enthusiasm, projects that will endure.
- More focus on developing existing access, developing new routes and good marketing.
- The strength of the Broads Landscape Partnership is what will ensure the legacy – whether it's building the strength of that partnership or developing new ones.
- Where is the fun in this for people who are not particularly Broads minded? Could have some form of informal fun such as a crafts/arts experience using the Broads as a starting point – it might bring in schools, disabled groups, the unemployed etc.
- May need to consider having to mothball many of the mills – preserve them but if you mothball them, people who are farmers but they're used for other purposes you'll get volunteers and landowners will go along with that but not if you're allowing general public in to them
- Mills are mostly in private ownership so to succeed in the long term we are going to need landowner cooperation and for this financial support is needed so that they don't become a financial or administrative burden. Future funding needs to be available for maintenance etc. including support for filling out applications to reduce the administration burden. If they were cost-neutral that might be sufficient for some of them.
- Most of these windmills are listed buildings and the owners are responsible for their maintenance. It's up to the local authority to make sure the owners realise that, and for the owners to appreciate that if the Broads Authority or anybody else is going to help them with maintenance of their mills it's actually going to be of benefit to them.
- The key issue is where is the money going to come from into the future, and hopefully the answer could be the Broads Charitable Trust. The ambition is that they will expand to the scale

of the Lake District Charitable Trust who have millions of pounds to allocate and various projects within this scheme will be eligible to apply to the BCT in the future as part of their funding.

**Outcomes and legacy – input on table worksheets:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To have established viable local businesses which work with local resources – crafts, reeds, local foods, local premium for quality, locally resourced products.</li> <li>• Better interpretation – actual and virtual – and better understood.</li> <li>• Audiences – everyone not just local community.</li> <li>• More complete sense of ownership.</li> <li>• Need to be able to create income so it is sustainable. Could be heritage skills which have economic value.</li> <li>• Opportunities for skills training and employment in rural area.</li> <li>• Better access, into buildings and/or across the marshes.</li> <li>• To succeed in long term, need landowner cooperation, will need support so does not become either a financial, time or administrative burden. ‘Cost’ retrieval may be enough – legacy for them.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishing between <u>outputs</u> and <u>outcomes</u> in bid!</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better understanding by public of the area – local and further afield.</li> <li>• Conservation of the area for future generations.</li> <li>• After project: 500 ??? [volunteers] not sustainable, who coordinates the volunteers, mothball mills not preserve all, bat boxes, barn owls etc.</li> <li>• To maintain interest web cams etc. Berney Arms Mill, river taxis/transport to create access to mills, cycle routes connect land – water</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Results:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More people understanding landscape.</li> <li>○ Better access for all.</li> <li>○ Set up community groups and train to undertake series of activities and coordinate existing.</li> <li>○ Have a well-known project people can relate to.</li> <li>○ Charitable trust for funding.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Maintenance:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure community groups are able to run after the project finishes.</li> <li>○ Set up publicity that will endure with updates.</li> <li>○ Encourage enthusiasm to continue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Changes:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Development of existing access and extending into new routes.</li> <li>○ Good marketing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with landowners, collaborative approach – landowners working together on larger scale.</li> <li>• Broads curriculum.</li> <li>• Active engagement – <u>supported</u> as well as supportive.</li> <li>• Engage individuals – particularly young people, to secure legacy.</li> <li>• Instil sense of ownership and pride in landscape.</li> <li>• Support and resource volunteer groups to recruit and ‘train’ younger people – mentoring, junior ranger initiative.</li> <li>• Resources to engage people at weekends when they will want to be out in the Broads.</li> <li>• Student engagement – involve them in developing app for teachers etc.</li> <li>• Branding crucial – clear identification of project strength of Broads LP Partnership will ensure legacy – develop new and strengthen existing – need to develop tangible, realistic not</li> </ul>

<p>'woolly' projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A registered 'Windmill Friends' with a known number of participants. An overarching organisation including holiday makers.</li> <li>• Recruit a new 'Volunteer Days' – what does 500 volunteers mean? Day/hours/for how long?</li> <li>• Establish a volunteer group/ages/different interest groups.</li> <li>• A number of mills to be restored – training of skills, engaged with mills – recording, measuring, drawing.</li> <li>• Informal fun outdoors – experience in engaging with outdoors/with children &amp; unemployed &amp; disabled.</li> <li>• Cultural/art experiences focusing as inspiration (starting point) on the area.</li> <li>• Education providers – linked to curriculum provided for 16+.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Understanding and connection.</li> <li>○ Collaborative legacy, organisations can work together beyond this project – steering group.</li> <li>○ Local legacy.</li> <li>○ Advocates within the community to keep the projects alive beyond this scheme.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Over subscription – selection of projects, using ideas in future Broads plan.</li> <li>• Match funding – to aid projects which may follow on.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for trust to be established to take on ongoing maintenance?</li> <li>• Method to prioritise which mills.</li> <li>• Need for sites to deliver across all themes.</li> <li>• Is it sustainable to just carry out minimal works to stabilise structures.</li> <li>• Need for local business involvement particularly regarding legacy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connections across water maybe reinstating ferries?</li> <li>• Mothballing mills may preserve them for landowners rather than public access.</li> <li>• Ensuring good publicity and marketing.</li> <li>• Where is the fun in the project??? Arts may be the key to unknown potential and people's interest??</li> <li>• Look for cost neutral projects especially as regards the mills.</li> <li>• Broads Charitable Trust.</li> <li>• Listed structures value to owners?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't do hill walking – we do "mill walking!"</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Festival.</li> <li>• Connections with Health Partnerships and local archaeology groups.</li> <li>• Youth groups e.g. Young Farmers, Scouts, Guides.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>'built heritage skills training'</i> – not just <u>built</u>, broader skills.</li> </ul>

### **Session 6: HLF Landscape Partnership Scheme – process, projects and opportunities**

The timescales and key milestones for the project including the application deadline and the development/delivery phases were outlined, and the following options for involvement in the project were explained:

- **Partners** – Driving the scheme forward
- **Stakeholders** – Delivering individual projects
- **Contributors** – Facilitating the process

**Questions and comments:**

Q – How far would projects need to be developed to be included in the first application in May?

A – They will need to be at a point where we know roughly how much money is needed and the audiences to be targeted.

Questions in relation to roles – How many partners, which partners and why? How are the groups identified? What's the distinction between partners and stakeholders? What is the structure of the Project Board? How are the different groups identified? Will landowners be partners?

A – The distinction is primarily about membership of the Project Board – partners will be the core group steering the process for the duration of the project, and will guide the decisions made throughout. We can't have as many partners as stakeholders and not everybody will have the time. We're very happy to talk to individual groups but we also need to find a way of making sure that everybody is comfortable that the Project Board would be reflecting/representing everybody's interests.

Comment – There is a question about landowners and it's a big problem getting them on board – they will be on board but it's the wrong time of year to get a farmer out and there's got to be a carrot and stick. It's important because of access by boat and access across the land.

Response – That's why we need you and others to give us a way in to talk to people.

Q – Could you clarify the issue of risk? You mentioned the Broads Authority would shoulder the financial risk, but you mentioned there would be an element of sharing risk between partners.

A – We need to constantly analyse the risk and part of that risk is in doing the project itself, e.g. lots of the information gathering might not be used. We don't need to be frightened of that but it's about being aware and thinking about how to mitigate against things changing.

Q – There is potential for cross-over between the HLF scheme funding and planned/potential IDB bids for funding from DEFRA and the Environment Agency e.g. for the Halvergate Triangle and removal of electrical equipment in some of the mills. Whilst there are trade-offs and potential add-on benefits, there are concerns about overlapping grant aid and too many organisations moving in parallel but not together.

A – We agree and that's why we're here today. We need to pull different paths together to create something that's bigger than the smaller parts.

Q – How and when are we going to approach the smaller non-cash-rich groups to ascertain whether they would like to be involved, and how do you intend to get these groups involved in the development phase?

A – These are the kind of groups that will be doing the bulk of this work. If there is a group that is not here that you believe should be involved give us their details [using the form provided on the day] so that we can gather that information.

Q – When are the parish councils going to be involved?

A – They will be the next group to be spoken to. We needed to get this far to first of all find out if this is a good idea and then to make it public, and there will now be further work with more groups.

### **Other questions on table worksheets:**

- How wide a representation of groups will there be?
  - Few representation from District Councils?
- 

### **Session 7: Way forward/next steps**

The next stages in developing the application were explained, including the work that needs to be done between now and the submission deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> May 2015.

Suggestions for other organisations/individuals to be involved in developing the application were handed in to the Broads Authority. Email was agreed as the main form of communication, with other suggestions included a Facebook page, Twitter and Padlet. The Authority is also planning a regular newsletter.

### **Questions:**

Q – Quite a lot of things have been said today that are supplementary to the draft matrix – if you were to take all of these on board what impact would that have on the timescales?

A – The timescale is fixed. There is a lot of work that’s already gone on to get the matrix to this stage however the process is still very open to any other project and we have planned in taking on board what’s been discussed today. From what we’ve heard today we’re all broadly on the same page and whilst some ideas might not fit into the three streams, we can carry on from this starting point with some guidance from the stakeholders in the room.

Q – Will there be a point when you look for public opinion?

A – Yes but we don’t know the timescales yet.

Q – The timescales look ambitious for further project development work. How are you envisaging prioritising projects as you will need to have a fairly robust process in place to deal with that?

A – The HLF has a very thorough way of scoring using the criteria of heritage, people and communities. We envisage that we will develop a scoring matrix using these three criteria. It won’t be a hard and fast rule and some projects might be modifiable to meet the criteria.

---

### **‘Graffiti wall’ additions (grouped into themes):**

*(some of these replicate points raised during plenary discussions but they included here in full for completeness):*

- People/groups to involve:
  - Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Blind
  - Loddon History Group
  - The Canoe Man
  - Yarmouth History and Archaeology Society
  - Hawk and Owl Trust
  - Barn Owl Project
  - Norfolk Bat Project

- Young Farmers Group – growing organisation in Norfolk and Suffolk.
- Project ideas/extension of scope of scheme:
  - Survey/explore the peat landscape of the project area – feeds into existing/up and coming archaeological projects
  - Opportunity to include Lower Waveney Valley – rich prehistoric archaeology (e.g. BA trackways etc.)
  - Area extended to include the high ground by ½ km of the old Estuary “Gamensis”
  - Camera on top of Berney Arms Mill
  - Water taxis, ferry crossings
  - More water access to features
  - Excavate Halvergate Fleet Dyke, stock with fish for fishing groups
  - Banner scheme for grazing marsh. What about a model, community farm, developing animal husbandry and other ways of managing the land and water? For local people?
  - A fun project – craft/cultural/arts, based on the area.
  - Social local community project – schools, youth organisations, family groups.
- Mills:
  - What about aiming mill-righting training at middle-aged people rather than only young people?
  - Is there a case for keeping/maintaining a back-up system of drainage mills. Should there be a crisis when engines knocked out e.g. via major floods etc. – compare with Holland, they do.
  - A group to ‘Adopt a Mill’? Fundraise and restore?
  - Recording of mills as they are – physical, photography, drawings etc.
  - Record Mill Graffiti is a community engagement project.
- Landowners and farmers:
  - It seems there is a need for the creation of a new way of connecting the farming industry with the rest of society – both locally and regionally.
  - Important not to increase burden on landowners/farmers – be that financial, administrative or time. Need to be supported to ensure projects happen.
  - FWAG working with farmers to understand changes to Agri- Environment scheme.
- Process and aims:
  - Focus on heritage at risk e.g. Halvergate Conservation Area
  - Must retain social, cultural and traditional ways of Broadland life.
  - Stronger people-focus needed – people’s relationship with a living landscape could be the top priority with sub-strands relating to built-landscape and archaeology.
  - Another strand is relationship with the landscape past, present and future.
  - Getting the engagement of the community either as participants or volunteers is highlighted as the biggest challenge! re community groups with which we work – need to be positive but realistic about the role of the community and volunteers.
  - A strategic approach to the scoring and prioritisation of sites/projects.
  - As Tony Goodwin stated, ensuring there is no double-funding or crossover of funded projects from the Broads Authority and IDB, but also the next enjoyment schemes (NELMS) introduced in January 2016. Discussions needed with DEFRA, NFU, CAAV etc. about potential projects and what may be funded by NEALMS ensuring this fund is not wasted. Scoft Parke, TW Gaze.

Appendix: Attendees

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
James	Albone	Norfolk County Council
Carol	Allen	Norfolk Coast and Broads
Gill	Austin	Museum of the Broads
Keith	Bacon	Broads Society
Andrew	Barratt	International Boat Building College
Clive	Bound	Eastern and Otley College
Helen	Bristol	Waveney Valley Community Archaeology Group
Jacque	Burgess	Broads Authority
Richard	Card	Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association
Hilary	Carlisle	Norwich University of the Arts
Lottie	Carlton	Broads Authority
Nick	Carter	English Heritage
Dorothy	Casey	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Adrian	Clarke	Broads Authority
Jonathan	Clemo	Norfolk Rural Community Council
Nick	Collinson	Suffolk County Council
Maria	Conti	Broads Authority
Di	Cornell	Upper and Middle Thurne Tenants Association
Caroline	Davison	Norfolk Archaeological Trust
Jonathan	Dix	Natural England
Geoff	Doggett	Waveney River Trust
Alison	Fisher	Norfolk Museums Service
Matt	Gooch	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Jenna	Goodall-Browne	TW Gaze
Tony	Goodwin	WMLA
Mark	Greenhough	British Association for Shooting and Conservation
Brian	Grint	Acle Lands Trust
David	Gurney	Norfolk County Council
Jeremy	Halls	Broads Environmental Service Ltd.
Jo	Hand	RSPB
Rachael	Hipperson	TW Gaze
Dan	Hoare	Broads Authority
Ben	Hogg	Broads Authority
Simon	Hooton	Broads Authority
Martin	Horlock	Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service
Brian	Horner	Voluntary Norfolk
Peter	Howe	Broads Trust
John	Jones	Norfolk County Council
Andrea	Kelly	Broads Authority
Caroline	Laburn	WLMA
Andrea	Long	Broads Authority

Andrew	Macdonald	Waveney Valley Community Archaeology Group
Paul	Mace	Waveney Local Action Group
Lesley	Marsden	Broads Authority
Michael	Nutt	Nutt Consulting
Vincent	Pargeter	SPAB Mills Section
Scott	Parke	TW Gaze
Martin	Peace	Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils
Anna	Perrott	BBC
Richard	Powell	Wild Anglia
Kelly	Powell	Norfolk County Council
James	Reeve	Greater Anglia
Amanda	Rix	Norfolk County Council
Fiona	Roberts	Active Norfolk
Ian	Robinson	RSPB
Nigel	Robson	Acle Lands Trust
Nick	Sanderson	Broads Authority
David	Savill	International Boat Building College
Cally	Smith	Broads Authority
Mike	Sutton-Croft	Norfolk Non Native Species Initiative
Fiona	Taylor	RSPB
Claire	Taylor-Crisp	Community Action Suffolk
Jess	Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology
Sophie	Tremlett	Norfolk County Council
Heather	Wallis	Heather Wallis Archaeology
Lynsey	Wilson	Eastern and Otley College
Jonathan	Woolley	Cambridge University
Alison	Yardy	Norfolk County Council
Sharon	Yull	Workers Education Association

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
James	Albone	Norfolk County Council
Carol	Allen	Norfolk Coast and Broads
Gill	Austin	Museum of the Broads
Keith	Bacon	Broads Society
Andrew	Barratt	International Boat Building College
Clive	Bound	Eastern and Otley College
Helen	Bristol	Waveney Valley Community Archaeology Group
Jacque	Burgess	Broads Authority
Richard	Card	Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association
Hilary	Carlisle	Norwich University of the Arts
Lottie	Carlton	Broads Authority
Nick	Carter	English Heritage
Dorothy	Casey	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Adrian	Clarke	Broads Authority
Jonathan	Clemo	Norfolk Rural Community Council

Nick	Collinson	Suffolk County Council
Maria	Conti	Broads Authority
Di	Cornell	Upper and Middle Thurne Tenants Association
Caroline	Davison	Norfolk Archaeological Trust
Jonathan	Dix	Natural England
Geoff	Doggett	Waveney River Trust
Alison	Fisher	Norfolk Museums Service
Matt	Gooch	Suffolk Wildlife Trust
Jenna	Goodall-Browne	TW Gaze
Tony	Goodwin	WMLA
Mark	Greenhough	British Association for Shooting and Conservation
Brian	Grint	Acle Lands Trust
David	Gurney	Norfolk County Council
Jeremy	Halls	Broads Environmental Service Ltd.
Jo	Hand	RSPB
Rachael	Hipperson	TW Gaze
Dan	Hoare	Broads Authority
Ben	Hogg	Broads Authority
Simon	Hooton	Broads Authority
Martin	Horlock	Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service
Brian	Horner	Voluntary Norfolk
Peter	Howe	Broads Trust
John	Jones	Norfolk County Council
Andrea	Kelly	Broads Authority
Caroline	Laburn	WLMA
Andrea	Long	Broads Authority
Andrew	Macdonald	Waveney Valley Community Archaeology Group
Paul	Mace	Waveney Local Action Group
Lesley	Marsden	Broads Authority
Michael	Nutt	Nutt Consulting
Vincent	Pargeter	SPAB Mills Section
Scott	Parke	TW Gaze
Martin	Peace	Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils
Anna	Perrott	BBC
Richard	Powell	Wild Anglia
Kelly	Powell	Norfolk County Council
James	Reeve	Greater Anglia
Amanda	Rix	Norfolk County Council
Fiona	Roberts	Active Norfolk
Ian	Robinson	RSPB
Nigel	Robson	Acle Lands Trust
Nick	Sanderson	Broads Authority
David	Savill	International Boat Building College
Cally	Smith	Broads Authority
Mike	Sutton-Croft	Norfolk Non Native Species Initiative

Fiona	Taylor	RSPB
Claire	Taylor-Crisp	Community Action Suffolk
Jess	Tipper	Suffolk County Council Archaeology
Sophie	Tremlett	Norfolk County Council
Heather	Wallis	Heather Wallis Archaeology
Lynsey	Wilson	Eastern and Otley College
Jonathan	Woolley	Cambridge University
Alison	Yardy	Norfolk County Council
Sharon	Yull	Workers Education Association