

ALDE AND ORE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Final MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE ALDE AND ORE COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

HELD ON THURSDAY 17 SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 6.30PM BY ZOOM

PRESENT: Nominated representatives

Tim Beach (TB) Chairman
Ray Herring (R)
Ben Coulter (BC)
Peter McGinity (PMcG)
Colin Chamberlain
Frances Barnwell (FB)
Andrew McDonald (AMcD)
Alison Andrews (AA)
Jane Skepper (JS)
Harry Young (HY)
Chris Gill (CG)

Cllr. Snape Parish Council
Cllr. East Coast Council
Butley, Capel St Andrew and Wantisden Parish Council
Chair Chillesford Parish Meeting
Cllr. Iken PC
Cllr. Orford and Gedgrave Parish Council
Cllr. Sudbourne Parish Council (sub)
Alde and Ore Association
IDB Board Member
Business Representative (first part of meeting)
Treasurer

ADVISERS/ATTENDEES:

Giles Bloomfield
David Kemp (DK)
Ed Boyle

East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board (ESIDB)
Environment Agency (EA)
Natural England (NE)

Jane Maxim

AOET

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 2

AGENDA

- 1. Apologies:** Andrew Reid Cllr. Suffolk County Council, T-J Haworth-Culf, Cllr. East Coast Council, Andrew Cassy Cllr. Boyton PC, Peter Palmer Cllr. Aldeburgh TC, Judi Hallett Parish Clerk Hollesley, David Robinson Cllr. Sudbourne PC, Niels Peterson Cllr Tunstall Parish Council, Edward Greenwell IDB alt, Emma Lloyd AOET, Karen Thomas Coastal Partnership East
 - 2. Declarations of interest**
No new declarations of interest were made. Most representatives had now submitted forms. The Secretary had sent reminders.
 - 3. Minutes of the meeting on 11 June 2020**
These were agreed without amendment.
 - 4. Matters arising from the meeting on 11 June 2020 not otherwise on the agenda**
 - i. Finance:** TB reported that he had been pursuing bank accounts with the Cooperative bank which had proved very complicated and with the Ipswich Building Society where a traditional building society account could be opened. Following up having an account with the Ipswich Building Society was approved.
Action: TB and officers
 - 5. IDB update on the Outline Business Case submission.**
GB reported that all the technical questions put by Environment Agency on the Outline Business Case had been answered: all that remained was for the OBC to go through the remaining internal processes which could be delayed by Covid related issues. RH asked if a prompt was needed: JM had already spoken with our local MP and TB with the RFCC Chair so it was agreed no more need be done at present.
 - 6. Constitution**

The draft constitution had been circulated for comment by the end of July and some amendments were made for greater clarity. It was noted that Hollesley PC had chosen to step aside for the time being. It was suggested that rather than omitting Hollesley PC from the list of eligible parishes in the Constitution, as it might want to participate at a later date, the draft could be amended to read

D. MEMBERSHIP

The Partnership comprises representatives nominated by each of the following:-

.a. The following Town Council, Parish Councils and Parish Meeting wholly or partly within the flood area are entitled to nominate a representative, namely'

It was agreed that the amended draft was approved subject to the Chair writing to Hollesley to check that this change was acceptable.

Action: TB

7. Communications- Report back from AOCP Comms Group. (Paper –Notes from Comms Group)

7.1 AMcD explained that a smaller action group from within the Comms Group had been set up (AMcD, BC, FB, AA, and Julia Grant who had volunteered to help) had met on 14 August. Two main areas for action were identified. -first, a review and refresher of the public face of the AOCP including devising a flyer to explain what the AOCP was and did and the future, and a look at the website with the same aim in mind (noted work was underway with Julia working with David Gillingwater).

-second, relating to longer term actions in the toolkit agreed at the June AOCP meeting, updating data and links on regular communications by the various means available on paper and in other media and developing regular links with Parish Councils to solidify AOCP relations with Parish Councils whilst recognising the ESIDB and AOET had their own relationships too.

7.2 Comments were invited on the tone and layout of the very early draft of the flyer. A number of points made -who was the target audience as parish councillors might manage a more wordy version but the general public would need a punchier version. It was agreed that whoever the audience, the next version needed to be shorter and sharper. It was suggested individual reps might try the draft on people they knew to get sample of views, rather than using a more organised focus group. Some felt that the main target market initially should be for PCs and using them as one of our nodes of communication, that at the very least there was mileage in giving what was in the draft to Councillors and then may be offer a shorter leaflet to councils to pass on. Another warned that it was often hard to get further than councillors but another felt it should be put to the general public directly.

7.3 On timing for issuing such leaflets, concern was expressed about regular communications when nothing was happening but there was also the issue of losing public awareness if there were no communications. It was put that it was best not to raise expectation by releasing something with no follow up soon and may be the best time to do so was when we know something is happening with the business plan so people know how and why the matter is being handled and here what shortly afterwards.

7.4 Suggestions for points in the draft- that the relationship between the three estuary bodies should be earlier in the leaflet as it came up so often and would get the idea of working with them nearer the front; another illustration might be a cross sectional diagram: other illustrations called for.

7.5 Since no AOCP member was a communications expert, TB asked whether the Councils might provide some professional input on communications like the flyer. RH would check and see what was possible

7.6 **Concluding**, TB said reps could give the draft flyer even in its current form to people close to them and get feedback and pass it to AA and RH was committed to getting professional eyes on it. Also, the Comms Group would be in touch with IDB and AOET (Emma Dixon and Emma Lloyd) to try to join up approaches.

Action: reps to try draft flyer on a few people, feed comments back to Hon Sec.: RH

7.7 On links with Parish Councils, the thought was 4 or 5 AOCP members/officials would adopt 3 or 4 parishes each to keep up close relations with the Parish Councils just to raise the profile in anticipation work on the estuary being able to move ahead. This was noted.

Action: develop closer links with AOCP parish councils (Comms Group)

7.8 AMcD regretted that because of other commitments he would have to stand back for some six months and asked if anyone would come forward to take over the lead of the Comms Group. TB and all present thanked him very much for all his work getting AOCP this far.

Action: Comms Group leader volunteer needed

8. Alde and Ore Estuary Plan –Monitoring and Review Strategy :

Following the discussion of the information paper at the June AOCP meeting a smaller group had met to discuss the AOCP understanding and view of the commitment to the Monitoring and Review Strategy and the related provision contained in the Estuary Plan to provide replacement habitat should there be a net loss due to the impact of coastal squeeze.

AA explained that an essential part of securing official endorsement of the Estuary Plan in 2016 had been to set up a monitoring and review strategy with the statutory bodies to provide clear benchmark data to enable assessment of the impact of coastal squeeze over the years and to review the data every five years with a commitment to taking mitigatory action should coastal squeeze be found to be having an impact- the Plan stated that ‘replacement habitat will have to be provided’. (Noted that there is already some new habitat we can call on to contribute towards any replacement but the need for action is most unlikely for at least some 15-20 years). A Working Group to undertake the monitoring had been operating under the former AOEP, involving invaluable support from representatives of the AOEP, EA, NE, Suffolk County Council and IDB with other experts being called on for data. There had been annual reports on setting up the review and a 5 year report was during this year, subject to Covid constraints.

TB reported that the small group had concluded that the monitoring and review work was central to the plan and would argue that we carry on doing that, commenting that was no great onus of work because it was using surveys being undertaken any way. On the commitment to replacement habitat, the smaller group reached the conclusion the whole issue was very complex because, looking into the future, there were so many variables it was almost impossible to pin the matter down any further than we have in the plan: the plan is there and says there is a commitment to find alternative habitat but how that will be done and who it falls to is unknown. The Partnership cannot walk away from the commitment so the Chairman recommended continue monitoring and review (including the sub-group) and accept there is a commitment in the plan and know that the AOCP constitution provides for the plan to be amended, which would include changing habitat provision, and that the constitution provision would involve in that process the wider partnership not only of AOCP representatives but the statutory bodies who also sit on the AOCP as representatives or advisers. **This recommendation was agreed by all.**

9. Any other business: None

8. Dates of Next meetings

The next meeting would be on **Thursday 10 December at 6.30pm**, almost certainly by Zoom. Noted when the time came to possibly revert to meetings in person, opinions would be canvassed.

AA
18.9.2020