



## NORFOLK LOCAL ACCESS FORUM

### DRAFT NAIP subgroup minutes

Date: November 16<sup>th</sup> 2017

Time: 10am – 12noon

Room 2, Floor 3

<b>Present</b>	
Ken Hawkins	Seamus Elliott
Martin Sullivan (CHAIR)	Pat Holtom
David Hissey	Geoff Doggett
Paul Rudkin	
<b>In attendance</b>	
Russell Wilson (RW)	Senior Trails Officer (Infrastructure)
Sarah Abercrombie (SA)	Senior Projects Officer (Environment)
Su Waldron (SW)	Project Officer (Environment)

Item	Description
1	Apologies for absence were received from Helen Chester
2	Minutes of the meeting on 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2017
2.1	SA had not yet received a list of partners/stakeholders for consultation from the group which had been agreed at the last meeting. SA agreed to put together (and circulate) a list as a 'starter for 10' and <b>ALL to send further contacts/partners to SA by 24<sup>th</sup> November.</b>
2.2	Minutes were accepted as a true record of the previous meeting
3	Statement of Actions and Delivery Plan
3.1	3 spreadsheets: Statement of Actions; 2018 Delivery Plan; Delivery Plan structure had been circulated. All had been revised by SA to take account of overarching aims, challenges and monitoring.  PR said that there should be links to the main plan from the spreadsheets.
3.2	Statement of Actions: Overview sheet: SA explained that all the 8 themes/ambitions for the NAIP aligned with NCC overarching priorities. The previous NAIP had suffered from poor targets and follow up, turning it into a fossil. The new themes and monitoring targets and action plan in the new NAIP documents would help keep the plan current and fresh over the next 10 years. Comments were recorded as follows: (i) well-managed network – the Survey Key Indicators (Key Benchmark Indicators (KBI))for PROW were the metric to be monitored with an ambition to raise targets for KBI 15 from 52 to 57 and KBI 16 from 49 to 52. The metric conflates Trails and PROW figures. These suggested targets will bring Norfolk into alignment with counties

	<p>within our peer group.  KH suggested a more ambitious target.  GD asked how monitoring could capture what was happening with footpath use at a local Parish level. RW said that the CRM system is a barometer of footpath use, but GD felt this would only highlight problems. GD offered time to finding out how many parishes (in his NCC PROW officer patch - Jodie Thurston) have footpath wardens. RW said this wasn't an NCC priority and NCC could offer no resource. SE suggested that maybe GD could pilot the idea, but the challenge would be to find a measure that fitted in. MS suggested that the idea was revisited in relation to the Parishes Conference which the PROW subgroup was working on.</p> <p>(ii) Well connected access network. PR felt this aligned well with CIL and green infrastructure. Could consider an additional monitoring statistic - numbers of people accessing the countryside.</p> <p>(iii) Well Protected environment. PR said it was key to influence the district councils in relation to protecting the environment as developments came forward and CIL and S106 monies could be used to help mitigate for the impacts of development by creating new access opportunities. He said that CIL and S106 in the main NAIP document should be changed to 'delivery of planning gain' for public benefit</p> <p>(iv) Well Promoted network. Communications plan needed to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public perception of NCC CRM problem logging system</li> <li>Getting more people to use the network (who need to for health reasons)</li> </ol> <p>(v) – (viii) – not discussed in detail</p> <p>The 8 themes approach taken by SA on the Statement of Actions was fully agreed.</p> <p>ALL agreed to send further thoughts to SA by 24<sup>th</sup> November.</p>
3.3	Reporting. SW had been looking at using Microsoft Access to hold the information from the spreadsheets. GD advised against this so SW will look at layout/presentation using Excel
4	NAIP document format
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GD offered photos for the access to water section</li> <li>PR said that there should be links from the spreadsheets to the main plan</li> <li>GD said that partnership working was very important – especially with partner landowners such as NWT</li> <li>PH said it was important to reference Pathmakers</li> <li>PH said the need to create more Walkers are Welcome towns should be mentioned</li> <li>ALL agreed they were happy with the format.</li> <li>GD said that printed versions would be needed, including a large print version should be created (from pdf) and that the printed copies should</li> </ul>

	<p>include the hyperlinks in full (maybe in an appendix). He offered help if needed on any aspects of printing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PR said there were some inconsistencies within the document on numbers of miles of network etc.</li><li>SA was thanked very much for her work to date on the spreadsheet and plan</li></ul>																								
5	Stakeholders																								
5.1	See 2.1																								
6	Consultation																								
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A robust consultation process would be needed. SA to speak with NCC consultation team to get their advice and help</li><li>RW said that consultation would be managed in stages to allow learning</li><li>PR said that local district buy-in would be essential</li><li>RW said that John Jones has suggested a public stakeholder event as part of the public consultation exercise. ALL agree that this was an excellent suggestion</li><li>PR offered to help with consultation (district councils)</li><li>GD said it would be important to get the plan to named officers at district level, and to get the plan endorsed at their Council meetings. This could happen during (or even before the consultation process).</li><li>KH said that in his opinion the NAIP might not always reflect the views of the NLAf (as it is an NCC document and the NLAf is independent of NCC). SE said that in his opinion it was essential that the NAIP is fully supported by the NLAf. PR said that once adopted, the NAIP would be the NLAf's 'bible'</li><li>PR offered to work with RW on a list of consultees at district council level.</li><li>KH said that follow up would be needed on specific actions (the living action plan) with districts. PR said he would also ask how the districts would do this.</li></ul>																								
7	<div>Timetable</div> <table><tr><th>Date</th><th>What</th><th>Who</th></tr><tr><td>by 15/12/2017 (need to check exact date for committee papers)</td><td>NAIP draft complete</td><td>NCC/NLAf</td></tr><tr><td>on the 19/01/2018 (if EDT committee)</td><td>NAIP draft signed off</td><td>EDT committee/OTHER NCC committee</td></tr><tr><td>19/1/2018 to 1/2/2018</td><td>NAIP design completed and sufficient copies printed for consult</td><td>NCC</td></tr><tr><td>on the 7/2/2017</td><td>NAIP signed off</td><td>NLAf</td></tr><tr><td>between 7/2/2018 to 7/5/2018</td><td>NAIP consultation (stakeholders and public) including a public event</td><td>Consultation handled by NCC/NLAf</td></tr><tr><td>between 7/5/2018 to 30/6/2018</td><td>NAIP redrafted and completed</td><td>NCC/NLAf</td></tr><tr><td>on the 1/7/2018</td><td>NAIP published</td><td></td></tr></table>	Date	What	Who	by 15/12/2017 (need to check exact date for committee papers)	NAIP draft complete	NCC/NLAf	on the 19/01/2018 (if EDT committee)	NAIP draft signed off	EDT committee/OTHER NCC committee	19/1/2018 to 1/2/2018	NAIP design completed and sufficient copies printed for consult	NCC	on the 7/2/2017	NAIP signed off	NLAf	between 7/2/2018 to 7/5/2018	NAIP consultation (stakeholders and public) including a public event	Consultation handled by NCC/NLAf	between 7/5/2018 to 30/6/2018	NAIP redrafted and completed	NCC/NLAf	on the 1/7/2018	NAIP published	
Date	What	Who																							
by 15/12/2017 (need to check exact date for committee papers)	NAIP draft complete	NCC/NLAf																							
on the 19/01/2018 (if EDT committee)	NAIP draft signed off	EDT committee/OTHER NCC committee																							
19/1/2018 to 1/2/2018	NAIP design completed and sufficient copies printed for consult	NCC																							
on the 7/2/2017	NAIP signed off	NLAf																							
between 7/2/2018 to 7/5/2018	NAIP consultation (stakeholders and public) including a public event	Consultation handled by NCC/NLAf																							
between 7/5/2018 to 30/6/2018	NAIP redrafted and completed	NCC/NLAf																							
on the 1/7/2018	NAIP published																								
8	<div>Next steps</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Comments received (by SA) from all by 24<sup>th</sup> November</li><li>Stakeholders/partners received from all by 24<sup>th</sup> November</li><li>PR/RW to research list of key players (for endorsement of NAIP) at district council level</li><li>SA to establish process for consultation with appropriate team at NCC</li><li>SW reformat spreadsheets and NAIP document, incorporating comments/revisions with SA and inserting photos to end up with a NAIP text document and separate Action Plan and Statement of Actions for publication. SW sort out all aspects of printed copies.</li></ul>																								
9	Date and time for next meeting – no further meeting date set.																								

