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ABSTRACT

The coastline of the UK is continually under threat from inundation by the sea. It is the responsibility of Local Councils and The Environment Agency to provide coastal and estuarine protection from flooding. Due to pressure of cost and changing priorities there has been a change in emphasis from protecting people to warning them of encroachment by the sea in some areas. A strategy is also being proposed that returns some coastal areas to salt marsh. These are contentious issues.

Without consultation with and participation of coastal residents and other affected groups there is a serious danger of conflict with Statutory Agencies who control the planning of our coastline. The need for improved public involvement has been recognised by Guidance from the EU Government as well as organisations such as The World Bank and The United Nations.

This paper uses theoretical research and guidance to analyse the reasons for increased participation in environmental assessments. A strategic report of the Alde and Ore Estuary is used a case study to research how participation is carried out in practice. A review of the theory and practice allowed recommendations to be made for ways of improving public involvement in coastal management planning.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to be living very close to an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that people in the area feel strongly enough to want to conserve. Some people are involved because it is their job but also because they have a genuine empathy with the area. This has meant a commitment that has helped me gain access to views and documents I would not have had otherwise. I am therefore very grateful to Mike Steen of the Environment Agency, Gareth Dalglish of English Nature, John Davis of Suffolk Coastal District Council and Grant Lohoar of the National Trust.

Penny Kay, of the local group Friends of the River, has also been of great assistance in loaning me documents and information she has collected on the case study.

I would also like to thank all the other people who agreed to let me interview them and freely gave of their time and insights.

My final thanks are for my advisor and supervisor Mat. Cashmore, who has been a source of constant help and encouragement.
1. Introduction ................................................................. 7
   1.1. Justification for research into public participation in coastal  
       management ............................................................... 7
   1.2. EU recognition of the need for public participation ................ 7
   1.3. Reason for selecting the case study for the present research .... 8
   1.4. Project aims ............................................................. 9

2. Theoretical Research .................................................... 11
   2.1. Introduction .......................................................... 11
   2.2. The issues for improving Public Participation of stakeholders in  
       environmental impact assessment ..................................... 11
   2.3. Researched guidance for a best practice model for public participation .... 16
       2.3.2. Guidance for best practice from the proposal for amendments  
              to EU Directive 85/337/EEC and 96/61/EC (2001) and  
              ratification (2003) .................................................. 17
       2.3.3. Guidance for best practice for public participation from the World  
              Bank ......................................................................... 18
       2.3.4. Guidance for best practice from EU Integrated Zone Management  
              report. (ICZM) .......................................................... 19

3. Techniques and methods used in Consultation and Public Participation ... 20
4. Methodology ............................................................................................................. 24
   4.1. Introduction ............................................................................................................. 24
   4.2. Justification for a case study approach ............................................................... 24
   4.3. Research Design ................................................................................................... 26
      4.3.1. Interviews ........................................................................................................ 26
      4.3.2. Selection of Interviewees ................................................................................. 27
      4.3.3. Direct Observations of Planning Partnership meetings .............................. 28
      4.3.4. Documentation ................................................................................................. 29
   4.4. Data Analysis ....................................................................................................... 30
      4.4.1. Pattern Matching ............................................................................................. 30

5. Results ....................................................................................................................... 32
   5.1. Introduction ........................................................................................................... 32
   5.2. Results of techniques used by different stakeholders ......................................... 32
      5.1.2. Key to Interview References .......................................................................... 33
   5.3 Results of the discussions of methods of consultation and participation
      used from the interviews ......................................................................................... 34
   5.4. Results and interpretation of meetings .................................................................. 39
      5.4.1. The North American and UK Exchange ......................................................... 39
      5.4.2. The Formation of the Alde/Ore Partnership ................................................... 40
   5.5. Results and interpretation of Documents ............................................................ 42
      5.5.1. Conclusions of the N. American/Countryside Exchange Report ............ 42
      5.5.2. Terms of reference for setting up the Estuary Planning Partnership. 42
      5.5.3. Results from consultation of EPP ................................................................. 43

6. Analysis and Discussion of Results and Recommendations for best
   Practice ....................................................................................................................... 44
   6.1 Results of Interview Concerns .............................................................................. 44
   6.2 Analysis of the Empowerment Issue ..................................................................... 45
   6.3 Analysis of the Trust Issue .................................................................................... 47
   6.4 Analysis of the Conflict Issue ............................................................................... 48
6.5 Analysis of the Respect, Change and Feedback issues .......................... 50
6.6 Analysis of the Stakeholder Identification Issue ................................. 51
6.7 Analysis of other issues .................................................................. 52
6.8 Summary of Recommendations ...................................................... 53

7. The development of a best practice model for coastal management planning from guidance ................................................................. 55
7.1. Introduction to Guidance ............................................................. 55
7.2. How the EPP fits United Nations Guidance .................................. 55
7.3. Guidance from EU Directive and World Bank ............................. 56
7.4. Guidance of ICZM and how it relates to EPP ............................... 56

8. Conclusions ...................................................................................... 59
8.1. Overall conclusions of the study ................................................ 59
8.2. Recommendations for further study .......................................... 60

9. References ......................................................................................... 61
10. Appendices ....................................................................................... 65
Appendix 1 Annex 1 to EU Directive .................................................. 65
Appendix 2 Location Maps ................................................................. 66
Appendix 3 Management Plan Map to Hold the Line 1997 ............... 67
Appendix 4a Map to show Managed re-alignment at Slaughden ....... 68
Appendix 4b Detail of report to show change in designation at Slaughden .... 69
Appendix 5 Semi-structured interview questions .............................. 70
Appendix 6 Prompt list of methods used in interviews ..................... 71
Appendix 7 Descriptions of participatory methods used in interviews .... 72
Appendix 8 Table to show Issues of Concern for stakeholders in interviews ..... 73
Appendix 9 Table to show Issues of Concern by statutory and non-statutory Groups ................................................................. 74
Appendix 10 Proposed Alde and Ore Management Plan ................. 75
Appendix 11 Example of Parish Council questionnaire for consultation .... 76
List of Figures, Tables and Graphs.

Figures.

Figure 1. Adaption of Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of Participation. (Petts, 1999) .............................................................. 13

Figure 2. Schedule of Interviews ....................................................... 28

Tables.

Table 1. Methods of Consultation and Participation, their nature, advantages and disadvantages ........................................... 20

Table 2. Results of techniques used by different stakeholders .................. 32

Graphs.

Graph 1. Results of Interview Concerns, all stakeholders ..................... 44

Graph 2. Results of Interview Concerns, by statutory and non-statutory groups .................................................................................. 45
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Justification for research into public participation in coastal management.

Public involvement in decision making for environmental impacts is important for both local project issues and strategic planning (Petts, 1999). Cross boundary impacts are of particular concern with coastal processes where local solutions can pass on problems further along the coast or inland (Hyder, 1999). Coasts and estuaries have complex dynamics and multiple effects on the natural and human landscapes that they influence. It is due to these processes that people living in coastal areas have to adapt to change. Unless local people are aware of the changes, understand the processes and can be helped to adapt, there is always the potential for conflict with the powers that want to accelerate or impose changes that are not felt acceptable by the people living in the area (Guthrie et al, 2003).

Consultation is generally what is perceived to take place at present and is a process that involves giving and receiving information and comments about proposals (Petts, 1999). It is the premise of this research that this is not enough to satisfy some stakeholders and the lack of a more participatory approach can be the cause of conflict. Participation that allows some influence on decisions (Htun, 1988), that is actual or perceived, allows greater involvement and a reduction in conflict. This research aims to suggest ways in which such conflict could be avoided and propose some recommendations for better practice.

1.2 EU recognition of the need for public participation.

Recently presented EU legislation has highlighted the need for increased involvement of the public in projects, plans and programmes for environmental proposals. Changes to
legislation are proposed to increase public participation and amend Council Directives 85/337/EEC (‘the EIA Directive’) and 96/61/EC (‘the IPPC, Pollution Directive’). The objectives of the changes are to make sure that provision is made for public participation in all activities listed in Annex 1 (Appendix 1). Annex 1 does not specify projects directly affected by coastal processes and management. However, they will often be included because activities in coastal areas can have ‘significant effects on the environment’ (EU, 2001; EU 2003).

A further EU involvement with increasing public participation is seen in a report by the Hyder Consultancy, for ‘Participation in the Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Processes: Mechanisms and Procedures Needed’ (Hyder, 1999). The report was initiated from recommendations of the Aarhus Convention that provided a ‘Resolution on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters’ (UN/ECE 1998). The EC commissioned the Hyder group to produce a report that gave guidance to how public consultation and participation was carried out in a variety of coastal projects across the EC. Study of these projects has led to a series of recommendations and advice that proposes integrated coastal zone management between statutory agencies. This includes active opportunities to involve all stakeholders. The Hyder strategy of reviewing case studies recognises that it is important to study what the problems can be, using actual examples. A design also used in this research.

1.3  Reason for Selecting the Case Study for the present Research.

A perceived lack of public involvement in a coastal defence management strategy plan is the stimulus for this research. In 1999, the Environment Agency sponsored a report to broaden an investigation into the impact of their policies on sea defences in the Alde/Ore Estuary in Suffolk (Potsford Duvivier, 1999). The impact of the original shoreline management policies (Halcrow 1997), such as, holding the line, a managed retreat or delay-do nothing were applied to the coastline and river banks in the estuary area. A location at Slaughden (See Map for location in Appendix  ), had its designation changed
in a Shoreline Management Plan from holding the line in 1997 (Appendix 3), to a managed retreat or re-alignment following more detailed studies, post 1999 (Appendix 4a and 4b). The consequences of this would be flooded farmland and unknown effects on discharge and deposition in the estuary.

The consultants, Potsford Duvivier, who carried out the research for the Environment Agency, engaged in a consultancy exercise with local people and agencies that had and has led to serious questioning of their conclusions and the basis for decisions and recommendations made. The circulation of this strategic report alerted local people, groups and agencies to the need to achieve consultation that satisfies the aims and objectives of all the people involved. This example is therefore a ‘live’ issue and one that will enable study of the processes of consultation and participation.

1.4 Project Aims.

1. Research into the theory of public participation in environmental impact assessment.

2. Investigation into procedures of public consultation and participation carried out in a case study of changing defence strategies for the Alde and Ore Estuaries in Suffolk.

The structure of this report will follow the above aims with:

a) An initial review of the literature that will form the basis of the analysis from the interviews given.

b) A description of the methodology that includes interviews, attended meeting notes and documents review.

c) Analysis of the data, that aims to assess some current guidance and recommend guidance from this research for best practice for public consultation and ultimately public participation.
CHAPTER 2.

Theoretical Research.

2.1. Introduction

The theoretical research incorporates two aspects of public participation. The first is, the issues of concern that have to be addressed to improve public participation in environmental decisions. The second aspect is a review of some existing Guidance, which can make decisions more acceptable to those involved.

2.2 The issues for improving Public Participation of stakeholders in environment impact assessment

Renn et al. (1995,) propose the definition of public participation to be “forums for exchange that are organised for the purpose of facilitating communication between government, citizens, stakeholders, interest groups and businesses regarding a specific decision or problem.” The implication of a forum for exchange is that it enables the public to be brought into the decision making process. It could be argued that some transference of power has to take place for participation in decision making to take place (Roberts, 1995).

There are fundamental ethical reasons why public participation should be carried out. Rousseau (1755) stated that people learn democracy by being engaged in its workings and that it is an integral way towards popular sovereignty and political equity. Participation provides a level playing field for individual interests and personal and social development (Webler et al. 1995). These ideas are essential for people to see the fairness in decisions made and be involved in the process. Anyone should be allowed to participate, there is no single public (Roberts, 1995). The question is if they can, or be
allowed to be involved in decisions, in any practical sense. Various consultation and participation techniques can be employed to improve fairness in public involvement in environmental assessment and planning.

If it is accepted that the individual has the right to participate through a moral and ethical belief in democracy then he also has responsibility towards the society in which he lives, by being a good citizen (Petts, 1999). The responsibility for decisions is therefore two-way. Developers need to take into account the needs of stakeholders but stakeholders also have a responsibility to help towards a balanced decision. The same two way approach is needed for communication, between those making decisions and those affected by the decision outcome. It is essential that people feel involved in the process for they are more likely to try to stop developments if they are not well informed (Clarke, 1994).

One of the major reasons for EU Governments and UK Statutory Agencies to increase their efforts to improve public participation is to resolve potential conflict. Over recent years there have been much publicised efforts to stop major developments and plans. Examples are the roads through Twyford Down and the Newbury by-pass where tree sit-in and underground camping have seriously delayed the road building and cost considerable amounts of money in delays and legal and security costs (Monbiot, 1997). These types of tactics, if somewhat extreme, have forced decision makers to pay attention to public demands. The people who are going to be mostly affected by the development ought to be the ones who are consulted. If they are expected to live with the consequences they can expect to have a share in the responsibility of making the decisions (Roberts, 1995).

There are however perceived problems with too much participation. Some politicians and developers would see a loss of power and control to special interest groups and NGO’s as a threat. In the case of politicians, who have been democratically elected, relinquishing power to non-democratically elected people would challenge the idea of elected and responsible representatives (Petts, 1999). Developers could feel the participation process
was making the decision economically inefficient with delays and the outcome possibly technically incompetent (Webler et al. 1995).

Consultation in environmental impact assessment is often from a top down approach, and mostly entails passing on information (Petts, 1999: Hickie and Wade, 1998). Response can be sought or encouraged but it is often felt there is little feedback and therefore involvement in the process. Canter, (1996), proposes there should be feedback as opposed to feed forward. Participation by definition, needs to involve more empowerment as represented by the much used and adapted Arnstein (1969), Ladder of Participation.

Arnstein’s adapted model (Petts 1999), shows participation moving towards more power to the citizen and control of the decisions made. The further up the ladder the more power and control the citizen has. By inference and backed up by some research carried out by Poortinga and Pidgeon, (2003) there is a tendency for a greater level of participation to lead to a greater level of trust. A consequence of increased trust could also be a greater possibility of overcoming some of the NIMBY responses.
Lack of power leading to lack of trust was also identified by O’Riordan and Ward (1997), in research carried out in a coastal management case study on the North Norfolk Coast. The study observed lack of trust and conflict between ‘inside track people, that is English Nature, Local Authorities and the Environment Agency and the ‘outside track people’ that included local residents, wildfowlers, fishermen and local users of the coast who had no statutory connections. The outside track people felt the Environment Agency and others were deaf to their interests, nobody knew how to involve them and there was no trust or transparency in the process or insight into where the process was going. Local people felt they knew that the proposed sea defences of the Shoreline Management Plan would not work. The premise of the schemes conclusions was based on a cost-benefit equation that did not take into account important externalities, such as relocation of a wetland. In this example, mediation by the researchers had to be used to help resolve the conflict between the local people and the Environment Agency.

Trust, like communication between stakeholders, is a two way process. There can be much distrust of government and statutory agencies and developers. The way the discourse is carried out between the developer or planner and stakeholder public can very much affect the success of the participation exercise. Communication must be felt to be without coercion. (Habermas, 1987). The participator may feel there is little point in taking part if the knowledge and information given by them is not used and valued (Robinson et al. 2003). Participators often have useful technical knowledge and must not be perceived as making irrational decisions. Addressing these problems will help the participator to have more confidence and thereby trust in the process. More trust should induce less conflict between lay person and expert and reduce the predisposition to a NIMBY response (Webler, 1995).

Developers and politicians may not trust the public to come to an acceptable decision. However they will need public participation to legitimise their decisions, so will need to engage the public. Democracy demands that institutions are responsive to the social and psychological characteristics of its citizens (Renn, 1995). Some elements of the public
may be more trusted than others. A key question is, should public involvement only be conducted through NGO’s or definable local interest groups or attempts made to involve individual members of communities (Petts, 1999). The EU Directive proposal recommended that the public should include ’the public affected or likely to be affected by, or having an interest in, the development consent procedure’ (EU, 2001).

Other countries also have environmental involvement policies. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (2003), states that the public involved in participation is not a single entity but made up of, local residents, communities, local and regional officials, community organisations like homeowners, senior citizen organisations, clubs, conservation groups, professional and business organisations, educational institutions, public interest groups and the media. The involvement of as many stakeholders as possible is therefore stressed.

Stakeholder identification should also be carried out early in the process, (EU, 2001). Concerns and values are identified to reduce misinformation and rumour. Information should be exchanged at this stage in a two way dialogue that maintains credibility and can improve decision making. There is a need to find a common language and a need to listen and consider the incorporation of ideas. The process should be proactive not so reactive for greater success (Roberts, 1995).

Soneryd et al. (2003) have suggested from their research that a greater concentration on producing more participation using designs that are innovative, should discourage poor ill thought out proposals. They also felt that better decisions would build trust for future decisions and make the process more accountable and transparent. Public awareness of environmental issues would also be heightened.

Some other problems that need solutions before successful public participation can take place are identified by Robinson et al., (2003). In their research on stakeholder views of local resident involvement in Environmental Impact Assessment. They felt some of the major problems were: Developers did not want early participation for competition and
breaches of confidentiality reasons; Consultants had different approaches and attitudes to consultation, only 10% of consultants used Guidelines and 60% used them only occasionally (Spooner, 1998); The most vocal groups of the public had the most influence and were not necessarily representative of the full spectrum of public opinion.
Guidance for a best practice model will need to address the problems of early participation, the increased use of guidance and trust in the public consulted.

The conclusion of the literature review is that there would appear to be several main areas of concern that have to be addressed before improved public participation can take place. Issues of stakeholder identification and empowerment are thought important by Petts, (1999), O’Riordan (1997) and Roberts, (1995), decision making relating to feedback (Clarke,1994;Canter,1996) and timing (Petts,1999;Robinson, 2003), trust (Renn, 1995) and conflict, (Webler, 1995) were also identified as significant.

2.3 Researched Guidance for a best practice for Public Participation.

The following research has suggested attributes that could contribute to recommendations for a best practice model for public participation. The UN, EU and World Bank Guidance are not specifically for coastal management but could be applied. The ICZM, EU recommendations are specifically for integrated coastal zone management.


To help effective public participation the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), has suggested five basic functions. These recommendations could resolve some of the concerns about stakeholder identification and feedback in decision making:

- The first is to identify stakeholders involved.
- The second is to outreach by providing information that leads to,
- Thirdly dialogue that has to,
- Fourthly be assimilated and take account of what is said to,
Lastly provide some feedback to participants. (Clarke, 1994)


The proposal for an EU Directive for Public Participation aims to make the drawing up of certain plans and programmes more accountable and transparent in the decision making process. One aim is to increase the publics’ awareness of environmental issues and increase their involvement, either as individuals or in groups. A major aim is to improve the quality of decisions and make the final results more acceptable. The amendments recognise some of the problems identified in the literature in that they want to help build trust and resolve conflict. Other advantages could be to discourage poor proposals and reduce documentation (EU, 2001).

An extension of Public Participation is hoped through guidance to make agencies reach out to gather information and ideas. Use of public participation exercises to modify decisions and review alternatives suggested by local stakeholders should also be encouraged. A more proactive approach, including stakeholders before decisions are made will help to avoid unnecessary costs and delays. Integration of stakeholders should be from the beginning of the process and not as an ‘end of pipe’ consideration. Monitoring the effectiveness of the process is advised. Identification of a wider public and taking account of their views is recommended. Finally making sure developers plan in a reasonable time frame for consultation to be effective.

Some recommendations to how public participation should be carried out have been provided in Article 6 of the EC Treaty. These however, are somewhat limited and only extend to such as, bill posting, publication in local newspapers and records from public inquiries. Article 7 states it is necessary to make provision for public participation in plans and programmes for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). It is recognised that both these articles need combining and updating (EU, 2001).

Recommendations from the World Bank lay out a strategic approach for good practice in public participation that enables more efficient delivery of project sustainability and protect the interests of affected communities. (World Bank, 1999).

The benefits of public consultation are stated to be:

- Fewer conflicts and delays
- Greater transparency and accountability for Governments
- An increase in credibility and understanding of public agencies and NGO’s
- Reduce adverse impacts and maximise benefits and compensation
- Ensure vulnerable groups are given special attention and equity
- Environmental Management Plans using the Environmental Assessment process are more effectively.

In the Environmental Assessment process it is noted that all members of the EA team may not fully appreciate the benefits of consultation. (The World Bank, 1999, p3). Steps must be taken to convince and include these people for successful consultation. The composition of groups always brings together people with diverse backgrounds and attitudes and it is a challenge to reconcile these towards agreed conclusions.

Identification of stakeholders could usefully answer the questions:
Who will be directly and indirectly affected?
Who might have an interest or feel they are affected?
When the people involved have been identified meaningful consultation should take place. It is suggested on three levels:
Level 1 Conveying information to the Public
Level 2 Listening to the opinions and preferences of the public
Level 3 Involving the public in decision making
Once the consultation has taken place its effectiveness should be evaluated to answer these key questions.

1. Were stakeholders able to acquire the information they needed to participate meaningfully?
2. Were stakeholders given the opportunity to have their views heard?
3. Did stakeholders have a realistic opportunity to influence the design and implementation of the project?
4. Where all stakeholder groups involved?
5. Were activities appropriately phased to achieve the intended results?
6. Did consultation occur early enough?
7. Were the stakeholders perception of the process, that is was fair?

2.3.4. **Guidance for a best practice for public participation from the EU Hyder Report for Integrated Coastal Zone Management. (ICZM).(1999)**

The report sets out the following principles for improved public participation in coastal management planning.

1. A clear, simple and integrated strategy needs to be set out.
2. Active involvement needs to be encouraged
3. The process must be seen as open, transparent, fair and impartial.
4. Information and knowledge needs to be shared using suitable media.
5. Conflict needs to be expected and managed
6. Close working with existing institutions and stakeholders
7. A respect for the special character of the location and the effect of change.
8. Adequate resources, to include time, skills and funding
10. A partnership at all levels that will also aid wider sustainable goals.

The Guidance discussed above will be applied to the case study of this research to help suggest best practice for coastal management planning.
CHAPTER 3.

Techniques used in Consultation and Public Participation.

For a best practice model to succeed there is no single approach to consultation or participation that is ever sufficient in itself. (Petts, 1999). A comparison of different techniques thought useful by different statutory and non-statutory participants in environmental decision making is one of the main aims of this research. The following table discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the methods researched in the case study.

Table 1. Table of the nature of each method described with their advantages and disadvantages.

(Adapted from: Petts, 1999; World Bank, 1999; Morgan, 1998; Hutton, 1986; Stewart et al. 1993; Lynn et al, 1995; Vari, 1995; Dienal and Renn, 1995; Armour, 1995; O’Riordan, 1997; Crosby, 1995.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>The text should be simple and non-technical, relevant with instructions as to how to obtain more info.</td>
<td>Direct to those concerned, cost-effective and provides record of feedback if given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspapers</td>
<td>Can disseminate a large amount of relevant information to target audience.</td>
<td>Readily available and cheap Can reach most literate adults and provide detailed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and Radio.</td>
<td>Possible to control the type of broadcast offered and target a type of listener or viewer.</td>
<td>Many people have potential access. The media can convey powerful images and stimulate response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video or DVD</td>
<td>Has the potential to reach wider audiences.</td>
<td>Can be innovative and eye-catching. Convenient and the advantage of editorial control as opposed to other media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>Can be staffing to provides one-to-</td>
<td>Staffing to provides one-to-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone helplines.</strong> Can be staffed or use an answer-phone.</td>
<td>If staffed can provide one-to-one feedback. Easy access for those who don’t want to write letters</td>
<td>Pre-recorded information can be too limited and simple to answer concerns. No feedback from answer-phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newsletters.</strong> Often produced by interest groups. Needs to be relevant to the reader.</td>
<td>Allows on-going contact and can promote trust. Can be designed to meet changing needs. Feedback possible, as well as liaison between support groups.</td>
<td>May not be seen as independent and lack credibility and distribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advertisements.</strong> Useful for announcing public meetings. Effective if well prepared and targeted</td>
<td>Good for introducing an issue and relatively cheap. Presentation is controlled.</td>
<td>Has a limited scope to convey messages and may cause suspicion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews.</strong> For collecting information and feedback</td>
<td>Can use contacts established later and identify different values and concerns</td>
<td>Time-consuming, can be biased. May not be a representative sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys.</strong> Through questionnaires allows info collecting for EIA’s</td>
<td>Can identify existing levels of knowledge and concerns. Info can then be more targeted.</td>
<td>Can be expensive and biased. Need to be random and only supplies temporal view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Visits.</strong> A selected group can get first hand information. Visits need supporting with info and briefings.</td>
<td>Useful for alternatives comparison and when the project is complex.</td>
<td>Only reaches a small group of people also may need much planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public meetings.</strong> Can be arranged for both project sponsor and community group.</td>
<td>Helps respect if well run. Allows for meeting others and being made aware of different views.</td>
<td>Can be difficult to control and difficult to develop dialogue. May raise unrealistic expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Groups.</strong> A type of open-ended group interview that creates lines of communication</td>
<td>Useful in market research and collecting qualitative data. Allows problems to be identified and reconciled to build consensus.</td>
<td>Structure of meeting needs careful planning with a moderator in control otherwise becomes unfocused and a general discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Inquiries.</strong> Allows a forum for individuals to object and air grievances</td>
<td>Promises justice, equal treatment and neutrality in decisions. Can increase the confidence of lay people and action groups.</td>
<td>Gives an advantage to those who can afford to pay for professional legal representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advisory Groups.**</td>
<td>Community Advisory Groups. Independent members from interest groups appointed by an authority to review information and formulate recommendations</td>
<td>Requires commitment in time from members and funding from planners and organisers. Needs a clear remit, planning and independent control. Limited use of experts therefore needs a high degree of environmental awareness from participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Juries.**</td>
<td>Can represent a microcosm of their communities. Hear evidence and question witnesses. Jurors are randomly selected and mediated by an independent facilitator. Recommendations are given in writing at the end of the process to the decision authority after a vote on the findings.</td>
<td>The agenda may not be as open and fair as it ought to be because it is set by the sponsor. Selection of jurors may be unrepresentative. Dialogue is one way with no feedback and there is none between the jurors, witnesses or policy makers. Issue of trust between ordinary people and the composition and conclusions of citizens juries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Cells.**</td>
<td>When considered consultative, the process gains external legitimacy. Decisions are not made but recommendations reported. Allows a selection from those people affected by the development. Helps towards the authority trusting the process of participation.</td>
<td>The authority is free to reject recommendations. Tendency to fragmentation of the problem. Can only really deal with unique problems and one question at a time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Networks.**</td>
<td>Allows for more adventurous consultation. Helps build consensus and trust. Mediation can resolve conflict. Enables feelings and fears to be expressed in an authentic manner. Helps community building.</td>
<td>Spontaneity may result in unrepresentative involvement and lack of trust by authority. Lack of knowledge as to who to inform and how to inform them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Partnerships.**</td>
<td>Trust and co-operation is sought through sharing information and decisions.</td>
<td>A lack of willingness of statutory agencies to relinquish decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representatives who meet to establish permanent management planning.</td>
<td>Wider participation is carried out because of shared local concerns.</td>
<td>power. Individual attitudes within the partnership have to respond to group needs and expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attributes of each of the methods will be assessed as to their use and usefulness during this research. What public involvement takes place in coastal decision making in the case study and the way some of these methods could improve planning, is one of the main aims of this study.
CHAPTER 4.

Methodology.

4.1 Introduction

The research methodology has been designed from a study of the literature on public participation and the choice of case study. From the basis of the comprehensive review of the literature three main areas of concern have been identified that should aid improved participation. The areas were:

1. Democracy and who participates.
2. Involvement in decision making and how decisions are made.
3. Trust, respect and why conflict occurs.

Guidance has also been reviewed and recommendations noted from the literature as to what criteria needs to be addressed, to achieve a best practice guide to public participation. A case study was used because it can critically test existing theory (Yin, 1994). It was also the method chosen by the Hyder Consultancies ICZM report for the EC, and therefore appears to be an approved approach.

4.2 Justification for a case study approach.

One of the main advantages of using a case study is that they can focus on contemporary events and causal relationships (Cashmore, 2003). A case study approach can provide a contextually rich understanding and help to investigate context that would be difficult to gain from surveys that often demand a limited number of variables, questions and respondents (Yin, 1994). Case studies also have the advantage that phenomena can be observed and analysed, that are often not accessible to scientific investigation (Yin, 1994).
There are several important criticisms levelled at the use of case studies which this research will endeavour to overcome. A lack of rigor in collecting evidence can introduce bias and influence the direction of findings and conclusions (Denscolm, 2002). Bias is not a unique problem to case studies and is also found in both experiments and questionnaires.

Another criticism often cited in the use of a single case study is the validity of making generalisations (Cashmore, 2003). However there are also concerns about generalising from surveys where populations are selected that may be unrepresentative. Statistical generalisations are made using quantified data where relationships are identified that may not include the complex variables that may exist. Populations in surveys may not be a representative sample, be biased and jeopardise the validity of the generalisations (Aldridge and Levie, 2001). A case study can be like an experiment, in that it doesn’t use a specific population like a survey but through investigation produce results that can test theory and make analytic generalisations (Yin, 1994). It is recognised that there are difficulties with making generalisations with relatively few respondents. In this study at least one and a half to two hours was spent with each interviewee. This enabled in-depth information collecting. The interviewees were recommended because of their knowledge of the case study and were therefore also accepted as competent representatives of the agencies and groups selected.

Another significant criticism that has to be overcome is that case studies can be very time consuming and produce massive unreadable documents (Bryman, 2001; Yin, 1994). The present study targeted a group of those involved that allowed analysis of data using categorising, tabulating and a strategy of pattern matching. This technique will be described in the data analysis section. The overall aim was to identify patterns in the responses of interviewees and employ some quantitative analysis but not at the expense of losing the depth and variety in answers given and possibilities for qualitative analysis.
4.3. Research Design.

The research method was a case study approach that used interviews for the majority of the data collection. Documentation and notes from direct observations of meetings were also collected for analysis. Use of a mostly interview method allowed data to be collected, that is not just based on facts but also the emotions, feelings and experience of the people concerned (Denscolme, 2002).

4.3.1. Interviews

Interviews were carried out using these methods:

1. Note taking during interviews
2. Tape recording the interview with the permission of the interviewee
3. Resisting using leading questions and being aware of biasing the answers.
4. There also a need to be achieve a balance between responses that were important to the interviewee and making sure the semi-structured questions were answered, by focusing back to the case study.

Interview technique has many of the same advantages as the case study approach. It allows for a depth not just breadth of information to be collected and insights that are not available using either surveys or experiments. Interviews allow for flexibility of approach using open and semi-structured questions that can allow for unusual responses and a high response rate (Bryman, 2001; Denscolme, 2002). A copy of pre-formulated questions was taken to each interview. (Appendix 5).

The interview was opened with questions about the background and interest in the case study of the interviewee. (Questions 1 – 4). Question 5 and 6 asked of their experiences of consultation and participation. From the stimulus of the first questions, the pattern of most of the interviews became a discussion about the concerns that the interviewee felt
about the lack of success of consultation in the case study report. Questions then turned to
the types of methods they are familiar with. This was achieved using a prompt list of
methods (Appendix 6). Interviewees were then asked to evaluate the list and look at the
more participatory methods using the information sheets or show cards. (Appendix 7).
It was found difficult for interviewees to read the information sheet and an easier and
more user-friendly approach was to produce postcards with individual descriptions of the
more novel methods of participation, of which they may or may not have had any
experience.

An awareness of bias is addressed in this work by being vigilant in not asking leading
questions in the interviews and being aware of ‘interviewer effect’ (Denscombe, 2002).
The main task of the interviewer during the interview is to allow the interviewee to be
forthcoming with the knowledge and insights that they have of the case study, without
unduly influencing the outcome and to listen and record responses.

4.3.2. Selection of Interviewees.
The Strategy Report produced by the consultants Potsford, Duvivier for the
Environmental Agency and present case study, had a list of consultees in the back of their
report. It was noted that they fell into three categories:

1. Statutory Agencies
2. Non-Governmental Agencies (NGOs)
3. Local Groups and Individuals.

The selection of interviewees attempts to draw in a cross section of the people involved.
Four interviewees were from statutory Agencies, a representative from the Environment
Three representatives from NGOs: The National Trust; Royal Yachting Association and
Suffolk Coasts and Heaths. Three representatives from local groups: The Alde and Ore
Association; Orford Town Trust and Friends of the River. Also interviewed was one
retired person who initiated the Alde and Ore Association and was involved in the original consultation and one of the consultants who produced the case study report.

Most are representatives of organisations but they also have their own personnel ideas about public participation in coastal management planning. During the interviews they often separated the ideas of their organisations and their own views, both were valid for the aims of this research. More individuals would have enriched the outcome of the research but were not interviewed due to the time constraints of the project.

Figure 2. Schedule of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Mike Steen</td>
<td>20.05.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Suffolk Coastal District Council</td>
<td>John Davis</td>
<td>05.06.2003</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Sudbourne Parish Council</td>
<td>Elizabeth Cooper</td>
<td>12.06.2003</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>Gareth Dalglish</td>
<td>27.06.2003</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>RYA</td>
<td>Chris Edwards</td>
<td>23.04.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Suffolk Coasts and Heaths</td>
<td>Neil Lister</td>
<td>05.06.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>Grant Lohoar</td>
<td>23.06.2003</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local group and individual</td>
<td>Retired from Alde/Ore Association Orford Town Trust</td>
<td>Richard Roberts</td>
<td>27.05.2002</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Group</td>
<td>Alde/Ore Association</td>
<td>Nicholas Bushell</td>
<td>27.05.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Group</td>
<td>Friends of the River</td>
<td>Penny Kay</td>
<td>25/06.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Potsford/Haskoning (previously Duvivier)</td>
<td>Richard Cottle</td>
<td>06.06.2003</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3. Direct Observations of Planning Partnership Meetings.

One of the responses to the perceived lack of public involvement in the case study was the formation of an Estuary Planning Partnership. This was due to a growing desire and need for integrated management between the statutory agencies and the NGOs who also recognised that involving and informing local people of their plans and proposals was desirable. It could be said that the start of the partnership was a recommendation from the North American/UK Countryside Exchange Programme which held a meeting and reported their findings in October 2002. The significance of this programme will be analysed to assess its significance in producing a best practice model and the formation of an Estuary Planning Partnership for the Alde/Ore area.

Meetings attended to collect information of the forming Estuary Planning Partnership.
1. 3rd October 2002 – Report from N. American/UK Countryside Exchange
2. 8th May 2003 - Meeting of the Steering Group for Estuary Planning Partnership
3. 12th June 2003 - Meeting of the Steering Group for Estuary Planning Partnership
4. 10th July 2003 – Meeting of the Steering Group for Estuary Planning Partnership

At these meetings detailed notes were taken, minutes acquired and planning documents collected for analysis. Meetings took place at Orford Town Hall and Sudbourne Village Hall.

4.3.4. Documentation.

Documents produced by the Countryside Exchange Group and the evolving Planning Partnerships will be reviewed to help towards recommendations for the best practice model. The reports that were used were:-

1. The Report of the North American/UK Exchange Programme Group
   (North America and UK Countryside Exchange Programme report, 2002)
2. The Terms of reference for setting up a Planning Partnership

Criteria from guidance in the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the EU Directive on ‘Public Participation in drawing up plans and programmes’ (EU, 2001); the World Bank ‘Strategic approach on public consultation in the EA process’ (World Bank, 1999), and EU, Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) will be used to assess the processes in the meetings and evaluation of documents towards recommendations for a best practice model.

4.4 Data Analysis.

In the research into the theoretical background that involves the public in strategic planning and projects, several areas of concern were identified. These were issues concerning democracy, decision making, trust and conflict. A technique for analysing data from interviews is Pattern Matching (Yin, 1994). The analysis allows comparison between empirical data and desirable attributes predicted in theory.

4.4.1 Pattern Matching.

The pattern matching technique will help to analysis the interview notes and tapes. This technique will aim to identify where issues of concern have been stated in the interviews. The elements of theory that will be matched are:

Aspects of democracy:
1. Identification of stakeholders
2. Empowerment of non-statutory stakeholders
Aspects of decision making:

3. Feedback to decision makers acknowledged and/or acted upon
4. Timing of decisions and time given to the consultancy process

Aspects of trust and conflict:

5. Trust in other stakeholders and statutory agencies
6. Whether conflict was perceived

The issues of respect, attitude and resistance or adaptability to change were also identified during interviews as criteria that affected consultation and added into the analysis.
Results

5.1 Introduction.
Results include:
1 Interview results of the methods used by different organisations
2 Discussions with the interviewees as to which consultation and participation techniques they were aware of, which they had used and thought the most useful.
3 Data from meetings and documents of an evolving estuary planning partnership.

5.2 Results of Techniques used by different stakeholders.

Table 2 Techniques and Methods used in Public Consultation and Participation by Stakeholders. (See Appendix 6 for classification used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Consultation:</th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>SCDC</th>
<th>SPC</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>RYA</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>CPD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspapers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and radio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone helplines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ CD and DVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ websites and e-mail</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public inquiries</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Tele/ Video conferencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More Participatory Methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EN</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>SCDC</th>
<th>SPC</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>RYA</th>
<th>SCH</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>CPD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Advisory Councils (CAC’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Juries (CJ’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Cells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Partnerships</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The fact that the individual interviewed did not discuss the method or rejected it at not used or useful does not necessarily mean that the organisation they represent does not use it at some time.)

5.2.1. **Key to Interview References:**

SCDC – Suffolk Coastal District Council SPC – Sudbourne Parish Council
NT – National Trust      RYA – Royal Yachting Association
SCH – Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AO – Alde and Ore Association
RR – Richard Roberts (Retired AO) FR – Friends of the River
CPD – Consultant from Potsford, Duvivier now Potsford, Haskoning Consultancy Firm.
5.3 Results of the discussion of methods of consultation and participation from interviews.

The most used method of information dissemination, consultation and feedback but not participation, was that of public meetings (Table 2). These were thought by many to be an essential method to involve general public stakeholders. They have the advantage, if well run, of helping to engender respect and understanding between groups (AO, RR. 2003) but can be hijacked by dominant and vociferous individuals and groups (FR, CPD.2003). They have limited scope for feedback, as not much consultation is felt to take place (SPC. 2003). It is mainly a forum for giving information by Statutory Agencies about the strategies they want to employ. However, meetings are not a productive forum for the Agencies when they exhibit anti-feelings they had not anticipated, as they did in this case study. (CPD, 2003). The solution would appear to be to avoid the anti-reactions by an information campaign before the public meeting. The consultant interviewed suggested a constant ‘drip feed exercise’ and a relationship with the public that was kept going during quiet, non-issue times. (CPD, 2003).

**Recommendation:**

1. **Not to rely on public meetings as the main method of consultation.**

2. **Building relationships between groups.**

Information dissemination by paper methods was the next most used. Newspapers, newsletters and leaflets could be sent to each household and inform a potentially large population of individual public stakeholders. Newsletters were favoured by interest groups, such as Suffolk Coasts and Heaths and The Alde and Ore Association because it provided on-going contact, informing its members and interested stakeholders. However the main problem with solely using this method is that, unless people are interested they treat it a ‘junk mail’ or do not read the articles in the paper.

Newspapers were viewed with some suspicion from some interviewees. The Consultant thought there was a slant put on the reporting of the case study facts, using emotive language that overemphasised the risk of flooding in the area. However if people were
aware that a slant is sometimes used, then they could be a useful way of informing the public. (CPD, 2003).

Leaflets are favoured because they can be a cost effective way of reaching a lot of people and can allow feedback through contact telephone numbers or reply slips. However their impact can be difficult to evaluate, especially if the feedback is low. Some interviewees stated that there was a less than 5% return on general feedback (NT, 2003; AO, 2003).

**Recommendation:**

*Paper methods are a good way to spread information widely but they are not the best way to gain feedback. Follow up contacts have to be made to increase responses and feedback.*

Websites, which were added to the original list, during the interviews and exhibitions were used to provide information for stakeholders. Websites are particularly popular with Statutory Groups, possibly because they have the resources to produce them but it is becoming more widespread for many stakeholders or stakeholder groups to set up and design a website. However, the location and content of a website needs more effective advertising, especially for access to information for particular issues.

**Recommendation:**

*Web addresses and specific locations for information and available feedback sites need more effective advertising.*

Exhibitions are also more favoured by Statutory Groups. They feel that the can use their expertise and advice more effectively in discussion with attendees of exhibitions. Often they can provide feedback for the planners. Both verbal and written responses can be collected. In preparation for their current report on the strategy for the coastline, the Environment Agency is using the exhibitions method. They feel they need to fully explain some of the engineering options and soft sea defences to make people more aware of flood risk. There is a current change of emphasis, away from flood control and defence to flood risk management (EA, 2003). This strategy means less emphasis on defending the coastline and is therefore potentially controversial. The change in emphasis
will need careful presentation. The Environment Agency is aware of this and under their guidance has employed a group of consultants to professionally carry out the consultation exercise. Employing a consultant is the same strategy they employed with the first strategic report but they now have the experience of the problems from that process to help inform and improve consultation in the current report.

**Recommendation:**

*Exhibitions presented in as many local venues as possible for wide coverage.*

The local current Environmental Agency exhibition in Orford Town Hall had an attendance of 60 out of a population of 690. A similar exhibition concerning sea defences, over two days at Felixstowe by representatives from Halcrow Consultants, SCDC and the Environment Agency had an attendance of 200 out of a population of 20,900. The number of attendees obviously varies and does not appear to be a high proportion of the population. Low attendance at exhibitions was also noted as a problem by some of the other interviewees (SCDC, 2003; RR, 2003). Apart from exhibitions another preferred consultation method of the environment agency is glossy brochures. These are being produced by the present consultants employed by the agency. The consultant interviewed was not sure of the value of these (CPD, 2003).

**Recommendations:**

1. *More extensive and improved advertising of events.*
2. *Producing plain English guides to strategies and developments.*

Videos were not popular unless professionally produced and therefore expensive. They were also considered not useful for specific issues or were prone to be seen as giving a biased view. TV and Radio were used more frequently than videos and are particularly good at informing local live issues. However, like newspapers, videos can slant stories and not portray the true situation (SCDC, 2003; AO, 2003). Advertisements were also thought too costly by most organisations. However perhaps they are not used enough to inform people of local consultation meetings and issues. Several interviewees complained of not being aware of the report or meetings associated with it. More effort needs to be made to inform interested stakeholders or those who could be affected, (EU, 2001).
growing use of CD’s was thought by some interviewees to be useful. The technology to mass produce cheaply is not yet readily available but could be in a short period of time.

Recommendation:

Use more novel ways of using media, like CDs to capture new, possibly younger and/or wider audiences. Can be distributed like paper through letterboxes when price allows.

Most organisations did not use interviews, they were considered too time consuming. However the National Trust did use them to find out about the history of their properties, in this instance, the buildings on Orford Ness (NT, 2003). Surveys and Site Visits were thought to be important but used more for researching information. Public inquiries had been attended. One person interviewed had a good experience of an inquiry, and in his view saw what he perceived as a fair outcome. (RR, 2003). However generally they are viewed as expensive and give an advantage to those who can afford to pay for professional and legal representation, like the Statutory Agencies. The Consultant and English Nature representative had given evidence in several Inquiries and felt that differences should be resolved before it got to that stage. However they also recognised that conflict situations had to be resolved and that this was a fair way of achieving this (CPD, 2003; EN, 2003). Mediation was a method not considered in this research although it did prove a satisfactory technique in O’Riordan’s North Norfolk case study. It is possibly more suitable than inquiries for local more small scale disputes.

Recommendation:

Earlier use of more participation methods to reduce conflict and the need for Inquiries.

There was little knowledge of public participation methods that go beyond consultation. The idea of Citizens Advisory Groups had been heard of and approved but not engaged in, by Suffolk Coastal District Council. The RYA representative thought Advisory groups a good idea but did not think generally including the public was useful. He did not agree with Roberts (1995) that anyone should be allowed to participate. He thought that consultation groups ought to have representatives of organisations on them, much like the planning partnership idea.
Recommendations:

1. Improved use of representatives of groups to collect feedback from members
2. More effort to outreach the general public from representative groups.

Interviewees had not heard of Citizen Juries or Planning Cells. There was some concern, especially by Statutory Agencies as to how these groups would be constructed and how much influence in decisions they would have. The response of some of the other interviewees was interest but not a clear idea about how it could be made to work in a local context.

Recommendation:
More research and experimenting with more participatory methods by Local and National Government in the first instance to, encourage use.

The use of informal networks was generally thought to be a good idea and one interviewee stated that that is how it works anyway (RR, 2003). In a well connected and educated community, like Orford or Aldeburgh, that may be the case but not necessarily in less cohesive communities.

Recommendation: Encourage informal networking between groups and individuals, possibly through a register kept by the Local Authority.

The Planning Partnership Method was the most known of the participation techniques by the interviewees. Most were involved in some way. Representatives of the Environment Agency, English Nature, Suffolk Coastal District and Parish Councils, The National Trust, Suffolk Coasts and Heaths and Friends of the River were part of a Steering Group for the formation of the Estuary Planning Partnership and the other interviewees had knowledge of how a planning partnership worked.

Recommendation:
Consider the formation of a Planning Partnership.

The recommendations in this section are for methods that could improve public involvement. Some will be used with reference to best practice in Chapter 6.
5.4. Results and interpretation of meetings.

5.4.1 The North American/ UK Exchange (Data from public meeting October 2003 and the history of the reason for the Exchange from Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC.)

The present case study has been noted as precipitating a local outcry due to the consultation methods adopted by the Environment Agency through their consultants. The reaction was observed by the Local District Council (SCDC), who received letters from local Parish Councils and the Alde and Ore Association. To compound the dissatisfaction with the Environment Agency, the Agency was in the process of applying for planning permission to continue shingle recharge along the coast. Conflict grew from objections by English Nature to the recharge and there was a delay in permission. There followed a general perception that the two Agencies were they not co-operating. This led to a loss of trust in the Agencies and a questioning of their credibility by local organisations and individuals. To try to help reverse this perception, the environment group attached and partially funded by Suffolk Coastal District Council, Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Unit, co-ordinated a North America and UK Countryside Exchange. A bid was put to the Exchange Group to get it to come to the Alde/Ore area. Their aim is to help local communities and organisations with specific problems as well as providing professional development opportunities for experienced professionals and volunteers. It has to date been involved in nearly 100 case study projects. Four team members were from the UK and four from the USA.

Prior to the visit of the Exchange Team they were sent a research brief by a local organising team. Due to local concerns they were specifically asked to look at how to improve communication between stakeholders, also to see what could be done to develop confidence in the statutory environmental agencies, to include the idea of an overall Estuary Management Plan. They met widely with a great range of organisations that
included statutory bodies, local groups, commercial interests and residents in the area. Their findings relevant to this case study, will be discussed in the documents section of this report. Their report was the impetus in the Alde/Ore area for the development of an Alde and Ore Estuary Planning Partnership.

5.4.2. **The formation of the Alde/Ore Planning Partnership. (Data collected from Observations in attending Partnership Meetings).**

The idea of planning partnerships is not new. In the period 1990-1991 it is said English Nature set up 11 such partnerships around the coast (Dalglish, 2003). Examples that are known still to exist are in the Humber, Severn and Forth Estuaries and Poole Harbour in Dorset. A recent planning partnership is forming in the Stour/Orwell Estuary of Suffolk. There are probably more.

The Planning Partnership that is developing as a result of recommendations from the exchange programme, has formed a group of committed stakeholders that is made up of both statutory, NGO and local groups. The main aim of the partnership is:

‘To provide a forum to improve communication, understanding and promote best practice.”

The management steering group is made up of representatives from:

- Environment Agency
- English Nature
- National Trust
- Suffolk Coastal District Council
- Suffolk Coasts and Heaths
- Major of Aldeburgh
- Parish Council representatives
- Orford Town Council
Friends of the River
Alde and Ore Association
Aldeburgh Yacht Club.

The steering group is planning to consult with a listed wider group made up of landowners, farmers, fishermen, commercial and leisure users of the river, and any others with any interest in what happens to the estuary, if it becomes flooded. The Environment Agency, who are responsible for flood control in the estuary, is on the Steering Group and their involvement and commitment to making the partnership work is crucial. The issue of what power and decisions the group has depends on the co-operation of the Environment Agency and their representative.

The dynamics of the group is developing as the statutory agencies are learning to co-operate with each other and exchange information and ideas. At present the non-statutory representatives on the steering group are listening to how decisions are being made. In their turn the statutory Agencies need to listen to the local groups and NGOs for the process to work. Listening and just as important, being seen to listen is an important pre-requisite recognised by the World Bank and noted in Section 2.2.3.of this report and also stressed by Roberts (1995).

The central idea of the Planning Partnership is that the different agencies and groups have an input into projects of concern or interest to local stakeholders and these are all fed into a Central Strategy Management Plan. This is shown in the working diagram produced by Suffolk Coastal District Council (Appendix 10).

There is a strong feeling at present from the Statutory Agencies (EA, EN) and NGO group (NT), that the planning partnership should be a forum that collects recommendations from stakeholders and that they are not directly involved in decision making. There is felt to be a need to manage expectations and that non-statutory input has to be advisory. Initially this is not what the non-statutory members thought was going to happen and some members of the group found a non-decision making role untenable.
However, a move towards a neutral position has been reached and so far the issue of decision making is not at the forefront of the present planning. It is an issue that will have to be resolved by some form of compromise and understanding for the future.

5.5. Results and interpretation of Documents

5.5.1. The conclusions of the North American/Countryside Exchange Report

- Communications and management should not be separated
- Plans and regulations for estuary planning need co-ordinating to stop overlap and encourage consensus
- Any technical information needs to be accessible to lay people
- There needs to be more face to face consultation
- Conflict and disinformation needs addressing
- More pro-active outreach is needed
- More attention is needed towards improved communication. Communication needs to be two-way, carried out early in the process and more professionally organised.

The formation of the Planning Partnership was put forward by the Exchange Team as the main solution to their conclusions.

5.5.2 Terms of reference for setting up the Estuary Planning Partnership

- Members of the EPP shall consist of a Steering and Wider Group
- No member shall have precedence or powers over any other
- A plain English guide will be produced to explain legislation
- A plain English guide will inform stakeholders of plans that will affect the estuary.
- The group represents, voluntary, non-statutory and statutory groups.
At present the group functions as an ad hoc organisation with no agreed rules. These are planned for the near future and will be crucial in terms of how much decision making will be allowed for the non-statutory members of the Steering Group and the Wider Group.

5.5.3. Results of interpretation from consultation documents for a mandate for the Estuary Planning Partnership.

An initial decision of professional help for the consultation was rejected by reason of cost. A simple questionnaire was chosen that would help stakeholders give a positive response and make comments about what they would like to see the partnership do to help them. The questionnaire plus a covering note about the role of the partnership was sent out directly by post to all consultees of different groups in the area. These included parish councils, sailing and yacht clubs, farmers, businesses, some individuals and newspaper editors. (Appendix 11 shows an example of the Consultation for Parish Councils). Much discussion was carried out as to the compilation of consultation lists. The original strategy plan provided one list of consultees. It was felt that a database of contacts would need constantly updating.

A further consultation is to be carried out using a forum meeting for information and feedback. It is part of the terms of reference for the partnership to consult widely but there are no plans at present to engage in more proactive participation techniques for public stakeholders. The partnership has not got yet, a cohesive plan for consultation or participation but it does want to learn from the original mistakes of the Environment Agency. In future more diverse methods would be needed to capture as many stakeholders as possible to avoid conflict and eventually as required by regulation. The Proposal for amendments of the EU Directive described in 1.2 have been recently ratified in June 2003 and now awaits UK regulations (EU, 2003).
CHAPTER 6.

Analysis and Discussion of Results and Recommendations for Best Practice

6.1 Results of interview concerns

Interview concerns have been categorised into the criteria established from the literature review and into statutory and non-statutory groups. (Comprehensive Tables can be found in Appendices 8 and 9).

Graph 1: Total number of times during interviews that issues of concern were discussed

- Number of Times
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- Conflict
- Change

Democracy | Decision Making | Issues of Concern | Other Issues
It is acknowledged that in categorising issues of concern, each category is not totally exclusive. There are overlaps, especially between trust and respect and strong links between empowerment and conflict. The consultancy was assimilated into the statutory category because they used guidance from the Environment Agency in this instance and for many of their contracts. NGOs and local groups were put together because they are non-statutory. Categorising allowed for a systematic analysis of the issues identified.


Empowerment was identified as the most significant concern in this research. (Graph 1, Appendix 8). It is the problem that is going to have to be resolved if public participation is going to take place. The Statutory stakeholders will engage in consultation exercises and do, but there was little knowledge or enthusiasm for more participatory techniques. All interviewees had experience of some consultation methods and many thought there was a need to be more innovation in the methods used. This was also the feeling of Petts
and O’Riordan in the theoretical research. The National Trust representative felt that some members of the public he has experienced were apathetic and not good citizens. However it was possible to get stakeholders to respond in a more proactive way by a ‘well managed’ consultation process (NT, 2003). For democracy to work, statutory agencies need to engage with local people and local people need to be good citizens. (Roberts, 1995; Petts, 1999). It was said that some other countries are better at engaging their citizens in decision making and the Dutch had a better culture that was more consultation friendly (Sadler, 1996; CPD, 2003). It would be difficult to change the culture of the UK in the short term but more efforts towards participation at an earlier stage (EU, 2001) and using more imaginative and innovative methods to get stakeholders more involved in decision making (O’Riordan, 1997; Soneryd 2003), would help towards the improvements needed.

**Recommendation: Consult early and use more diverse methods.**

Local groups felt as strongly about empowerment as the Consultant and Statutory agencies (Graph 2, Appendix 9). They thought that there was no point in engaging in the consultation process if their views were ignored. (SPC, 2003; Roberts, 1995). The Alde and Ore representative thought that people who used the river knew better about the processes involved. They therefore should have a say in the strategies employed to protect the coastline and river banks (AO, 2003). Empowerment and the political right to have a say in the decision making that effects the environment in which you live and your livelihood could be perceived as a fundamental right (SCDC, 2003; Rousseau 1755). However, in practice it is not so simple. Agencies need to fulfil their statutory obligations (EN, 2003) and people need to become personally involved to encourage expansion of the power base from Government (RR, 2003). A problem that needs to be overcome for agencies to be happy about open consultation is that the process should not be seen to be taken over by a non-statutory and unelected, vociferous and confrontational element of the public (EN, 2003, CPD, 2003).

**Recommendation: A more proactive and innovative approach to consultation that would include more participatory techniques.**
6.3 Analysis of the Trust Issue.

The second most important concern identified in the case study is trust in the process of consultation (Graph 1, Appendix 8). Both local groups and statutory agencies had similar amounts of concern. Comments ranged from trust lacking due to a feeling of incompetence and superficiality from the different stakeholders to not believing in the truth of the information given. Often this was due to a real or perceived lack of transparency and assumptions made that were not checked and verified. There appeared to be a dilemma between what the experts responsible for statutory decisions and scientists have concluded and what the local people know or think they know (EA, 2003; Cashmore, 2003). Transparent and reliable information was seen by many of the stakeholders to be the key to improved trust. English Nature stated they believed in contacting people individually when designating areas. This method could be expanded to other contacts with the public by Statutory Agencies. The Environment Agency are using exhibitions attended by experts to a greater extent but as mentioned these are not always well attended. More face to face contact was also a recommendation of the Countryside Exchange report.

**Recommendation:** A closer relationship between statutory and non-statutory groups achieved by individuals forming relationships through meetings and increased face-to-face contacts.

Trust was also seen by people having confidence in those representing them. (Petts, 1999; O’Riordan, 1997). An individual viewpoint can influence decisions and needs to be kept apart from the collective or organisational stance being represented. This can be difficult and is often solved by statutory agencies concentrating on the application of the Law or engineering and technical solutions at the expense of the values of the local people involved. An example is the Coastal Habitats and Management Plans (CHaMPs), produced by the Environment Agency and English Nature. The plans are drawn up to avoid damage to habitats and bird populations on coastal sites but do not include any consultation. The Statutory Agencies are exhibiting a ‘duty of care’ to prevent flooding
(EA, 1999) or protection of habitats (EN, 2001), which is their job but there is also need to redress the balance in a duty to the local community as well.

**Recommendation:** Consultation should be carried out for all developments and not just considered too technical for people to understand or prejudged as irrelevant to local people.

Statutory Agencies are aware of the problem and are making increased efforts to consult more widely and consider more participatory approaches to decision making. Many of the reasons for this have been noted, for example ethics and politics but there is also the reason of avoidance of conflict. It was said by a member of one of the local groups that there was a general suspicion of statutory bodies and she went as far as calling it part of conspiracy theory. There were felt to be mistakes in the report that led to distrust of other conclusions and recommendations made. (FR, 2003). Many of the local people and Statutory Agencies, do not know the true consequences of not maintaining the sea and river defences. The Environment Agency is planning to carry out measurements on the estuary and produce a computer model of what they think might happen. Monitoring was one of the recommendations to help inform future planning and improve transparency by the RYA representative. There is therefore a key concern about information that is trustworthy in a dynamic environment where it is difficult to predict change.

**Recommendations:**

1. More research into coastal processes and the consequences of man’s modification of these.
2. Monitoring and publishing results of the monitoring.
3. Producing plain English analysis and results for the less scientific public.

### 6.4 Analysis of the conflict issue.

Conflict was felt by many stakeholders interviewed to be closely associated with trust. English Nature were thought to be ‘anti-boats by representatives from the RYA and Alde and Ore Association. Conflict was witnessed between English Nature and the
Environment Agency over beach recharge and habitat protection on Orford Ness. There was a growing feeling that because of the increased power of English Nature through strident European legislation and the Habitats Directive, that there was an increasing conflict between the needs of plants and animals and the needs of people. This conflict, was specifically alluded to by the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths Unit interviewee. Comments from Suffolk Coastal District Council felt that English Nature needed the support of the Community. The implication was, that this was lacking.

The representative interviewed from English Nature held the view that they made the decisions about land designations, such as SSSIs. People were notified of the designation and then allowed to consult and object within a three month time period. Previous notification had allowed a three month consultation period first and then a designation. Practices had changed because people were destroying the sites during the consultation period and then designation and protection was pointless. It was obviously happening too frequently and habitats needed protecting. However this situation has set up conflict between English nature and some local people and the Agency now has a reputation for strict application of the Law.

English Nature also promote a reputation for consultation and they claim to have been the first to introduce the idea of planning partnerships that encourage co-operation and discourse between affected groups. They feel consultation is important in bringing groups together and follow up notification with a face-to-face consultation. (EN, 2003).

**Recommendation:**

*A conscious effort needs to be made by statutory groups to not just inform individuals affected by plans, such as land designation or flood warnings but also to increase involvement and reduce conflict.*
6.5 Analysis of the Respect, change and feedback issues.

Interviewees gauged these issues as important but not as important as empowerment, trust and conflict (Graph 1, Appendix 8). Respect is aligned to trust, in that they both relate to confidence in others peoples’ assessments of a situation. If local knowledge is not taken into account, consultants and statutory agencies will lose the respect needed to carry out their plans. Statutory Agencies need to accept that local people can be well informed (Clarke, 1994). Statutory agencies will lack confidence in the views of others, if those non statutory groups and individuals do not respect their engineering expertise. Local people must also feel that experts are competent and are seen to be competent (Webler et al. 1995). A lack of information exchange was cited as one of the main problems that caused lack of respect between stakeholder groups. (North American/UK Countryside Exchange, 2002)

Recommendation: Increased exchange of information in an accessible form from the decision makers and more feedback seen to be acknowledged from other stakeholders

A reluctance to change was an issue identified of more concern for the statutory agencies. They are proposing the enactment of plans and policies that will mean change and are getting a NIMBY reaction in the extreme, from groups such as The Alde and Ore Association. A lack of openness to the idea of change was also much noted by the Consultant (Appendix 8). The representative from the Alde and Ore Association regretted the perception of NIMBY and felt that this was a misconception and could be avoided if consultation was carried out earlier in the process of decision making.

Recommendation: Consultation carried out early in planning to inform local people of changes and move towards involving them in decisions.

Feedback was considered of more importance to statutory agencies. Feedback was seen as important to build trust by the Consultant and Statutory Agencies (Graph 2, Appendix 9 ). Inadequate feedback was one of the main problems with consultation by The Environment Agency representative. When feedback is not gained, assumptions are made that lead to a lack of understanding (Canter, 1996). Lack of feedback and late feedback
after the case study report publication was thought to have been one of the causes of the conflict that ensued between groups such as the Alde and Ore Association, Friends of the River and the Environment Agency. (SCDC, 2003).

**Recommendation:** Develop strategies for gaining and being seen to use feedback from consultation. Use more participation methods to achieve immediate feedback.

### 6.6 Analysis of stakeholder identification issues.

In this research most of the people interviewed were representatives of larger groups. The original Potsford Duvivier report had a distribution between people consulted of:

Numbers of people:
- Statutory Agencies: 32
- Non-Statutory Agencies: 40
- Individuals: 24
- Total: 96

The total population of the case study area is approximately 9000. The proportion consulted was therefore in the region of 10%. This may be considered as a reasonable sample but was not able to produce a non-confrontational outcome. The way stakeholders are involved is a more crucial issue.

The Environment Agency produced a communication plan that the Consultants carried out. The communication plans of the Agency in general were said to need improvement, by the Consultant. A retrospective view due to the problems encountered. (CPD, 2003). Stakeholders were identified from a document of listed people from the Environment Agency and then enlarged as these contacts helped recognise others involved. They would then be sent a copy of the report for comments. Apart from individuals thought to be affected, the general public were not directly consulted. This could be said to be one of the causes of the negative reaction to the report. It was only after some time that other
interested parties found out about the reports existence (FR, 2003). One of the main reasons that will stop wider consultation is the problem of cost. However if more extensive consultation is needed to reduce delays and conflict it is in the interest of Agencies to find the finance. Also it is now a Directive from the EU which will at some stage be translated into UK Regulation and therefore will become standard practice (EU, 2001, EU, 2003). It was generally accepted by most interviewees that it was more practical to contact group representatives and go out to general public consultation from there, for specific issues. General public stakeholders were consulted by public meetings in this case study.

*Recommendations: Enlargement of the stakeholder network, keeping records or databases of local stakeholders. More effective use of representatives gaining feedback from the people they represent.*

### 6.7 Analysis of other issues.

Some issues were identified in the case study that are not emphasised by theory. The present case study has much in common with the research by O’Riordan, (1997). The North Norfolk Coast example described in Chapter 2 also demonstrated how decisions of the Environment Agency caused concern and conflict. The Agency did not fully consider the integrity of local opinion or values. One of the other issues was therefore the different attitudes people and organisations bring to situations. It could be argued that these are manifested in trust, respect and ability to adapt to change but there is also the issue of how people interact with each other. This was noted in interviews by the National Trust and Friends of the River Representatives, who are also strong characters on the Steering Group. Strongly held opinions and personalities can find it difficult to compromise. Compromise and acceptance of compensation is often the way forward to non-confrontational decisions (EN, 2003; O’Riordan, 1997). The World Bank (1999) recognised the attitude to consultation of individual Environmental Assessment team members varied and some may not want to be involved in increased participation. To overcome negative attitudes it is only by sensitive interactions, persuasion, commitment and encouragement that improved participation can take place. Vociferous or charismatic
leaders from either statutory or non-statutory agencies, who are informed or uninformed can either resolve situations or lead people into conflict.

**Recommendation: Forming relationships through increased contact between affected groups.**

Another issue is that of raising expectations. The Statutory groups, Environment Agency, and English Nature and National Trust NGO, felt that people should not have their expectations raised. That it was unrealistic for them to expect to be involved in decision making to any great degree and that a more acceptable contribution would be from recommendations they may have. Managing expectations by decision makers is therefore a crucial issue to solve for improved public participation. However expectations of being involved in decision making is what stakeholders increasingly want and are demanding. (FR,2003; AO,2003)

**Recommendation: Providing forums where inputs into decision making are allowed and made acceptable to statutory agencies.**

### 6.8 Summary of Recommendations

In conclusion to the analysis of the interviews, meetings, documents and methods used, a best practice model must attempt to solve these concerns and provide:

1. A well managed and more proactive consultation process to reduce conflict and increase involvement in decision making. *Using more innovative methods.*

2. More involvement in decision making by non-statutory stakeholders to encourage greater empowerment of stakeholders. *More face-to-face opportunities from exhibitions and public meetings to planning partnerships.*

3. Transparent and reliable information to aid trust, respect and ability to cope with change. *Plain English guides produced for technical solutions and legislation and more outreach in meetings to explain plans.*
4. Communication that ensures feedback to facilitate more involvement in decision making. *Contact lists made and kept for more widespread dissemination of information and more effort to gain feedback.*

5. The management of expectations to allow statutory stakeholders to be more comfortable with sharing decisions. *An increase in contacts and relationship development between statutory and non-statutory groups. Possibly provided by partnership arrangements.*

Solutions for inclusion into a best practice model are shown in italics. These have been suggested from recommendations in Chapter 5 and 6.
CHAPTER 7.

The development of a best practice model for coastal management planning from Guidance.

7.1 Introduction to Guidance

It is the contention of this report that the formation of an Estuary Planning Partnership (EPP) has many of the attributes that are proposed as necessary by the Guidance produced by:

The United Nations Environment Programme (Clarke, 1994)
The EU Report for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM),(1999)

7.2 How the Estuary planning partnership fits United Nation Guidance

The main recommendations, discussed in chapter 2 of this report from the United Nations Environment Programme states that the process must have five essential elements. The Estuary Planning Partnership is attempting to fulfil the guidelines by:

1. Identification of stakeholders through consultation lists and a database of local interest groups and individuals. A recommendation of the enlargement of local stakeholder groups by the EU. (In the process of compilation)

2. Outreach through consultation and participation emanating from The Steering group to the Wider group identified in the Partnership.

3. An open dialogue that includes discussion and information sharing between statutory and non-statutory groups. Initially in planning partnership meetings, then through discussions of the representatives with their groups and ultimately
wider dialogue with the public through various consultation and participation methods.

4. **Assimilation** through a joint plan produced of the activities and developments in the Estuary (Appendix 10).

5. **Feedback** from consultation exercises in response to communication from the wider group and individuals in the area.


Aspects of the EU Guidance that is already planned for in the Planning Partnership are those relating to **outreach**, taking stakeholder views into account, **dialogue** with a wider public to modify decisions and review alternatives. An area that needs developing from the EU guidance is to monitor the effectiveness of public participation when the Planning Partnership has been in existence for a longer period of time.

To assist with the effectiveness of monitoring consultation processes key questions from the World Bank, in Section. 2.2.3 of this report, could be used to improve stakeholder involvement.

### 7.4. Guidance from the EU, Integrated Coastal Zone Management Recommendations.

Recommendations from the ICZM can and are being addressed by the current setting up of the Estuary Planning Partnership for the Alde and OreEstuary.

Aspects that are being addressed are:

1. **An integrated strategy** that involves both statutory and non-statutory groups that are attempting to work together to co-operate with the production of an Estuary management plan. (Referred to in 5.3.2 of this report and Appendix 10).
2. **Active involvement** with the formation of a Steering Management group that is proactive in involving the Wider Group and general public (Section 5.3.2. of this report).

3. **Transparency and fairness** is hoped to be achieved by monthly and sometimes twice monthly meetings of the Steering group that allows every member to have an equal say. The terms of reference of the EPP states that no member has precedence over any other. (Referred to in 5.4.2. of this report). There exists awareness that the process needs transparency, to aid trust between members.

4. **Information and Knowledge** is to be shared in meetings and in the production of a website, for the EPP that includes data from all Agencies and Groups. An aim is to produce plain English documents on legislation and planning for the estuary (Referred to in 5.4.2. of this report). A voluntary consultant has joined the Steering Group and is advising on different methods of consultation.

5. **Potential Conflict** is to be expected and resolved without members of the Steering group leaving. Attitudes and personality conflict needs careful management. Within the group there is a commitment to make the process work. This aim should help to resolve conflict before situations become irreconcilable. Conflict between the Steering Group the Wider Group and general members of the local communities need to be averted by careful consultation planning. The Environment Agency and Planning Partnership are having a joint forum for the launch of the planning group and flood defence strategy consultation (5.4.3.). The more involved and well informed people feel the less likely the outcome to plans will be conflict and the less likely the NIMBY response (Clarke, 1994; Webler, 1995.)

6. **Close Working** with Statutory and Non-statutory groups should be achievable within the Steering Group who will outreach to other stakeholders.

7. **Respect** of the special character of the area was identified by external visitors from the US/UK Exchange. The area also has a designation for an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and it is a European Marine Site with areas of SSSI. One of the reasons people have such a resistance to change in the area is because of its special character. This is generally understood. Respect of other
members in the Planning partnership can be more easily achieved with greater involvement and contact through monthly meetings and planning for future developments.

8. **Resources** to help fund the EPP are forthcoming from the Statutory Agencies. English Nature has designated £2000 in this financial year and will contribute more in the future. There are plans to chase more finance. There are several voluntary members of the Steering Group who are giving their time and skills to make the process work. The Statutory agencies are allowing their representatives the time and some resources to make the EPP work.

9. **A long term Commitment** is what is hoped that the EPP will have. It is the intention for the partnership to be a permanent group that represents the interests of the area and plans for future changes. The Management Plan (Appendix 10), is at the centre of future planning.

10. **It is hoped to be a partnership at all levels.** Present plans are: the consultation through leaflet/questionnaire for support from local people; a forum to launch the EPP and the EA new flood control strategy plan for the area together; using the website to publish estuary monitoring data; looking into helping form a coastal observatory for the Suffolk or East Anglian Coastline; the production of plain English guides for relevant legislation and estuary plans.

The solution to planning for coastal areas could be the formation of an Estuary Planning Partnership. Certainly it brings together different agencies and groups to share information and ideas. Greater transparency in the information used for decision making will improve trust in the process and respect of decision makers. However there is still the issue of participation for the wider public. Realistically people want involving when it affects them personally. (FR, 2003: EN, 2003). If the Planning Partnership can achieve the role of improving relationships between statutory agencies, between statutory and non-statutory groups and between both of these and other public stakeholders then greater participation could be achievable for coastal planning.
CHAPTER 8.

Conclusions.

8.1. Overall Conclusions of this Study.

One of the main aims of this report has been to review issues of concern from the literature that will inhibit improved public participation in coastal environmental planning and decision making. Recognition of the issues concerned with democracy, decision making, trust, respect and conflict has been used to signify what was important to stakeholders from interviews. As the concerns were identified and categorised by stakeholder it was possible to recognise the problems of the original case study. When problems were identified it was possible to make recommendations for better practice.

The Planning partnership idea would seem to solve some of the main issues of concern to improve public participation. It allows for trust and respect to build up in the closer relationship between statutory and non-statutory agencies, also providing outreach to members of local groups.

It has the potential to allow for some decision making and enabling earlier involvement through planning meetings. Direct feedback can be sought from groups participating in the partnership.

The main problem, identified in this study, is the issue of empowerment. There has to be some mechanism for the transference of power (Roberts, 1995), for non-statutory groups to be involved in decision making or at least be content with an advisory role. It could be argued that being involved could be enough to satisfy democracy and the final decision should be made with those with the expertise and political power to legitimise the decision.
A review of the techniques for both consultation and participation in coastal management plans showed that stakeholders were mostly familiar with consultation methods. It was therefore difficult to assess the effect of improved public participation from the case study because few people had experience of the different methods, except Planning Partnerships. This method was in progress and became the emphasis of the analysis for improved participation.

The Planning Partnership idea as demonstrated in the present case study was applied to guidance from the UN, EU and World Bank. Many of the criteria needed for improved participation was shown to be included in the Partnership idea. It is therefore the main recommendation of this report that Planning Partnerships should be considered as a way to achieve improved public participation in coastal management planning.

8.2. Recommendations for further study.

1. It could be that the other methods of public participation like Citizens Juries, Planning Cells and Citizens Advisory Groups are not be so relevant to coastal planning and possibly why they have not yet been used. If and when they do, further research is needed.

2. Other areas have Planning Partnerships for coastal areas. It would be useful to see how many of the original ones have survived and why. A study of how other Partnerships operate could be compared with the current plans for the Alde/Ore. Information from other Partnerships would aid its setting up and long term survival. A recent article in a publication called ‘Coastnet’ has a special article on Partnerships in the Severn and Forth estuaries. It would appear to be an idea that it being adopted more widely and needs serious consideration.
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Appendix 1

Annex 1 EU Directives for Provisions for Plans and Programmes Referred to in Article 3. To include Amendment to EIA Directive (Article 2).


(c) Article 5 (1) of Council Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources.


(e) Article 14 of Council directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste.


(g) Article 14 of Council directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of waste.

Extract from Amendment of EIA Directive (Article 2)

6.2.1. Objective.

Article 6 of the Aarhus Convention makes provision in respect of public participation in decisions on the specific activities listed in Annex 1 of the Convention and on activities not so listed WHICH MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
Appendix 2  Location Maps

Map 1  Location of Alde & Ore Estuary in UK

Map 2  Location of Alde & Ore Estuary in Suffolk
Appendix 4a Map to show change from “hold the line” to managed realignment or retreat at Slaughden.
Appendix 4b  Proposed change in designation to realignment of defences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>Critical Time</th>
<th>Defence Length</th>
<th>Defended Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldeburgh Marshes</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>3670 m</td>
<td>154 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Strategic Issue</th>
<th>Slevel</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hold the line increases the cost of defence for little economic value of assets protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant element in achieving balance of intertidal habitat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue affecting Strategy</th>
<th>Significance and Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area closely associated with Aldeburgh. Need to examine in closer detail possible impacts of policy. Review strategy subject to feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review local social impacts and potential compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue affected by Strategy</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impacts on the lower section of the estuary. Assumed reduction in pressure on FC 10b. It is assumed that adequate habitat compensation can be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assume strategy conditions. This will be resolved as part of the Slaughters Bend Study. Assumes likely results of ongoing management negotiations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Issues</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets to rear of compartment have important social and economic bearing on Aldeburgh</td>
<td>Visually important area</td>
<td>Compensation as part of strategic benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential overtopping storage area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for managed habitat re-creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational area and foreshores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term approach</th>
<th>Long term approach (to be applied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain existing defences, while detailed investigations undertaken.</td>
<td>Managed re-alignment, subject to findings of detailed studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5  Semi-structured interview questions

Interview questions for methods used and those that could be considered for public participation in coastal management planning.

**Question 1.** Name:
**Question 2.** Organisation:
**Question 3.** Responsibility within organisation:
**Question 4.** Discussion of types of sea defences/coastal management preferred and why. Coastal Management strategies: Do Nothing  Hold the line Advanced and Managed retreat
Defences: Groynes, Sea wall, rip rap, gabions, revetments, beach recharge.

**Question 5.** Types of reports produced? Examples SEA (areas/regions) EIA project specific?
Types of reports used?

**Question 6.** Methods of Consultation/participation
Please use list of methods of consultation / participation.
Which of these methods have you used? (Please tick)
Which of these methods do you think are effective? (a short comment beside the ones chosen would be helpful.)
Why do you use some methods and not others?

**Question 7.** What do you consider to be the difference between public consultation and participation?
Do you favour the use of consultation or participation methods? Please explain your reasons.
Please use public participation option sheet. CAC’s, Citizens Juries, Planning Cells, Informal Networks.
Have you considered any of these methods of public participation? (See info. sheet)
Which have you used or seen used?
Why was this method chosen?
Which have not been used?
Why do you think this method was not chosen?
Appendix 6  Prompt list used in interviews

For information
Leaflets
Local newspapers
Television and radio
Video
Exhibitions
Telephone helplines
Newsletters
Advertisements

For information and feedback:
Interviews
Surveys
Site Visits

For consultation:
Public Meetings
Focus groups
Public inquiries

For participation
Community advisory groups / committees
Citizens Juries
Planning cells
Informal networks
Planning partnerships
Appendix 7  Descriptions of participatory methods

Community Advisory Committees/groups.
Involves key members of the local community from interest groups that are affected by the proposal under consideration. Appointed by an authority. Participants do so as individuals not representatives of particular views. Reviews information and formulates recommendations for the decision maker. Group agrees objectives and agenda with an independent chairman. The time period is weeks or months. NO payment for time in the UK. There is no transference of power to decide but recommendations will be taken on board.

Citizens Juries.
Representatives of the public who hear expert evidence and question witnesses. Usually randomly selected and mediated by independent facilitator. Jury members decide the questions to ask to learn and reflect on the issue. At the end of the process they meet to vote and present their recommendations in writing to the decision authority. The time period is usually a few days and sometimes paid. There is no direct interaction between jury and decision makers.

Planning Cells.
Random section of citizens who can be directly or indirectly affected. Use of stakeholders and public officials as witnesses not participants. Evaluation of different decision options in accordance with personal values and preferences to be able to draft recommendations for the decision maker. The time period is a continuous meeting over several days.

Informal Networks.
Local communities and regulatory organisations work in partnerships. Informal networks that come and go. Maintained by informal contact. Formal meetings conducted in round table style with mediator. Gatekeeper coalitions that permit entry and exit of interests. Representative arrangements that establish networks on a local and informal basis.
Appendix 8  Table 2 – The number of times during interviews that issues of concern were discussed by individual organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
<th>Other issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Nature (EN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the River (FR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust (NT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbourne Parish Council (SPC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting Association (RYA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alde/Ore Association (AO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired AO, Orford Town Council (RR)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency (EA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy (CPD)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Coasts and Heaths. (SCH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table  The number of times during interviews that the issues of concern were described in discussion by individual organisations.
## Appendix 9  Table 3 – Issues of Concern for Public Involvement by Statutory and Non-Statutory Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Stakeholder ID</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutory: EA, EN, SCDC, SPC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO. NT, RYA, SCH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Groups. FR, AO, RR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statutory/Consultancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NGO, Local Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10  Proposed Alde and Ore Estuary Management Plan
Appendix 11  Example of parish council questionnaire for consultation exercise

Date:
To: Parish Councils

Consultation on the Formation of the Alde & Ore Estuary Planning Partnership

The Parishes surrounding the Alde & Ore Estuary will be aware of discussions between statutory bodies, businesses and residents on the future of the Alde and Ore Estuary and the surrounding land area.

- In April 2002 the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Project Unit organised an initial meeting of a Local Organising Group.
- As a result a UK/North America Countryside Exchange Team visited the area and presented their report at a public meeting in October 2003.
- The Study Team's main recommendations were that an Estuary Planning Partnership should be created as soon as possible, to include all interests, serve as a communications forum and guide the process of creating a strategic plan.
- The Local Organising Group agreed and has composed the draft terms of reference attached. Local organisations are now being consulted on the next step.

Please send your comments on our proposals to the Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit by [August 31st 2003] using the form below so that the Local Organising Group can consider any views/suggested changes.

If you have any queries regarding this letter and Estuary Planning Partnership then please contact me. Further copies can be sent electronically if you contact [email protected]

Yours faithfully,

Simon Horrocks, Chairman, Local Organising Group for the Alde & Ore Estuary
Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit, Dock Lane, Melton, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP13 9BA. Tel/Fax: 01394 384948

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-mail address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Parish Council Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you support the creation of an Estuary Planning Partnership?</td>
<td>Is the membership of the proposed Estuary Planning Partnership realistic? If not please add a comment below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the membership of the Estuary Planning Partnership realistic? If not please add a comment below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that one person should represent Parish Councils apart from Orford &amp; Alderburgh on the steering group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Does your Parish Council...

Comments: What happens if there is a split decision on this?

Data Protection: If you do not wish your details to be held on a database please tick this box.

Your comments will be stored on our computer for the purposes of implementing the Estuary Planning Partnership, but this information will be destroyed once your comments are no longer of use.

Please return to: Alde & Ore Local Organising Group, c/o Suffolk Coast & Heaths Unit, Dock Lane, Melton, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP13 9BA. Tel/Fax: 01394 384948 e-mail: [email protected]