

## **Minutes of Newborough Liaison Partnership Meeting**

---

7 – 9 pm Wednesday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2006, Ysgol Niwbwrch

### **Purpose of the meeting**

- To check the progress in task and finish groups, resolve any issues arising
- Create a long list of possible criteria against which to 'test' emerging options
- Consider how to improve engagement and consultation from here on

### **Summary of meeting outcomes**

*(for use by the Involvement and Partnership group, and by all members of the liaison partnership to update their 'constituencies')*

Each Task and Finish groups continue to make progress working up the range of options for the future of the Forest and Warren. The Liaison Partnership started to consider possible criteria for assessing options to see which, if any, are agreed by all Liaison Partnership members. More work needs to be done on these.

The Liaison Partnership also discussed the importance of communication and engagement, and set up a new group to oversee gathering views and consultation from here on. The Partnership area on the FC website has been re-vamped, it now includes the summaries and press coverage. All members of the Liaison Partnership need to play a part in spreading the word and we need to review how at the next meeting.

The next Liaison Partnership meeting is on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2006 at Newborough School.

Contact: Robert Williams, [robert.williams@forestry.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:robert.williams@forestry.gsi.gov.uk), 07775818958

### **Attending the meeting:**

Participants: Lindsey Colbourne (independent facilitator), Kate Evans (Residents of Dwyran), Anne Harrington-Rees (Newyddion Niwbwrch), Simon Hunt (Anglesey County Council), Hefin Lloyd Roberts (Cerddwyr Ynys Mon Ramblers), Wil Sandison (CCW), John Tripp (CPRW), Michael Webb, Liz Webb (Newyddion Niwbwrch), Robert Williams (FCW), Chris Edwards (FCW), Catrin Ellis (independent facilitator), Rita Farrall (Newborough Forest Preservation Group), Elinor Gwynn (CCW), Ann Hesson (Newborough Forest Preservation Group), Martin Hollingham (hydrology), Laurence Jones (CEH), Nellie Jones (Sefydliad y Merched Niwbwrch), Elizabeth Llanddwyn Jones (Residents interested in Ynys Llanddwyn), Alwyn Jones (Rhosyr Community Council), Hugh Knott (Menter Môn), Jon Levell (FCW), Delyth Owen (Barnardos), Maureen Parry-Williams (Traeth Rhosyr Horseriders Association), Chris Wynne (Wildlife Trust), Dominic Insham, Helena Burrows (Eryri Orienteering), Kath McNulty (FCW coordinator)

Apologies: Barbara James (Climbing Clubs and Schools otherside of Menai Straits), Simon & Pat Parker, John Ratcliffe (CCW)

<b>Decision</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
New website is welcomed	Manage website and keep it up to date	Nicky	ongoing
Place a notice on the resident's car park notice board about the health & safety work in Forest	Robert to liaise with Liz	Rob to contact Liz	By Friday 3 <sup>rd</sup> Feb
Consider how many more meetings will be required to work through the options	Discuss at next meeting	Habitats and Species Task and Finish group	Next meeting
If new/other issues arise, while still finishing options work, try to accommodate them	Have first set of options finished by Spring 2006, and new issues to be dealt with according to the following procedure: 1) explain options process to proposer 2) do quick sift – appropriate T&F group 3) encourage proposer to put issue through the grid	All T&F groups	From now until Spring 2006
Consider how to deal with new issues in the long term	Need a set of rules about how to deal with new issues	Community I&P group	ongoing
Interpretation Centre – need to decide whether to consider according to options grid or not?	Anne to discuss with Michael & Kath, and consider the information in the "feasibility study"	Anne, Michael, Kath	This month
Please hold on to articles about Newborough LP and the Newborough Forest & Warren appearing in the press	Let Anne or Liz know if you have such an article and allow them to archive a copy if necessary	everyone	ongoing
Do a concise, self-explanatory summary of the work done in your T&F group at each meeting	End of each meeting	All T&F groups	Every meeting
All members of the Liaison Partnership to understand current communication arrangements	Include in the minutes of this meeting a copy of the communications table, for distribution	Kath	When distributing minutes to members & website etc.
Ensure Helena is included on mailing list	Share contact details	Helena & Kath	01.02.06
Set up T&F group to look at consultation	Sign up tonight	Everyone interested	01.02.06
Next Liaison Partnership meeting to include: - review the criteria - review how partnership members communicate with 'constituencies'	Attend	All	13 <sup>th</sup> March 2006

## What criteria would you suggest should be used when assessing whether or not an option is feasible/desirable?

In this task, members of the Liaison Partnership considered what criteria they would recommend for 'sifting' through the options, to reduce them to a more manageable number. A long list of all ideas was created, and members of the group were given coloured dots to indicate which suggestions they particularly strongly supported (up to 4 could be indicated) or not support (up to two could be indicated). The results give an indication of the feeling in the room re: which criteria might be useful or not. More work needs to be done to refine this list.

*Note: These criteria have been rearranged to indicate the level of support for its use.*

*Note: It was noted after the meeting that some criteria might get higher levels of support if turned around – so 'is supported by the general public' did not get much support, but 'does not produce public outcry' might have got much more support.*

<b>Suggested criteria for assessing the options</b>	<b>Answer required would be</b> – (negative) or + (positive)	<b>I would support this being used</b>	<b>I would not support this being used</b>
<b>Supported</b>			
Is it fulfilling the objectives of the partnership (sustainable)	+	18	0
Does it have an adverse effect on the environment	-	13	0
Does it provide economic advantage to the local community	+	7	0
Does it preserve the current facilities	+	7	0
Does it add value to or is it compatible with other accepted uses	+	7	0
Does it create educational opportunities	+	7	0
Does it significantly negatively effect quality of life (eg sound pollution, wind blow)	-	6	0
Is it proven, based on sound evidence	+	5	0
Does it enable risks to be managed	+	3	0
Does it involve potentially damaging operations in the technical sense (eg SSSIs)	-	2	0
Does it restrict access or is it constrained by existing access rights	-	1	0
Is it likely to be accepted by the general public	+	1	0
<b>Mixed support</b>			
Is it legal in terms of health and safety etc	+	4	1
Is it accessible to all age groups, abilities and interests	+	5	4
Does it improve recreational opportunities	+	3	2
Is it economically viable	+	2	2
Is it consistent with by-laws	+	1	4
Does it comply with local planning policy	+	2	8
Is it too complicated, contain too much jargon, create bureaucracy	-	3	9
<b>Not supported</b>			
Is it possible to do it elsewhere	?	0	2
Does it have an exit strategy	+	0	5
Does it preclude other future options (ie stops them from being possible)	-	0	4
Is it able to be carried out straight away	+	0	4
Does it make FC 'sit on the fence'	-	0	5
Is it one that CCW wouldn't like	-	0	7

## Forward timetable (a reminder)

What work needs doing	By when?
Improve communication within the liaison partnership, and to the local community	Now and ongoing
<p>Finish work on options in <b>task and finish groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finish working options through the grids, ensuring benefits/disbenefits are completed</li> <li>- Do any relevant information, opinion and fact finding required to be sure of options, and update options accordingly.</li> <li>- Record any supporting information for each option</li> <li>- Rationalise any duplication within options</li> <li>- Consider whether as a group, there are any options that everyone in the group could support (could live with), and any conditions to that support (eg I would support it if...)</li> <li>- Identify the major points of contention and what underlies these</li> <li>- Draft recommendations to the liaison partnership re:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options to put forward</li> <li>- Key decisions or contentious issues that need to be resolved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	To spring 06
<p>Liaison partnership to have look at options put forward, resolve any duplication and pull together coherent 'scenarios' of feasible futures for the forest and warren area.</p> <p>This would include agreeing and using set of 'criteria' for assessing option feasibility.</p>	Spring 06
Consult on scenarios, including explaining which options have not been included and why. Consultation to include finding out what options are preferable, which downsides are not acceptable etc	Spring/summer 06
Liaison partnership to consider results of consultation and make recommendations on the preferred way forward for the area. This will include trying to engage relevant bodies that could help take ideas forward.	Autumn 06
Work to be undertaken by appropriate bodies (eg forestry commission on the Forest Design Plan). This may be done in consultation with the appropriate task and finish group and/or liaison partnership.	Autumn/winter 06
Action and monitoring, including deciding about the future role of the liaison partnership...	Winter 06 onwards