

Document Reference (click arrow to select from list)	Table/Appendix and/or Sub Para number	Matters Identified by Members	Action Required	Action Type	Comment provided by:	Response from team	Action Taken	Section Amended (New para nos and Table nos used in this column)	SMP Review	Comment provided by:	Date comment provided
SMP	General	The CSG appears to have settled upon North Norfolk as the name of this SMP, despite possible confusion with NNDCC SMP. I would map to include the national SMP map. National map is available.	The CSG should consider including the national SMP map and using the associated national SMP numbering. Consider inclusion.	Addition to document.	Steve Jenkinson	The next SMP is called Kelling to Lowestoft	no change	No action taken.	QRG Review continues on next line in column F		
Non Tech Summary	PDZ maps	Assuming these are the maps to be used in conjunction with the policy statements, I do not think these are at all adequate. The background is too faint to be readable, hence it is not possible to readily identify key towns and other features which are described in the Policy Statement discussions. Also the key includes a legend for internationally designated sites and breach location but on the map I reviewed I could not see these. Finally the PDZ boundaries for PDZ 2 are confusing.	I suggest the CSG consider overhauling these maps which are a key part of the communication process, and will be available for use on the web, for example.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	National team has advised that an up to date National map of all SMPs is not currently available to include in the main document.	None	No action taken.	I assume that the current out-of-date version has been removed.	Steve Jenkinson	24-Sep-10
Non Tech Summary	PDZ3 maps	The maps show PDZs 3A i to iii. The Main document includes five zones and uses a different numbering style.	Please clarify and make these consistent.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	See above	amended	Maps used to support policy statements will also be used in NTS	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Figure 2.1 (94), Figure 3.1 (44)	No OS Licence is cited	Lead authority to check whether correct OS licence agreement is in place.	Please confirm.	Lee Swift	Note in latest draft to include this on OS based maps	amended	OS licence now shown on all relevant maps.	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	General Point	Several spelling errors and missing full stops.	Please review and amend text.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Will be checked thoroughly before disseminating final plan	amended	All documents will be edited before final versions published	QRG Review continues on next line in column F		
Main Doc.	General Point	Please complete action			E Fisher	This action will be completed when final SMP and appendices submitted in advance of RD sign-off.	Relevant documents amended as necessary	To be sent with final submission (early October)	Satisfied that this will be completed for final version.	E Fisher	17-Sep-10
Main Doc.	General Point	Without OS Maps, some of the location references are not known.	Include detailed location map into the Main Document.	Document change required.	E Fisher	More maps to be included (see my comments on latest draft to follow)	added maps	Fig 1.2 enlarged to show all locations in SMP area	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	glossary	The definition for adaptation includes for habitats and communities, yet there is an emphasis in many places towards communities.	Can the team please amend the table to be more general?	Document change required.	Jim Hutchinson	Are we planning to amend this definition?	amended	Definition amended	Satisfied	Jim Hutchinson	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	glossary	Some 'technical' terms are used in the plan and not in the glossary. Includes: ebb estuary, brackish, super-frontage.	Lead authority to consider adding more terms to the glossary	Document change required.	Lee Swift	Have also added bathymetry, biodiversity, conservation area, control point, damage, Deverlan, geodiversity, GAP, grey dunes, heritage assets, historic environment, HER, inland management, longshore economy, mitigation, policy package, super-frontage, tidal exchange, tidal range, till.	amended	Glossary	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Overall	Overall, an excellent introduction.	None.	None.	E Fisher			Introduction improved with more relevant information	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.20	Figure 2.2 - shows Natural Defence from Hunstanton to Holme next the Sea. Review of Futurecoast snap maps shows a seawall and groyne.	Update figure and/or Superfrontage WPM and NAI accordingly.	Document change required.	E Fisher	There is no sea wall in the frontage from the end of Hunstanton cliffs (boundary of SMP) to Holme next the Sea. The dunes here have gabion baskets and dragon teeth facing to stabilise them with groynes on the beach.	improved figure 2.2, which shows that there are indeed structures along this section shown as red dots. Policy development has been based on what's really out there.	See table F2.6 - analysis of defences - in appendix F for confirmation	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.25 cross-section	The phrase 'longshore economy' is confusing, this is a cross-section diagram with a longshore reference.	Could 'longshore economy' be changed to 'economy'?	Document change required.	E Fisher	Longshore economy now defined in glossary	amended	Glossary revised	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.3 and pp.55 onwards	Cops or non-cops for HTL, MR, ATL and MR	Please be consistent.	Document change required.	E Fisher	EA to check for consistency	amended	Draft final SMP and appendices on which QRG commented already checked. Remaining appendices will be checked before submitting for approvals.	QRG Review continues on next line in column F		
Main Doc.	p.31	Action to be completed			E Fisher	This action will be completed when final SMP and appendices submitted in advance of RD sign-off.	Relevant documents amended as necessary	To be sent with final submission (expected early October)	Satisfied that this will be completed for final version.	E Fisher	17-Sep-10
Main Doc.	p.34	Reference to 'grey' dunes.	If defined in the report of Appendices, please make reference to it, please add brief description of what they are.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Added to glossary	amended	Glossary revised	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.34	With Present Management. For epoch two there is not a distinction between the area of natural defence and where there is defence. For example, the 'dunes would need to be reinforced with a harder defence line'. For the natural section, would this mean new defences.	Distinguish between defended and undefended areas in text.	Document change required.	E Fisher	This is correct and the reason we have suggested a slightly different SMP policy from SMPF for this frontage over the long term	amended in 2.3.2.	Text in section 2.3.2 amended to make this clearer	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.45	Second to last paragraph, first sentence. Agreed by whom?	Please verify.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Environment Agency and Natural England	EA and NE; text added	Text in section 3.1 amended	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.48	Figure 3.1 shows the flood extents for all three epochs. Much of the saltmarsh remains unconfined even into the year 2100 - it is assumed that this is 'with existing defences scenario'.	Please clarify in the legend if this is a 'with existing defences' scenario.	Document change required.	E Fisher	This figure still needs a lot of improvement	No saltmarsh is outside defined floodzone but obviously does flood. Added text to explain in 3.2 (ref to figure). Note, scenario has no impact on flood risk area because this is the same with and without defences.	Figure 3.1 revised	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Page 76	Should 'undertaker' read owner?	Please verify.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Changed in relevant policy statements	amended	Policy statements for PDZ 2B and 2E amended	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	PDZ Summary Statements	The PDZ statements contain a note on the difference to SMP1 which is helpful.	Could the CSG add a simple summary table comparing the SMP1 and SMPF policies, summarising the reasons for the difference where appropriate?	Consider addition to the document.	Steve Jenkinson	Ask CS/EMF if they want this	added note for CS/EMF to consider.	Table 4.1 added	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	photos throughout main plan document	The photos in the draft plan document have no figure numbers. This may have been done on purpose to improve presentation but I felt that figure numbers would make specific locations easier to reference in the text. References could also be made to earlier photos / locations in the policy statements.	Lead authority to consider using standard citation format (i.e figure numbers) for all photos.	Consider document change.	Lee Swift	Not included in latest version. Are we planning to do this?	the text does not refer to the photos, they have been included for illustration only. Suggest no change.	All photos numbered	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Plan doc: section 1.2 or section 2.1	Although (sometimes) described in glossary and in parts elsewhere, there is no overview / definition of the spatial units used in the plan. [L8] The use of the term "Super Frontages" along this coast requires a definition in the Glossary of Terms. Please add "Super Frontages" to the Glossary. It would also be useful to include a paragraph to explain the relationship between the terms PDZs and Frontage Units. Finally, please add a PDZ overview plan for ease of reference - possibly at the start of Section 4. [P9]	Lead authority to consider adding a summary table to define spatial units (plan area- super-frontage- PDZ) [L8]. Please add "Super Frontages" to the Glossary. It would also be useful to include a paragraph to explain the relationship between the terms PDZs and Frontage Units. Finally, please add a PDZ overview plan for ease of reference - possibly at the start of Section 4. [P9]	Document change required.	Lee Swift Phil Perkins	1. Super-frontage now added to glossary. 2. Super-frontage now added to glossary. 3. PDZ overview maps now included in final SMP. Inadvertently omitted from draft.	Added terms in glossary. Added map of PDZs (Figure 4.1).	Glossary amended and policy maps added	Satisfied	Lee Swift Phil Perkins	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	plan document: section 4	The Policy Appraisal Results tables summarise (usefully) the impacts of the draft policy upon each of the SMP priorities. But I sometimes noticed a red symbol and wanted to know more - exactly what the impact and what can be done to mitigate against this. These aspects are probably addressed in the appendices but are not always clear in the accompanying text within the plan document.	Lead authority to consider extending the table to show how any rednegative effects can be managed.	Consider document change.	Lee Swift	This would probably be helpful. Not sure that all the red symbols have been commented on in the latest draft, eg PDZ1A in epoch 1?	Have not changed the tables / graphics. Have added text on 'reliance on defences' in one PDZ, awaiting EA confirmation on whether to apply throughout.	Where relevant, all policy statements should now include a comment about red icons	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Policy Statements	The text in the 'What this Means' column is difficult to read	Unjustified text.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Text unjustified in all tables in main SMP and appendices	amended	All tables in main SMP and appendices amended	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Sec 4	The symbology is difficult to read, and is a lot to process - a legend placed alongside the policy statement pictures might help? [AP] In 4.1 Introduction (pages 53-55) - there is a clear explanation of the schematic diagrams and symbols. Subsequent references should refer to pages 53-55 not just page 53. There should also be an explanation of the "adaptation to communities" symbol (what do the four symbols represent). This symbol is confusing especially when each of the four symbols represented can change colour individually depending on the effect on the principle. [P9]	Please consider adding the symbol legend at each policy unit set of symbols. [AP] Please consider adding a 'pull-out' reference chart for pages 53-55, as this would assist when reading through the various PDZs to understand the symbols rather than constantly referring back to these pages. [P9]	Consider document change.	A Parsons Phil Perkins	1. Each policy statement gives page number where definitions of symbols can be found. 2. Considered.	no change	No change made	Satisfied	A Parsons Phil Perkins	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Section 1.2	Text on p5 describes the extended study area - a map showing this area may help reader understand extent of the area.	Lead authority to consider	Consider document change.	Lee Swift	Figure 1.2 shows extent of tidal flood zone. Coastal strip and hinterland defined in section 1.2	map amended to show this, note that the hinterland is whatever is landward of the floodzone, and has no firm inland boundary itself. Therefore not included.	No change made	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Section 1.3.2 (9)	Many references to 'Key Stakeholders'. Should this be 'stakeholders' to be more inclusive and remove chance of 'non-key' stakeholders from being alienated / feeling less important?	Lead authority to consider	Consider document change.	Lee Swift	Appendix B amended by EA Area Comm Business partner to show different "levels" of stakeholders. Still call main stakeholders "key" when referring to the group that meets on a regular basis.	ok	App B clarifies this	Satisfied: QRG to note in any reviews of guidance - consistency issues with other SMPs	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Section 2.1.1	Description of super-frontage extents could be confusing as different locations are used for the end of one S-F and the start of the next S-F.	Needs to be made clearer - either by using same location or explaining why they are different (e.g. in opposite sides of estuary).	Document change required.	Lee Swift	Please refer to Fig 2.1 as showing extent of SFs. This also needs to be a bigger map - my comments on latest draft will follow	Amended in section 2.1.1 and appendices, where relevant.	Satisfied	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	section 2.2	The x-sections are a good idea to see visually what assets are involved, etc. and will assist stakeholders and the public. [LH] I suggest the use of the cross sections to both inform and create interest. For future reference I am not sure that the dimension lines below adding anything that would not be covered by a simple list. [S3]	The location of defences on these are not clear [maybe none?] but if they are, it might be useful to set out the zone of possible realignment? [LH]	Consider document change.	Jim Hutchinson Steve Jenkinson	CSG, EMF and KSG are happy with cross-sections	No change made	Satisfied	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Section 3.2	It would be useful to have a reference to where the SEA is in the SMP document here.	Add reference.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Done	amended	Section 3.2, para 2 amended	Satisfied	E Fisher	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Section 4	Neighboring PDZs 2J and 2K have the same draft policy option. Should they be merged into one PDZ in line with Defra SMP guidance? (for QRG - is this correct?)	Lead authority to consider.	CSG to comment and consider possible change.	Lee Swift	No as they protect different things	no change	No change made	Satisfied	Lee Swift	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Section 4	PDZ 3A is in five parts and has various policies proposed - the statement under 'Changes from Present Management' in this section is very vague.	This section requires a some further work to improve clarity.	Document change required.	Phil Perkins	More text added	amended	This section revised for PDZ3A	Satisfied	Phil Perkins	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Fig 2.3	It would be worth adding a couple of words to introduce the SLR plots given that they are all round the country.	Suggest extra text.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	SLR text and new figure added to show HDR at Lowestoft	amended.	Section 2.1.6 completely revised	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	Glossary of Terms	Terms "tidal exchange", "control point".	Suggest adding to Glossary.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Added to glossary	amended	Glossary updated	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.2	Aim of SMP to develop an "intent of management".	I would prefer to avoid introducing yet another phrase - can we not say the same thing in plain English?	Suggest re-wording.	Steve Jenkinson	Term now defined in glossary		Glossary updated	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.4 Fig 1.2	The inclusion of CFMP boundaries is useful. However, overall the base mapping is unclear and does not allow the easy identification of key locations such as towns and rivers. Also Cromer is mentioned in the text above which is off the map altogether - I suggest noting that Cromer is to the east of the SMP area.	Please reconsider the use of what looks like a road map as the background for this important scene-setting plan.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Figure 1.2 improved.	maps improved	Section 1.2 amended	QRG Review continues on next line in column F		
Main Doc.	p.4 Fig 1.2	Clarity still not that good.	Any ready alternatives?		Steve Jenkinson	OS base map has been used to introduce this SMP as it has for the other SMPs in Anglian Region. This shows the location of settlements and features of interest that could affect SMP policy. Figure 2.1 also clearly shows the outfalls of the main rivers running through the SMP area and the extent of the North Norfolk SMP. The SMP project area will be shown on this figure. The relevant text will be changed to make it clear that this is different from the SMP study area, which extends further inland.	Figure 2.1 amended to clearly show the extent of the North Norfolk SMP area along the coast. Labels for neighbouring SMPs changed to show new numbering system. Flood zones re-drawn to show tidal and fluvial separately and inland boundary of SMP project area now shown on this figure.	Figure 1.2 and section 1.2	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	24-Sep-10
Main Doc.	p.48 Fig 1	This map is too busy to allow the key data being presented to be identified, especially the properties and defences. Also there is a typo in the key - 1055.	This map needs to be re-worked in some way to improve clarity.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson		in progress	All policy maps revised	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.5 1.3.1 part 2	"The SMP is mainly the..." does not read well and seems to be at odds with the partnership approach.	Suggest re-wording.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended	ok	Section 1.3.1 amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	p.x	Definition of Defra in Glossary is incorrect.	Please amend.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Glossary amended	Glossary amended	Glossary amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	PDZ 2i p.86	Summary table What this Means - should we be talking about socio-economic assets?	Please consider the wording.	Document change.	Jim Hutchinson	Socio-economic assets are mentioned in introductory text for each PDZ	ok	No change made	Satisfied	Jim Hutchinson	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	PDZ 2i p.83	Comment on appraisal in advance of works okay, but next sentence states "process will need to achieve landowner agreement" - which process? and "demonstrate negative impacts are acceptable and manageable" - to whom, landowners, households? This starts to suggest that nothing will be done unless everyone is content, which of course is unlikely to be the case.	Please consider the wording.	Document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Managed realignment over private land cannot go ahead without the agreement of the landowner. Negative effects need to be mitigated through communication and possible adaptation - action plan includes actions to do this where relevant.		MR policy for this PDZ now removed from final SMP following comments during consultation period.	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Main Doc.	PDZ Summary Tables - What This Means column	As a member of the public or stakeholder I would go to this to get the "easy to understand" version. However, they do not generally contain any comments or caveats about affordability. Wouldn't this be the ideal location to make appropriate comments?	Could the CSG consider adding something on affordability to these tables.	Consider document change.	Jim Hutchinson	Each SF introductory statement now contains caveats about affordability where relevant	ok	Sections 4.2,4.3 and 4.4 amended	Satisfied	Jim Hutchinson	27-Aug-10
Main Doc.	Text Box 2.1	I think this text box is helpful - breaks the text and makes the report more accessible.	None.	N/A	Steve Jenkinson		ok	Satisfied	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
General		The North Norfolk SMP area has very diverse issues but in general the draft document is a straightforward document to read. This will be appreciated by the public and professionals will also have the added supporting evidence provided in the appendices.	No action.	N/A	Phil Perkins		ok	Satisfied	Satisfied	Phil Perkins	18-May-10
Appendix B	Page B18	Residents is to be read and started with no explanation. It is also indicated in the 'Analysis' column that the Residents have a low influence. Concerned about implication of stating that the residents have a 'low-influence' on the decision making.	Please clarify the meaning of red text and the asterix. Consider use of 'low' influence.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Stakeholder analysis removed from appendix B	ok	Appendix B amended	Satisfied	Andy Parsons	18-May-10
Appendix B	Whole document	I thought this generally read well but a couple of comments: pp. 85, 86. If those who have to involve are statutory consultees then I suggest you say this, in order to distinguish from those you need to involve p. 81 seems odd to include a comment about treating farmers with due care.	Text changes.	Consider document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended	ok	Appendix B amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Appendix C	Fig C3.1	Potentially a good graphic but currently let down by the illegible legend.	Could the CSG improve the text to make it readable?	Document change required.	Steve Jenkinson	Figure improved		Fig C3.1 amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Appendix C	General	This appendix contains a lot of relatively detailed process information, but no summary of the key issues that need to be taken forward to influence the policy option decision-making process. Unless this is somewhere else in the SMP I suggest a conclusion for this appendix would be extremely helpful.	The CSG should consider summarising the key findings from this appendix.	Consider document change.	Steve Jenkinson	Summary of this appendix appears in main SMP document		Section C1 amended to say where summary of this appendix appears in main SMP	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Appendix C	Whole report	It is not clear where Futurecoast has been referenced in the body of text in Appendix C.	Please could this be clarified in the text?	Document change required.	E Fisher	Futurecoast to include reference to Futurecoast		Section C2.3 amended	Satisfied	Emma Fisher	18-May-10
Appendix G	Page 33	Effect on neighbouring frontages scores 5, which is average. If there are no significant effects would this not score higher?	Further clarification required on how scoring has been awarded would help understanding. Further definition of how the scoring should be undertaken.	Document change required.	E Fisher	Text in table expanded		Table G3.4.2 amended	Satisfied	Emma Fisher	18-May-10
Appendix H	p.H1	Table 3.4 is noted but not referenced.	Helpful to explain where this is covered if not App. H.	Document change required.	Steve Jenkinson	Text amended		Section H1 amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Appendix H	Table 1	Presentation of NAI frontages in Table 1.	It would be helpful to include NAI frontages with no assessment to avoid any ambiguity, such as a single line noting - NAI No Assessment.	Document change required.	Steve Jenkinson	Table amended		Table 1 amended	Satisfied	Steve Jenkinson	18-May-10
Appendix L	p.75 (Landscape)	Either the colour of the assessment box or the wording in the box is incorrect. Currently it is stated to be a minor negative impact, but is coloured to represent a minor positive.	Please amend.	Document change required.	Karl Fuller	RH to amend		Changes to app L to be included in post-adoption statement	Satisfied	Karl Fuller	27-Aug-10