

Minutes of meeting held 8 February 2010, Charles Darwin House, 12 Roger Street, London WC1N 2JU

Attendance

Policy Committee

Annie Coombs (AC)
 Noel Farrer (NF)
 Ian Phillips (IP)
 Peter Wilder (PW)
 Richard Copas (RC)
 Jane Knight (JK)
 Emily Smyth (ES)
 Paul Tiplady (PT)

Staff

Alastair McCapra (AMc)
 Paul Lincoln (PL)
 Stephen Russell (SR)

Apologies

Clare Brockhurst (CB)
 Val Kirby (VK)
 Emily Smyth (ES)

Item	Report	Action
1	<p>Attendance/apologies</p> <p>As above.</p>	n/a
2	<p>Declarations of interest</p> <p>AC declared that she was a registered commissioner for the Infrastructure Planning Commission.</p>	n/a
3	<p>Minutes of meeting held 14 July 2010</p> <p><u>Item 4.3: Consolidation of PPSs and PPGs into National Planning Policy Framework</u> SR informed the Committee that Communities and Local Government were currently accepting comments on the consolidation of existing PPSs and PPGs into a National Planning Policy Framework. SR invited all members of Policy Committee to submit views.</p> <p>The minutes were subsequently approved as an accurate record of the meeting.</p>	All
4	<p>Why invest in landscape?</p> <p>PL updated Committee on the 'Why invest in landscape?' campaign, launched on 4 February and with the publication being inserted into the Winter edition of Landscape. He highlighted that the document should be seen as a tool for members to lobby their clients and councilors at a local level and that the LI had already received requests from some members for extra copies to enable them to do this. The launch would be followed by a series of events on the subject, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecobuild seminars, 2 March - 'Why invest? The debate', 21 March - Street Design seminars, 30 March <p>PW suggested that the debate should be filmed and placed online. PL agreed to explore this idea.</p> <p>NF suggested that the debate on 21 March should be used to advance the thinking</p>	PL

	<p>outlined in the current document, as this was merely a starting point and that more work was needed on the subject of economic value and landscape.</p> <p>IP suggested that copies should be sent to the leader of each local council. PL advised that this would be considered but that forthcoming local elections in England might mean a delay was necessary.</p> <p>SE advised that national elections in Scotland meant that distribution in that context should be delayed until after June. However as local elections wouldn't be taking place until 2012, circulation to local authorities in Scotland now would not be a problem.</p> <p>ES suggested that the when sending letters to local councilors, the relevant LI branch chair should be mentioned as a contact for local matters.</p> <p>JK advised that management of landscape should be covered in any revised edition of the current document. She also highlighted the need for the LI to consider new types of clients, as a result of the Government's localism agenda: these included community groups and neighbourhood forums.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Responding to Government</p> <p><u>Localism Bill</u></p> <p>PL opened the discussion by explaining that an initial meeting had taken place to discuss the LI's response to the Localism Bill, given that the Bill was now at scrutiny stage and written evidence was being accepted. He suggested that the LI should focus on one particular area of the Bill, and try to find something within it that the organisation could 'own' and on which it could speak with confidence. He suggested that Neighbourhood Planning could be an area of focus for the LI's written evidence.</p> <p>SE suggested that the European Landscape Convention (ELC) could be used as a point of reference from which the LI could make a series of points about the current provisions for Neighbourhood Planning.</p> <p>PT suggested an approach that explored the implications of this legislation on other government policy areas, and vice versa.</p> <p>SE highlighted it was important to ensure that the cumulative impact of Neighbourhood Planning was considered under the proposals within the draft Bill.</p> <p>It was agreed that SR would conduct an initial analysis of the clauses and schedules contained within the Bill against the articles of the ELC. He would then circulate to AC, IP and PT who volunteered to assist.</p> <p><u>Correspondence with ministers</u></p> <p>SR informed the Committee that the LI had been corresponding with ministers, and shadow ministers, on a number of matters include the closure of CAFE Space, the incorrect use of the term 'green infrastructure' and initial thoughts on the Localism Bill.</p> <p><u>Update on CAFE Space</u></p> <p>AMc updated the Committee on discussions surrounding the future of CAFE Space. He highlighted that discussions had taken place prior to Christmas with RTP1 and RIBA on how any voids, particularly with regards Design Review, might be filled. He informed Committee that the recent announcement of a 'merger' with the Design Council meant that these discussions had now come to an end.</p>	<p>SR, PT, AC, IP</p>

	<p>NF highlighted that the loss of CAGE Space provided an opportunity for the LI to step in and fill the void in terms of advocacy, research etc. AMc acknowledged this and explained that the LI had already been considering what gaps it could potentially fill.</p> <p><u>Consultations</u> SR highlighted three consultations to which he felt the LI should respond:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Future of the public forest estate in England: deadline 28 March 2011 - Defra guidance to local flooding authorities on sustainable development: deadline 16 February 2011 - National Planning Policy Framework: deadline 28 January 2011 	<p>SR,SE SR, RC SR, IP</p>
6	<p>GI and Localism publication update</p> <p>SR updated the Committee on the work being undertaken on the next publication which would explain in simple language how GI could be delivered in the context of the Government's localism agenda. Case studies had been selected which explained the range of functions performed by GI, and which had taken place at a local scale. An illustrator had been appointed to create what would hopefully become the definitive GI diagram. The aim is to publish the document in time for the next distribution of the Journal – early May 2011.</p>	n/a
7	<p>Proposals for the year ahead/remaining actions in development plan</p> <p>The following items either remain in the development plan for 2010/11 or will feature in the Committee's work plan for the year ahead. They appear here in the order of priority decided by the Committee:</p> <p>(i) <u>ELC Action Plan</u> SR confirmed that the final version of the ELC Action Plan would be complete by the end of April 2011 and required no further input from Policy Committee at this stage.</p> <p>(ii) <u>Good clients guide</u> AC is currently involved in the GI and Localism publication. As a result, work on the Good Clients Guide will not commence until this is in the final stages of completion. CB will also be a member of the working group on this project. It was agreed that this would be a useful project to include members from outside of the Committee as a way of succession planning. SR informed the Committee that he had already been in touch with some members regarding possible involvement but that it would be appropriate to communicate this opportunity to all members.</p> <p>(iii) <u>Major infrastructure projects</u> While other subject areas remain from the development plan, the increasing importance of major infrastructure projects, for example, energy generation and high-speed rail, was agreed as higher priority and one that should be tackled by the Committee. It was recognised that experience in this area from within the Committee was somewhat lacking and that it would be sensible to use this as an opportunity to engage with members with expertise in this subject. RC did however agree to play a role in this area.</p> <p>(iv) <u>Land Use Futures – urban agriculture/agriculture, education, health</u> SR outlined the potential role that could be played by Foresight's Land Use</p>	<p>SR</p> <p>AC/CB/SR</p> <p>tbc</p>

	<p>Futures report. He explained the background to the project and the importance it attaches to multifunctional land use in meeting a wide range of challenges in the future. Its purpose, to help Government think strategically about the future, would make it a useful point of reference to help ensure that the work of the Landscape Institute is relevant and thinks about the issues of importance. It was suggested that a working group be established from within the Committee to analyse the report, and decide which areas should be priority for the Committee. This would be a way of dealing with issues still on the development plan (health and education) plus SR's suggestion that food production would be of increasing importance</p> <p>NF – reserve right to change mind and be flexible in light of changing political agendas. EH - water and waste</p>	
8	<p>Committee make-up and devolved nations representation</p> <p>NF – outstanding issue surround Welsh representation JK – new audience for the LI in the form of local communities AC – NF to email all existing members of Policy Committee asking them to inform which areas of work for the year ahead they will commit too.</p>	
9	<p>Proposed new post</p> <p>The following comments were made in response to proposals put forward by AMc and PL to create a new post at the Landscape Institute which would deal with policy consultations at a devolved nation level as well as helping the organisation respond to the rising localism agenda. The following comments were made by members of Committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NF: advocacy at a local level was necessary to reflect the new localism agenda - JK: concerns that the post will be spread too thinly across a range of different responsibilities - EH: there should be 50 per cent devolved nation responsibility - SE: must be in response to clearly identified issues and was unsure that this was the case at this stage. SE also expressed concerns at how effective work would be on matters concerning the devolved nations when the post was based in London. <p>AC asked that any further comments should be sent to her in advance of the next Council meeting on 15 February where the subject would be discussed further. AMc and PL advised that they would take these comments into consideration in refining further the proposals for a new post.</p>	
10	<p>AOB</p> <p>SR informed the Committee that he would be meeting with a researcher from the Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology.</p>	
11	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>SR confirmed that, in line with recent email correspondence with members of the</p>	

	Committee, the next meeting would take place on Tuesday 7 June 2010 at 12:30pm.	
--	---	--