

PROJECT MEETING NOTES: Draft

MEETING / PROJECT NAME: Catchment Management Group

NOTES PREPARED BY: Jayne Wilkinson

1. ATTENDEES PRESENT

NAME	ORGANISATION/ROLE	EMAIL	TEXT REF
Pete Evoy	SCRT/ CMG Host	pete@scrt.co.uk	PE
Jayne Wilkinson	SCRT/ CMG Secretariat	jayne@scrt.co.uk	JW
Simon Johnson	EA/ Catchment Director	Simon.johnson@environment-agency.gov.uk	SJ
Janet Chapman	SLFAG		JC
Sean Hall	SLDC		SH
Nigel Wilkinson	WLC		NW
Doug Coyle	CCC		DC
Neil Harnott	CWT		NH
John Gorst	UU		JG
Louisa Simpson-Brown	UU		LSB
Christina Worsley	NG		CW
Pete Miles	EA		PM
Chris Evans	EA		CE
Anthony Lane	CCC/ CSFP		AL
John Moffatt	NT		JM
James Anderson Bickley	FC		JAB

2. APOLOGIES

Nicki Rushton (EA), Richard Guzinski (SLFAP), David Sykes (SLDC), Fiona Inston (SLDC), Tim Duckmanton (LDNPA), Rachel Osborn (HE), John Quinton (LEC), Maggie Robinson (NE), Mark Southern (Landowner), Peter Lansberry (SLFAG), Helen Renyard (CCC)

3. AGENDA

1. Welcome & Apologies

2. Projects

- Review of Phase I projects
- Phase II Project Pipeline
 - *Catchment Matrix & Communities at Risk Strategy*

3. Innovation

- NERC/ Q-NFM

4. AOB

4. SESSION

LEAD

Welcome, Apologies and Introductions

Pete welcomed the group to the 6th meeting of the South Cumbria Catchment Management Group. Since the last CMG meeting the Project Working Group has also met; updates from the group will be shared during the meeting.

Actions Arising:

Jayne ran through the actions arising from previous meetings, please see the presentation for a full overview.

- The United Utilities actions are now complete
- **Action: Jayne to speak to Peter Lansberry for an update.**
- All other actions are covered within the rest of the meeting

Strategic Theme 1

Project Working Group Update: Phase I

Pete Evoy presented an update on the Phase I projects, these are defined as those projects which can demonstrate progress in 2018/19. An overview of progress against the 25 projects can be seen on the Becks to Bay website (<https://btob.scrf.co.uk/south-cumbria-catchment-plan/cumbria-floods-partnership/project-progress>). This has now been made public. It is frequently updated, based on contact with individual members to ensure the information is correct. There is also an option on the website to 'drill down' into individual projects to gain a better understanding of which 'phases' it is progressing through. It was noted that there is still scope to develop this, for example to include project leads and project descriptions as well as refining the mechanism for showing which projects may have 'blockers' to delivery. It can be hard to tell on the overview which projects may not be progressing as rapidly as they should; projects are delivered at different timescales some will be short term (few months) where others are longer term (few years) and these longer-term projects may therefore show slower progress over time. At the Project Working Group level it is important that we identify blockers which can then be raised to the CMG/CSFP.

This gives an overview of the 25 Phase I projects which are current, however, we now need to really look at where the CMG can add value.

Doug Coyle questioned the term 'current' on the CSFP spreadsheet, as this is quite open, a more definitive term would be preferable. It was also questioned how the 25 projects on our Phase I list relate to the CSFP spreadsheet. Jayne Wilkinson clarified that the lists should be the same; projects with a 'current' status on the CSFP spreadsheet equate to our 'Phase I' list, all the other projects on the CSFP spreadsheet fall into Phase II which is what we are now working to develop. Our South Cumbria projects spreadsheet just helps to split this out further and enables us to more easily track progress on the Phase I projects as a group.

Grange-Over-Sands Presentation: James Anderson Bickley:

A copy of the presentation is attached.

10 houses and 6 businesses flood here every year. Pete Miles questioned if it's always flooded (historically) are we actually going to be able to solve the issues here and what are the opportunities. James Anderson Bickley believes there's a whole range of things we can do, including a mix of NFM and urban NFM to hold back water. Doug Coyle highlighted that there were further difficulties associated with coordinating it with the tides.

James Anderson-Bickley highlighted that none of the traditional funding schemes, such as land management schemes, were suited in this instance, so there was/is very little incentive for the landowners

to engage. Therefore, we need to re-double our efforts as a partnership to try and secure funding to deliver in this area.

Phase II Pipeline

Decision Support Tool: Community Matrix

At the last meeting of the CMG the group commented on the flooding matrix which was presented at the time and discussed how we prioritise communities to focus discussions and delivery. The group felt that more information was required before a decision could be made and a matrix format was suggested. Therefore, a community matrix has been developed, with input from the Project Working Group. The matrix along with how this was developed was presented to the group for comment and the following questions were asked:

1. Have we included the right columns?

Nigel Wilkinson raised that the number of properties flooded was included but questioned if this also included businesses. Jayne Wilkinson thought that it probably just included households, however, if the data was available we could also include businesses. Pete Miles also noted that businesses are not well represented on the EA funding calculator and so we should make sure they are represented here.

Action: Pete Miles to see if he can source data on flooded businesses.

John Moffatt also raised that Local Parish Councils should be consulted as they hold the historic knowledge. It was also suggested that maybe we start with a couple as a trial.

Jayne to look into options for Parish Councils contributing.

Doug Coyle questioned how this works alongside the CSFP projects list? Jayne Wilkinson clarified that the two should work together, the community matrix once agreed will support decisions on where to focus. From this we can then look at the CSFP projects list to see which projects are on the list above these communities and either look at how we deliver these (i.e. what the blockers are), or if there are any gaps and opportunities. This helps inform discussions by the group and allows us to bring in other relevant partners/ individuals/ community representatives as appropriate to each area.

John Moffatt suggested looking at how the different tools are searched – i.e. is it by parish/ catchment/ town to ensure they are all the same. Chris Evans has been looking into developing this further to simplify the process and hold all the information in one searchable spreadsheet.

2. Do you agree with the three-point scoring system?

3. Do you feel the weightings are appropriate at this stage?

In general, it was agreed that as a first point of sifting the scoring system is absolutely fine, and the weightings allow you to look at different scenarios as needed.

Community Matrix Strategy:

A communities at risk strategy was proposed, this centered around the idea that the CMG 'enables' and therefore, has a role in more complex catchments with a longer-term timeframe and is place-based. The PWG as deliverers could focus on some of the smaller scale, short/medium term projects which are feasible and include some of the quicker wins. The final part to the strategy is support by the CMG to the PWG to deliver the Phase I projects which are already underway. The following general responses regarding the strategy and matrix were received:

- Are there enough planning bodies/ individuals represented on the CMG (e.g. LDNPA/ SLDC)? If we are going to be a body for change and resolving 'blockers' we need a mechanism. How many of us have the ability to get around blockers? (John Gorst) For example, World Heritage Status and how this may affect the planning process, other members stated that they had come across this on other projects. It was questioned whether a planner on the group would make a difference and suggested that we need to lobby to progress landscape change (Doug Coyle).
- Does this work then inform our plan for the catchment? If so it should feed into the Local Plan to help influence future development and landscape changes (Doug Coyle).
- It was hoped that members are reporting outcomes of the CMG within their organisations (Simon Johnson). However, it was questioned whether the group can have any weight behind this.
- Is this matrix being used at Cumbria level as we need a matrix to define flood risk and priorities going forward (John Moffatt). Pete Evoy clarified that no it currently isn't; not all the CMG's had taken the same route to develop and therefore were at different stages. Although, we appreciate that some people have to go to all three meetings. However, if the system works and people agree to adopt it then it could be shared with the other two CMGs. There is a framework to share this through the CMG Steering Group.
- Simon Johnson emphasized that we are trying to create an agenda for action, and this is the first version. We have to start the process to be able to answer some of the questions from organisations/ communities/ individuals such as why are we doing things here? How are we tackling the bigger problems?

Breakout session: *review the matrix and comment around the following questions*

1. Do you agree with the proposed strategy?
2. Provide you top priorities for enablement (1-2 communities)
3. Based on the prioritization which communities do we (CMG) commission the PWG to focus on? (8-10 options).

The following responses were received;

- It would be good for the Project Working Group to focus on a couple of things, firstly 2-3 smaller communities/ projects which are more deliverable. Secondly, at least 1 larger catchment scale (generally the darker red issues on the matrix), however, having the resources to look at a whole catchment could be difficult. It is often easy to lose sight of the fact that these issues are catchment scale issues. It would be good for the PWG to consider a mix of project types, e.g. some looking at NFM and others infrastructure (weirs/ in-river works/ restoration of headwaters) this could allow us to call on engineers when needed (as engineers aren't going to advise about bio-diversity gain).
- Group 1: in general, agree with the strategy. Think CMG enablement should be for a whole catchment, the Kent was mentioned as being interesting due to the relatively short reach from source to sea. It should also be taken to the PWG to decide which communities they think they could tackle.
- Group 2: agree with what was said by Group 1. A larger project would be good with some smaller projects. Could also look at landowner feasibility, such that an area with only a few landowners may be easier. Landowners wasn't included on the matrix. Should also give consideration to planning constraints, for example, projects within the National Park may need to allow for longer timeframes.
- Group 3: Broadly in agreement with the principles, but it needs re-finishing. Not all the evidence in the matrix is factually correct and there are some gaps. Windermere and Bowness should be split, as there could be different flooding issues, and this may affect priorities and opportunities. However, we need to get on and deliver. A mix of small scale and large scale would be a good strategy. There is a need to include more local knowledge, for example, areas around Troutbeck aren't

reflected in the evidence in the matrix but it is a known risk. Jayne Wilkinson clarified that the matrix includes a column for local knowledge/ input by the PWG/ CMG, and that it is an attempt to pull together existing information and a guide only, decisions should be made by the group based on what is known.

- Group 4:
 - Agree with the strategy, however, the matrix needs to be completely accurate and should consider splitting out communities, such as Windermere and Bowness.
 - Top priorities for enablement: can't say yet as need a fuller list. What about projects that cover several communities such as tree planting and hedge laying; how do we capture how these relate to catchments? Then do you go for large and complex catchments/ projects or a number of smaller ones.
 - Commission to the PWG: yes, but not at present; it was thought the PWG should do a mix of large and small projects of different types, top down and bottom up.

Is SC CMG covering Kent and Leven or wider? Pete clarified that the area was the same area covered by SCRT (as hosts), and therefore ranged from the Bela in the East to the Duddon in the West.

Jayne Wilkinson clarified that some of the difficulties with matrix accuracy is down to the data it is drawing on, and different sources of data don't always align (such as when separating out Windermere and Bowness). This is where we need input and checks by the CMG and PWG.

Action: Jayne Wilkinson to look at splitting out Windermere and Bowness. Nigel Wilkinson to support with local knowledge.

Doug Coyle would like to see it related back to the CSFP list and for CaBA projects to also show on the CSFP list. Pete Evoy explained to those in the group who weren't familiar with CaBA that it was a DEFRA initiative for which SCRT were the hosts in South Cumbria. SCRT had a pre-existing group, Becks to Bay, which some members of the PWG were also members of, it had a mainly habitat and species focus, however, flood & drought was one of the themes. Comparatively, the CMG came from a flood focus background. There is now a drive for the two groups for merge (over a 12-month period from June 2018), and we are moving towards this in the future.

Chris Evans, commented that there is lots of information and questioned how we process this to get the answers. Currently the work focusses on priorities and doesn't necessarily highlight opportunities. Smaller communities where a lower investment could solve the issue could be a good starting point (there was general agreement on this point). There needs to be a mechanism to pull partners together as people/ organisations often look at the same problem from slightly different angles however, we need to ensure we don't get lost in the detail. Also need consistency with the other two CMGs to adopt similar strategies for delivery.

Anthony Lane highlighted that the matrix draws on a lot of historic information but questioned if risk information and modelling was included. He clarified that CCC had done a big piece of work a few years back to develop a surface water plan. Jayne Wilkinson clarified that flood risk was a historic dataset based on the number of times a community flooded (mainly based on EA information), however, the number of properties was based on the EA NaFRA (National Flood Risk Assessment) modelling data for flood risk.

Action: Anthony Lane to source CCC Surface Water Modelling and send to Jayne Wilkinson for inclusion in the matrix.

Action: Jayne Wilkinson send out versions of spreadsheet to the group for comment, following amendments mentioned above.

Strategic Theme 3: Innovation		PE
<p>Slides have been provided by The Rivers Trust on the Q-NFM project (attached), further information can also be found here: http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/lec/sites/qnfm/</p> <p>John Quinton was unable to attend the meeting but provided the following update for the group:</p> <p><i>Lancaster and CEH submitted a project proposal to NERC, under their digital environment programme. The project would be focused on Windermere and look to draw together all available data, particularly real time data into one place and to provide analysis of that data to support decision making around water quality and lake level management. We have also asked for funding to improve our knowledge of the major inflows to Windermere, again with a focus on water quality and quantity. In practice this would mean an additional Q-NFM gauge above Windermere to provide evidence of NFM measures and better flood warning for Windermere residents, water quality data on the Rothay, and a series of experiment low cost gauges on the other Windermere inlets. The project would run for 12-months, but with potential to extend if successful. We should hear about the project in December and would start in February if successful. Obviously if we are successful then I will get back in touch with the SC CMG group to arrange a start-up meeting. Thanks to everyone who provided letters of support, they are very much appreciated.</i></p>		
AOBs:		
<p><u>Windermere Lake Action Plan</u> Pete Evoy raised the Windermere Lake Action Plan; this is a new plan for 2017-2022 (replacing previous versions) and has been adopted by LDNPA and SLDC. Partners are now meeting again regularly to progress breakthrough actions identified in the plan, several which SCRT will be involved with. The plan also mentions resilience options; however, it has a lake focus, and for resilience we need to look at a catchment scale.</p>		
4. ACTION ITEMS: SUMMARY		
ACTION	ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY	DATE TO BE ACTIONED
Actions brought forward from previous meeting		
Peter Lansberry to arrange to discuss short list options with Craig Cowperthwaite and Robert Courtier	Jayne to follow up with Peter	26 th Feb
CMG members to provide information on flood damaged footpaths/bridleways to LDNPA via Tim	All	26 th Feb
Peter Lansberry to report back on the need for a presentation on the impacts of flooding on wider road networks	Jayne to follow up with Peter	26 th Feb
Lake District National Park to provide an update or presentation on the planning process	Tim Duckmanton	26 th Feb
Send project updates and new project proposals to Jayne for inclusion on the PWG pipeline and CSFP spreadsheet	All	On-going
Actions arising from this meeting		
Source information on the number of businesses flooded	Pete Miles	14 th Jan

Look into options for Parish Councils contributing information to community matrix	Jayne Wilkinson & John Moffatt	26 th Feb
Source CCC Surface Water modelling and share with Jayne for inclusion into the community matrix	Anthony Lane	14 th Jan
Amend/ refine the matrix including splitting Windermere and Bowness into separate communities.	Jayne Wilkinson	14 th Jan
Circulate re-vised versions of the matrix to the group for comment	Jayne Wilkinson	14 th Jan

5. NEXT MEETING (if applicable)

DATE	26 th Feb	TIME	10am-1pm	LOCATION	Winander House, Bowness
------	----------------------	------	----------	----------	-------------------------

GLOSSARY:

AMP	Asset Management Plan
BTOB	Becks to Bay (South Cumbria's Catchment Partnership)
CABA	Catchment Based Approach
CCC	Cumbria County Council
CMG	Catchment Management Groups
CP	Catchment Partnership
CSFP	Cumbria Strategic Floods Partnership
LEC	Lancaster Environment Centre
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
MSW	Making Space for Water Groups
NERC	Natural Environment Research Council
NFM	Natural Flood Management
NNR	National Nature Reserve
RFCC	Regional Flood & Coastal Committee
RT	Rivers Trust
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCRT	South Cumbria Rivers Trust
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest