

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
Tim Duckmanton	LDNPA		TD
Helen Renyard	CCC		HR
John Gorst	UU		JG
Peter Miles	EA		PM
Nigel Wilkinson	WLC		NW
Christina Worsley	NG		CW
James Anderson Bickley	FC		JAB
John Quinton	LEC		JQ
Ana Mijic	ICL		AM
Louisa Simpson Brown	UU		LSB
Janet Chapman	SLFAP		JC
David Myers	SLFAP (Observer)		DM

2. APOLOGIES

Nicki Rushton (EA), Richard Guzinski (SLFAP), Rachel Osborn (HE), Chloe O'Hare (HW), Peter Lansberry (SLFAP), Mark Southern (Landowner), John Moffat (NT), Chris Evans (EA)

3. AGENDA

1. Welcome & Apologies

2. Projects

- Review of Phase I projects
- LDNP Planning and Routes to Resilience Outcomes
- PWG update: initial 9 communities
- CMG Enablement Discussion

3. Innovation

- NERC/ Q-NFM
- CASYWat

4. AOB

4. SESSION

LEAD

Welcome, Apologies and Introductions

PE/ JW

Actions Arising:

Updates are covered in the rest of the meeting.

Strategic Theme: Projects

Project Working Group Update: Phase I

An update of all the projects on the Phase I list can be found on the Becks to Bay website:

<https://btob.scrt.co.uk/south-cumbria-catchment-plan/cumbria-floods-partnership/project-progress>

There are now 36 projects on the Phase I list, this is an increase of 11 since the last CMG meeting, mainly reflecting the addition of more Cumbria County Council projects. Additionally, some projects are now complete, these will eventually be taken off this reporting system and captured as case-studies elsewhere.

Pete Evoy gave a presentation on the NFM work which has been undertaken by SCRT on Bell Beck. This has been a successful outcome of the NFM programme and has been positively received within the local community. James Anderson-Bickley questioned whether the leaky woody debris structures could be bigger. It was clarified that this was a good start and that work was initially done within felling permits; now the initial phase is complete, and we have been able to see the dams working during high flows, there is an opportunity to add to the structures as needed.

Pete Evoy raised some of the difficulties which have been experienced with the NFM programme. This a new and innovative programme but the method of funding is proving difficult. It was only in December that it was made clear to SCRT and other lead organisations that the full business cases for each of the awarded NFM projects (8/9 in South Cumbria) would need to be prepared and submitted by the end of February. Prior to this it was believed they could be developed and submitted for business case approval over the span of the NFM programme, i.e. until 2021. This complex process of funding for what are relatively small-scale projects (compared to, for example, some of the FCRM programmes) means it is unlikely that the deadline of the end of February will be met. It is hoped that there will be more flexibility with the programme and internal processes to allow some of the projects to go ahead. This is a new, innovative programme but the funding system hasn't caught up. Other CMGs/ Rivers Trust are having the same issues.

Simon Johnson clarified that this is an old way of thinking and there is an opportunity as a CMG/ consortium to look at this as our challenge and to see what we can make from this.

Pete Evoy: as an enabling group (CMG) we need to be able to flag up these barriers and raise them to the CSFP.

There was uncertainty as to whether some business cases across Cumbria had been submitted and approved and whether we could learn from them in terms of the level of detail and agreement required at this stage.

Action: Pete Miles to check with David Kennedy the status of all the business cases

Nigel Wilkinson stated that you wouldn't run a business like this, with high admin requirements compared to the cost of the projects. We need to feed back that the system isn't fit for purpose.

James Anderson Bickley questioned, what is the chain? Do we take this to the CSFP/ RFCC to raise this to DEFRA. Note, the same problem has occurred with Countryside Stewardship Schemes. Nigel Wilkinson,

mentioned that we can also raise this through community groups such as LEP and CRAG but these groups need guidance from the CMG as which 'levers' to pull to progress this.

John Quinton asked whether there are other options such as being contracted delivery agents. There could be a framework for delivering the programme with the EA as a rolling contract. This has been done on other programmes in the past.

Simon Johnson clarified that as CMG members we can raise this through different routes which will all help. Pete Evoy clarified that we will also be taking it to the CSFP on behalf of the group.

Action: Pete Evoy to see if can add the problems with the NFM funding programme to the next CSFP meeting agenda. Members will also raise during their updates at the meeting.

Tim Duckmanton (LDNP): (Presentation Attached)

The Lake District National Park is a local planning authority, delivering against a core strategy. The Local Plan (Strategic Plan for the Lake District up to 2034) review is underway and will soon be published following recent feedback. The principles of development can be viewed on the website; sustainable development includes natural capital and the flood risk policies.

Tim offered to do a more detailed presentation on the policies, particularly ones relating to flooding, at a future meeting.

Simon Johnson asked Tim how he sees the CMG framework fitting with the local plan? Tim Duckmanton clarified that the relationship is mostly through the consultation process; there will be an opportunity to reflect on the next draft and the principles of development (roughly 9 of these principles relate to our work as a group).

Further links: LDNP Website – 'caring for' section – natural environment: this includes information relevant to flooding.

Routes to Resilience: This was the Lake District National Park Authorities response to the flooding in 2015, focusing on the rights of way network, with the message to keep Cumbria open. They are looking at additional ways to add resilience.

John Quinton asked what happens with the parts which haven't been touched? Tim Duckmanton clarified that there's an access and recreation programme with LDNP, and that they will keep applying for money to fund this. The £3million Routes to Resilience programme were the priority sites.

Nigel Wilkinson questioned whether there's a wider communication issue around resilience. For example, at Troutbeck bridge where a new bridge has been installed we understand that this may withstand another Desmond but are other people questioning the spend and if it's proportionate? Maybe we should be communicating the benefits more widely.

Community Forms:

Jayne Wilkinson gave an overview of the developments the group (and PWG) have made since the last meeting. At the last meeting we were discussing the decision support tool, and the group agree that further information was needed before it was ready for use. This information has since been gathered and included (including the number of businesses flooded in 2015, and the Cumbria County Council Surface Water Modelling Report from 2012). A revised matrix was then re-circulated to the group, and this was agreed for use. Furthermore, the group agreed to use the proposed strategy, meaning the CMG as an 'enabling' body took the top 6 potentially more 'complex' communities for investigation and the PWG initially focused on the next 9 communities whilst also identifying any potential quick wins elsewhere. The PWG took this commission on board and have since been working to develop community opportunity

forms. The Coniston form was presented to the group as an example. The forms aim to collate all the relevant information from a range of sources, building on the information gathered in the decision support tool. This information is then used to understand the full picture & identify opportunities.

There are still a couple of gaps in the data which need to be completed to ensure we have the full picture before we can discuss the options. The main gaps are from UU and EA; further work also needs to be undertaken to gather the local, community knowledge.

Action: EA & UU to send in missing information

Action: Work with communities to develop local knowledge section

Janet Chapman asked if communities had been spoken to? It was clarified that this was a work in progress and we would be gathering the input from local communities and flood groups as part of this process.

Pete Miles agreed that this was an important part of the process and that these forms and the information needs to be QA'd by local people.

Simon Johnson highlighted that the EA has been running an appraisal process and that this is coming to a conclusion. The EA are also about the launch the FCRM strategy, so this is a key time for the group.

Simon sits on the boards over-seeing some of this and is working to align the business planning processes, building catchment management groups into this.

CMG Discussion

Simon Johnson reminded the group of the strategy and Jayne Wilkinson gave an overview of the 6 communities which the CMG had agreed to focus on and why they came out at the top of the decision support tool.

David Myers questioned why Ulverston featured so high on the table, as the town had only flooded significantly once (in 2009) and the issue was related to surface water and the drains not being cleared. It was believed these hadn't been cleared for 8 years prior to this. An FCRM scheme was subsequently put in place and the cost:benefits of this were questioned.

It was again highlighted that this is a support tool only, it is a way to funnel down the 45 communities.

It was put to the group to see if we had captured that right information, did we know the interventions which were in place and what did the group believe should be the strategy for these communities?

Comments:

David Myres: all the questions are the right questions and if we pursue them as best we can, then we are on a path to success.

Janet Chapman: there are issues with the data, but we just need to get cracking. Simon Johnson agreed with this and stated that we are moving towards an action focused agenda.

Pete Miles: there is an overwhelming desire to get this out to the communities to QA it, whether in the form of the tool or the community forms, we need to understand how we're going to take this out and what the message is. It is important that we communicate that the ones below the line (i.e. outside of the top 15) aren't forgotten about: it's about how we manage expectations. Additionally, the weighting of surface water was questioned, does this need a higher weighting?

Pete Evoy asked the group; how do we approach the top 6? Do we follow the same template as we saw for the other 9 (i.e. community opportunity forms)? Janet Chapman asked if we had enough time to do this and take it out to local communities. It was thought that local communities were vital to this and so we would have to make time to engage.

Simon Johnson raised that we need to be speaking to developers if surface water flooding is a big issue. Recent flooding at the new development in Kendal was also raised. It is important that we look at multiple benefits and what else you can get out of it (Tim Duckmanton).

It was highlighted that 4 of the top 6 communities are within the Leven catchment and therefore, what do we think our approach should be?

Pete Evoy stated that Ulverston and Kendal are already getting some form of intervention. Whereas the Leven catchment is completely un-supported, but it is a huge and complex catchment.

Nigel Wilkinson thought the decision support tool was really useful and that it does highlight the areas where there are no interventions. Although it doesn't always reflect the cost of the damage (Windermere was an 8-figure sum in 2009/15) and the cost of the intervention can often be in the form of relatively cheap, quick wins. It was thought that this might be drawn out further in the next stages as we begin to look at the details of each community further. Nigel thought that a different approach was needed for the top 'division' compared to lower down the table. There should also be a different approval process to get things moving i.e. to facilitate the quicker/ easier solutions which may benefit some of the smaller, less complex communities and catchments. He is happy to go with the table, there are some tweaks which are needed but it is thought that generally the picture will stay the same in such that we know the top communities, the rankings may change but they will stay somewhere near the top.

Pete Miles agreed with Nigel's comments, and thought the next step was the community documents. The strength is in when we take these out to communities and how we have the conversations to fill in some of the gaps such as what are the damage costs and are there any quick wins. With local intelligence we can make some quick changes and deliver something on the ground.

Nigel Wilkinson suggested adding a quick wins box to the community forms. He also noted that there isn't just 4 communities affected in the Leven catchment; even though there are only 4 in the top 6 we should also consider Newby Bridge and Backbarrow as these are connected. There is a role to look at this as a separate issue, not only a flood issue but also drought, water supply and water quality. It is a bigger debate and the perfect catchment to have a study. However, he wouldn't want this to delay delivery on the other communities. The group generally agreed.

John Gorst raised communications around flooding, stating that we need an honesty about what we can and can't achieve especially in relation to the big events. The conversation is not about how we stop it happening, but how we can mitigate the effects. It also how you communicate the message.

Simon Johnson thought that this was one of the key roles of this group; co-creating solutions and understanding why things can't be done.

Janet Chapman also raised that she had passed a round of quick wins information to the EA in the past and that these hadn't gone anywhere.

We need to ensure we capture the quick wins.

Action: Pete Miles to follow this up and see if they were included as part of the appraisal process.

Action: Develop a proposal for the CMG approach based on the comments above and re-circulate to the group for comment.

Strategic Theme: Innovation

John Quinton: Q-NFM Update:

John quinton gave a presentation on the Q-NFM project.

This is 1 of 3 projects which NERC has funded on NFM. It focuses on smaller catchments to measure the differences NFM measures are having on the catchment.

Data can now be viewed on the dashboard: <https://dashboard.hobolink.com/public/5932/Q-NFM/>

In South Cumbria we have one flume at Eggerslack in Grange-Over-Sands.

If you have a good site (paired plots) and want some data, the team are very happy for suggestions.

Please contact Gareth (g.mcshane@lancaster.ac.uk). There is also some kit available for use, including pressure transducers.

By the end of the project modelling will be available for the whole of Cumbria at a 2m resolution. However, they are currently focusing on the Kent.

John Quinton was happy to feed back to the LEC team that the next priority from this group would be Windermere/ Leven. They initially started with the Kent catchment as modelling and data had previously been generated for this catchment.

Action: John Quinton to feed back to LEC that the next priority for South Cumbria CMG would be modelling on the Windermere/ Leven catchment.

David Myres asked whether they have the ability to add in wind direction in relation to topography. John Quinton said that there was previously a slide in the presentation on this and how wind direction can be very important in showing much rain falls and where. This forms part of the monitoring they undertake.

Ana Mijic: CASYWat

Ana is senior lecturer in water management at Imperial College London, she is currently on secondment to the EA to work on this project.

The project is based on the 25-year environment plan, and in particular annex 1: supplementary evidence where the need for a system-based approach for water management is highlighted.

This is part of the Cumbria catchment pioneer and the water management perspective. This project focusses on Windermere and is looking at integrated delivery – cause & effect. The project started in November 2018 and runs until end of Oct 2019. The last 6 months of the project will provide more opportunities for group (CMG) involvement, particularly in testing the framework with a range of case studies. The intervention needed in a system may not be the obvious one and this work helps to highlight this. Additionally, most of the pressures relate to collective activities and so need collaborative solutions. The model is being developed specifically for the Windermere/ Leven catchment, and will be developed for individual stakeholders and then overlapped. Ana is happy to bring the first map to the group to verify; the map should be ready at the end of April/ early May.

Nigel Wilkinson highlighted that there is an opportunity to pick up on some of the modelling which has already taken place. JBA undertook modelling after the 2009 flood and this has been refined following subsequent flood events.

Tim Duckmanton clarified that the LDNP are also keen to be involved (will follow up with Ana)

Pete Evoy said that SCRT are happy to support and can also help circulate the questionnaires or information to the group.

Thanks to all for the presentations & to Nigel for provision of the meeting room.

AOBs:

None were raised at the meeting.

4. ACTION ITEMS: SUMMARY

ACTION	ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY	DATE TO BE ACTIONED			
Actions brought forward from previous meeting					
Peter Lansberry to discuss the short list options with Craig Cowperthwaite & Robert Courtier.	Peter Lansberry				
Peter Lansberry to report back on the need for a presentation on the impacts of flooding wider road networks	Peter Lansberry				
Actions arising from this meeting					
Check with David Kennedy progress on the business cases for the NFM programme	Pete Miles	March 2019			
Add an agenda item on the difficulties with the NFM program and in particular the funding structure to the CSFP meeting	Pete Evoy	1 st March 2019			
Send in missing evidence for the community opportunity forms	Louisa Simpson Brown Chris Evans	10 th March 2019			
Work with community reps to complete the local knowledge section of the community forms	Jayne Wilkinson & Community Reps	1 st April 2019			
Follow up on the quick wins information which Janet Chapman had previously submitted to the EA	Pete Miles	March 2019			
Develop a proposal for the CMG approach & re-circulate to the group for comment	Simon Johnson, Pete Evoy & Jayne Wilkinson	March 2019			
5. NEXT MEETING (if applicable)					
DATE	May - TBC	TIME	TBC	LOCATION	TBC

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