

Meeting Notes EA & NYCC

9 am 6th October 2015

There was no formal agenda for this meeting. Items numbered for easy reference.

- **Present** - James Duke, Duncan Fyfe, Janet Sanderson, Kathy Stevenson.
- 9.47am Ian Cooke.
-

Objectives of the group –		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To address the risk of flooding in Thornton Dale (area from Victory Mill to Old Railway Station) 2. Improve the water quality of Thornton Beck. 3. Eradicate duplication of effort - Environment Agency (EA) and Thornton Dale Parish Council (TD PC) 		
No.		
1	<p>Funding bid for Thornton Beck. The EA had worked hard with residents of Thornton Dale and Pickering fisheries but the internal EA bid was not successful. This was thought to be because other rivers were in worse condition and greater need.</p> <p>Funding was requested from EA for habitat and general improvement of water quality and to address siltation which in turn affects flood risk.</p>	DF KS DF
2	<p>Thornton Dale history of improvement attempts. There has been a long historic attempt to improve the river. The PC have had input over several years, but have failed to follow through due to staff changes at EA. A residents group was set up in 2013.</p> <p>The beck was made 'Main River' in 2006 – giving EA powers to do weed and silt removal where it impacts flood risk. A major desilt was done 5 or 6 years ago – ongoing maintenance since then by TD PC Caretaker and EA</p> <p>2015 despite a dry spring, the level was very close to the top of the bank and residents had concerns that the river would flood if the weed and sand banks were not cleared. EA cleared the river of weed in the village centre and down Maltongate. IC attended the following PC meeting to explain his role and funding arrangements for maintenance.</p> <p>The village care taker cleared the beck of water cress in August. The annual Duck Race would not have been able to be held without the river being cleared of water cress to make a channel for the ducks.</p>	JS
3	<p>Water Framework Directive (WFD) This was thought to be a good piece of European legislation which identified a need to improve water quality. The EA role is to monitor water quality and invertebrates. At the time of the formation of the Thornton Beck group in 2013 a "Moderate" ecological status was given to Thornton Beck.</p> <p>Classifications are - Bad, poor, moderate (majority in this category) good, high (probably non in</p>	DF

	<p>Yorkshire)</p> <p>What do they measure?</p> <p>Chemistry – specific pollutants, plus fish and a range of invertebrates.</p> <p>The fish are failing and water quality deteriorating largely due to sediment being deposited in the river. High siltation in a water course or drainage network can also be a contributing factor for flood risk – hence in areas like TD where siltation has been highlighted as an issue, there is a potential link between water quality and flood risk measures.</p> <p>This silt problem was thought to be as a result of a number of factors in the catchment–</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry Commission (FC) working practices – FC working with EA to improve practice since the start of the year (2015). Also to improve communication regarding FC operations. • Farming Practice –.The catchment is very sandy so doesn't taken much human intervention to throw things out of balance. • Discharge from septic tanks - e.g. camp site. • Erosion of the river bank – in particular 'cattle poaching' (cattle cutting up the banks and stirring up mud when they come down to drink) EA working with local farmers to provide guidance and fencing etc to reduce this • Surface water runoff down Limekiln lane, Greengate Lane, South Lane, Priestmans Lane and in to the Beck. This was also thought to be contributing to highways erosion. <p>DF reported a proposal to get a student from Hull University to carry out some modelling work on the catchment which might provide evidence to attract funding for works.</p>	<p>KS DF</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Maintenance of Thornton Beck</p> <p>Roles of EA officers defined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IC responsible for maintenance of the beck in respect of flood risk. • DF for improvement in water quality issues. <p>IC was in attendance at the spring meeting of Thornton Dale PC. IC informed the council that he had a budget of £9,000 for maintenance of the river through TD. Councillors and residents were very keen to see how the funding had been used and a request was made for a breakdown of money spent and the exact area covered by the spend. This would help to avoid duplication by the PC and encourage a more coordinated approach. It would also be a valuable tool for improving visibility to the community regarding the work of the EA giving them an idea of what is being done and importantly - what cannot be done. (Action point 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. £4,000 had been spent on clearance between southern end of the village to the Derwent, and about £3-4K through village itself. (Action point 8 to clarify details of spend) • KS – suggested that more visibility of what the EA were doing would be 	<p>IC</p> <p>JS</p> <p>KS</p> <p>IC</p>

	<p>helpful as there was a perception that nothing was being done.</p> <p>TD PC employed a local JCB to clear the weed and silt in 2013 but it was too big to be used in critical areas such as Maltongate. JS asked if it were possible to team up with the local IDB. (Action 8)</p>	
5	<p>Permission for clearance of weed.</p> <p>Owners of land adjacent to the river were encouraged to clear the weed themselves. If the weed was cleared by hand, permission from EA was not required. If it was cleared mechanically then permission from EA had to be sought – Land Drainage / Flood Defence consent.</p>	
6	<p>Flooding issues in the village.</p> <p>There have been several flooding issues in the village. Two different flooding types</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flash flooding with water running off the highway. 2. Slow build-up of the water level in the beck either locally or from the moors above the village. <p>Prevention suggestions –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building of woody debris dams up in the catchment to slow the water coming down into the beck and increase opportunity for soaking in and silt settling out. This has already been explored with FC and East Yorkshire Rivers Trust. Taking into account voluntary help offered, this was thought to cost in the region of £60K. The aim would be to slow the flow in the forestry, speed up through the village (to carry the silt through) and slow again at the southern end of the village. 2. The reinstatement of the second sluice gate. It was noted that alteration of the river course could cause an issue with liability and suggested that modelling would need to be done to confirm if it would do any good. This is a complicated area of the beck where three arms of the river meet. The original engineering design has clearly failed over time as the middle arm of the river now runs in the wrong direction. 3. More maintenance and improved coordination between the EA and local community activities (village care taker/PC) to maximise the impact of recourses. 	
7	<p>Funding suggestions -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Flood and Coastal bid – RFCC. NYCC member thought to be David Jeffles. • East Yorkshire Rivers Trust. Putting bid together - John Shannon colleague. • Application to HMF - general and specific to Thornton Dale. • FDGIA bid with partnership funding (could be combined with bid to RFCC for local levy). • Contribution in kind from FC • Vale of Pickering IDB • Thornton Beck on radar of Derwent Catchment Partnership. • Heritage lottery find bid. • A tick box on WFD planning but flooding issues will have to be proven. • Can WFD take funding from partnership projects - yes. • Capital funding from FDGIA could form part of a funding package with other 	<p>KS</p> <p>IC KS</p>

	<p>Revenue funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could anything come from flood arm of EA? Capital funding could form part of a funding package along with funding from other sources, but rules around proving benefits are strict. Any EA revenue funding would have to show a resultant reduction in maintenance spend following any works.(sounds like not - external match funding needed) 	
8	<p>Action to take forward</p> <p>Short term immediate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigate what it would take to move this forward and come back to the group in December. KS 2. TD PC representative to be invited to the next meeting. JS 3. IC to drop a fence post to replace the rotten bottom board of the sluice gate. IC 4. IC to monitor and take base line pictures of the river in Maltongate. IC 5. JS to find a working group to feed into TD PC. JS 6. IC to organise an Autumn walk over - include PC caretaker. IC 7. JS to get contact details of TD PC caretaker (perhaps best done through PC) JC 8. IC to provide a breakdown of how the £9,000 has been spent on TD beck. IC 9. IC to provide the area covered by the above. IC 10. IC to coordinate with TD PC possibility of IDB sub contract. IC 11. NYCC Highways to be contacted regarding silt brought on to road from key areas mentioned at 3. KS <p>Medium term</p> <p>Resilience plan. (Use template from NYCC resilience forum) and tailor to flooding (Grace Lawes – NYCC Emergency Planning Officer for this area can provide guidance)</p> <p>Long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention of silt and improve water quality. • Prevention of flooding in key areas of the village. • Eradication of work duplication by PC and EA. • Public visibility and accountability of the EA at a locally sensitive time. 	

Janet Sanderson 11th November 2015

Meeting notes agreed 18th December 2015