

Yorkshire Derwent Partnership

Minutes of Delivery Group (DG) meeting – 20th July 2016, North York Moors National Park Authority, Helmsley

Attendees:

Karen Saunders – Yorkshire Derwent Partnership	(KS)
Don Davies – Ryedale District Council	(DD)
David Renwick – North York Moors National Park Authority	(DR)
Jenny Craven – Natural England	(JC)
Liz Bassindale – Howardian Hills AONB	(LB)
Tim Burkinshaw – Scarborough Borough Council	(TB)
Duncan Fyfe – Environment Agency	(DF)
Jeremy Pickles – East Riding of Yorkshire Council	(JP)
Steve Axford (Part)	(SA)

Apologies:

Petra Young – Forestry Commission
Jon Traill – Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Jim Smith – Forestry Commission
Ian Cowx – East Yorkshire Rivers Trust
Rachel Pickering – North York Moors National Park Authority
Mark Young – North Yorkshire County Council
James Copeland – National Farmers Union

Summary of Actions:

No.	Action	Who?
1	Ensure minutes of May meeting are reviewed at the next DG meeting in September/October and follow up any outstanding actions before the meeting.	KS
2	KS to establish whether Board meetings are public or private meetings	KS
3	KS to follow up progress on CaBA application with EYRT.	KS
4	KS to review outputs of pitch/Tor mapping exercise and draft a single set of goals for the Yorkshire Derwent Partnership	KS
5	DF to follow up and obtain copy of the report by Chris Bowles on sediment in the Upper Derwent.	DF
6	Contact Woodland Trust to explore routes for engagement with private woodlands.	KS
7	DG members to send comments/thoughts to KS on what type of resource they think is needed to support the partnership, going forward.	All
8	KS to canvass availability for a DG meeting in September/October - done	KS

1. Welcome

KS welcomed people to the meeting and thanked them for attending, as originally it looked as if only a few people would be able to meet. There were apologies from Ian Cowx, Jeremy Walker, Petra Young, Mark Young, Jim Smith and Jon Traill.

Steve Axford attended the start of the meeting and explained that he would not be representing EYRT at future meetings and chairing the Delivery Group meetings. Ian Cowx, Chair of EYRT will represent the Catchment host in future. The group thanked Steve for all of

his work over the past few years, helping to get the Partnership established and wished him well for the future.

2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising

As this meeting had not been planned as a formal Delivery Group meeting, the minutes of the last meeting were not presented and reviewed and no matters arising were discussed. Outstanding actions will be reviewed at the next Delivery Group meeting in September/October and followed up in advance of the meeting, where relevant.

ACTION: KS to ensure minutes of May ISG meeting are reviewed at the next DG meeting and follow up outstanding actions.

3. Feedback from Board meeting

KS gave some initial feedback to the group from the inaugural Board Meeting, held on 11th July 2016. DR had also attended the meeting and gave his reflections on the meeting. The minutes of the Board meeting will be circulated to the Delivery Group. The group asked about the status of the Board meetings i.e. were they public or private meetings? KS confirmed that this had not been discussed at the Board Meeting, but she would raise it at the next Board meeting. The minutes, once approved by the following Board meeting would be made publicly available and posted on the EYRT website, alongside the minutes of Delivery Group meetings.

ACTION: KS to establish whether Board meetings are public or private meetings.

There was a brief discussion in relation to the funding item on the Board's agenda and it was agreed that the issue of short-term funding, including progressing the CaBA application for hosting purposes, needed to be sorted as soon as possible.

ACTION: KS to follow up progress on CaBA application with EYRT.

4. Progress Measures

KS introduced the item. There is an action on the Delivery Group to develop a set of high-level measures that could be used to monitor the progress of the Yorkshire Derwent Partnership in delivering its Goals/Objectives. The aim is to present a paper to the next meeting of the Board in late October/early November.

The group split into two sub-groups. Each group was initially asked to map the six objectives in the High Level summary document to the Partnership against the eight goals outlined in the governance document and developed/agreed as part of the stakeholder engagement work completed in Spring 2015.

Objective from Pitch document	Comments
Improve ecology and WQ of the river and its tributaries	Maps exactly to ToR goal.
Improve water level management, reducing flood risk and increasing resilience to drought	Matches to more general goal of ‘Encourage a more natural catchment scale approach to water level management’ → Drought and flood risk management are both implicit in this, but may be better to be explicit. Pitch objective though excludes a reference to natural catchment management. → possible rewording of objective to: “Improve water level management, using a natural catchment scale approach to reduce flood risk and increase resilience to drought.”
Introduce/sustain catchment sensitive land use	Maps to ‘increase levels of catchment sensitive farm management.’ Board discussion reflected concern re: use of ‘introduce’, and that it isn’t just relevant to farmers. Both pitch and ToR may need rewording to reflect this.
Create, improve, expand habitats and woodlands [connectivity]	Recognised that woodlands are an important habitat, but is strange to just refer to woodland habitats here; sense that species now missing and that ToR wording is better – ‘Protect, improve and expand habitats to increase connectivity and protect vulnerable species.’ → may need create adding in, as it isn’t always a case of expanding existing habitats. Narrative to support/explain this would then explicitly refer to woodlands as these are important both for biodiversity and nfrm measures.
Improve public access and a sense of connection to the river	Need to change this to reflect comments/concerns about the type of access YDP wants to promote i.e. isn’t about new navigation rights etc. Maps to ToR goal of ‘Facilitate access to the river and its surrounding area for enjoyment and wellbeing.’ → needs reviewing across both documents Creating a sense of connection maps to ToR goal of ‘Raise awareness, interest and understanding of water-related issues on the Derwent’ Pitch and ToR goal may need reviewing to produce a single version.
Support the growth and sustainability of the local economy.	Wasn’t an explicit goal in the original work, but maps exactly to the ToR goal ‘Support the growth and sustainability of the local economy.’

Additional comments: The ToR goals include ‘Return the Derwent to a more natural river system.’ → is this more appropriate to have at the Vision level, rather than as a specific goal, as it is a key part of delivering many of the other goals such as natural flood risk management, catchment sensitive land use, removal of barriers to allow fish migration (species connectivity) etc. It is more of an overall outcome, rather than a specific objective in

its own right, i.e. delivering some of the other objectives will result in a more naturally functioning system → delete from the ToR?

ACTION: KS to review outputs of pitch/Tor mapping exercise and draft a single set of goals for the Yorkshire Derwent Partnership.

The groups then reviewed the six objectives and identified potential measures that could be used to monitor progress. Further work is needed on this before the Board meeting, but the initial results are outlined below:

Objective (From summary doc)	Potential measure	Comments
Improve ecology and WQ of the river and its tributaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFD measures → status/element improvement within class. - Length of river improved - Volunteer monitoring → ARMI results; monitor volunteer effort/time; length of waterbody 'adopted' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistency of data collection needed - Use volunteers to monitor also links to objective on increasing engagement of local population with the Derwent.
Improve water level management, reducing flood risk and increasing resilience to drought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of planning applications that include SUDS or sustainable drainage elements (RDC, SBC, ERYC, NYMNPA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs more proactive promotion of SUDS
Introduce/sustain catchment sensitive land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No of farms that have adopted catchment sensitive farming principles 	
Create, improve, expand habitats and woodlands [connectivity]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of hectares/no. of sites/no. of designated sites and status. - A Connectivity index? - % of GI network in place - No. of AE schemes with CS measures/£ value of /km of watercourse. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use habitat inventories to create a baseline? - National Policy Planning Framework → objective on 'ecological networks' - Baseline for connectivity not available
Improve public access and a sense of connection to the river	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of volunteers involved in monitoring the Derwent e.g. WQ, walkover surveys etc - No. of visits to schools/ community groups in the catchment. 	
Support the growth and sustainability of the local economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. of new business start-ups? → SMEs – tourism sector; land economy sector e.g. Farming, forestry? - Employment rates 	-

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Engagement' rate with individual businesses? - No. of community/social enterprises established? - No. of apprenticeships? (specialist skills etc.) 	
--	---	--

5. Action Planning

The final session was a plenary discussion to generate ideas for potential projects and/or work/actions needed in the Upper Derwent sub-catchment. The results of the discussion are set out below:

Upper Derwent

Issues

- Abstraction/Irrigation of potatoes – is it at a sustainable level?
- Fish are failing on most of the water bodies (could mainly be because of downstream issues such as barriers)
- Dissolved Oxygen, Phosphate and Ammonia → from diffuse pollution, STW and septic tanks mainly
- Invertebrates/macrophytes are not as healthy as they should be → could link to habitat availability +/- chemicals
- Land drainage operations in some areas
- Lack of connection to the river
- Sediment appears to be the main issue in the Upper Derwent. A report was produced by Chris Bowles, River Hertford IDB.
ACTION: DF to follow up and obtain copy of the report by Chris Bowles on sediment in the Upper Derwent.
- INNS are an issue → plants and animals. Signal crayfish in stream at Settrington
- There is a lack of bankside shelter
- Nitrate levels in groundwater are high and metaldehyde is increasingly becoming an issue in drinking water.
- STW, septic tanks and industrial discharges are also an issue e.g. Eastfield Drain

Potential Actions:

- We need to start at the top and move down the catchment
 - Low North Beck
- Need to remember the coast as well – there are issues there too.
- Irton Safeguard Zone – provides an area to focus on, if needed.
- Low North Camp – need to work with the owners/users to investigate and manage silt pathways → consider developing/promoting code of practice; encouraging users to drive responsibly.
- More work needed on Thornton Beck
- StF initiatives, wetland creation/sediment reduction work
- Peat Restoration → still more to do. Gap in knowledge → need to link in with Tim Tom

- Forestry operations – sediment including from clear-felling activities, particularly larch
- Retention of brashings → GAP: engagement with private woodlands needed and study of benefits of using brashings for energy from waste vs leaving brashings in situ. Do we need a leaflet on water friendly forestry → a Catchment Sensitive Forestry initiative?
ACTION: Contact Woodland Trust to explore routes for engagement with private woodlands.

6. Partnership Support

KS updated the group on the discussion at the Board meeting about resourcing the Partnership going forward and asked for feedback/suggestions on what the Delivery Group thinks is needed. There is an action to develop a resourcing proposal for the next Board Meeting in order to secure longer term support for the Partnership. The current thoughts are that a part-time officer will be needed for 3 days per week initially, but as the work of the partnership develops and builds momentum, this could become a full-time requirement, either using one person or a combination of two part-time roles. This would be in addition to potential Project Officer roles that may be appointed to progress individual projects on behalf of the Partnership. As an interim measure, KS explained that NYCC have offered some money to fund a Partnership Facilitation Officer post, while the longer term strategy is agreed/implemented.

ACTION: DG members to send comments/thoughts to KS on what type of resource they think is needed to support the partnership, going forward.

7. Date of Next Meeting

KS to issue a Doodle Poll to set a meeting date towards the end of September/early October.

ACTION: KS to canvass availability for a DG meeting in September/October.

Karen Saunders

Partnership Facilitation Officer

5th September 2016