

Broadland Catchment Partnership - Steering Group

MINUTES



Wednesday 25th November 2015 (10am - 1pm)

Harnser Room, Dragonfly House, Environment Agency, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich, NR3 1UB

Attendees: Andrea Kelly (Chair), Dave Brady, Maria Conti, Richard Cooper, David Diggins, John Hiskett, Bridget Marr, Neil Punchard, Ian Robinson, Rory Sanderson, Alison Smyth, Heidi Thompson, Robin Twigge, Rob Wise, Lottie Carlton (minutes)

Apologies: Geoff Doggett, Richard Reynolds, Ian Robinson, Will Robinson

	Action items	Actions
1.	Welcome, introductions, apologies	None
	Apologies were received as above. New members to the group were welcomed and introductions were made round the room.	
2.	Minutes of the meeting held on 19th Aug 2015	
	The minutes were agreed as accurate. Matters arising as follows: Item 2: Regarding the MH action, NP to approach an alternative officer for this information Item 4: The Slow the Flow action point had been completed. Item 6: Results of the Wensum DTC sediment fingerprinting research had been produced in 'layman's terms' and had been circulated as per the action.	
3.	Activity since the last steering group meeting	
	<p>Slow the Flow (£31k Defra funded project) update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 schemes had been worked up and 4 had already been completed, with the remaining 4 hoped to go ahead (further project details were required). Modelling had helped decision making regarding scheme choices. IDB information was in for Martham Drain project and this was now ready to start. Sediment results were awaited regarding the two Saxthorpe projects. Position Statement Rural SUD: Desilting water courses regarding contamination material being moved. Exemptions – may not be able to put on the bank near the water course (normal criteria) due to site constraints, therefore a position statement was being drawn up for locally met conditions. It was noted that EA will not prevent reasonable schemes. Partners will find this useful. There was still an issue regarding water resource/impoundment, but this was a national permitting scheme and would therefore be more difficult and take longer. <p>Comments and answers to questions re Slow the Flow as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Topsoil traps: is it part of the scheme to encourage management of gateways? One scheme was addressing roof issues and field corner bund plus farmer advice regarding cropping directions etc. Massive soil loss into the Yare from the A140 had been noted. AS agreed to chase up this and update the group (action). Regarding bigger projects, EA was open to working similarly on these but expectations regarding capacity would need to be managed. It was suggested that NP act as facilitator regarding co-operation between partner organisations. Following a question on what consents were upcoming NP agreed to circulate a one page summary/file note and a tick list regarding low risk impoundments from EA's national perspective (action). 	<p>AS</p> <p>NP</p>

	<p>Defra's Sustainable intensive Platform Event</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This had been well attended by farmers from this catchment and further afield. NP had represented the BCP. • Protection of soil and cover crop mixture were key issues. • There was scope to put on joint events with them. • The approach from Defra was to let industry take the lead. • EDP article: Cover crop trials were showing good results. <p>Farmer Workshop in Summer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following a query that had been made regarding usefulness of this event it was explained that the group had agreed an action to carry out further engagement regarding mapping. • A December meeting had been set up between NE/EA/FWAG to look at mapping and improve modelling. • Modified data sets: LIDAR data is used now and this has improved results with direct connections to water courses. • Group members agreed the mapping information was useful for starting conversations. • NP was available to attend meetings to present the information. <p>Funding requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i) Parrots feather on dyke near Witton (BA) (ii) Ochre settlement pond near Somerton N.pump - Martham Broad (IDB). • EA and NE had attended a site visit. RS agreed to provide an update • River Waveney Trust has various ad hoc projects. • The group was encouraged that projects like this were coming in to the partnership. Strategy/process was needed to deal with such requests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If projects fit within the objectives of the Catchment Plan the group would look at how they could help otherwise, sign-posting to other potential sources should be made. ○ If avenues are not available to sign-post to the group should work to try and solve. ○ Bundling projects with other related projects (e.g. RSPB might be able to help with Parrot's Feather project). 	
4.	<p>WaterLIFE Water Sensitive Farming</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A presentation was given updating the group on the successful WaterLIFE Water Sensitive Farming funding bid. The group was thanked for their co-operation and support during the application process. • 2 contracts had been awarded: Broadland – Norfolk Rivers Trust and Cameo – The Rivers Trust. Both would run over 2 ½ to 3 years. • The financial contract arrangements and sign off were awaited. • The project included funded posts: 2 farm advisers and 1 part-time regional expert. • There would be 50 farm visits a year (per catchment) and 2000 acres per year farming improvements made. • Partnership help was requested with delivery. • The measure of success would include 'replenish' Cranfiled calculation. Coca-Cola wanted to see results and this ties into delivery of WFD. Water quality came from EU drivers and water quantity from Coca-Cola (match funded). • Deliverables of the project: staff time, farmer level knowledge events, writing farm plans, improvements to soil retention and water quality. • More details would be brought to the group once finalised. • UEA: DD had visited potential sites that could be involved and keen landowners. 	

5.	Upper Wensum Farm Cluster	
	<p>HT gave a presentation on the Facilitation Fund Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Norfolk FWAG - the steering group was a place to talk about conservation farming. • All FWAG advisors had a minimum standard of training, 2 years minimum. • Connecting Nature Fund – Wild Anglia offsetting, some money from NDR, dealing with gaps in road projects re nature. • Membership was £75 standard and £250 enhanced (including extras). There was also supporter membership for non-landowners. <p>Facilitation Fund:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was unlikely to be a third round of funding. • FWAG had been successful due to this being a farmer driven funding requirement. • Upper Wensum cluster farm group working with Buglife on B-lines. • The fund was important for marginal mid-tier farmers - 20% uplift CSS points • The first farmer meeting was being held shortly, the success of the project would lie with their enthusiasm. The group had a key farmer which should help. <p>Comments and answers to questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GIS shapefiles were available for the Buglife B-lines. NP would like to be able to overlay these on the Ecosystem Services mapping. It was agreed to share mapping and NP would talk to HT regarding setting this up. • Farm gateways mapping would be really useful if correlated to flow paths. The group agreed this was an important issue. AS agreed to check if this exists (action) if not it could become part of WaterLIFE. • Website information was available regarding mink (number of traps/kills). It was noted that one farmer was not in CS. • Catchments in Trust potential: The National Trust has recognised its role as a landowner regarding improving water quality and the environment. The Catchment Trust was set up to carry out best practice on NT land and to influence other landowners. Funding – different sourced via HLF. An agenda item was suggested to update further on this project (action). 	<p style="text-align: center;">AS</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AK</p>
6.	Broads Plan update	
	<p>MC updated the group on the review of the Broads Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis was on a strategic plan for the Broads, not just the Broads Authority, and so partners plans/strategies would be included. • The current plan had a lot of explanatory text and objectives/actions therefore got somewhat lost further into the plan. The plan had therefore not been used as well as it could have been with organisations just getting on with their own thing. More joined up working could have been integrated better by the plan. • The reviewed plan was aiming to improve with a smarter, sharper action and evidence base. • The new structure would follow: Projects/Results/Uses/Benefits (PRUB). Projects were often started without enough thought as to the USE at the end e.g. moorings: what do people actually want? Some just need somewhere safe to sleep and don't want to get onto the land/use facilities. Therefore some moorings can be away from facilities in quieter areas i.e. not just one result/use. • Stakeholders would be asked to input their ideas into the strategy with enough detail to provide a solid set of actions with obvious partnership involvement. • The first draft would go out in February for consultation with stakeholder input going into the draft prior to this. <p>Comments and answers to questions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge support for influence and communication. Co-delivery and looking at joint/overlapping work , quick wins and overarching project themes were key. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of information needed for the plan: delivery focused, what, where, who for, when. Organisations would not need to convert their information to the PRUB format if they used different methods to ID work aspirations/outputs. • LEPs were being consulted. There was a feeling that economic benefits and drivers needed to be better recognised. • The plan would run from 2017-2022. Since funding was not confirmed for many organisations this far into the future it was difficult to be completely accurate and an element of aspiration was acceptable. However first steps needed to be identified such as 'seek funding to enable x,y,z to be undertaken'. This was intended as a living document with recognition that reviews were needed to account for changing circumstances. 	
7.	Partner Updates	
	<p>RT: To bring project ideas to next meeting.</p> <p>RS: River Basin Management Plan had gone to ministers for review.</p> <p>BM: Current projects include: Marlingford: Project modelling river restoration to be completed this financial year. Trowse: fish monitoring. Rivers Trust: Tree planning Bure/Yare where devoid of cover and Reepham Stream: in stream habitat improvements. Hoveton Great Broad: Funding from LIFE and HLF to go ahead with this project, £4.2 million over 5 years, lake restoration and improved access with canoe routes and boardwalk, EA providing technical fisheries resource for biomanipulation.</p> <p>AS: Staff resources: ½ time vacancy still open, all other areas have now been covered.</p> <p>Countryside Stewardship update: Advising mid-tier farmers 29% supplement by catchment sensitive farming. Most applications likely to be successful. Various events have taken place. Another due on 10th December.</p> <p>HT: Farm advise: FWAG haven taken on CFE. 'Maize and cover crops' event had very good information with 30-40 farmers and agronomists attended. Information provided on resource protection, linking habitats and cover crops.</p> <p>RW: Uptake on the above event had been high due to the brand value of CFE and CSF. Ministers recognise tight rein on budgeting year to year has been a bad idea resulting in good people being lost via the short term contracts involved. CSR announcement that it will commit to longer term funding, but budgets may be smaller e.g. CFE likely to be much less which is unfortunate in light of farmers recognition of this as 'brand'.</p> <p>RW: NE are looking into getting the Countryside Stewardship application process into a better place for next year. It had not yet been decided if paper applications would be used. Feedback from group: Ridiculously short deadlines re consultations. Agreements were likely to come out in skeleton form and this made it hard to advise farmers. What does signing commit them to if full details turn out not to be as they had expected?</p> <p>IR: 'Multiple', RSPB/BA/Rivers Trust Interreg bid had not been quite right, but a resubmission had been advised. A stakeholder workshop would be held on 10th December to work on the resubmission ready for March 2016.</p> <p>DB: Bure work: Park farm work had been completed opening up a meander that had been cut off in the in the 1950s. Catchment in Trust would be an exciting new project if the funding came through with links from Blickling to Felbrigg.</p> <p>DD: Anglian Water had been commission to carry out a feasibility study on an integrated wetland mitigation scheme on Ingol. Liaison with IDB was continuing re contract for management plans. Some small projects bids included Sheringham local environment schemes, baseline research for fish populations and research into otter</p>	

	<p>populations.</p> <p>RC: UEA was into the second year of trials of cover crops with rye grass and vetch mix before sugar beet and oilseed raddish before spring beans. Further funding from British Beet Research was being sought to enable the project to continue. Support letters from the group would be welcomed</p> <p>AK: BA was working with EA on Elma Beck restoration. IDB have remaining concerns. Only £5k was available. Following on from the Lake Review, Hickling Broad was being looked at with enhancements round margins likely. Some biomanipulation at Ranworth was also a potential project. Broads macrophyte survey report would be available soon. The Climate Change Adaptation Plan had been out for consultation. RSPB had been supportive. Tree/scrub maintenance re navigation was being reviewed at a strategic level. BA was supporting a researcher on killer shrimp. Current thinking was that killer shrimp had low impact on the food chain.</p> <p>NP: Request for newsletter items. Suggestion made to provide updates via email in future but to highlight any particular information that could be used in the newsletter.</p>	
8.	Any Other Business	
	None	
9.	Date of next meeting	
	A doodle poll would be circulated to arrange beginning of March date.	

Action Summary

Who	What	Deadline
AS	Massive soil loss into the Yare from the A140 had been noted. AS agreed to chase up this and update the group	March 2016
NP	NP agreed to circulate a one page summary/file note and a tick list regarding no risk impoundments from EA's national perspective	March 2016
AS	Farm gateways mapping would be really useful if correlated to flow paths. AS agreed to check if this exists	March 2016
AK	Catchments in Trust - National Trust: An agenda item was suggested to update further on this project.	March 2016

Visit: www.broadlandcatchmentpartnership.org.uk to download the catchment plan.

Email: admin@broadlandcatchmentpartnership.org.uk for further information.