





THINKING AHEAD TO 2020 AND BEYOND: DEVELOPING NORTHUMBRIAN WATER'S CATCHMENT STRATEGY

Tyne Catchment Partnership Workshop

Monday 3rd April, 9.30-3pm

Environment Agency, Tyneside House, Newcastle upon Tyne

Workshop Notes

Workshop Aim

Northumbrian Water wish to engage with stakeholders and partnerships over the development of its catchment strategy, and to understand where opportunities may be for working in partnership to help deliver common objectives.

Objectives

- To communicate key messages about NW's business operations and current partnership working to stakeholders and partnerships;
- To understand stakeholders' and partnerships' high level objectives for 2020 and beyond and identify common objectives on which we may want to work in partnership;
- To scope high level opportunities for partnership projects with multiple benefits in 2020-2025;
- To discuss the practicalities of working in partnership in catchments and explore solutions to overcome any barriers and challenges.

Agenda

TIME	SESSION
09:30	Arrival and refreshments
09:50	Welcome and introductions
10:00	Northumbrian Water – How we work and our catchment priorities
11:00	Short break and refreshments
11:15	The Tyne Catchment Partnership – Priorities and ambition
11:35	Activity 1: Identifying common objectives
12:15	Networking & Lunch
12:45	Activity 2: Common objectives and priorities in the Tyne Catchment
14:00	Short break and refreshments
14:15	Activity 3: Working in partnership – barriers and challenges
14:45	Evaluation of the day & next steps
15:00	CLOSE









Presentations

Northumbrian Water gave a presentation about the company, how it works and what activities it undertakes. This presentation is available in PDF form as a 'Briefing Pack' to partners.

The Tyne Rivers Trust gave a presentation on the Tyne Catchment and the Tyne Catchment Partnership which it hosts.

These presentations set the scene for the three activity sessions.

Activity 1: Identifying Common Objectives

Partners put their key objectives onto the Venn diagram where they thought they aligned – full alignment (inside the overlap), partial alignment (on the line), marginal/no alignment (outside the overlap). The resulting Venn diagram is shown below:









Activity 2: Common Objectives and Priorities in the Tyne Catchment

Facilitators took partners' objectives (Post-it notes) off the diagram and put them onto three alignment charts, for Full Alignment, Partial Alignment or Marginal/No Alignment.

In three groups the workshop attendees then undertook a carousel activity where they reviewed the alignment of the objectives and assessed the high level opportunities each of the objectives may represent for the Catchment Partnership.



The charts for each of the tables are shown below:











The table below details all the themes from the alignment charts and how partners considered their alignment changed through the session during the carousel activity. Shading is used to indicate the three Alignment charts – some themes appear on both:







	Alignment	Opportunities/Ideas			
Theme		Geography	Theme	Miscellaneous and comments on	
		Geography		partner objectives from Post-It Notes	
Biodiversity/ Conservation	Full	Catchment (bit by bit)	Integrated working → NW benefits	Themes ongoing Restoration = multiple years Derwent reservoir – F.P. Ouseburn – multiple benefits Enhancing where possible Peatland restoration Citizen Science Migratory fish	
Flooding	Full	Upstream beyond asset Countryside Stewardship	Urban creep Climate change Asset improvements Natural Flood Management SuDS Coordinated approach	New development discharge e.g. Brunton Park Learning from NFM best practice Whittle Dene Ouseburn Surface water Highways Resilience Better understanding Use of old mine workings	
SuDS	Full	Critical drainage areas Target problem areas Particularly Urban	Early engagement with developers Managing developer resistance	Adoption and future management Sewers for adoption Restrictions through planning policy – need more powers Homeowners SuDS consultation Ouseburn example	
Water Quality	Full	Catchment but priority focused	Integration Sharing data/info/evidence Aligning programmes	Focus individuals on responsibility and rights Peatland restoration (upstream) Metals Use of minewater treatment Pollution prevention – communities and diffuse Development impact, prioritisation Ouseburn example	
Access/ Communities	Full	Local Community base	Focus on urban areas Protect from over development Education	Managing access Adopt a Stream Ouseburn Trust Understanding community interest Improving/controlling/discouraging Community consultation	
Monitoring	Full	Catchment	Data sharing 3 rd party data	Ouseburn Data sharing agreements Improvement of monitoring techniques Species recording/data collection Partner with Water Rangers	
Water Treatment/ Infrastructure	Full	Catchment (cumulative impact)	CSO measures Pressure from development Separate systems?	CSO impact on catchment Risk prioritisation – impact? Maximising benefits from treatment – environmental permits and standards, flood risk Sustainable Reduced CSO impact as part of cumulative impact with other pressures Opportunistic Constrained by regulation	
Community/ Landowner Engagement	Full	Community Local stakeholder	Education Integrated (Tyne Catchment Partnership) Joining up campaigns	Target focus Curriculum Scout initiative Joining up key messages Customer value = support – use ready formed networks Volunteers Community involvement to address	







				catchment management challenges Taking advantage of joint opportunities Communities appreciate and value rivers, public engagement
Economic Growth Support	Full → Partial	(see Marginal sheet)	(see Marginal sheet)	Long term response to challenges of climate change (50-100 years) Economic development and job opportunities
Farming, Agriculture and Land Management	Full	National Catchment Specific land boundary	Using existing networks Catchment leads Countryside stewardship post-Brexit Wider environmental benefits	Brexit – farm support, gap Flexible environmental schemes Landscape scale approach Engagement in catchment management
Education and community engagement	Partial → Full	Team Ouseburn Don Whole catchment Rural/urban	Farming/agriculture Should be bothways by engaging	How aligned is this theme? Is there overlap, doubling up? Opportunities to work together Perception v. Required CIP 3 opportunities Curriculum based, river engagement Understanding of changing water cycle Awareness of ecosystem services Link to access and enjoyment Advice and guidance Business and community engagement Team Valley Trading Estate Business Improvement Forum GWNE project City to Coast Living Landscape Build on existing work of partnership
Farming and agricultural management	Partial	Upper Catchments	Look at shared objectives Financial pressures on agriculture What initiatives are there to pay for ecosystem services? Ecosystem services vs. polluter pays balance What are people willing to pay for these services?	Local Authority find it difficult to engage Use 3 rd party broker (e.g. Tyne Rivers Trust) Land owners see it as money making Brexit issue – what will this mean? Post- Brexit support for farmers Facilitation Fund opportunities Support and encourage High Nature Value farming (low intensity systems that support biodiversity)
Water quality – sediment	Partial → Full	South Tyne area Urban waterbodies: Ouseburn Team Don Main Tyne Derwent Reservoir		Metal sediment research Share research/university Sharing agreements Management of sediment flux within catchments Removing metal deposits from silt to allow cost effective dredging Discriminating between point and diffuse source pollution
Water quality – metals	Partial → Full	Derwent Broken Scar Horsley S.Tyne to whole Tyne	Metal and coal mines point source diffuse	Raw water intake – is this an issue? Sludges to land Minimise the risk/impact of mine discharges, including diffuse source Lead in Derwent
Monitoring (Water Quality and Wildlife)	Partial	Ouseburn Urban Observatory	Statutory Additional monitoring Better science needed, inexact measurement, Monitoring inconsistent, reducing, needs to be coherent	Better source apportionment Pollution is event driven e.g. flooding Citizen science Is there technology to address this? River flow monitoring difficulties – use of 3 rd parties and existing networks Better integration needed across organisations







				Proactive monitoring
				Working with land mangers
			Urban and rural issues	The whole of the Type
Integration			can be the same - e d	Rural and urban issues
		Urban/Rural Ouseburn Team	NFM	Funding streams
	Partial		Aligning flow and water	Evidence base
			quality	Interventions – water quality water
		Don	Aligning flood risk and	quantity biodiversity
			water quality funding	Energy – renewable eat from water
			inclusion quantification ig	sources as low-carbon energy
			Planning authority	Knowledge of infrastructure issues
			NW	Beyond the devlopent sites
			SuDS and Green	Can NW work with deelopers to offer
			Infrastructure	additional opportunities around
Development	Partial	All new	New development	connection/SuDS
Development		developments	planning - need to	Joint resposes to large
			protect site plus site	sites/developments
			Supporting integration of	Work with Science Central
			high quality blue green	Retain public access to rivers
			infrastructure	Ensure water quality mitigation
Elood Rick	Partial		Reduced/mitigated	Link to community safety
FIOOU RISK	Failiai		through development	Resilient city – climate change
				Issues with silt/sediment as Tyne not
			Access versus nature	navigable
Tourism	Partial		conservation e.g. for	Use of Kielder/Derwent for access to
Tourisin	Failiai		walking and access to	anglers and other recreational users
			landscape	Supporting and encouraging sustainable
				tourism
				Flows from Kielder – natural flows
				Urban areas – SuDS and Green
				Infrastructure
				Integrated GI planning with Local
				Authorities
Conservation/			Use Protected Areas as	Strategic GI
Protected	Partial	Kielder	a multifunctional use –	Calaminarian Grasslands - Save our
areas		Redesdale	e.g. wash water areas	Magnificent Meadows (SOMM) project
			5	Species as indicators of clean water
				Enhancement of natural beauty
				Kielder Living Landscape – Restoring
				Ratty and Wildwood (to post 2020)
				Revitaising Redesdale HLF 2017
			Moro Croop Space	
			Health is a massive	Can NIM anon un autorte/deutight? Link
Hoalth and				to bottor integration
	Partial		Authorition	Improved better environment and
weilbeing			Link to Outfalls nood	niproved - beller environment and
			signage to avoid areas	places to live
			Support for good	NW as an enabler of development
Economy	Marginal →	Urban/Rural	practice	Fsn long term
Loonomy	Partial	orban/rtara	Pay for good quality	Avoid water being a limiting factor
Woodland	Marginal ->		Trees to mitigate	
Management	Partial/Full		flooding	PAWS restoration
				Local Plan sets limits
Ecology and	Marginal ->			NW encourage SuDS
Development	Partial			Local Authorities lack resources
Development				Resolving conflicts between
				development and nature conservation
				Additional resources for the partnership
Water				Nominated lead
Framework	Marginal →			Information made simple
Directive	Full			Difficulties of prioritisation
				Uncertainties over Brexit
				Better understanding of classification







				needed
Volunteering/ Community Involvement	Marginal → Partial		Create a joint plan Water Rangers, increasing knowledge	Short term funding can cause problems Deliverign rver improvements, tree planting, invasive species Management, citizen science
Flood Management	Marginal → Full	South Tyne	Large scale Natural Flood Management also for habitat creation Link to diffuse metals management	Marginal at present Slowing and storing evidence base strong Multiple objectives from a wide set of partners
Landowner Engagement	Marginal → Partial/Full (depending on area)	Whittle Dene Throughout landscape		Medium term to increase involvement Minimise negative impacts on rivers

The facilitator for each table then fed back to the whole group the key themes from each alignment chart as reviewed by the three groups. These were split into Geography, Theme and Opportunities for the Tyne catchment as shown below. Partners were then provided with three sticky dots and asked to put these onto the themes on the chart which they were most interested in working on:

Full/Artel- Ociseburn / Dor - learn from communities hink up better . Fally - education integetion - 10 transvick contractions - project plans - shored padmes Economic Growth ... Magina/ patiant -Pathal - enables of development - Rio managing cools-Buppart goed practice Boodland Hanagement Land owner engagement + Agriculture . Catchment needs . white env. berefits Full / Pater - needs to which out the score, increas invol Integration How + wate Quality monitorize

focus when areas - subs SUDS. Fully - Laget Pablon areas Fully - manging dreveloper Fully-shore reserved. WFO. Fully-shore reserved. WFO. Colonist fracts focus Union issues full-wFO. Additional resources for Partneships. IAccess + Commonication - will now invited leave. Focus on Unloss areas Education Monctoring intelligenty-sharing-cetter science. Data Sharty how we access. Bater treatment ingrastructure. Opportunistic. Risk based prenticition Catchnest impact









The table summarises the themes from the alignment charts and puts them in rough priority order for the Tyne Catchment Partnership judging by the numbers of sticky dots on the flipcharts. Themes in bold had most support from partners:

Theme	Detail
Flooding	Including Natural Flood Management and SuDS, fully aligned but discussed on all three tables and detail in all charts
Landowner Engagement and Agriculture	Use of 3 rd parties to broker discussions, environmental benefits for catchment through widening out scope and involvement, Brexit concerns/opportunity, fully aligned but discussed on all three tables and detail in all charts
Community Engagement	Education, integration, link up better, learn from communities, shared partners, project plans, framework contractors, full alignment but discussed on all three tables and detail in all charts
Water Quality/WFD	Priority for catchment, needs to be integrated and joined up, share research, needs additional resources, rural and urban, full alignment but discussed on all three tables and detail in all charts
Biodiversity and Conservation	Focus on urban areas, link to development and SuDS, wider benefits of protected areas, full/partial alignment but discussed on all three tables and detail in all charts
Integration	Link to biodiversity and conservation, engagement and education, monitoring, funding, rural and urban land management, multiple benefits, partial alignment discussed
Monitoring	Intelligent use, sharing, use of 3 rd party data, citizen science, partial alignment discussed
Water Treatment/ Infrastructure	Risk based prioritisation, catchment impact, CSOs, development pressure, full alignment discussed
Economic Growth	Managing water, enables development, support good practice, partial alignment discussed
Health and Wellbeing	More green space and access, link to ecology and development, local plans, urban water management, SuDS and daylighting, partial alignment discussed
Development	Opportunities, flooding, discharges, ecology, partial alignment discussed
Tourism	Access to sites, nature conservation, partial alignment discussed
Woodland Management	Land use in upper catchment, opportunities for own land owned, partial alignment discussed
Access	Focus on urban areas, link to tourism, communities and education, partial alignment but discussed on full alignment table in relation to communities







Activity 3: Working in Partnership – Barriers and Challenges

For the final session, each table discussed among themselves the key things which would need to be undertaken to allow the partnership opportunities discussed earlier to be realised. The facilitators then fed back to the whole group.

Tyne Challenges & Barris Flooding Soluhars Opportunities Theme Burniers Compating time scales. EA 6 year place Trust can take on the management but need funding. who will awn 5106 the management of the lanescape. (i.e. liability). e.g. subs Dept & Tipul 2-3. LAir hand to are there any jant ventures Newcastle has only got 30 yes Peleba to manage nding to m who owns the publicus leaders - Closer working relation ship to ensure this works. the by x side development the NW4 capacity upgree injection. State 1 in 100 4 approach/conversation BREVIT Hauaye the -large numbers. - Facil Itation Fund e the incontives? what - EA NFM funding. lit. - Using the broker approach - not using enforcement. - identify the benefits -titionad, yillds etc. Barriers + challenges opportunities Concerner Citizes networking / reeting. IE SOURCE (People) data sharing agree e.g. ouseburn lucense agreements combuning courses of Interpreting data / useable Licensing Wa+ flow non-loring @ duta is ban ob servatory inwersity /students Can lo) + post bod ri lowering points Turescales | Planning cycles Time to teach L) Teachar interests L) Lunitations (H.S/resource) ng Material

Barriers and challenges and suggestions to address these are summarised in the table below:

Theme	Barriers and Challenges	Solutions/Opportunities
Flooding	Competing time scales Leadership – who owns the problem? Communication – statistics e.g. 1in100 year event	Just do it Manage the politics Use the can do spirit of the rural community, post-Brexit ○ Educate ○ Effects ○ Concerned citizens Insurance → Use these opportunities to influence
Landowner Engagement and Agriculture	Large numbers to engage with What are the incentives?	Two way approach needed – conversation and openness Brexit Facilitiation Fund EA Funding for Narural Flood Management Broker approach Not using enforcement Benefits identification, financial, yields etc.







Education	Funding Curriculum Time to teach Teacher interests Health and safety limitations Available learning material	Curriculum based Tools for engagement Opportunity for programme co-delivery – community tailored
Integration	Multiple projects and programmes Resource (people) Data sharing Monitoring points (i.e. same sites for flow and water quality) Interpreting data, usable data Licensing Timescales and planning cycles	Networking and meeting Data sharing agreements Urban observatory University/students Commitment to ambition and delivery
Development	Landscape management ownership Funding for management Development and network capacity working side by side	S106 funding Joint ventures Other parties to manage – e.g. eNGOs, but need funding Closer working relationship needed to ensure this works

There was also an ideas board available throughout the day which was used for ideas and suggestions which were not discussed elsewhere in the workshop. Ideas captured were:

- A request for a project called FOG on the Tyne
- How do we engage better with the LEP in relation to future growth etc.?
- Pressures land use, food and water, climate change, floods and droughts Linking the benefits of managing diffuse metals to slowing the flow principles and Natural Flood Management
- Potential use of temporary flood storage in mines to alleviate flood peaks
- All CSO spill events can be considered pollution events
- Resilience of the sewage pipe at Hexham
- Brexit and all that may come from it

Next Steps

Northumbrian Water are holding 4 further workshops, one in each of the other management catchments in its operational area, between February and May. A report will be produced for each workshop similar to this, and emailed to all workshop participants with PDFs of the slides and maps used in the session as NW's 'Briefing Pack' to our catchment partners.

After the 5 workshops are completed, the findings of all workshops will be reviewed, and a synthesis document produced outlining common themes or opportunities and what NW plan to do with this information. This will be circulated to all participants in all the workshops together with the notes from each individual workshop.







Catchment Partnerships will wish to take some of the points from the workshops forward, and we ask Catchment Hosts to include an agenda item on the Thinking Ahead workshops in the Catchment Partnership meetings which follow the sessions.

It is anticipated that the findings of these workshops will feed into our PR19 planning for catchment activities, and will be discussed with our Water Forum (Customer Challenge Group) and/or our Water Forum Environment Network in order to get feedback from a broader spectrum of stakeholders as part of our PR19 planning process.

Workshop Participants

We would like to thank all the participants for attending the workshop. It has been a great example of the Catchment Based Approach at work and will provide much useful material to take the Tyne Catchment Partnership to 2020 and beyond. We value your input and hope you found the session enjoyable and useful for your own organisation.

Name	Organisation
Clare Deasy	Northumbrian Water
Tony Baines	Northumbrian Water
Eilis Furlong	Northumbrian Water
Hazel Leah	Northumbrian Water
Laura Dixon	Northumbrian Water
Hugh Clear-Hill	Tyne Catchment Partnership
Susan Mackirdy	Tyne Rivers Trust
Rob Carr	Environment Agency
Clare Steward	Environment Agency
Andy Edwards	Environment Agency
Peter Thorn	Coal Authority
Aaron McNeill	Northumberland County Council
John Robinson	Newcastle City Council
Clare Ross	Gateshead Council
Gayle Wilson	Gateshead Council
Jimmy Young	Gateshead Council
Michelle Hogg	South Tyneside Council
Abi Mansley	Northumberland National Park
Rebecca Barrett	North Pennines AONB
Emma Craig	Northumberland Wildlife Trust
Lesley Silvera	Groundwork North East
Andrew Poad	National Trust
Rebecca Hetherington	National Trust
Chris Barnard	Ouseburn Trust
Angus Collingwood-Cameron	Northern Farmers and Landowners Group
Dorothy Fairburn	CLA
Adam Jarvis	Newcastle University
Andy Russell	Newcastle University
Paul Quinn	Newcastle University