

## Slowing the Flow at Pickering

### PROGRAMME DELIVERY GROUP MEETING

The Mill Suite, Memorial Hall Pickering

28<sup>th</sup> May 2010

11.00 - 12.30

### MINUTES

Present: Simon Marrington, Vince Carter (chair), Tom Nisbet, Jon Bates, Jeff Pacey, Lucy Huckson, David Rees, Rachel Pickering, David Steel, Neil Hugill, Nigel Trotter, Mike Potter, Gordon Clitheroe, Howard Keal, Linda Cowling, Nick Odoni, Stuart Lane, Mick Hoban

Apologies received: Liz Newbronner, Justine Clark, Don Davies

1. The Work Programme: Selected measures, action points for progress report and discussion:

**Bunded storage update** - LH delivered a presentation/briefing which she confirmed will be given to members of Ryedale District Council on June 15<sup>th</sup> by JP, SM and herself, with a view to RDC taking this forward as a funding proposal to full council in late July. (discussion)

LH - comments welcome?! It has been suggested we change our key message to be more positive than 'WE WILL NEVER STOP FLOODING IN PICKERING AND SINNINGTON'.

(all) - agreed.

GC - has there been a recorded level for the 1999 flood?

LH - no level was recorded.

LC - How does bund proposal stack up on cost-benefit analysis?

LH - not well. Not eligible for GIA from EA.

(general discussion follows re: licensing issues between EA/RFRG, ground-proofing measures, combined effects of bunds and land management)

HK - why was bund 7 eliminated?

LH - a smallhold property was adversely affected.

HK - there is the compensation scheme to account for this.

DS - there needs to be general awareness of the fact that landowners are being asked to bear the pain and that compensation does not necessarily cover this issue.

LH - bund 4 was eliminated because there was not enough room between the watercourse and the railway which we have established needed to be protected. Bund 5 was eliminated because the meander significantly reduces the available storage and bund 6 location had to be moved which again reduced the storage volume considerably.

The question to be put to the RDC members is whether we protect to a 12 or 15 cumec flow i.e. a 1-in-15 year event or a 1-in-25 year event.

LC - if the cost of the scheme is £1.2 million who is providing the remaining funds to add to the RDC money?

JP - The EA has some money (£150k).

HK - is it possible to make a GIA application on the excess only and would it stack up on cost-benefit on this basis? It would be fair to say that RDC would look more favourably on the scheme if there was serious commitment from EA via GIA?!

LC - Has Pickering Town Council been approached? £1 million is a ceiling is it possible to ask them (PTC) to contribute over a period of time?

**ACTION POINT:** JP/LH - EA will produce a statement on GIA for the project (re HKs query) before the RDC meeting.

(general discussion over the level of constraint created by the NYMR)

LH - there are legal reasons we cannot store water on the track.

NO - I take your point.

NT - railways don't like water due to their construction. We aim to be amenable but cannot agree to the railway being flooded. There may be places outwith the original bund locations?

LH - this wasn't part of our original remit.

LC - maybe this can be examined in the future as and when the bunds proposal as it stands proves its worth.

(general discussion follows over weirs and sluices, merits of improving water conveyance through the town)

SL - can we explore the potential for mini-bunds as part of the project? This needs to be carried out simultaneously with the bunds proposal, particularly if this appears to be a cheaper option or alternative for RDC to fund? What scope is there for potential trialling and funding thereof within the project timeline?

LC - no problem with this.

SM - there is a will to explore the potential of mini-bunds from the project, it isn't just a RFRG idea, but we need to clarify who will carry this forward.

SL - the strand needs to be taken forward simultaneously with the bunds.

(general discussion over mini-bund trials TN/MP/NO)

MP - has the point I raised previously about throttling the beck ever been given a satisfactory answer?

LH - the material you placed in the beck would move downstream. It wouldn't work.

TN - the general consensus would be that the material would move.

**Hydrological modelling update** - NO presented the final report on Durhams behalf and summarised the findings. The report will be published on the project website as a PDF document.

**AOB**

NT - we are looking at permanently blocking a span under a bridge beside the beck at the station in Pickering. We want to ensure this won't prove detrimental to the conveyance issues we have already discussed.

GC - I want to object to this on the record.

LH - I will look at this with Nigel.

DS - I want to clarify what was said earlier - the Duchy are supportive of the project but there remains some convincing to do.

LC - can I clarify, what is the Duchy?

DS - It is in effect the Queens private estate, not state owned.

LC/HK - If it is appropriate we would like to offer our services to assist convincing the Duchy as required from the RDC members perspective.

MP - when is work starting on the ground?!!

SM - LWD dam construction will be starting in Cropton during July.

DR - I have 20 farmers confirmed for a practical demo day on soil-aeration techniques on June 8<sup>th</sup> at Saltersgate. Contact me if interested.

**Confirm Dates/Locations for Future Meetings**

Next meeting scheduled for 11am Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> July @ Pickering Memorial Hall, tbc via email nearer the time.