Stour Catchment Initiative

Minutes – Urban Group Meeting

2nd December 2014

Admiralty, Corfe Mullen

Attendies:
Lydia O’Shea (WW), Fiona Bowles (Chair), Ben Rayner (EA), Doug Kite (NE), Mark Holloway (BBC), Andy Bremford (EA), Hilly Chittenden (Environmental Theme Action Group), Natalie Jones (Sembcorp), Matilda Bark (DCF), Amanda Broom (DWT), Nicola Hopkins (WW), Paul Ambrose (BBC), Simon Truick (C&ED BC), Stuart Terry (PBC), Tom Clarke (RSPB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Co-ordinator update  
It was agreed that a spreadsheet of all the plans and timescales would be useful, to include consultations. LO to circulate a table for all to complete | LO/ All |

Issues
Urban run-off – Bourne Stream effects bathing water. There are surface water outfall problems, also lots of culveting and channelizing. 
Birds and other animals can effect bathing water.

2 types of flooding: due to urban run-off and urban creep, catchment wide problems

SuDS – focus has been flood risk but not sure how water quality is being tackled. SuDS should be used for mitigation of water quality issues – existing retrofits and new developments.

Planning – urban drainage and flood defence potential for development. Need to get flood defence mechanism funded by developers but need to be more flexible with development. Christchurch BC liaising with EA on this.

Developers are asking why applications for new developments don’t take into account flood alleviation measures that are planned, currently planning look at applications as though nothing will change in the future.

There are lots of green spaces in urban areas but they are not necessarily linked up. The Great Heath Project – improving access, linking with the Stour is key.

Restoration plan needs to include the management of mires
Golf courses – can they be managed more sustainably

The bottom of the Stour is navigable river so sometimes there is position to some green solutions

Stour Valley Masterplan – could do an example of what an ideal urban
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>drainage system should look like</strong>&lt;br&gt;Hatch pond is not managed and silting up, may flood in years to come&lt;br&gt;Community worries – taking out of trees by Forestry Commission – Mires&lt;br&gt;restoration, urbanisation of green areas.&lt;br&gt;Risks to water courses need to be made clear at first stage to developers.&lt;br&gt;There are run off issues associated with the Hillside development.&lt;br&gt;Volume of info for planning is too vast.&lt;br&gt;There is huge pressure on Las to deliver housing by relaxing approach to flood risk. Need to make sure an argument is very lucid to support water quality concerns.&lt;br&gt;Sembcorp Bournemouth Water – principal concern is metaldehyde and nutrients, source of metaldehyde unknown&lt;br&gt;Bourne stream and Pumperne heavily modified.&lt;br&gt;Mapped historic water courses (underground). Paul has mapped all water courses since the late 1800’s – available as a layer.&lt;br&gt;Christchurch Harbour – boating, fishing, recreation. Several plans cover the harbour.&lt;br&gt;INNS – Japanese knotweed more of an issue in the urban areas. Not many water vowels. There is a large population at the bottom of the Stour, good for community resourcing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;Need to raise public awareness: INNS, water saving measures, responsible use of rivers, urban creep, culverts, yellow fish project, litter. This can be promoted by the Great Heath Project.&lt;br&gt;Paul suggested resurrecting the yellow fish campaign, renewal of signs, new sign.&lt;br&gt;Beach care groups – maybe they could become involved in water quality?&lt;br&gt;Acreditation for schools where children check the school drainage sy systems for misconnections, fat traps etc to take the message home&lt;br&gt;Community page for SCI website – Matilda will help to write&lt;br&gt;Need better links with LNP and LEP with the Governance Group#Section 106 funding – what influence can we have over direction of 106 funds (has to be directly related to the development)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Going forwards</strong>&lt;br&gt;Should this be a task ad finish group – this was discussed and agreed the group should meet again.&lt;br&gt;There should be an urban section to the Catchment Plan&lt;br&gt;The group should be translating policy into actions. Also translated so that the policy can be used for planning decisions – advise the development management process&lt;br&gt;LA roadshow run by EA and DWT on WFD and what info is available/ needed.&lt;br&gt;Also communication within LAs and with LAs&lt;br&gt;Circulate project list to urban group&lt;br&gt;All to feedback any news and events for the SCI newsletter in February.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next meeting: Wednesday 18th February 2015 10:00 – 12:30 Admiralty</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>