

# Evaluating the Multiple Functions of Woodlands for Natural Flood Management (NFM)

Gabrielle Powell<sup>1</sup> | Joanna Clark<sup>1</sup> | Hilary Geoghegan<sup>1</sup> | Tom Nisbet<sup>2</sup> | Kay Lacey<sup>5</sup> | Susie Hope<sup>4</sup> | Andrew Hagger<sup>3</sup> | William Neale<sup>3</sup> Arnaud Duranel<sup>1</sup> Selena Zito<sup>1</sup> Andrew Lomas<sup>1</sup>

# Introduction

NFM is the reduction of flood risk by protecting, restoring, altering, and emulating natural river catchment features<sup>1,5</sup>. NFM, part of working with natural processes (WWNP), has clear environmental benefits in comparison to its less sustainable, hard engineering alternatives<sup>3</sup>. It can also be initially cheaper and is an integrated element of the landscape, interconnected with both the social and natural sciences<sup>2</sup>. This study will focus on leaky barriers and woodlands (tree-planting) as forms of NFM along with community engagement.

Leaky barriers slow the flow of water immediately upstream, improving vertical and lateral connectivity to the floodplain and groundwater<sup>4</sup>. This discourages incision of watercourses, which heightens downstream flood risk as discharge is greater <sup>6</sup>. Arguably, there are 3 kinds of leaky barrier: natural (a tree has fallen), semi-natural (tree trunks and branches are cut and positioned to look natural e.g. Figure 1), and structured (purposefully engineered)<sup>8</sup>; this is influenced by what 'look' a landowner prefers.

## Aims

- Evaluate the impact of woody leaky barriers on peak flow using field monitoring data
- Evaluate the impact of woodlands on infiltration and soil water storage
- Assess the role of community engagement and knowledge in NFM project design, delivery, and monitoring

## **Methods**

- Flow monitoring (equipment and software and timescale) •
- Soil sampling to compare soil water storage abilities under recently planted trees versus that of long-established woodland



Figure 1: leaky barrier in Englefield

It is an integral part of NFM to incorporate local knowledge into NFM measures as this encourages a bottom-up approach to flood management. Community engagement encapsulates this; it is a participatory method where the public have an input in changing their environment as opposed to a top-down approach <sup>7</sup>.

## **Research Sites**

2 locations within lowland groundwater dominated catchments, fed by chalk streams in the West Thames area:

Interviews (walk and talk) with individuals from communities affected by flooding (Mill Corner and Pangbourne), and the use of images to describe their interactions with NFM in the environment

## **Wider Implications**

- This research will reduce the current knowledge deficit there is regarding the • effectiveness of NFM as part of WWNP by addressing research gaps and improving our understanding of NFM measures within the West Thames area
- This research is being co-produced by local communities and higher • authorities for a bottom-up and sustainable (both socially and environmentally) approach to flood management (figure 2)



1) River Bourne, Englefield, Berkshire.

Pang Valley Flood Forum (PVFF) selected this location based on the underlying geology of the catchment as it is a flashy watercourse which feeds into the River Pang

2) River Whitewater, Mill Corner, Hook.

Chalk streams running through gardens and private property, with ۲ additional sewer flooding

This research is supported by a University of Reading Strategic Studentship, School of Geography, Archaeology and Environmental Science, Forest Research and Thames Water. Field work is being supported by NERC Landwise project (NE/R004668/1) and University of Reading. Further field equipment and public engagement by EPSRC Twenty65 (EP/N010124/1). Funding for the NFM measures has been awarded to PVFF by a Defra grant and to Hart District Council by Local Levy and the Water Environment Grant.

#### **Contact information Email:** <u>g.b.powell@pgr.reading.ac.uk</u>

- <sup>1</sup> Department of Archaeology, Geography and Environmental Science, University of Reading, Whiteknights, RG6 6AH, UK
- <sup>2</sup> Forest Research, Alice Holt Lodge, Farnham, GU10 4LH, UK
- <sup>3</sup>Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Reading STW, Island Road, Reading, RG2 0RP
- <sup>4</sup>Hart District Council, Civic Offices, Harlington Way, Fleet GU51 4AE
- <sup>5</sup>Pang Valley Flood Forum (PVFF), 16 Briars close, Pangbourne, Reading, RG8 7LH

• Influencing culture & implementation of NFM

Developing tools & models to help make decisions

Figure 2: WWNP model showing the integration of community with NFM to form sustainable solution to flood risk management

#### Acknowledgements

Thanks to Cahyo Leksmono and Ian Read for providing University of Reading Technical Support.

#### References

<sup>1</sup>Barlow, J., Moore, F., & Burgess, L. (2014). Working with natural processes to reduce flood risk R & D framework : science report. Environment Agency. http://evidence.environment-agency.gov.uk/FCERM/Libraries/FCERM\_Project\_Documents/WWNP\_framework.sflb.ashx <sup>2</sup> Brace, C., & Geoghegan, H. (2011). Human geographies of climate change: Landscape, temporality, and lay knowledges. Progress in Human Geography, 35(3), 284–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132510376259 <sup>3</sup>Lane, S. N. (2017). Natural flood management. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water, 4(3), e1211. https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1211 <sup>4</sup>Ngai, R., Wilkinson, M., Nisbet, T., Addy, S., Burgess-gamble, L., Maslen, S., Nicholson, A., Page, T., Jonczyk, J., & Quinn, P. (2017). Working with Natural Processes – Evidence Directory Appendix 2 : Literature review (p. 332). Environment Agency. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/654443/Working\_with\_natural\_processes\_evide nce\_directory\_appendix\_2\_literature\_review.pdf <sup>5</sup>Nicholson, A. R., O'Donnell, G. M., Wilkinson, M. E., & Quinn, P. F. (2019). The potential of runoff attenuation features as a Natural Flood Management approach. Journal of Flood Risk Management, March, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfr3.12565 <sup>6</sup>Nisbet, T., Thomas, H., & Roe, P. (2015). Case study 12. Slowing the Flow at Pickering. 1–11. <sup>7</sup> Sharp, L. (2017). Reconnecting people and water: Public engagement and sustainable urban water management. In *Reconnecting People and Water*: Public Engagement and Sustainable Urban Water Management. Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315851679 <sup>8</sup> Short, C., Clarke, L., Carnelli, F., Uttley, C., & Smith, B. (2019). Capturing the multiple benefits associated with nature - based solutions : Lessons from a natural flood management project in the Cotswolds, UK. December 2017, 241–252. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3205