# Catchment partnership workshops

Angie Elwin, Jo Clark, Chris Short, Maleki Badjana, Jess Neumann

## Workshop objectives

- Score and select most acceptable and feasible NFM measures within each sub-catchment
- Co-create local NFM scenario maps - identifying extent and specific opportunities for locally preferred measures

### Additional application within

## wider LANDWISE project

- Assess the preferred NFM measures
  between catchments of different
  landscape character and the influence of
  participants of the workshops
- Compare participatory maps with technical opportunity maps to identify any areas of similarity and difference between these approaches



Samantha Broadmeadow  $\, {\cal Q} \,$ 



# Catchment partnership workshops

ANDWISE: Assessing acceptability and feasibility of Natural Flood Management measures in Upper Thames area

Please circle one options in each of the three categories that identify the group/sector you represent today.

- 1. Landscape area: [Upper Coln and Churn ANOB] [Lower Coln and Churn] [Cole]
- Your Expertise: [Community at Risk] [Farmer/Landowner] [Farm Advisor/Union] [NGO/Charity] [Local Authority] [Government Organisation] [Water Industry] [Research/Consultancy] [Other – please specify]

	_		-	-	_	_				_		
NFM Measure	Acceptability			Feasibility 5 = yeary high				Total score (A+E)	Please explain your scores (use other side of paper if needed)			
Runoff Management			101						19211	211	(8.17)	
Soil and land use management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Headwater drainage	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Run-off pathway management	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Woodland Management												
Catchment woodlands	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Floodplain woodlands	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Riparian woodlands	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Cross-slope woodlands	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
River and Floodplain Manageme	nt											
River restoration	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Floodplain restoration	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Leaky barriers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
Offline storage areas	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		











## NFM measure scores within specific sub-catchments

			Headwater drainage	Run-off pathway	Offline storage area	Floodplain restoration	River restoration	Leaky barrier	Woodland creation			
Workshop catchment	Catchment area	Soil & land use							Catchment	Floodplain	Riparian	Cross- slope
	Upper Coln and Churn 1	2	1	1		3	4		3	2	1	2
Upper Thames	Upper Coln and Churn 2	3			2	2	1	3				
	Lower Coln and Churn 1	5		3		4	3					
	Lower Coln and Churn 2	3		1	2	6	5	1	1	1	1	
	Cole			1			1	1	2	2	2	1
South Chilterns	Thames Corridor	4	1	1	3	1			3	1	2	
	Pang	3	2	4	2	2	1	4	2	2	2	2
	Wye	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	2		1	
Kennet	Lower Lambourn & Winterbourne	8	3	4		2	2	6	1	1	1	1
	Upper Lambourn 1	5		2		2	2		3	3	1	1
	Upper Lambourn 2	4	2	6	1		1		5	4	4	3
Loddon	Upper Loddon	2	1	3		2	2	3		1	1	1
	Lower Loddon	3			1		1		3		2	1
	Whitewater & Hart	2	2	3	3	2	3	3		1	1	
	Blackwater	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	2
Ock	Upper Ock	7	4	4	2	3		8	2		1	1
	Lower Ock	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	3			2
	Cow Common & Childrey Brook	4		2	1		3	1	1	3	2	1
	NFM measure combined score	61	22	40	20	35	35	37	32	23	25	18

Catchment	Participants	Farmer / Landowner	Community / Local Authority	NGO / Trust / Charity	Government Agency / Policy	Research
Kennet	20	8	7	3	4	
Upper Thames	25	10	11	4	4	2
South Chilterns	13		3	4	4	2
Ock	19	1	5	7	5	2
Loddon	17	5	7	5	3	







#### **Preferred NFM measures**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Soil and Land Management
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Run-Off pathways
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Leaky Barriers





## **Explanation of differences between catchment**







## Creation of bottom-up mapping of NFM opportunities



## Conclusions





Cartoons loaned from Catchment Study Centre (EA & University of Sheffield)

### The status and application of NFM