

NORTH YORKSHIRE AND CLEVELAND
COASTAL FORUM

Notes of the meeting held at The Spa, Scarborough on Monday 20 September 2004.

PRESENT:

Professor Allan Patmore in the Chair.

(Attendance list attached)

APOLOGIES:

(Separate list available on request)

1. **WELCOME BY THE HOSTS, NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

Councillor Eileen Bosomworth welcomed everyone to the Forum. She was pleased to see specialists and local people meeting together to discuss issues associated with the coastal zone. The coast covered by the Forum was diverse and she noted that there were many different issues affecting it including; provision of housing, tourism and its environmental impact, coastal protection and climate change.

2. **INTRODUCTIONS FROM HELEN SCHROEDER, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COASTAL FORUM EXECUTIVE AND FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FORUM, PROFESSOR ALLAN PATMORE**

Helen Schroeder thanked North Yorkshire County Council for funding the day and Scarborough Borough Council for providing the venue. She said that the new Strategy for the Coast was being launched that day. The Strategy was available in paper form and on CD.

She explained that the first bid for Interreg funding had failed, but a fresh bid with new partners was due to be submitted in November; if successful this would mean that the actions and priorities identified in the Strategy could be taken forward. A decision on funding was expected in February.

Professor Patmore reiterated that the Strategy was the Forum's document and included the Forum's priorities, it was not simply an officer-led document. He had hoped that this meeting of the Forum would have been devoted to exploring the roles of each partner in taking forward the actions identified in the Strategy, but with the failure of the bid this had not been possible; it was an "information giving" day instead. Richard Gunton was thanked for his involvement in the Forum; the responsibility for the Coastal Projects Unit would pass to Peter Barfoot at the North York Moors National Park. He explained that the failure of the bid had meant that the work of the Forum had had to be taken forward by existing officers, John Beech at the Coastal Projects Unit and Stewart Rowe at Scarborough Borough Council, rather than an officer dedicated to the Forum; he thanked them for the work they had undertaken on behalf of the Forum.

3. **PRESENTATION BY FRANK DE PLANTA, ENVIRONMENT AGENCY ON WATER QUALITY**

Frank de Planta of the Environment Agency gave a presentation which is summarised below:

- The results of Bathing Water Quality tests were classified as either:
I = Imperative (Mandatory standard)
G = Guideline (Higher than Mandatory)
F = Fail
- A diagram showing the results of bathing water tests for various locations along the coast was displayed. It was noted that there seemed to be a trend in some areas towards worsening results, particularly at Staithes. The Environment Agency would try to identify the reasons for this decline. The results this year had been worse than expected for some sites due to the bad weather and storms.
- One of the cause for poor water quality had been identified as “combined storm overflow”. This occurred when rainfall exceeded the capacity of the collection tanks and this caused sewage to overflow (rather than this being allowed to back up into people’s homes); the cost of increasing the capacity of these tanks was high.
- 20 samples were taken per annum at random pre-determined times from May to September.
- Each Beach was allowed to exceed the limits once per annum without causing it to fail.
- “Guideline” standards will soon be introduced; these were set by the EC and would soon replace the current mandatory standards. The tests were more stringent than the current standard.
- Funding of £90,000 over two years was available for a project to identify the reasons for failures; in particular Staithes would be targeted. Jane Hadinski would be the officer in charge of this project. When the problem was identified the Environment Agency would try to secure funding for remedial action to be taken.
- The Environment Agency would be looking for partners such as local authorities and Regional Development Agencies to fund any works which were identified as necessary to address the problems.

A Forum member was pleased that Staithes was being targeted for attention, but asked that the problems at Saltburn were also considered; the issue there was the run-off from old ironstone mines which coloured the water in streams brown. The principle of “polluter pays” did not help in this situation as the mine owners had been absolved of responsibility by the previous Government. The community at Saltburn felt that they were not receiving the help they needed to tackle the issue at the moment.

In response to a query, Mr de Planta explained that the residents of Staithes would be consulted regarding their views on the water quality issue.

Forum members wondered whether the quality of the water at Staithes was being adversely affected by the chemical works along the Tees and by Boulby Potash Mine. Frank de Planta said that the Environment Agency did not have a clear idea why these problems were occurring with water quality, which was why work was being undertaken to find out.

4. **PRESENTATION BY PHILIP TURPIN FROM ENCAMS ON BEACH QUALITY AND BLUE FLAG AWARDS**

Philip Turpin of Encams gave a presentation which is summarised below:

- Encams is a charity part funded by DEFRA
- It has run the Keep Britain Tidy Campaign
- Works with local authorities with People and Places
- Administers the Blue Flag and Seaside Awards
- Eco-Schools project

- What are the Beach Awards at present?
 - a) Blue Flag – the premier award administered by ENCAMS for FEE. This international campaign aims to improved the environmental management and public awareness of coastal areas. Beaches with Blue Flag Awards were as far afield as South Africa and the Carribean. The water quality standard required for Blue Flag is “Guideline”.
 - b) Resort Seaside Award – an award given to a beach that has many visitors and facilities within reasonable access to the urban community. There are 29 different criteria for this award. The water quality standard for this award is “mandatory”.
 - c) Rural Seaside Award – 13 different criteria. Not expected to have the same facilities as a resort beach and not managed, but under the “guardianship” of someone. Usually quite remote and difficult to reach. Standard of water quality required is “mandatory” (ie lower than for blue flag). They are enjoyed for their intrinsic qualities.
The main award criteria included:
 - i) Management Issues: Dogs prohibited or on a lead, public telephones within 5 minutes of the beach, toilets, drinking water available, safe access, adequate parking and well maintained facilities;
 - ii) Cleanliness Issues: Litter bins, cleanliness to Environmental Protection Act Standard including no seaweed on the beach or industrial discharge;
 - iii) Safety: Bathing safety, Supervision, First Aid, Incidents;
 - iv) Information and Education: Information displayed about current and recent water quality, a map showing sampling points and the area covered by the award; contact numbers for the local authority and Encams.
- Award Developments – the EU rules regarding bathing water were due to change in 2006, so there would be no seaside award from that date. As it would be increasingly difficult to comply with the requirements of the “Guideline” standard of bathing water quality, which would be in force from 2006, Encams were proposing a new system of categorisation of beaches.
- Dublin Beach Summit – Encams had invited interested parties from England, Scotland and Ireland to attend the summit. It had been proposed at that meeting that a publication should be produced which set out the details of all beaches in the UK “The Good Beach Guide”. It funding was achieved for this publication it would be available from December 2005. It would set out compliance of individual beaches with criteria similar to that used in the Seaside Award. For example, awards would be given for “Family” beaches, “Nature Conservation” beach and “Watersports” beaches, for example. Beaches would be zoned for activities such as horseriding, dog walking, kite surfing etc. Research was currently underway regarding what the public wanted to identify these beaches eg a flag or a plaque. It had the backing of many different organisations including; English Nature, Health and Safety Executive, Department of Culture, Media and Sport and DEFRA.
- The Blue Flag Awards would continue, but would be increasingly difficult to achieve, as the standard set was “Guideline”.
- The proposed new Beach Awards would include a Beach Management Module to help beach managers to improve the quality of their beach. Support and guidance would be available from Encams.
- Contact Details for Encams:
 - www.encams.org
 - www.seasideawards.org.uk
 - www.blueflag.org
 - www.fee.org

Philip Turpin Regional Officer for Yorkshire and the Humber (Beaches) 0113 2651862

Forum Members commented as follows:

- Concern was expressed from several different Forum Members that the new system proposed was likely to be too complicated and the public would not understand it. Mr Turpin explained that Encams wanted to acknowledge beach quality which could be gained without the link to water quality, given the new standards which would soon be introduced and the small percentage of users who actually used the water.
- In response to a query about consultation, Mr Turpin explained that the Dublin Beach Summit had provided a valuable opportunity to discuss the idea with a wide selection of people, however views about the proposed awards were welcomed from as many organisations as possible.
- There was concern about the potential economic impact on the areas surrounding a particular beach if an award was subsequently lost.
- Concern was expressed about the zoning of areas of the sea for different uses; the Borough Council had introduced this and jet and water skiers had now been forced into rougher seas; there had been no consultation with users about this and there was disquiet about it.

5. **PRESENTATION BY VICKI SHAW FROM THE NORTH YORK MOORS NATIONAL PARK ON RENEWABLE ENERGY**

Vicki Shaw, Community Renewable Energy Officer for the North York Moors National Park, gave a presentation on Renewable Energy, the main points are summarised below:
Her job is to increase the use of renewable energy in the National Park.

- What is renewable energy?
 - a) resources which are naturally replenished as they are consumed;
 - b) Harness energy directly from the sun, wind, waves, tides, rivers, streams, from the ground, burning wood;
 - c) carbon neutral – this is what makes it relevant to climate change.
- Why is energy an issue?
 - a) Energy is a key driver of everyday life and environmental change
 - b) Over-reliance on finite fossil fuels
 - c) Climate change and carbon dioxide emissions
 - d) Using a finite energy resource is essentially unsustainable
 - e) Energy security issues
 - f) Rising energy prices
 - g) Local investment
- Existing Energy Infrastructure – centrally located plants
- So what are the alternatives?
 - a) Reduce energy use through energy efficiency measures
 - b) A combination of large, medium and small scale production (the Government wants a mixture of sizes of plants)
 - c) Distributed energy – local energy generation for local needs using local renewable energy resources
- Opportunities and challenges:
 - a) Opportunities: Sustainability in practice, Community led, Local investment and regeneration, secure local energy supplies, reduce fuel poverty (make energy more affordable)
 - b) Challenges: Sensitive landscapes, address local environmental impacts of energy generation, commitment, dedication and support of local people
- Generating Electricity – the “green” alternatives – wind power, hydro power, wave and tidal power, photovoltaics (solar power) (PV)
- Wind Turbines – wind had been used as a power source for many years, this could be large wind turbines or offshore wind turbines, or small scale turbines such as the “swift” which could be erected on building.

- Hydro Power – this could include bringing old watermills back into use; there were a lot of old watermills in the National Park which had potential. This had proved successful in other areas and some had attracted additional interest as tourist attractions or bed and breakfast accommodation.
- Wave and Tidal Power – there were numerous technologies to harness this as a power source including: The Limpit, Nodding Duck, Palamis and underwater turbines.
- Photovoltaics (PV) – The panels could be mounted on buildings or in the garden or fields.
- Heating options:
 - a) passive solar design uses natural light to provide heating, cooling, lighting and ventilation;
 - b) Solar hot water panels
 - c) Heat pumps
 - d) Biomass energy – using organic material such as wood, straw, seaweed (still being developed), waste wooden pallets or animal or human waste.
- The Community Renewable Energy Officer was working with four communities in the National Park on projects this year. One of these was Staithes. The first part of the process was to introduce energy efficiency measures, then identify local resources available. It was important that everyone in the local community was involved.

A Forum Member questioned whether the project had the support of the planning section in the National Park. Vicki Shaw said that the key was to ensure that the planning officers were involved from the beginning of a scheme; to be successful each scheme would need the support of the National Park and local people. Richard Gunton from the National Park said that there was enormous enthusiasm for the project within the Authority; the challenge was to get the right scheme for the right location.

The Forum Chairman commented that this type of project was to be applauded, however to make a real impact renewable energy provision would need to be addressed at a national level.

6. **PRESENTATION BY MEL CUNNINGHAM, NATIONAL TRUST**

Mel Cunningham of the National Trust gave a presentation on the work of the National Trust along this coastline:

- The National Trust was established just over 100 years ago, and its first acquisition had been an area of coastline in Wales in 1897.
- It owned 70-80 acres of coastline in the area of the Forum including land at Hayburn Wyke, Ravenscar, Runswick Bay, Port Mulgrave, Loftus and Saltburn. The Visitor Centre in Robin Hood's Bay was also owned by the Trust.
- A team of people were employed to look after that land including wardens, visitor centre staff, education staff and caretakers.
- Cayton Bay – owned since 1980's by the National Trust. It's a nature reserve where natural processes of erosion are allowed to happen; the Trust was not, however, against sea defences in appropriate locations. There was a range of grassland and scrubland there which provided a variety of habitats for wildlife. In trying to manage the coastline, the Trust aimed to secure purchase of a field inland behind the coastal strip to enable paths to be moved back where necessary. The Trust compensated their tenant farmers where erosion took some of their land. Work to repair and maintain drystone walls was undertaken.
- Where the Cleveland Way crossed National Trust land, they had worked with the National Park to move the fence inland to enable a wider strip of land to be dedicated to Cleveland Way walkers as this helped to spread the walkers out and decreased the impact on the land.
- An education service was provided through the Robin Hood's Bay Visitor Centre; they were also involved in projects with individual local schools.

- Rocks – a dinosaur footprint was found following a rock slip at Port Mulgrave, with the help of English Nature and York Museums this was rescued and is now in York Museum. A cast is on display at the Old Coastguard Station.
- The Trust is involved in the Nortrail project and as part of the project a path for disabled users had been installed at Ravenscar.
- Ravenscar Alum Workings – restoration had taken place over a five year period.
- Slides were displayed at the meeting showing various elements of the National Trust’s work along this stretch of coastline.

A member of the Forum commented that it was a shame that the dinosaur footprint fossil had gone to York Museum.

7. UPDATES

a) Scarborough Borough Council on Coastal Defence

Chris Matthews gave the presentation:

- Government Policy - “To reduce the risk to people and the developed and natural environment from flooding and coastal erosion”
- DEFRA Objectives/Strategy –
Objective (b)– to encourage the provision of adequate, economically, technically and environmentally sound and sustainable flood and coastal defence measures
Strategy – encourage the setting up of coastal defence groups for specified stretches of the coast (North East Coastal Advisory Group - NECAG) and the development of shoreline management plans
- Shoreline Management Plans (SMP) – The aim of a shoreline management plan is to provide the basis for sustainable coastal defence policies and to set objectives for the future management of the shoreline: Policy Options were:
1) Do Nothing (No active intervention)
2) Retreat to the defence line (Managed Realignment)
3) Hold the defence line – (Hold the defence line)
4) Advance the defence line – (Advance the defence line)
The options in brackets are those used in the revised SMP
- Flat Cliffs – The SMP Policy Recommendation for Flat Cliffs was “Retreat the Line”. This should not include the construction of hard engineering works. There is the potential for property loss, which will require careful management. Monitoring Recommendations include six monthly “beach profiles”. A detailed study encompassing the whole of the Filey Bay Area will be carried out in the next five years.
- Filey Bay – The Coastal Defence Strategy Study Objectives (completed two years ago):
To identify options to provide cost-effective coast protection for a strategy duration of 50 years
To identify a preferred option for each discrete length of coastline and develop a preferred programme of work.
Filey Bay Coastal Defence Strategy Recommendations for Flat Cliffs – A revised policy of limited intervention, the provision of alternative access to Flat Cliffs and a rapid response monitoring system.

b) **Coastal Projects Unit**

John Beech from the Coastal Projects Unit updated the Forum:

- A pie chart was displayed which detailed current funding sources for the Unit.
- Seasearch — the CPU was working with local dive clubs along the coast to promote a national programme from the Marine Conservation Society (MCS) which involved collection of data relating to flora and fauna on the sea-bed such as sea-kelp and sea-turf; the data was passed to the MSC who collated it nationally. The data could be used in the future to monitor the impact of climate change.
- Millennium Volunteers – Seventy 16-19 year olds had been involved in a major clean up at Spital Vale, Whitby: some of the less able members of the group had been involved in putting forward ideas for improvements to access. The CPU had advised and assisted in setting up a local group and put forward a bid for “Living Spaces” funding of £22,000 from the ODPM.
- Staithes Community Woodland – this had been partly funded by the Single Regeneration Budget and had involved local residents in every stage of its development. Work to improve access to the woodland had been identified as part of the “planning for real” exercise”. A launch event had taken place following a lot of hard work, this had included storytelling, work done by the local school, charcoal burning and guided walks.
- The Living Churchyard Project – several churches were involved in the scheme including Hinderwell, Aislaby, Ugthorpe, Roxby and Lythe: the project was aimed at assisting churches to manage their churchyards as important wildlife habitats in conjunction with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.
- Runswick Bay Ponds – vegetation clearance had been undertaken by volunteers in order to protect the habitat of the great crested newts that inhabited the ponds.
- Adopt a Beach Project – litter survey and collection by local residents organised by the CPU enabled data to be collected about the litter and debris on the beach and the targeting of industries which produced the waste.
- Sustainable Tourism Funding had enabled the development of a number of cycle routes on the coast: the routes already existed, funding had been used for waymarking and leaflet production and promotion.
- Publicity – a regular newsletter and leaflets had been produced.
- Countryside audits were being undertaken using local volunteers to identify traditional countryside features such as walls, hedges and habitats.
- Coordination of a Coastal Interpretation Group.
- Promotion of the new Environmental Stewardship scheme in the new year.

c) **Interreg IIIb Bid**

Richard Gunton from the North York Moors National Park explained that a recent bid for Interreg funding had failed. A new bid was to be submitted with a new lead partner from the Netherlands. The main element of the bid was to obtain funding for an officer who could be dedicated to the work of the Coastal Forum and to provide a budget for the Coastal Projects Unit to enable works to be undertaken on the ground. The bid was for £450,000 over three years and a decision about its success was expected in February; this would be communicated via the Coastal Forums newsletter.

d) **The North Yorkshire and Cleveland Coastal Forum Strategy 2004-2009**

Richard Gunton from the North York Moors National Park explained that the Strategy had been produced by John Beech and Stewart Rowe following the work of the previous two Coastal Forum meetings. He said that the Strategy would require support and funding from the various agencies and partners involved in order to take forward the aims and objectives set out within it.

e) **North York Moors National Park**

Peter Barfoot updated the Forum on National Park issues:

- Nortrail – progress on this project was continuing
- Sustainable Tourism Project – this project had been funded by EU structural funds, it ended in December. The National Park was considering how the work started by this and other projects such as the Developing the Assets of Protected Areas (DAPA) could be carried on once they had ended.
- New Agri-Environment Scheme – the new schemes, which would replace ESA and Countryside Stewardship would be launched in January next year. There were three strands:
 - a) Entry Level Schemes – it was envisaged that 80% of farmers in England would take this Scheme up.
 - b) Organic Environmental Stewardship – this would provide continuous revenue support similar to that available at the moment.
 - c) High Level Scheme – National Parks in England have been involved in the development of this scheme. The Peak District National Park represented the other National Parks on the Working Group which was discussing the detail of the scheme and he was hopeful that the final scheme would be appropriate for the National Park in this area. It was important to ensure that the scheme was relevant to as many farmers in the National Park as possible. He explained that he had endeavoured to ensure that coastal issues featured in the targeting statements for this Scheme to ensure that farmers along the coast of the National Park could benefit. The Coastal Projects Unit would provide assistance to farmers in obtaining these grants.

North Yorkshire and Cleveland Coastal Forum Attendance List 2004

Name		Representative
Allanson	Cllr G W	Local Government Association
Allison	Profesor R	University of Durham
Bartlett	Mr G	Environmental Officer, NESFC
Beech	John	Coastal Projects Unit
Bell	Cllr L	Loftus
Booth	Cllr P	Whitby
Bosomworth	Co. Cllr E	Scarborough Borough Council
Brady	Ms T	Tees Valley Rural Community Council
Christon	Cllr B	Saltburn to Newholm-cum-Dunsley Parishes
Crooks	Mr P	Royal Yachting Association
Cunningham	Mr M	The National Trust
Davis	Cllr G	Saltburn
De Planta	Mr F	Environment Agency
Drewitt	Capt J L	Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast European Marine Site
Dunning	Dr S	Department of Geography, University of Durham
Edwards	Mr J	NYCC
Farquhar	Mr J D	North Yorkshire Moors Association
Fearon	Mr	Filey Against Dredging
Finlay	Alexe	Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast European Marine Site
Graves	Vicky	University of Hull
Hadinski	Jane	Yorkshire Water
Harland	Cllr M	Scarborough Borough Council
Heselton	Ms S	St Peters Centre Group
Hill	Mr G B	Scarborough Harbour Users' Association
Hill	Mr G	Whitby to Newby and Scalby Parishes
Hodgson	Malcolm	NYMNPA
Kelly	Ms L	Coastal Projects Unit
Leefe	Mr J D	CPRE (Scarborough and District Branch)
Mallows	Mr T	English Nature
Miller	Co Cllr T W	NYCC
Mortimer	Cllr Mrs J E	Scarborough Borough Council
Nesfield	Mr M	NYMNPA
Patmore	Prof J A	Coastal Forum Chairman
Pickering	Miss L	Coastal Forum Secretary
Pybus	Mr David	Cleveland Potash Ltd, Boulby Mine
Rosser	Dr N	Department of Geography, University of Durham
Rowe	Mr S	Scarborough BC
Schroeder	Cllr Mrs H	NYMNPA
Shaw	Mr D	Government Office for Yorks & Humber
Sigsworth	Cllr R G	Whitby Town Council

Name		Representative
Sinclair	Tolly	Cleveland Ironstone Mining Museum
Smith	Cllr V	Redcar and Cleveland BC
Spink	Mr B	Redcar and Cleveland BC
Sweeny	Mr B	University of Hull
Tallantire	Mrs J	NYMNPA
Tomlin	Mr D	Cleveland Ironstone Celebrations Committee
Turpin	Mr P	Encams
Vickers	Mrs E	Osgodby Parish Council
Viles	Cllr	Filey Against Dredging
Waring	Mr F	Hawsker cum Stainsacre Parish Council
Watson	Mr B F	Newby and Scalby Parish Council
Williams	Mr D	Scarborough Borough Council
Wingham	Cllr J	Cleveland Local Council's Association