North Yorkshire Council

Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee

19 October 2023

Notice of Motion on Water Quality for improvements in health, wildlife, biodiversity and economy

Report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal & Democratic Services)

1.0 Purpose of Report

1.1 To present information in response to a Notice of Motion submitted to Full Council on 19 July 2023.This information has been provided to enable the Committee to consider the numbered points in the motion text and agree recommendations for Full Council's consideration on 15 November 2023.

2.0 Background

2.1 At Full Council on 19 July 2023, the Chair, Councillor Ireton, decided that a Notice of Motion on water quality for improvements in health, wildlife, biodiversity and economy should be passed to the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration, with the intention of it being considered at the meeting today and recommendations brought back to the 15 November 2023 meeting of Full Council.

2.2 The Notice of Motion proposed by Councillor Arnold Warneken (and seconded by Councillor Mike Schofield) stated:

This Council resolves to:

1. Recognise it has a role to protect the rivers, watercourse and seas in North Yorkshire and precious habitats these support as far as possible from the cumulative impacts of pollution, including in line with its local planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Be aware that there is evidence of deterioration of water quality due to the cumulative impact of nitrates phosphates, micro-plastics, pharmaceuticals, historical metal mining activities, and multiple sewage discharge events from diffuse and point source pollution including private and statutory waste treatment systems and seek to better understand the impact on our local rivers, wildlife and the health of our residents.

3. Draw on relevant evidence that assesses the cumulative impact of pollution so that this is appropriately factored into the emerging North Yorkshire plan, including the overall level of future development

4. Ask the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee to invite senior representatives from Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Dales River Trust, Nidd Action Group, Natural England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and other interested groups to attend a meeting to allow for a better understanding of the current levels of pollution and remedial action being taken in this regard.

5. Ask Yorkshire Water, from this date onwards, in its planning consultation responses for major developments, to clarify which treatment works will be managing the sewage; confirm that these treatment works have the additional capacity to take waste from agreed developments

and whether it has the information available to assess the impact on the number or duration of sewage discharges into local rivers or seas, and if it does have this information to share it (noting that this can only be requested not required).

6. Request that planning assessments, from now onwards, include in all reports on major developments appropriate coverage of the impact on watercourses, including the potential for the development to affect sewage outflow into watercourses, so that this information is clearly and transparently set out. related to this is reducing the impact of surface water and encouraging the installation of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) on new developments. whether this could be a standard for North Yorkshire

7. Ask the Leader and appropriate Executive Members to collaborate with other Local Authorities facing similar water quality problems in order to best understand how we can use our influence to reduce and mitigate the damage done to our watercourses.

8. This Council plays its part in securing bathing water status for the Lido on the River Nidd in Knaresborough and any other applications in North Yorkshire

This motion has been endorsed by the: Yorkshire Dales Rivers Trust; Lower Ure Conservation Trust.

2.3 There are a number of minor amendments to the motion text submitted which Councillor Warneken, as the proposer of the motion, will outline at the meeting.

3.0 Introduction

3.1 Water is a crucial part of the natural environment, making life possible and providing goods and services to people. It is important for many reasons, such as human health and wellbeing, wildlife and habitats, farming and food, bathing, leisure activities such as fishing and the economy.

3.2 It is estimated we use about 14 billion litres of water per day and will need 4 billion more by 2025. Pollution, population growth and larger towns and cities are having an impact on the natural water environment. The quality of the water system is becoming a much more prevalent issue in the UK, particularly around the emerging use of new pollutants and the frequency of sewage discharges into rivers and watercourses by water companies. In 2022, more than 384,000 discharges of raw sewage took place across England and Wales, adding up to 2.3m hours of spilling.

3.3 According to the Environment Agency, Agriculture and rural land management is the biggest single contributor to river pollution in England, as excess nutrients from farmland and livestock end up in the water. But the water industry, with both treated and untreated sewage discharges, is a close second. Ratings for England and Wales, from 2019 and 2021, show that rivers are in a poor chemical and ecological state.

3.4 When in a healthy and naturally functioning state, rivers, streams, ponds, lakes, wetlands, estuaries, and coasts deliver multiple benefits for society. These benefits include flood risk management, carbon sequestration, clean water and drought resilience. Efforts to improve the quality of water bodies in the UK are ongoing, but need to continue to anticipate and prepare for further challenges ahead. In April 2023, the Government announced a Plan for Water, built around a catchment approach to managing the water system. The Plan aims to use regulatory powers to enforce and fine water companies who do not achieve set targets and a strategic policy approach to clean up the water environment and deliver a resilient supply.

4.0 Summary

4.1 In response to each individual numbered point of the motion submitted, information has been sought from North Yorkshire Council officers to inform members.

4.2 ***1. Recognise it has a role to protect the rivers, watercourse and seas in North Yorkshire and precious habitats these support as far as possible from the cumulative impacts of pollution, including in line with its local planning policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.***

4.3 There is a recognition that water is a finite resource, and that protection of water quality is a critical cross-sector objective.

4.4 North Yorkshire Council has been appointed as the Responsible Authority for developing a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) covering the whole of North Yorkshire and the City of York. That will include coastal as well as on land and freshwater habitats. The work on the LNRS will be undertaken in close co-operation with the five protected landscapes in North Yorkshire that together cover just under half of area of the county. Development of the LNRS will also involve close working with established Catchment Partnerships, including projects to deal with diffuse pollution and supporting habitats generally – and also the Yorkshire Marine Nature Partnership (YMNP) that covers the whole of the North and East Yorkshire coastline. (See response below to point 7 of the Motion for more detail on NYC work with the Catchment Partnerships and the YMNP).

4.5 In existing Local Plans there are policies, which range in scope and detail, that seek to protect watercourses from pollution as a result of new development; establishing at the point of decision what the impacts and pathways//receptors are in relation to that development. But the issue is the extent to which the local plan policies and NPPF work on addressing the impacts of the development specifically: they do not have the capacity to extend this consideration to the point at which the foul water is in the main sewer, in terms of how it is treated, and this is managed by water utility companies (of which there are three in North Yorkshire) covered by the Water Framework Directive, and regulated by the Environment Agency under DEFRA.

4.6 However, the new Local Plan will be looking at this in more detail in relation to eliminating pollution incidents as a result of new development, and in a context of water scarcity in the face of climate change. There are current measures which are used in the planning process to minimise pollution incidents:

- In the last decade water companies have sought separate systems of foul and surface water management where new development is able to connect to the existing mains sewerage system, this is about reducing pressure on sewerage systems, by not having clean rainwater entering the sewerage treatment process in principle and reducing stress on the sewer network in the event of high levels of surface water runoff.

- For those developments that are not on mains drainage, and this is not uncommon in North Yorkshire, there has been a drive to replace septic tanks with package treatment plants which produce clean water which can be released back into the environment, whereas a septic tank needs additional treatment, and if damaged can cause a pollution incident.

- A key component of the Local Plan evidence base, and a resource for planning applications, is the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). It is a technical document which examines existing flood risk and uses modelling to predict flood risk increase over a 15 year period and beyond. It helps to inform a key component of local and national planning policy, the application of the Sequential Test, which seeks to locate

development in areas of least flood risk- an action which can reduce the incidence of pollution by reducing the incidence of flooding - as flooding events can cause pollution. The Sequential Test is complemented by the Exception Test, which is used in instanced where is not possible to locate development in an area of lower flood risk, and it is used to assess whether the development brings wider sustainability benefits and can reduce the flood risk at the site and not cause greater risks of flooding elsewhere. These tests can only be applied to proposals on the ground, either as allocations through the local plan process, or as applications (for sites which were not allocated).

- The planning system, through local plans also promotes the utilisation of the drainage hierarchy, which seeks to:
    - Re-use water at the point it is collected (which is becoming more common)
    - Slow water's movement into river systems/water bodies/ground at a rate which can be accommodated
    - Ensure that clean water (rainwater) is not contaminated en-route or lead to contamination of ground water
    - As a last resort is the input of surface water into combined sewers- this will happen in relation to many householder extensions unless SuDs are possible.

4.7 Where the planning system has very limited input into is the impact of water quality as a result of agricultural land use, namely application of fertilisers and pesticides/herbicides. Also, many industrial processes which use water are subject to Environmental Permitting.

4.8 But as a Local Authority under other remits, through our work on Natural Capital/LNRS/Biodiversity Net Gain, there are avenues for the Council to explore in relation to reducing rates of run off and exploring how land managers can reduce their usage of chemicals on the land and ultimately help to reduce the incident of diffuse pollution of waterways and bodies.

5.0 **2. Be aware that there is evidence of deterioration of water quality due to the cumulative impact of nitrates phosphates, micro-plastics, pharmaceuticals, historical metal mining activities, and multiple sewage discharge events from diffuse and point source pollution including private and statutory waste treatment systems and seek to better understand the impact on our local rivers, wildlife and the health of our residents.**

5.1 The impacts of pollution and poor water quality have been widely reported in recent months, with a focus on problems associated with the management of sewage and in particular storm water discharges from 'combined sewer outfalls'. At the same time, rivers in North Yorkshire have suffered from other pollution incidents including major fish kills associated with point-source pollution from agricultural operations and low flow / high water temperature issues.

5.2 Whilst the focus on the specific sources and cause of pollution incidents is understandable, it is also important to consider the wider physical condition of many of our watercourses. Years of physical modification (for example straightening and artificial deepening of channels, removal of habitat etc) means that most of our rivers and the wildlife within then are not well placed to mitigate the impacts of further stresses imposed by pollution or changing flow / temperature patterns. Indeed, the UK River Restoration Centre (RRC), the national centre of excellence on river restoration techniques and training based at Cranfield University, has recently highlighted the need for a much more holistic approach to river and catchment management that addresses the physical / morphological processes in watercourses alongside challenges from pollution. This is particularly pertinent in the face

of long-term changes to river flows arising from changing weather patterns. If Members wish to have more information on this, it can be provided on request.

5.3 The potential for cumulative impact from different pollutants is now much more widely recognised and the subject of intense research. For example, NYC is supporting a project led by the University of York specifically looking at the impact of combinations of chemicals (e.g. veterinary and human health products, cosmetics, agricultural fertilizers and pesticides) in the water environment.

6.0 **3. Draw on relevant evidence that assesses the cumulative impact of pollution so that this is appropriately factored into the emerging North Yorkshire plan, including the overall level of future development**

6.1 As part of the development plan, production impacts on water quality would be considered in areas such as Habitats Regulations Assessment in relation to European Designated Sites. This is a specific area of work which will be looked at by specialist consultants. It will need to consider this on a proportional strategic basis and look at the influence of other plans and strategies and will eventually drill down to a site specific basis because of the need to understand receptor pathways. It is unlikely the work will directly influence levels of development at a strategic level, but it will inform decisions about general approaches to the location of development. Other assessments and strategies will inform the levels of development.

6.3 A Site Assessment Methodology (SAM) is being developed which will be a key component of the approach to assessing sites. This will consider on the ground site constraints and context which could have an increased risk of being subject to pollution.

6.4 We are in the process of finalising a brief for the commissioning of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which assesses all forms of flood risk (including sewer flooding), and this will be applied through the SAM.

6.5 Discussions with water companies are crucial, and there is a clear mandate to seek to have more robust engagement with them, given the Government's consultation of making utilities companies subject to the a 'requirement to engage' in the plan-making process, this is to fully understand capacity constraints and opportunities, and to allow the companies to embed expanding their capacity and technologies to reduce the incidence of flooding, whilst accommodating increased usage as new homes and businesses are recreated in North Yorkshire.

7.0 **4. *Ask the Transport, Economy, Environment and Enterprise Overview and Scrutiny Committee to invite senior representatives from Yorkshire Water, the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Dales River Trust, Nidd Action Group, Natural England, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and other interested groups to attend a meeting to allow for a better understanding of the current levels of pollution and remedial action being taken in this regard.***

7.1 There are a number of initiatives already in train for engagement by North Yorkshire Council with key stakeholders on water pollution and related matters.

7.2 For example, in a meeting with the Head of the Environment Agency for North Yorkshire, the Chief Executive outlined concerns regarding Scarborough South Bay, and sought a more effective testing programme that can help identify the issues causing the pollution. It is hoped that this additional information can be used to pull together an effective action plan

to reduce the level of pollution. The quality of our marine environment and the protection of businesses whose livelihoods depends on it is a key priority for the Council.

7.3 Furthermore, following meetings between the Leader and Chief Executive, a Summit meeting will be hosted in Scarborough on the Monday 9th October to bring more attention to the water quality issues currently experienced in Scarborough South Bay. As a result of the summit, a list of actions has been agreed with the Environment Agency, DEFRA, Yorkshire Water and the Council to take forward and reiterates the commitment to continue to tackle the complex issues at South Bay together.

7.4 More widely, North Yorkshire Council is already engaged with established Catchment Partnerships and other key groups that involve many of the bodies listed here and that are working to address at least some of the concerns identified in this Motion (see motion point 7 below).

8.0 **5. Ask Yorkshire Water, from this date onwards, in its planning consultation responses for major developments, to clarify which treatment works will be managing the sewage; confirm that these treatment works have the additional capacity to take waste from agreed developments and whether it has the information available to assess the impact on the number or duration of sewage discharges into local rivers or seas, and if it does have this information to share it (noting that this can only be requested not required).**

8.1 As discussed earlier, current consultation is being undertaken by the Government to ensure that utilities companies, including water companies become part of a 'requirement to engage' the plan-making process. This is intended to help Local Planning Authorities to actively press for information about capacity. It is hoped that water utility companies as statutory undertakers will invest in staff resources to help support and engage in plan-making, and to that effect we are looking to arrange a meeting in the coming months to start a robust dialogue.

8.2 The motion text refers to only Yorkshire Water, and whilst they do account for the vast majority of water service in Yorkshire, parts of the local authority are served by United Utilities to the west and Northumbrian Water to the North. In regard to Yorkshire Water's (or any Water Utility company) role in the consultation of planning applications, they are not currently a statutory consultee but have been a longstanding consultee on planning applications.

8.3 Currently investment strategies for water companies are based on a rolling 5 year cycle, and not necessarily aligned to the phased roll out of development in a given area. This presents a concern, and greater understanding is needed with both developers and water companies to understand the need to phase developments. So, there is clear scope to do this through the plan-making process.

8.4 The type of information this motion seeks water companies to provide goes beyond Local List requirements, as it goes beyond ascertaining the specific nature and impacts of the development being considered. This is the key consideration of the planning application. Whilst it is possible for the utility company to identify where sewerage from a development will be treated if on a mains system, and provide information on the number of discharges, it will not be able to fully define the impact on a capacity level or impact on sewerage discharges of the development proposed. It should also be noted that some major planning applications do not generate significant sewerage/foul water, but do generate a change in the surface water regime. Also currently large scale agricultural buildings do not have building control approval and so their drainage considerations do need to be addressed at

the planning stage – but only if they need planning permission, as the prior approval process does not include drainage details to be satisfied. Major development are 10 dwellings or more or developments over 1ha or 1000 sqm of floor space. But it is clear that cumulatively small scale house building across North Yorkshire will in itself generate hundreds of new homes each year each will be input onto the sewerage system. As singular schemes, all we can do is ensure that they are served by separate systems of foul and surface water and ensure that there is a drainage system proposed for surface water.

8.5 So it is proposed that this understanding of capacity be focused on the plan-making process and not as part of major planning applications.

9.0 **6. Request that planning assessments, from now onwards, include in all reports on major developments appropriate coverage of the impact on watercourses, including the potential for the development to affect sewage outflow into watercourses, so that this information is clearly and transparently set out. related to this is reducing the impact of surface water and encouraging the installation of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) on new developments. whether this could be a standard for North Yorkshire**

9.1 It should be noted that the term SuDS should refer to 'Sustainable Drainage Systems', without the inclusion of 'Urban'. This convention changed some years ago as the reference to urban was considered to be too restrictive.

9.2 In determining planning applications, the policy framework of the existing local plans (The Development Plan) has primacy in the decision making process unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has weight as a significant 'material planning consideration'. A motion of Council, as a 'material planning consideration' would be of limited weight, and were they to be treated as having more weight than the Development Plan or the NPPF, the decision could be challenged via an appeal, which could be judged unreasonable and result in an award of costs against the Council. It could also be subject to Judicial Review.

9.3 A planning application is also assessed in relation to the direct impacts generated as a result of the proposed development itself. We would be unable to consider the potential of the development to be affecting sewerage outflow into water courses, as there is no direct correlation between the proposal and that pollution incident. Such events are a function of more than just the development's foul water generation, and it is a matter which is the responsibility of Yorkshire Water and monitored by the Environment Agency.

9.4 Betterment (e.g. using a planning application to derive wider benefits and improve/address existing deficiencies) is not an automatic derivative of planning permission. We can only require that a development addresses its own impacts, although there are instances where betterment is an indirect impact.

9.5 So it would not be advocated that such an approach is taken in relation to planning applications.

9.6 It is the plan-making process which will need to get robust information from water companies about capacity, and what additional infrastructure is necessary to address the impacts of new development as whole. This can then be embedded in as part of a capital programme. We need to understand what their timeframes for implementation are, to phase key schemes potentially - particularly as significant sewerage treatment facilities are a considerable cost. CIL or its successor could be needed to pump-prime developments depending on the locations of development.

9.7 Policy standards, such as those on SuDs need to be considered and developed as part of the Development Plan - and cannot be implemented ad-hoc or prior to that process (for the reason above). Local Plans already encourage the use of SuDs (sustainable drainage systems). Implementation of SuDs as a principle is also already encouraged as part of the National Drainage Hierarchy, but SuDs will not always be the most appropriate solution depending on the hydrogeology of the ground and the presence of aquifers (as contamination risk in their own right) or a relatively impermeable sub-strata which will simply lead to increased run-off rates.

9.8 Other aspects to consider are consistent consideration of the nationally- defined Sequential Test and Exception Tests, which operate to maximise the amount of development in areas of lowest flood risk. This is important because one of the key reasons why pollution incidents have occurred is during heavy rain when run-off rates increase - as that is currently when Utility companies are legally permitted to make discharges.

9.9 What is also important to consider is water wastage and usage, and whilst this is usually the remit of Building Control Regulations, planning policies can apply tighter standards in an area of water stress. A letter from Steve Double MP wrote to all Chief Executives in September 2022 which effectively green-lighted the ability of local plans to set locally derived standards for water efficiency, and states:

"...*we encourage Local Authorities to apply the tighter standard of 110 litres per person per day (l/p/d) set out in the 'Housing: optional technical standards' guidance and prescribed by regulation 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations 2010".*

9.10 Evidencing this in the past has been around water stress, and whilst North Yorkshire is not yet in that category, it is likely that parts of the authority will be subject to intermittent periods of water stress. It would still need to be evidenced as part of the plan-making process.

9.11 Whilst this is not about water pollution *per se*, water usage reduction is part of the wider picture for reducing our impact on water resources and it does reduce the amount of water needing to be treated. It is also part of the holistic response to adapting to climate change, as water resources are more in demand, and potentially scarcer as our climate warms.

9.12 It is considered that there are alternative approaches which need to be explored before capacity information is requested from a utility company as part of a major planning application. This will be addressed as part of the plan-making process.

10.0 **7. Ask the Leader and appropriate Executive Members to collaborate with other Local Authorities facing similar water quality problems in order to best understand how we can use our influence to reduce and mitigate the damage done to our watercourses.**

10.1 North Yorkshire Council is happy collaborate with other local authorities in appropriate initiatives to address water quality matters affecting both the freshwater and marine environments.

10.2 **Freshwater**

North Yorkshire Council (NYC) officers are already active members of several Catchment Partnerships that cover watercourses across North Yorkshire – including the Dales to Vales Rivers Network (the Swale/ Ure / Nidd / Ouse and Wharfe catchments), the Yorkshire Derwent Catchment Partnership, the Aire Catchment Partnership and the Your Tees Catchment Partnership (covering the Leven catchment and other watercourses in the county running north into the Tees.) These Catchment Partnerships have representatives from other local authorities in those areas including from West and East Yorkshire, and

Teesside / Co. Durham – as well as other stakeholders such as the water companies (Yorkshire Water and Northumbrian Water) and environmental organisations such as the Rivers Trusts.

10.3 North Yorkshire Council is also directly involved in several catchment-based projects across the county that are working to improve water quality as a key project outcome, along with a range of other environmental benefits. For example, NYC is providing project management on the River Foss Project (north of York), working with the Environment Agency and the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust. The Council is also a core partner on the Living Leven Project (around Stokesley and Great Ayton), working with the Environment Agency and the Tees Rivers Trust.

10.4 Other catchment / river projects that are delivering multiple environmental benefits where the Council is a participant / steering group member include:

- The Long Preston Flood Plain project - on the river Ribble south of Settle
- The Ryevitalise project – on the river Rye, a major tributary of the Yorkshire Derwent
- The River Skell Project – west of Ripon

10.5 The Council is also active in two important regional water focussed projects led by local universities: the Integrated Catchment Solutions (ICASP) project led by Leeds University and the ECOMIX project lead by York University that is exploring the impacts of combinations of chemical pollutants on river ecosystems. Both projects also involve other local authorities from across Yorkshire and more widely and provide useful opportunities for exchange of information and ideas.

10.6 **Coastal Waters**

North Yorkshire Council is collaborating with other coastal authorities facing similar coastal water quality issues as a member of the LGA Coastal Significant Interest Group (LGA Coastal SIG). Cllr Bastiman is the Vice Chair of the LGA Coastal SIG. The SIG has a Coastal Water Quality working group. The working group brings together local authorities to call for strong national policy and using best practice and joined up approach to ensure the best possible coastal water quality.

10.7 The priorities of the group are:

- Better understanding of current policy context, direction and opportunities
- Better understanding of Defra/EA resource allocation process
- Build relationships with key points of influence
- Engage Coastal Communities APPG on this issue
- Share local best practice between member authorities.

10.8 The current membership of the group consists of officers and Elected Members from across the Country with particular emphasis on areas with poor bathing water quality. Membership includes South Tyneside, ERYC, Thanet, NYC, Teignbridge, Essex, Canterbury, Cornwall, Westmorland, East Suffolk, North Norfolk, Isle of Wight, Great Yarmouth, Lewes, Kings Lynn, Southend and North Devon. The Coastal Water Quality working group would welcome NYC Member involvement; at present, NYC's Principal Coastal Officer attends the group on behalf of NYC.

10.9 Also relevant in this context is the Yorkshire Marine Nature Partnership (YMNP) that brings together a range of partners including local authorities from across the whole of the North and East Yorkshire coast to support initiatives to promote protection of the natural environment of the coast and promote nature recovery. NYC's Principal Environmental Policy Officer is a member of the Executive Board of the YMNP.

11.0 **8. This Council plays its part in securing bathing water status for the Lido on the River Nidd in Knaresborough and any other applications in North Yorkshire**

11.1 A separate Motion was brought to the full Council meeting on 19 July seeking Council support for an application for formal bathing water status for the Nidd at Knaresborough Lido. That Motion was adopted by the Council – and on 21 August 2023 a letter was sent by the Leader to the DEFRA Secretary of State confirming the Council's support for this designation.

11.2 Council support for similar designation of other sites in North Yorkshire, both coastal and freshwater, will be considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account all relevant local circumstances.

12.0 Issues to Consider

Equalities

12.1 There are no significant equalities issues associated with the motion text proposed.

Climate Change

12.2 The climate change issues associated with the motion text are covered under each substantive numbered point of the motion.

Financial Implications

12.3 There are no significant financial issues associated with the motion text proposed.

Legal Implications

12.4 There are no significant legal implications associated with the motion text proposed.

13.0 Way Forward

13.1 In considering the Notice of Motion put to Full Council in July 2023 and the information provided in this report, Members have the opportunity to consider the issues raised and make a recommendation to the meeting of Full Council on 15 November 2023.

14.0 Recommendations

14.1 Members are asked to consider the information provided within the report and agree a way forward.

Barry Khan
Assistant Chief Executive (Legal and Democratic Services)
County Hall,
Northallerton
9 October 2023

Report Contributors:
Hugh Clear Hill, Principal Environmental Policy Officer
Rachael Balmer, Planning Policy Team Leader (Ryedale)
Will Baines, Principal Democratic Services and Scrutiny Officer

Appendices:

Appendix 1 - UK River Restoration Centre's 2023 Conference Declaration

Background documents:

Constitution of North Yorkshire Council – North Yorkshire Council Constitution (northyorks.gov.uk)

Full Council Meeting 19 July 2023 – Agenda

House of Commons Library, Water quality research briefing (July 2018) - Link

DEFRA Plan for Water: our integrated plan for delivering clean and plentiful water (April 2023) - Link

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.