

South West Region: River Yarty, Sir Arthur's Pill

Annex of R&D Note 456

Silsoe College, Cranfield University

R&D Project Record 317/21/ST

Further copies of this report are available from:



Foundation for Water Research, Allen House, The Listons,
Liston Rd, Marlow, Bucks SL7 1FD. Tel: 01628-891589, Fax: 01628-472711



NRA

National Rivers Authority

South West Region: River Yarty, Sir Arthur's Pill

Annex of R&D Note 456

J A L Dunderdale, J Morris

**Research Contractor:
Silsoe College, Cranfield University**

**National Rivers Authority
Rivers House
Waterside Drive
Aztec West
Bristol
BS12 4UD**

R&D Project Record 317/21/ST

Publisher

National Rivers Authority
Rivers House
Waterside Drive
Aztec West
Bristol
BS12 4UD

Tel: 01454 624 400

Fax: 01454 624 409

©National Rivers Authority 1996 First Published 1996

All rights reserved. No part of this document may be produced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission of the National Rivers Authority.

The views expressed in this document are not necessarily those of the NRA. Its officers, servants or agents accept no liability whatsoever for any loss or damage arising from the interpretation or use of the information, or reliance upon views contained herein.

Dissemination Status

Internal: Released to Regions
External: Released to Public Domain

Statement of Use

This document describes methods, results and conclusions of a study to evaluate the impacts of alternative river maintenance strategies on the River Yarty and Sir Arthur's Pill in the South Western Region. Its main purposes are to provide supporting information for R&D Note 456 'River Maintenance Evaluation' and to provide data which support routines for the prioritisation and programming of river maintenance.

Research Contractor

This document was produced under R&D Project No. 317 by:

Silsoe College
Cranfield University
Silsoe
Bedford
MK45 4DT.

Tel: 01525 863 000

Fax: 01525 863 001

NRA Project Leader

The NRA's Project Leader for R&D Project 317 was:

Stewart Powers - NRA Severn Trent Region

Additional Copies

NRA Staff wishing to obtain additional copies of this document should contact their Regional R&D Co-ordinator. External persons should contact: **The Foundation for Water Research, Allen House, The Listons, Liston Road, Marlow, Bucks. SL7 1FD.** Tel: 01628 891 589; Fax: 01628 472 711, who will advise as to price and availability.

RIVER YARTY

CONTENTS

RIVER YARTY

1. BACKGROUND	1
1.1 <u>PHYSICAL BACKGROUND</u>	1
1.2 <u>STUDY REACH</u>	1
1.3 <u>RIVER CHARACTERISTICS</u>	1
1.4 <u>LAND DRAINAGE</u>	4
1.5 <u>GEOLOGY, SOILS AND LAND CAPABILITY</u>	4
1.6 <u>CAPITAL WORKS</u>	8
1.7 <u>RIVER MAINTENANCE</u>	8
1.7.1 <i>Farmers views on maintenance</i>	9
1.7.2 <i>Alternative maintenance strategies</i>	9
1.8 <u>CLIMATE</u>	9
2. FARM SURVEY	9
2.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	12
2.2 <u>FARM TYPE, SIZE AND TENURE</u>	12
2.3 <u>LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISES</u>	12
2.4 <u>ARABLE ENTERPRISES</u>	12
2.5 <u>LAND USE IN THE BENEFIT AREA</u>	13
2.6 <u>TURNOUT AND YARDING DATES</u>	16
2.7 <u>GRASS CONSERVATION</u>	16
2.8 <u>NITROGEN APPLICATION</u>	16
2.9 <u>FLOODING</u>	17
2.10 <u>WATERLOGGING</u>	19
2.11 <u>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS</u>	19
3 HYDRAULIC AND HYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION	21
3.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	21
3.2 <u>CROSS-SECTION SURVEYS</u>	21
3.3 <u>FLOOD RETURN PERIOD</u>	22
4. LAND DRAINAGE	29
4.1 <u>FIELD DRAINAGE STATUS</u>	29
4.2 <u>DEBRIS DAMS</u>	31
4.2.1 <i>Nature of debris dams</i>	31
4.2.2 <i>Impact of debris dams</i>	31

4.3 <u>SIMULATION OF DEBRIS DAMS IN THE CHANNEL DEBRIS DAMS</u>	32
4.3.1 <i>Physical effect of in-channel blockage</i>	32
5 SCHEME APPRAISAL	34
5.1 <u>BENEFITS OF TREE AND BUSH MAINTENANCE</u>	34
5.2 <u>MAINTENANCE BENEFITS</u>	34
5.3 <u>DEBRIS DAMS</u>	40
5.3.1 <i>Financial and economic impact of debris dams</i>	41
5.4 <u>MAINTENANCE COSTS</u>	42
5.5 <u>SCHEME APPRAISAL</u>	42
6 ENVIRONMENT	44
6.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	44
6.2 <u>RIVER CORRIDOR SURVEY</u>	44
6.3 <u>PUBLIC CONSULTATION</u>	44
6.4 <u>FARMER ASSESSMENT</u>	44
6.5 <u>CHANNEL AND BANK QUALITY</u>	45
7 CONCLUSIONS	46
7.1 <u>SCHEME APPRAISAL</u>	46
7.2 <u>MAINTENANCE BEST PRACTICE</u>	46
<i>Channel</i>	46
<i>Bank</i>	47
7.3 <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	47
7.4 <u>EPILOGUE</u>	47
8. REFERENCES	48

APPENDIX I	Example of input and output data for the watertable model
APPENDIX II	River corridor survey

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Site location, benefit area and land use blocks	3
Figure 2 Land drainage and location of cross-sections	6
Figure 3 Soil profiles.....	7
Figure 4 Land use in the benefit area	15
Figure 5 Areas prone to flooding and location of debris dams	18
Figure 6 Channel information.....	23 - 27
Figure 7 Flood return period curve	28

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Rainfall totals	10
Table 1.2 Probability of climatic condition.....	10
Table 2.1 Land use within the benefit area.....	13
Table 2.2 Turnout dates.....	16
Table 2.3 Yarding dates.....	16
Table 2.4 Nitrogen application rates	17
Table 2.5 Farmer assessment of wetness condition	19
Table 3.1 Bankfull capacity and return periods	22
Table 3.2 Flood return periods and flooded areas.....	22
Table 4.1 Drainage status for wet, average and dry seasons, with/without maintenance	30
Table 4.2 Impact of 50 % of cross-sectional area blocked by debris dam on drainage status	33
Table 4.3 Impact of 75 % of cross-sectional area blocked by debris dam on drainage status	33
Table 5.1 Financial net returns	36
Table 5.2 Economic net returns.....	36
Table 5.3 Flood costs	37
Table 5.4 Change in financial net returns.....	38
Table 5.5 Change in economic net returns	39
Table 5.6 Farmer assessment of maintenance benefits	40
Table 5.7 Net return with 50 % and 75 % blockage.....	42
Table 5.8 Maintenance scheme appraisal: River Yarty.....	43

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Physical Background

The River Yarty rises at Staple Hill in the highland area of Black Down Hills, 6.75 km south of Taunton in Devon. The river is 21 km in length from source to the confluence with the River Axe, 0.75 km south of Kilminster. The catchment area of the River Yarty is 21 km² and predominantly rural in character.

1.2 Study Reach

The reach of river selected for study (Figure 1) runs for 5 km from Long Bridge (GR. 256 055) to Beckford Bridge (GR. 266 014). This site was selected for inclusion within the River Maintenance Evaluation study as it is characteristic of main rivers in the region on which maintenance is performed. The area of land deriving benefit from the river maintenance work in terms of its effect on flooding and land drainage is estimated to be 85 ha (Figure 1).

1.3 River Characteristics

The River Yarty is typical of many main rivers in Devon. The river banks are heavily lined with trees, especially alder and willow, along much of the study reach and deciduous broadleaved woodland is common in the lower area of the study reach. The river meanders over a narrow floodplain, constrained by steep valley sides. The meander belt is 450 m wide, containing both large sweeping and tight meanders.

The channel width ranges from 3 to 12 m. Freeboard varies dramatically from 0.25 m with slumped grass banks to 3 m high solid earth cliffs. Bank heights and angles are variable in dimension and change every few metres. Earth cliffs are a common bank feature, especially on the outer bend of meanders.

The River Yarty is a fast flowing river with an average gradient of 1 in 74. Riffles and pools are interspersed with rapids, runs and areas of slack water. Cobbles and pebbles are the dominant bed substrates with areas of gravel and the occasional boulder.

1.4 Land Drainage

The majority of the benefit area is naturally drained. Figure 2 shows the areas of the benefit area which are drained by pipes. Further information is provided in Section 2.4. Twenty four ditches discharge water into the River Yarty within the study reach.

An old weir upstream of the ford at Waterhouse Farm (GR. 261 031) serves to split the channel in two, reducing flow in the main channel which is crossed by a ford. The secondary channel is crossed over a very low concrete slab bridge approximately 18 inches above the river bed. In times of higher flow, this bridge is frequently submerged.


1.5 Geology, Soils and Land Capability

The geology of the area is characterised by the soft red sandstones of Permo-Triassic age. The Permo-Triassic period was an extended episode of continental erosion and deposition under an arid climate.

The Fladbury Soil Association is characteristic of the River Yarty floodplain. The Fladbury series is the dominant soil with the subsidiary Wyre series found on the slightly higher floodplain areas. Both series are deep clayey alluvial soils. The Fladbury soil is a pelo-alluvial gley soil which is characteristically mottled throughout the subsoil. The Wyre series is described as a pelogleyic brown calcareous alluvial soil which lacks mottling above 40 cm in depth.

Soil profiles taken within the reach are shown in Figure 3. The wetter sandy clay soil is characterised by mottling and has a gleyed subsoil. Both the Fladbury and Wyre soils are permeable, albeit slowly. The soil is waterlogged within 70 to 40 cm of the surface for more than 180 days in a year. The primary source of waterlogging is groundwater, the levels of which fluctuate seasonally. The Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW) classify soils with this wetness regime as Wetness Class IV (Findlay et al, 1984). Locally, prolonged waterlogging results in a Wetness Class of V during the winter in which soil is waterlogged within 40 cm for 180 to 335 days in the year. According to records from the nearest meteorological station to the site (Twist), the average annual rainfall is approximately 972 mm.

The land is classed as Grade 4 under the Agricultural Land Classification System of MAFF, with the dominant land use being permanent grassland or long leys. The risk of poaching (surface damage by livestock) is high and the incidence of flooding restricts grazing seasons.



Legend :

-  Piped drainage
-  Natural drainage
-  Cross-section location

Scale 1 : 21 250


Figure 2 Land drainage and location of cross-sections

Grid Reference 255 044

Soil Core Number 1

Soil Colour Dark reddish brown

Comments Uniform profile




Grid Reference 259 037

Soil Core Number 2

Soil Colour Dark reddish brown

Comments Uniform profile



Grid Reference 262 027

Soil Core Number 3

Soil Colour Dark brown

Comments Mottling of subsoil




Figure 3 Soil profiles

1.6 Capital Works

Capital works were performed on the River Yarty in 1968 following the East Devon floods which were the result of summer storms. These works involved a pioneer timber and bank management scheme when tree clearance and bank maintenance took place. Between 1980 and 1987 a block stone bank revetment scheme was carried out. Bed check weirs were created although these works are just downstream of the study reach.

1.7 River Maintenance

The aim of river maintenance work is to provide a clear watercourse in times of high water and to prevent the flooding and damage of the transport network and numerous low bridges which cross the river. Maintenance is carried out as a preventative measure to minimise the probability of fallen timber accumulating against bridges or as debris dams.

The first tree and bush river maintenance work since the capital scheme was performed during the winters of 1992 and 1993. The return period for future maintenance work is to be five or ten years. Chain-saws and tractors fitted with a winch are the predominant methods used in the tree maintenance. Unstable limbs and low, overhanging branches are removed if they pose a restriction to flow. Willows are pollarded in order to generate regrowth.

Fallen trees and other debris are removed from the channel as required. Since 1968, five gang days per year have been spent clearing debris from the channel.

The level of maintenance on the River Yarty is set following an inspection of the river by the NRA. Availability of equipment and labour also determine the timing of maintenance. In practice, tree and bush maintenance on this section is performed on a 'stop gap' basis. When work gangs have no other maintenance to perform, they are transferred to the River Yarty.

Standards of service (SoS) for the level of maintenance performed are set following an engineers' survey. Watercourse condition and availability of skills and machinery determine the method of tree and bush maintenance performed.

Prior to maintenance, conservation, fisheries and pollution bodies within the NRA and external groups are invited to attend a meeting to discuss the work programme in detail. If necessary, the work programme may be modified following this meeting. Landowners, tenants and

fisheries owners are informed via a telephone call and visit. If public utilities may be affected, relevant bodies are notified via a telephone call which is followed by a letter and map detailing the areas of work.

1.7.1 Farmers views on maintenance

During interviews with farmers, opinions expressed on the maintenance regime were divided. Five farmers expressed their satisfaction with the maintenance regime, stating that it was both beneficial and necessary in order to protect the bridges from flooding and to prevent blockages. However, others stated that it was both a waste of time and pointless as it had no impact on channel capacity. One expressed the opinion that maintenance was carried out at the wrong time and another thought that maintenance worsened the situation as the channel was deepened which resulted in faster flow and increased erosion.

1.7.2 Alternative maintenance strategies

Various alternative maintenance strategies were suggested by farmers during discussions. The dominant suggestion was that some action should be taken to reduce erosion. It was thought that this could be done through planting trees on the river banks and through the use of stone block revetments. Straightening of the bends was suggested as a method of reducing erosion as it would allow a direct route for flow thus reducing the risk of bank erosion. If maintenance were performed in the summer (June onwards) rather than during winter, this is thought by farmers to reduce the incidence of soil compaction as during summer, the load bearing strength of the land is higher than in winter. Stone revetment work has since been carried out in the vicinity of Crandons Farm Bridge (GR. 259 038).

1.8 Climate

The impact of river maintenance on watertable depth and river levels depends on the particular weather conditions, especially rainfall, which vary from season to season and year to year. The seasonal and yearly totals for the period of study (Twist met. station, GR. 290 037) are presented in Table 1.1. The probability of wet, average and dry seasons and years occurring has been determined through analysis of monthly rainfall figures which span a 13 year period. The classification system of the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) was used to determine the wet, average and dry rainfall bands. Wet and dry seasons and years are classed

as those which receive greater than 125 % and less than 75 % of the average rainfall values respectively. Further information on this classification system is presented in the R&D Note 456 Section 3.5.4.

Table 1.1 Rainfall totals

Period	Season	Actual Rainfall (mm)	Average * Rainfall (mm)	% Average Rainfall
1992	Spring	168.4	202.0	83.4
	Summer	220.8	180.1	122.6
	Autumn	331.8	282.4	117.5
1993	Spring	218.8	202.0	108.3
	Summer	173.2	180.1	96.2
	Autumn	398.6	282.4	141.1
1994	Spring	259.0	202.0	128.2
	Summer	119.9	180.1	66.6
	Autumn	392.1	282.4	138.8
1995	Spring	187.0	202.0	92.6
	Summer	119.9	180.1	66.6
	Autumn	392.1	282.4	138.8
Total	1992	913.3	970.05	94.1
	1993	1134.3	970.05	116.9
	1994	1199.6	970.05	123.7

* Based on 13 Year record from 1980 to 1993, Twist met. station

The summer and autumn of 1992, autumn of 1993 and spring and autumn of 1994 were wetter than average when compared to the long term average rainfall. This fact is confirmed by farmers who reported some flooding and wet condition underfoot.

The probability of a wet, average and dry season and year occurring is shown in Table 1.2. Rainfall probabilities are based on a 13 year record of monthly rainfall data from the Twist meteorological station (station reference 352 634, GR. 290 037).

Table 1.2 Probability of climatic condition

Season	Dry *	Average *	Wet *
Spring	0.07	0.715	0.215
Summer	0.21	0.43	0.36
Autumn	0.21	0.57	0.22
Year	0.64	0.22	0.14

* Based on records since 1980

The process by which financial benefits of maintenance are calculated according to the probability of each type of season and year occurring is explained in the R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.4.

2. FARM SURVEY

2.1 Introduction

Through site survey, structured interviews and informal discussions with farmers the area deriving benefit from river maintenance in terms of its impact on flooding and land drainage is estimated to be 85 ha. This area is classed as the benefit area (BA). The benefit area has been divided into different blocks (Figure 1) according to land management and land use, drainage conditions and flooding.

2.2 Farm Type, Size and Tenure

Five of the 13 farms within the benefit area are classed as dairy farms according to the European Union (EU) classification system. Three are lowland and livestock farms and one a mixed enterprise. The remaining four are classed as other enterprises. These include small holdings (2 and 5 ha) one of which is grazed by a horse.

Farm sizes range from 2 ha to 202 ha. The average farm size is 65 ha. The Standard Man Day (SMD) or Man-Work-Unit requirement ranges from five to 804, the average is 290. This SMD requirement may be used to assess the labour requirement of the agricultural enterprise. Generally, the higher the SMD value, the greater the amount of labour required.

Ten of the farms are under sole proprietorship. The remaining three are run in partnerships. All the farmers have one holding, although one farmer has two farms. These two farms are run as one unit under the same holding number. The majority of land within the benefit area is owner occupied. Only two farmers have rented land within this area. This comprises 1 ha which is held under a 364 day tenancy agreement and 6 ha held under a summer grazing agreement.

2.3 Livestock Enterprises

The general farming pattern of the Yarty valley is one of mainly beef and sheep enterprises with small areas which are cut for hay and silage.

Six farms have beef herds of various sizes and ages. All the cattle are under two years of age, with four herds following an 18 month grass / cereal system. One is under a system of

fattening with beasts sold on when they reach 400 - 700 kg in weight. The remaining herd consists of store cattle which are fattened off grass and silage and sold on.

Four farms have sheep enterprises. The lambing rate for these Horn Cross ewes under the fat lamb system is above average at 1.6 lambs/ewe tupped. One farm has 300 store lambs under the grass fattening system. These are bought in April and sold in the following February and March after being fattened.

The size of dairy herds on five farms range from one to 80 Freisan cows. Three farms have dairy followers aged between six months and two years. Milk yields range from 5350 litres/cow/year (average yield) to 6000 litres/cow/year (high yield).

One farm has a large pig enterprise under which 300 hogs are kept under a fattening system.

2.4 Arable Enterprises

Two farms have some arable enterprises, although only 0.5 ha lies within the benefit area. Winter cereals, commonly winter barley, turnips and sugar beet are grown under an arable / root crop rotation.

2.5 Land Use In The Benefit Area

Table 2.1 and Figure 4 provide a breakdown of land use within the benefit area. The majority of land is under extensive grassland (76 %). The remaining area is predominantly under intensive grassland with 0.5 ha under cereal and root production.


Table 2.1 Land use in the benefit area

Land Use	Area (ha)	% of Benefit Area	% Land With Field Drains
Extensive grass	64.9	76.3	43.9
Intensive grass	19.6	23.1	43.9
Cereal / root	0.5	0.6	0.0

Extensive grassland is classified as that which receives little or no nitrogen input and is subject to little or no grass conservation. If grass conservation takes place, hay rather than silage is usually cut. Beef and sheep commonly graze extensive grassland over a short grazing season.

In comparison, grassland under an intensive system is usually grazed over long grazing seasons by dairy cattle. Multiple cuts of silage are taken and inputs of nitrogen are relatively high (> 50 kgN/ha).

Approximately 44 % of land under intensive and extensive grassland systems is artificially drained by pipes. The remaining areas are naturally drained by gravity. Land under the arable / root crop rotation is not drained by pipes (Table 2.1).



Legend :

-  Intensive grass
-  Extensive grass
-  Cereal / root crop

Scale 1 : 21 250

Figure 4 Land use in the benefit area

2.6 Turnout and Yarding Dates

Dates for the turnout and yarding of livestock vary within the benefit area as Tables 2.2 and 2.3 indicate. The majority of grassland within the benefit area is grazed from April to October. Drier areas have longer grazing seasons although no livestock are overwintered out to grass within the benefit area - livestock are moved from the valley floor to graze higher areas. Eight percent of the benefit area is not grazed by livestock. A small area is grazed by horses and the remainder is left as meadow.

Table 2.2 Turnout dates

Turnout Date	% Grassland Area	% of Benefit Area
Mid / late March	12.9	12.8
Early / mid April	10.7	10.6
Mid / late April	59.4	59.0
After first silage cut	8.5	8.4
Not grazed	8.5	8.4

Table 2.3 Yarding dates

Yarding Date	% Grassland Area	% of Benefit Area
Mid / late October	45.9	45.6
Early / mid November	15.0	14.9
Mid / late November	20.6	19.9
Mid / late December	10.0	9.9
Not grazed	8.5	8.4

2.7 Grass Conservation

The majority of grassland is grazed only and is not cut for silage. One cut of silage is taken off 12 % (10.1 ha) of the grassland. Silage is cut in early to mid June. No hay is cut within the benefit area.

2.8 Nitrogen Application

Levels of nitrogen applied to grassland within the benefit area range from zero to 74 kg/ha. Table 2.4 shows actual levels applied. Fifty eight percent of the grassland area receives no

application of nitrogen. Over the remaining area, the compound NPK fertiliser in the proportions 20:10:10 and 29:5:5 are commonly applied.


Table 2.4 Nitrogen application rates

Rate (kg N/ha)	Grassland Area (ha)	% Grassland Area
0	49.0	58.0
1 - 15	5.7	6.8
16 - 30	28.5	33.7
50 - 74	1.3	1.5

2.9 Flooding

Six farmers within the benefit area reported flooding on their land. In all cases, high river water levels due to excessive rainfall were thought to be the main factor responsible for the flood conditions. On average, 21 % of the benefit area floods (Figure 5) on an annual basis during the autumn and winter months. However, 6 % of the benefit may be subject to flashy summer floods if rainfall is high and the channel blocked by debris.

The duration of flood events is short. All farmers report the flood duration to be of one or two days. Litter and debris on pasture are cited as the main consequences of flooding by many of the farmers. Such debris has to be cleared by hand. Erosion of the river banks is also reported to be a consequence of some significance.



Legend :

-  Flooded areas
-  Debris dams

Scale 1 : 21 250

Figure 5 Areas prone to flooding and location of simulated debris dams

2.10 Waterlogging

Throughout the spring and summer the wetness condition of the land within the benefit area is reported to be relatively dry. During the summer, as Table 2.5 shows, the majority of land is rarely wet with only 12 % being occasionally wet.

In the spring and autumn, a greater proportion of the land is wet. In the autumn, 29 % of the benefit area is reported as being often wet and four percent of the land is permanently wet. These wetter conditions have been attributed to the low lying nature of the land and the weather conditions.

Table 2.5 Farmer assessment of wetness condition

Season	Wetness Condition	Area (ha)	% Benefit Area
Spring	Rarely wet	30.8	36.2
	Occasionally wet	54.2	63.8
	Often wet	0.0	0.0
	Permanently wet	0.0	0.0
Summer	Rarely wet	74.5	87.6
	Occasionally wet	10.5	12.4
	Often wet	0.0	0.0
	Permanently wet	0.0	0.0
Autumn	Rarely wet	11.6	13.6
	Occasionally wet	44.7	52.6
	Often wet	25.0	29.4
	Permanently wet	3.7	4.4

2.11 Statistical Analysis

It is apparent that land use, farming practice, drainage and flooding are interrelated. Statistical methods were used to determine whether these relationships occurred more frequently than might be expected by pure chance. Full details of this analysis in which the 12 sites were grouped according to NRA Region, are presented in the Interim Report R&D 317/13/ST, presented to the NRA in December 1994.

The following observations can be made from the statistical analysis of fields in the benefit area of the River Yarty maintenance programme:

- Land management within the benefit area and land use are a function of the farming system followed. The dominant farming system influences land use within the benefit area.

Typically it is an area of pasture, devoted to dairy, sheep and beef and therefore even if the land is liable to flood and prone to wet conditions, land use reflects the dominant farming system; in this case dairy and lowland and livestock.

- A relationship exists between flooding and land use. The cereal / root crop production areas are not prone to flooding. Extensive grassland areas are prone to flooding. Flood duration is longer on extensive grassland (2 days) than on intensive grassland (1 day). (Statistically, there is a 40 % chance of correctly predicting the incidence of flooding on the basis of land use).
- A relationship exists between turnout dates for livestock and field wetness conditions in the spring. Land which is rarely wet in spring is grazed from late March or early April. The wetter land (occasionally wet) is grazed from mid to late April. (Statistically, there is an 85 % chance of correctly predicting livestock turnout dates on the basis of field wetness conditions in the spring).

3 HYDRAULIC AND HYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION

3.1 Introduction

Information on channel hydraulics and hydrological data has been used to determine the impact of maintenance on channel capacity and flood return periods.

3.2 Cross-section Surveys

Cross-sectional surveys of the River Yarty channel were taken at five points along the study reach at an average interval of 1.2 km (Figure 2). Channel capacity and freeboard were determined from these cross-sections. The channel cross-section remained unchanged following the tree and bush clearance programme and so a post-maintenance cross-sectional survey was not necessary.

Prior to maintenance, channel roughness was expressed in the form of Manning's n coefficient, in accordance with the methodology developed by Cowan (1956). This coefficient is composed of six elements which include the degree of irregularity of the channel bed, level of vegetation growth and relative effect of obstructions such as tree roots and fallen branches. Further details of this methodology are contained within the R&D Note 456 Appendix IV. The same procedure was followed post-maintenance in order to determine friction values for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situation.

Stage/discharge curves for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situation were constructed for each cross-section using the different values of Manning's ' n '. Channel cross-section information, stage/discharge curves and channel information are presented in Figure 6. The bankfull channel capacities and associated return periods for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance scenario are presented in Table 3.1.

The bankfull capacity figures obtained from the cross-sections indicate an average increase in capacity attributable to maintenance of 16 % and an average increase in the interval between flood events of 35 %.

Table 3.1 Bankfull capacity and return periods

Cross-Section No.	Without Maintenance		With Maintenance	
	Bankfull Capacity (m ³ /s)	Return Period (years)	Bankfull Capacity (m ³ /s)	Return Period (years)
1	16.7	3.0	20.8	8.0
2	5.6	0.3	7.1	0.4
3	10.3	0.9	11.5	1.1
4	10.1	0.8	11.5	1.0
5	14.5	2.0	17.2	3.8

(Source: modelled estimates)



3.3 Flood Return Period

Throughout the period of study (1992 to 1995) river water level information was collected on a regular basis through the reading of three gauge boards which were installed in the reach at Longbridge, Case Bridge and Beckford Bridge. Information regarding frequency, duration and magnitude of flood flows were collected from interviews with local farmers and NRA staff. A flood return period curve has been compiled from this information, using the methodology contained within the Flood Studies Report (NERC, 1975). The frequency of floods of different magnitudes can be estimated from the flood return period curve (Figure 7).

The flood return period for each block which floods and associated flooded areas are shown in Table 3.2. The 'without' maintenance return period is estimated by the farmer, the 'with' maintenance value is a modelled estimate using the cross-section information and Manning's n coefficient. It is assumed that the flooded area remains unchanged following maintenance.



Table 3.2 Flood return periods and flooded areas

Block No. (Size, ha)	Flooded Area (ha)	Flood Return Period (Years)		Block No. (Size, ha)	Flooded Area (ha)	Flood Return Period (Years)	
		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance			Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
101 (1.1)	0.88	0.3	3.0	801 (15.2)	1.90	0.3	3.5
201 (2.0)	1.60	1.0	3.0	901 (8.6)	2.00	0.3	3.0
202 (1.3)	0.33	1.0	3.0	1001 (1.90)	0.23	0.5	2.0
203 (1.3)	1.00	0.5	3.0	1201 (0.5)	0.10	0.5	2.0
301 (0.5)	0.50	1.0	3.0	1301 (17.8)	3.56	0.5	1.0
501 (2.6)	2.08	0.5	1.0				
601 (3.3)	0.33	0.5	1.0				




River channel information			
		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
Manning's n value	0.063	0.051	
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	16.7	20.8	
Return period (years)	3	8	

Figure 6 River Yarty channel information




River channel information			
		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
Manning's n value	0.05	0.05	0.04
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	5.6	5.6	7.1
Return period (years)	0.3	0.3	0.4

Cross section 3 - chainage 8300 m




Stage / discharge curve




River channel information

	Without maintenance	With maintenance
Manning's n value	0.05	0.045
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	10.3	11.5
Return period (years)	0.85	1.1



Cross section 4 - chainage 7200 m



Stage / discharge curve



River channel information		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
Manning's n value		0.049	0.043
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)		10.1	11.5
Return period (years)		0.8	1.0



River channel information	
Manning's n value	0.062
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	14.5
Return period (years)	2.0
Without Maintenance	0.052
	17.2
	3.8




Figure 7 Flood return period curve

4. LAND DRAINAGE

4.1 Field Drainage Status

Through an extensive literature review and farmer survey, the drainage status of agricultural land has been classified into three standards according to watertable depth. Three watertable bands have been identified:- > 0.5 m from the surface, between 0.3 to 0.5 m of the surface and < 0.3 m from the surface. According to the time the watertable lies within these bands, the drainage status is classed as good (G, no limitations to agriculture), bad (B, some restrictions on agriculture) or very bad (VB, severe limitations to agricultural productivity). Further details are presented in the R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.2.

The drainage status of the different land blocks within the benefit area of the River Yarty has been determined on a seasonal basis using a non-steady state watertable model which relates infield watertable levels (and hence drainage conditions) to observed water levels in the river and ditch system (see R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.2 for further details). The model has been run with river water levels for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situation using the same climatic data to enable the isolation of the impact of maintenance on drainage status. An example of the input and output of the model is shown in Appendix I. An example of the classification of the weeks of each season which are under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage status are shown in Appendix I.

In some cases, there may be a change in the number of weeks that the watertable lies within the good, bad or very bad drainage bands following maintenance. However, these changes may not be of sufficient magnitude to change the drainage status classification. Where a change in drainage status has occurred due to maintenance, the changes appear in bold print in Table 4.1.

The results of the model and the assessment of drainage status made by farmers are shown in Table 4.1. The results from the watertable model are consistent with the farmer assessment of drainage condition under dry and average rainfall conditions. In a wet season, the majority of farmers perceive the field drainage condition to be drier than predicted by the watertable model. In a wet season, there is 50 % agreement between farmer and modelled assessment of drainage conditions. During wet seasons, farmers attribute much of the drainage problem to surface runoff, antecedent rainfall, flooding from the river and the clay soil type. One farmer

reported that submerged outfalls for field drainage pipes contributed to the waterlogged conditions.

These assessments of watertable position in various seasons confirm that with maintenance, drainage status in the benefit area is generally bad in wet climatic conditions and good in average and dry seasons. If maintenance were not performed, the drainage status would generally remain unchanged. Without maintenance, under average weather conditions, farmers estimate that drainage conditions would deteriorate from good to bad over 5 % and from bad to very bad over 29 % of the benefit area.

Table 4.1 Drainage status for wet, average and dry seasons, without/with maintenance

Block No		Wet Season *		Average Season *		Dry Season *		Farmer Assessment			Without
		Without	With	Without	With	Without	With	With Maintenance	Average	Dry	
101	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	<i>B</i>	G	G	G
201	Y	B	B	G	G	G	G	<i>G</i>	G	G	G
202	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
203	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
301	N	B	B	G	G	G	G	B	G	G	G
302	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
401	Y	VB	VB	B	B	G	G	<i>B</i>	<i>G</i>	G	B
402	N	B	B	G	G	G	G	B	G	G	G
403	N	B	B	G	G	G	G	<i>G</i>	G	G	G
501	N	B	B	G	G	G	G	<i>VB</i>	G	G	G
601	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
701	N	VB	VB	B	B	B	G	<i>B</i>	B	G	VB
702	N	VB	VB	B	B	G	G	<i>B</i>	B	G	B
801	Y	VB	VB	G	G	G	G	<i>B</i>	G	G	B
901	Y	B	B	G	G	G	G	B	G	G	G
902	N	VB	B	B	B	G	G	B	B	G	VB
1001	N	VB	B	G	G	G	G	B	G	G	B
1101	N	VB	VB	G	G	G	G	<i>G</i>	G	G	G
1201	N	VB	B	G	G	G	G	B	G	G	G
1301	N	B	B	G	G	G	G	<i>G</i>	G	G	G

NB : *Modelled results

Y or N refers to the presence or absence of field drainage

Bold type indicates a change in drainage status as a result of maintenance

Italics indicate a difference in drainage status predicted by the model and farmer assessment

Current levels of maintenance activity prevent the deterioration of drainage status on 4 blocks of land. The percentage change of area by drainage status as a result of maintenance is estimated to be :

- in a wet season, maintenance prevents a deterioration in drainage status from B to VB on 9.9 ha (12 % of BA)
- in a dry season, maintenance prevents a deterioration from G to B on 2.2 ha (3 % of BA).

4.2 Debris Dams

The impact of maintenance on land drainage within the floodplain is negligible. This is expected as the trimming of trees and bushes which overhang the river will have minimal impact on channel friction and capacity unless debris dams form. Maintenance is carried out as a preventative measure to minimise the probability of fallen timber accumulating against bridges and thus causing localised flooding, increased water levels upstream of the debris dam, waterlogging, structural damage and risk to the general public using the road network.

4.2.1 Nature of debris dams

Debris dams are accumulations of organic matter within the river channel. Such dams form when a piece of woody material such as a tree limb falls into the channel and lodges against boulders or protrusions from the bed or bank(s). Smaller pieces of debris are caught against the original piece of debris. These provide the framework in which leaves and other debris accumulate.

4.2.2 Impact of debris dams

Unless removed, the accumulation of debris will form a dam and a barrier to flow causing the water upstream of the dam to 'back-up'. Ultimately, debris dams exert a resistance to flow and alter the roughness of the channel. Under low flows, when the water is shallow, irregularities in the dam are exposed and their effects more pronounced. The frictional drag exerted on the water as it crosses the dam reduces the flow slows water over the blockage. Water levels are thus raised upstream of the debris dam due to this 'back-up' effect. This may result in a localised increase in flooding and waterlogging as the watertable locally rises.

Under higher flows, the frictional drag of the debris dam is drowned out and the dam exerts less influence over river flow,

In addition to their impact on watertables, debris dams which partially or completely block the channel may exert control over local channel morphology. In meandering streams such as the River Yarty, the formation of debris dams may result in local erosion and scour of the bed and banks around the dam. This may serve to widen the channel thus diverting flow around the blockage. Mid-channel bars may develop immediately downstream of the blockage due to reduced flow levels and flow velocity in the lee of the dam. Stream ecology may be influenced by the dam through the creation of temporary habitats for such wildlife as otters.

4.3 Simulation of Debris Dams in the Channel

The impact of debris dams on land drainage has been determined through simulation modelling using FLUCOMP; a computational river model package produced by HR Wallingford. This model was used to predict the impact of debris dams on water level and discharge values along the study reach.

Debris dams were simulated via the imposition of fixed weirs along the channel section. Weirs are the closest approximation to debris dams available in the package. The height and breadth of the weir crest was altered to simulate varying degrees of channel restriction. The two sizes of dam simulated were 50 % and 75 % blockages of the cross-sectional area. The 50 % blockage of the cross-sectional area is deemed to be the lower limit for 'justifiable' debris removal (Bowles, 1992).

4.3.1 Physical effect of in-channel blockages

The location of the simulated debris dams are shown in Figure 5. The debris dams were located so as to be out of spatial influence of each other. The simulations showed that debris dams on the River Yarty affected river levels for a distance of approximately 300 m upstream of the dam irrespective of the season. The 50 % blockage is estimated to result in the change in drainage status over 28 ha (33 % of BA) whilst the 75 % blockages result in a change over 43 ha (51 % of the BA). The impact of debris dams on drainage status is shown in Tables 4.2 and 4.3.

Table 4.2 Impact of 50 % debris dam blockage on drainage status

Dam Location	Season	Current Drainage Status	Drainage Status with debris dam	Area affected (ha)	Land Use
1	Spring	G	B	2.8	Extensive grass
1	Summer	G	B	0.9	" "
1	Autumn	G	B	0.94	" "
2	Spring	VB	VB	0	" "
2	Summer	VB	VB	0	" "
2	Autumn	VB	VB	0	" "
3	Spring	G	B	4.5	" "
3	Summer	G	B	2.7	" "
3	Autumn	G	B	3.6	" "
4	Spring	G	B	5.4	" "
4	Summer	G	B	2.7	" "
4	Autumn	G	B	4.41	" "

Table 4.3 Impact of 75 % debris dam blockage on drainage status

Dam Location	Season	Current Drainage Status	Drainage Status with debris dam	Area affected (ha)	Land Use
1	Spring	G	B	5.85	Extensive grass
1	Summer	G	B	2.16	" "
1	Autumn	G	B	4.5	" "
2	Spring	VB	VB	0	" "
2	Summer	VB	VB	0	" "
2	Autumn	VB	VB	0	" "
3	Spring	G	B	5.4	" "
3	Summer	G	B	2.79	" "
3	Autumn	G	B	5.13	" "
4	Spring	G	B	6.3	" "
4	Summer	G	B	5.4	" "
4	Autumn	G	B	5.85	" "

5 SCHEME APPRAISAL

5.1 Benefits of Tree and Bush Maintenance

The benefits of river maintenance on the Yarty comprises two elements. Firstly, the control of tree and bush growth has a direct influence, albeit small, on the hydraulic performance of the channel. Secondly, tree and bush work reduces the probability of debris falling into the channel and creating a debris dam. When dams do arise, it is customary to remove them to limit the potential damage to the channel, adjacent land and structures downstream. The following benefit assessment examines these two elements.

5.2 Maintenance Benefits

For each block of land, agricultural production scenarios were created which reflect different levels of field management under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage (see R&D Note 456 Section 3.5.4). These scenarios are based on discussions with farmers in the benefit area over the period 1992-1994.

Changes in field drainage status as a result of maintenance under dry, average and wet climatic conditions have been identified. Changes in flood risk due to maintenance have also been determined. Estimates have been derived of the monetary value of changes in field management and productivity associated with changes in the standards of drainage service.

Two perspectives have been used to value agricultural performance. The first perspective is that of financial analysis which uses the prices paid and received by farmers to estimate the added-value associated with drainage. Financial analysis shows the benefits of maintenance to farmers in the benefit area.

The second perspective is that of economic analysis which modifies the financial analysis to make allowance for the direct and indirect subsidies paid to farmers by Government. In accordance with the MAFF Project Appraisal Guidance Notes on Flood Defence (PAGN, 1993), these modifications involve reductions in the financial value of output (including subsidies) by 10 % in the case of cereals, oil seeds and grain legumes, 35 % for beef and 25 % for sheep. Commodities subject to quota such as potatoes, sugar beet and milk are treated as

winter wheat. The set aside areas are also treated as wheat. The reasons for these adjustments are discussed in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

Table 5.1 shows the financial net returns (1995/96 prices) for each block of land within the benefit area under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage. Changes in net returns relating to a change in drainage status are also shown. Table 5.2 presents similar data using economic prices. Table 5.3 shows the flood costs for each block of land assuming 'with' and 'without' maintenance and specified field drainage conditions. It is assumed that there is no difference between financial and economic values in the case of flood damage to standing crops.

Table 5.4 combines data on changes in drainage status, flood risk and financial performance to determine the financial benefits and change in financial net returns due to maintenance for wet, average and dry weather conditions for each block of land in the benefit area. These benefits are the avoidance of losses which would occur in the absence of maintenance. Benefits weighted by field size for wet, average and dry seasons are multiplied by the relative probability of the occurrence of the season to give an average expected annual benefit. These are summed for the benefit area as a whole.

Table 5.4 estimates a total expected annual benefit of £ 382 in 1995 financial prices, equivalent to about £ 4.5/ha per year. These are very modest benefits which reflect the small direct impact of tree and bush work on drainage conditions in the flood plain. Table 5.5 shows the benefits attributable to maintenance using economic prices based on the current MAFF Project Appraisal Guidance Notes. Total average expected annual benefits are about £ 334 in economic prices for the benefit area, equivalent to £ 3.9/ha. On this basis, the benefit to the national economy is 87 % of the benefits which accrue to farmers. This difference reflects the adjustments required by MAFF to remove government subsidy from the assessment of benefits. These estimates require cautious interpretation as explained in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

Table 5.1 Financial net returns

Block	Area (ha)	Net Return (£/ha)			Change in Net Return (£/ha)		
		G	B	VB	G - B	G - VB	B - VB
101	1.10	389	341	291	49	98	49
201	2.00	511	410	339	101	172	71
202	1.30	511	410	339	101	172	71
203	1.30	515	413	346	102	169	67
301	0.50	375	334	292	41	84	43
302	2.80	375	334	292	41	84	43
401	2.40	207	170	135	37	72	35
402	5.70	177	152	108	25	69	44
403	3.50	406	353	308	54	98	45
501	2.60	401	305	265	96	136	40
601	3.30	165	134	112	31	53	22
701	2.20	446	334	292	112	155	43
702	0.90	462	399	282	63	181	118
801	15.20	208	159	115	49	93	44
901	8.60	503	415	349	88	154	66
902	7.50	503	415	349	88	154	66
1001	1.90	182	149	118	33	64	31
1101	3.90	253	208	168	46	85	39
1201	0.50	607	316	101	291	506	216
1301	17.80	151	125	99	26	52	26

Table 5.2 Economic net returns

Block	Area (ha)	Net Return (£/ha)			Change in Net Return (£/ha)		
		G	B	VB	G - B	G - VB	B - VB
101	1.10	107	84	68	23	39	16
201	2.00	126	89	68	37	58	21
202	1.30	126	89	68	37	58	21
203	1.30	130	92	74	38	56	18
301	0.50	93	77	62	16	30	15
302	2.80	93	77	62	16	30	15
401	2.40	97	70	46	27	51	24
402	5.70	45	32	17	13	28	15
403	3.50	378	305	194	73	184	111
501	2.60	79	54	42	25	37	12
601	3.30	58	37	25	22	33	11
701	2.20	110	77	62	33	48	15
702	0.90	64	47	25	17	39	22
801	15.20	75	45	18	29	57	27
901	8.60	503	415	349	88	154	66
902	7.50	503	415	349	88	154	66
1001	1.90	76	52	32	23	44	20
1101	3.90	120	94	71	26	49	22
1201	0.50	378	305	194	73	184	111
1301	17.80	62	43	26	19	36	17

Table 5.3 Flood costs

Block Number	GOOD DRAINAGE				BAD DRAINAGE				VERY BAD DRAINAGE				CHANGE IN FLOOD COSTS			
	Without maintenance FRP	With maintenance FRP	Without maintenance		With maintenance		Without maintenance flood cost	With maintenance flood cost	Without maintenance flood cost	With maintenance flood cost	Without maintenance flood cost	With maintenance flood cost	Without maintenance flood cost	With maintenance flood cost	Without maintenance flood cost	With maintenance flood cost
			cost	cost	cost	cost										
101	0.30	3.00	15.43	1.54	14.22	1.42	12.91	1.29	13.89	12.80	11.62	12.68	11.49	11.37		
201	1.00	3.00	6.08	2.03	5.17	1.72	4.47	1.49	4.05	3.45	2.98	3.14	2.75	2.44		
202	1.00	3.00	1.90	0.63	1.62	0.54	1.40	0.47	1.27	1.08	0.93	0.99	0.86	0.77		
203	0.50	3.00	11.71	1.95	9.95	1.66	8.60	1.43	9.76	8.29	7.17	8.00	6.94	6.65		
301	1.00	3.00	5.79	1.93	5.34	1.78	4.83	1.61	3.86	3.56	3.22	3.41	3.05	2.90		
501	0.50	1.00	10.60	5.30	8.53	4.27	7.75	3.88	5.30	4.27	3.88	3.23	3.49	2.45		
601	0.50	1.00	1.04	0.52	0.95	0.48	0.85	0.43	0.52	0.48	0.43	0.43	0.38	0.33		
801	0.30	3.50	2.70	0.23	2.70	0.23	1.99	0.17	2.47	2.47	1.82	2.47	1.76	1.76		
901	0.30	3.00	6.25	0.63	5.55	0.56	4.93	0.49	5.63	5.00	4.44	4.93	4.38	4.31		
1001	0.50	2.00	1.25	0.31	1.14	0.29	1.02	0.26	0.94	0.86	0.77	0.83	0.74	0.71		
1201	0.50	2.00	41.88	10.47	33.16	8.29	23.40	5.85	31.41	24.87	17.55	22.69	15.11	12.93		
1301	0.50	1.00	1.76	0.88	1.62	0.81	1.46	0.73	0.88	0.81	0.73	0.74	0.65	0.58		

Table 5.4 Changes in net returns due to maintenance and climate, 1995/96 financial prices

Block	Area (ha)	Wet Season			Average Season			Dry Season			Total Change (£/yr)
		Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	
101	1.10	0	14	14	0	14	14	0	14	14	15
201	2.00	0	3	3	0	4	4	0	4	4	8
202	1.30	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
203	1.30	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	13
301	0.50	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	2
302	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
401	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
402	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
403	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
501	2.6	0	4.27	4	0	5.3	5	0	5.3	5	13
601	3.3	0	0.52	1	0	0.52	1	0	0.52	1	2
701	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
702	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	111.99	0	112	40
801	15.2	0	1.82	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
901	8.6	0	5	5	0	2.47	2	0	2.47	2	35
902	7.5	65.91	0	66	0	5.63	6	0	5.63	6	47
1001	1.9	30.91	0.74	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
1101	3.9	0	0	0	0	0.94	1	0	0.94	1	17
1201	0.5	215.65	15.11	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1301	17.8	0	0.81	1	0	31.41	31	0	31.41	31	42
Total	85				0	0.88	1	0	0.88	1	15
											382
Probability of :-		Wet season			Average season			Benefit (£/ha)			4
		0.265			0.572						
		0.163									

Table 5.5 Changes in net returns due to maintenance and climate, 1995/96 economic prices

Block	Area (ha)	Wet Season			Average Season			Dry Season			Total Change (£/yr)
		Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	
101	1.10	0	14	14	0	14	14	0	14	14	15
201	2.00	0	3	3	0	4	4	0	4	4	8
202	1.30	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
203	1.30	0	10	10	0	10	10	0	10	10	13
301	0.50	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	2
302	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
401	2.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
402	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
403	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
501	2.6	0	4.27	4	0	5.3	5	0	5.3	5	13
601	3.3	0	0.52	1	0	0.52	1	0	0.52	1	2
701	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.86	0	33	12
702	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
801	15.2	0	1.82	2	0	2.47	2	0	2.47	2	35
901	8.6	0	5	5	0	5.63	6	0	5.63	6	47
902	7.5	65.91	0	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
1001	1.9	20.46	0.74	21	0	0.94	1	0	0.94	1	12
1101	3.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1201	0.5	111.1	15.11	126	0	31.41	31	0	31.41	31	28
1301	17.8	0	0.81	1	0	0.88	1	0	0.88	1	15
Total	85										334
Probability of :-		Wet season			Average season			Dry season			Benefit (£/ha)
		0.265			0.572			0.163			
											3.93

As an alternative estimate to that based on watertable modelling, Table 5.6 estimates the benefits due to maintenance which were perceived by farmers (earlier reported in Table 4.1) where they identified a change in drainage conditions between the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situations in an average, representative season. These estimates include the flood damage costs identified in Table 5.3 which were based on a combination of farmer and modelled data.

Farmer assessment gave an average annual financial benefit of £ 1631 (£ 19/ha) and an economic benefit of £ 1252 (£ 15/ha).

Table 5.6 Farmer assessment of maintenance benefits

Block	Area (ha)	Average Season Financial Prices			Average Season Economic Prices		
		Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance
101	1.10	0	14	15	0	14	15
201	2.00	0	3	7	0	4	8
202	1.30	0	1	2	0	1	2
203	1.30	0	10	13	0	10	13
301	0.50	0	4	2	0	4	2
302	2.80	0	0	0	0	0	0
401	2.40	37	0	89	27	0	65
402	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
403	3.50	0	0	0	0	0	0
501	2.6	0	4.27	11	0	5.3	14
601	3.3	0	0.52	2	0	0.52	2
701	2.2	43	0	95	15	0	33
702	0.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
801	15.2	49	1.82	772	29	2.47	478
901	8.6	0	5	43	0	5.63	48
902	7.5	66	0	495	66	0	495
1001	1.9	33	0.74	64	23	0.94	45
1101	3.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
1201	0.5	0	15.11	8	0	31.41	16
1301	17.8	0	0.81	14	0	0.88	16
Total	85	Total financial benefit (£)		1631	Total economic benefit (£)		1252
		Benefit (£/ha)		19	Benefit (£/ha)		15

5.3 Debris Dams

Tree and bush work is partly justified as a means of avoiding the accumulation of debris in the channel with consequences for retained water levels and increased flood risk. The work is accompanied by debris removal as and when required. The influence of debris dams on land drainage was determined by simulation as previously described. The analysis showed that debris dams have greatest influence on land drainage conditions during spring. For this reason

spring has been used to assess the likely impacts of debris dams which form and are not removed.

Table 5.7 shows the reductions in financial and economic returns due to a reduction in field drainage conditions associated with debris dams. It is assumed that dams are formed at equidistant points along the reach, such that all the channel is affected in some way, but the dams are independent in their effect. The annual financial cost of a single dam at location 3 for instance is £ 401 in the case of a 50 % blockage and £ 481 for a 75 % blockage. If the whole channel was affected in some way by debris the annual financial costs would range between about £ 2576 and £ 3331 depending on the degree of blockage. Economic prices gives annual costs of £ 821 and £ 1060. The dams are also likely to result in an increase in flood incidence on land already subject to flooding, rather than significant increases in the aerial extent of flooding. Very high flows tend to move over, around, or sweep away debris material. Preliminary assessment suggests that flood costs will double from those identified in Table 5.3 above, equivalent to an additional £ 170/year. On this very rough assessment, a channel blocked with (75 %) debris dams would result in financial losses of about £ 3300 + £ 170 per year, about £ 41/ha, and economic losses of about £ 1060 + £ 170 per year (£14/ha).

These estimates indicate the order of benefits which could be attributable to a combined tree and bush and debris removal programme. The estimate excludes the benefits of avoiding damage to structures such as bridges and to the channel itself due to debris accumulating in or travelling down the channel.

5.3.1 Financial and economic impact of debris dams

Through simulation, the influence of debris dams on land drainage has been determined. Table 5.8 shows the change in financial net returns associated with the change in drainage status resulting from 50 % and 75 % blockage of the channel cross-sectional area.

Table 5.7 Net return with 50 % and 75 % blockage

Dam Site	Area Affected (ha)		Drainage Status	Current Net Return (£/ha)		Drainage Status With Dam	Net Return With Dam (£/ha)		Total Change (£/yr) 50 % Blockage		Total Change (£/yr) 75 % Blockage	
	50 %	75 % Blockage		F	E		F	E	F	E	F	E
1	2.80	5.85	G	578	124	B	457	86	339	106	708	222
2	0	0	No Change									
3	4.50	5.40	G	613	125	B	524	90	401	159	481	189
4	5.40	6.30	G	815	453	B	475	350	1836	556	2142	649
								Total	2576	821	3331	1060

NB: F = financial prices, E = economic prices

Areas of influence based on spring conditions

Dams are assumed to be beyond the influence of each other, but collectively influencing levels throughout the reach

5.4 Maintenance Costs

Maintenance activities on the River Yarty involve the clearance and removal of overhanging trees and bushes, together with those which are at risk of falling into the channel. This work is carried out on a rolling programme with a return period of about 8 years. According to NRA records the cost for the 2 km reach was £ 1590 in 1995 prices. This is equivalent to an annual cost of £ 297 per year when spread over 8 years at 6 % rate of interest. In addition, the removal of debris dam material is carried out when deemed appropriate. Records of actual expenditure on debris removal are not available for the study reach, although average regional costs (based on the Severn Trent Region) are about £ 1500/km/year, equivalent to £ 3000 /year for the 2 km reach.

5.5 Scheme Appraisal

The estimated annual benefits attributable to maintenance can be compared with estimated equivalent annual costs spread over the relevant maintenance interval to determine the justification for expenditure. Table 5.8 shows that the tree and bush work carried out on an 8 year cycle is viable in both financial and economic terms. Benefits exceed costs. Table 5.8 also shows that it is worth spending up to £ 3600 along the reach per year on all tree and bush related activities, including the removal of debris from the channel. This assumes that blockages would become a permanent feature of the channel if no works were carried out. The possible damage to structures is excluded from the assessment.

Table 5.8 Maintenance scheme appraisal: River Yarty

Average Annual Benefit (£)	Average Annual Benefits (£)	Average Annual Costs (£)	Benefit: Cost Ratio
<i>Modelled Estimates</i>			
<i>Tree and Bush Work Only</i>			
Financial Prices	384	297	1.29
Economic Prices	334	297	1.12
<i>Tree and Bush and Debris Removal (75% blockages)</i>			
Financial Prices	3330	3000	1.10
Economic Prices	1000	3000	0.33
<i>Farmer Estimates (Tree and Bush Work Only)</i>			
Financial Prices	1631	297	5.49
Economic Prices	1252	297	4.22

The farmer based estimate shows that, based on benefits in an average weather year, the maintenance scheme is viable. The scheme generates an annual benefit : cost ratio of 5.49 and 4.22 in financial and economic terms respectively.

This analysis requires cautious interpretation. There is little evidence to confidently explain the link between tree and bush work and the probability of debris dams forming in the channel. Furthermore the behaviour and impact of dams change according to flows. A major justification for dam removal is to avoid the risk of flood borne debris causing damage or serious blockage at sensitive points elsewhere in the drainage system. The maintenance scheme is marginal in financial and economic terms. This implies that it is not justified. The maintenance is actually performed on an 'ad hoc' basis, providing work if there is spare capacity amongst the labour gangs.

This conclusion must be interpreted cautiously as discussed in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

6 ENVIRONMENT

6.1 Introduction

The environmental quality of the River Yarty is outlined in this chapter. Reference is made to river corridor surveys, public consultation and farmer assessment.

6.2 River Corridor Survey

Prior to the river maintenance works in 1992, a river corridor survey was completed (Appendix II) for the selected reach following the survey methodology developed by the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC, now English Nature, EN). Sketch maps and record cards have been produced for each 500 m section. The survey concentrated on the river corridor and adjacent land. Details concerning such features as channel dimensions, bed substrate, presence of structures, field drainage and bank vegetation were collected.

As river maintenance did not alter the channel characteristics, a complete post-maintenance corridor survey was not necessary. The post-maintenance survey took the form of a vegetational survey which concentrated on the banks and the areas on which tree and bush maintenance has been carried out (Appendix II). To date, two kilometres of the study reach have been subject to tree and bush maintenance.

6.3 Public Consultation

In the spring of each year a 'Conservation liaison Meeting' is held by the NRA to discuss the work programme for river maintenance in the following year. Representatives from various organisations such as the Countryside Commission (CC) and English Nature (EN) are invited to attend. Objections to the proposed work can be raised and if necessary modifications to the work programme made.

6.4 Farmer Assessment

Farmers interviewed within the benefit area were asked to identify any environmental features along the reach which they thought were likely to be disturbed or destroyed by the maintenance work.

All the farmers were aware of wildlife within the river corridor and mentioned kingfishers, herons as being particularly noticeable. The river is good for fishing - trout (brown and sea) and salmon frequent the river and spawn in shallow areas. The majority of those interviewed thought that the maintenance had a beneficial impact on the environment and encouraged tree regeneration.

6.5 Channel and Bank Quality

The environmental quality of the River Yarty has been determined by following the procedure outlined in the 'Guidelines for the Justification of River Maintenance' (R&D Note 511) produced within the framework of the NRA R&D Note 456 (River Maintenance Evaluation).

The quality of the river channel is classed as medium. There is a well developed pool and riffle sequence within the study reach and numerous minor habitats are created by tree roots and overhanging branches. The overall channel structure has developed and altered naturally over time and has been modified in only a few isolated areas by man.

The banks are of simple structure, consisting of predominantly three vegetation types including trees and bushes. Bank width is typically in the region of 5 - 10 m. The bank quality is classed as high. At times of low flow there is a well developed transitional zone between the river and channel edge and sediments are exposed. The structure of the bank vegetation is varied consisting of trees, bushes, scrub areas and grassland; some of which is grazed sheep and or cattle. Tree roots stabilise some banks and provide bank and underwater habitats. Earth cliffs provide ideal habitats for sand martins and kingfishers.

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Scheme Appraisal

The existing maintenance scheme of tree and bush clearance every 8 to 10 years is viable in financial and economic terms. The average annual economic benefit of maintenance in terms of its prevention in a deterioration in drainage status and increase in flooding is £ 334. Average annual maintenance costs are £ 297. The benefit : cost ratio is therefore 1.12.

Debris removal is justifiable in financial terms but not in economic prices. The benefit : cost ratios are 1.10 and 0.33 respectively.

7.2 Maintenance Best Practice

The 'best practice' vegetation maintenance methods for the River Yarty were determined using the procedures outlined in the Guidelines (R&D Note 511), produced as a result of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study.

Channel

Best practice maintenance operations for emergent weed are identified as :

- Biennial cutting;
- Cutting on a 3 to 5 year rotation; and,
- Desilting / raking at an interval of 2 to 7 years.

Best practice maintenance operations for floating and submerged weed are identified as :

- Annual cutting in the autumn;
- Biennial cutting; and,
- Cutting on a 3 to 5 year rotation.

All these maintenance operations should be selective, concentrating on those areas which are particularly choked by vegetation or areas in which the weed is liable to cause an obstruction, hazard or restriction to flow.

Since the beginning of this study, tree and bush maintenance and construction of bank revetments are the only maintenance operations to have been performed on the River Yarty

within the study reach. To date, the tree and bush work has been confined to the first two kilometres of the study reach. Little aquatic vegetation grows within the channel due to the mobile nature of the gravel substrate restricting root development and due to shading of the channel. Selective desilting of gravel shoals every seven years may be sufficient to enable the channel to provide the required standard of service. The maintenance regimes recommended as best practice in environmental terms for vegetation management are thus not applicable to this channel whilst the incidence of weed growth remains low.

Bank

Best practice maintenance operations for bank vegetation are identified as :

- Single bank mowing / flailing in spring / summer leaving a 1 m wide toe strip;
- Single bank mowing / flailing in autumn / winter leaving a toe strip > 0.25 m wide;
- Mowing / flailing every 3 - 5 years leaving a toe strip over 1 m wide or selective cutting (< 20 %); and,
- Light grazing.

Since the start of the study, the only bank maintenance performed has been some revetment work to protect an eroding bank near a bridge. The majority of the banks are grazed lightly by sheep and or beef and are not mown.

This is in accordance with the bank maintenance regime recommended as best practice in environmental terms.

7.3 Recommendations

It is recommended that further research examines in detail:-

- the impact of debris dams on flooding within the benefit area.

7.4 Epilogue

This report has assessed the impacts of the current maintenance regime on the study reach. It has been used along with other study sites to formulate guidelines on the appraisal of maintenance works and best environmental practice. These draft guidelines are summarised in Chapter 5 of the R&D Note 456 and presented in full under separate covers.

8. REFERENCES

Bowles, R. A and Morris, J. (1992). The Evaluation and Justification of Tree and Bush Maintenance. Report to the NRA, Severn Trent Region.

Findlay, D.C. Colborne, G.J.N. Cope, D.W. Harrod, T.R. Hogan, D.V and Staines, S.J (1984). Soils and their Use in South West England. SSEW, Harpenden.

MAFF (1993). Farm Incomes in the United Kingdom, 1991/92 Edition. MAFF, HMSO, London.

MAFF (1993). Project Appraisal Guidance Notes. HMSO, London.

Met Office (1990). Rainfall 1989. Met Office, Bracknell, Berkshire.

NERC (1975). Flood Studies Report. NERC, London.

Nix, J (1994). Farm Management Pocket Book, 25th ed. 1994/95., MAFF, HMSO, London.

NRA (1991). The Quality of Rivers, Canals and Estuaries in England and Wales. Report of the 1990 Survey, December 1991. NRA Water Quality Series No. 4, NRA, Bristol.

Map: Ordnance Survey Landranger 193. Taunton and Lyme Regis. 1: 50 000. Ordnance Survey, Southampton.

Map: Agricultural Land Classification, Sheet 177 (1974). MAFF.

APPENDIX I

Example of input and output data for the watertable model

River Yarty

Block Number 1001


Cross-section 5

Input Data		Output Data
River height (m AOD)		Watertable height (m AOD)
Week		
1993		
1	43.40	44.43
2	43.40	44.63
3	43.40	44.60
4	43.40	44.53
5	43.40	44.44
6	43.40	44.35
7	43.40	44.25
8	43.40	44.22
9	43.39	44.14
10	43.39	44.05
11	43.40	43.98
12	43.40	43.94
13	43.86	44.15
14	43.86	44.46
15	43.41	44.47
16	43.41	44.38
17	43.38	44.27
18	43.38	44.07
19	43.36	44.01
20	43.36	44.07
21	43.76	44.14
22	43.76	44.23
23	43.42	44.12
24	43.42	44.26
25	43.40	44.05
26	43.40	43.85
27	43.40	43.69
28	43.40	43.88
29	43.51	43.82


Example of drainage status classification, River Yarty

With maintenance		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks	
Block 1001		Watertable	1993	Spring 1993	Summer 1993	Autumn 1993	1993	Autumn 1993	No. of weeks
		depth (m)							
	>0.5	44.13	38	44.13	44.13	44.13	13	44.13	7
	0.3><0.5m	44.33	6	44.33	44.33	44.33	0	44.33	3
	<0.3m	44.63	8	44.63	44.63	44.63	0	44.63	3
Drainage status classification, according to time watertable is within the G, B, VB drainage bands							Good		Bad
Without maintenance		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks	
		Watertable	1993	Spring 1993	Summer 1993	Autumn 1993	1993	Autumn 1993	No. of weeks
		depth (m)							
	>0.5	44.13	21	44.13	44.13	44.13	6	44.13	4
	0.3><0.5m	44.33	9	44.33	44.33	44.33	4	44.33	1
	<0.3m	44.63	22	44.63	44.63	44.63	3	44.63	8
Drainage status classification, according to time watertable is within the G, B, VB drainage bands							Bad		Very Bad
							Good		


APPENDIX II




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER							
RIVER YARTY Km No. 0 - 0.5 km Date 9/4/92 Surveyor JALD		BANK FEATURES % sh-sh % AAA solid earth cliff 1m ↑ } XXX soft earth cliff > 80 } UUU rock cliff UUU artificial UUU flood bank abut UUU flood bank set back levee Height < 1m ↑ 1 < 2m > 2m Width < 1m → 1 < 2.5m 2.5 < 5m > 5m Slope: < 30° ↗ 30 < 60° 60 < 90° > 90° 4-1-1 mud 5-5-5 sand 5-5-5 bare shingle 5-5-5 vegetated shingle earth natural cobbles natural boulders BANK VEGETATION Cauler Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow - recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standard willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Rural/Sedge % Dense open % Sparse open % Re-seeded or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, + bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS HHH bridges/500m HHH weirs/500m HHH locks/500m HHH inlets/500m Depth < 25m ↓ .25 < .5 ↑ .5 < 1.0 > 1.0m Width < 1 ← 1 < 5 ↔ 5 < 10 → 10 < 20 > 20 Substrates BR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand t silt/mud clay peat Habitats and Flow pool slack riffle rapids run waterfall protruding rocks Margins shingle + bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent veg < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area bryophytes emergents submerged floating algae % of stretch		1 15 85 80 155 50 50 1 64 10 20 10 3 0-5 } total 100%					
G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + canal = ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % marina % 2. Running stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5.10m > 10 I. ROCK 1. cliff scree limestone pavement cave other 2. artificial/waste J. MISCELLANEOUS arable amenity grassland ephemeral/short herb hedge + hedge = fence on bank fence set back wall building caravans fish farm sludge clamp sewage works garden stick pile flood debris road railway disused used other		LB RB 2 2 3 1 3 10		8 7 4 10 20 90 80 90 70 10 10 60 50 40 50 100 100 6 4 1 14 8 2 1 2 2							
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation 2. Scrub - dense scattered Carr - alder willow 3. Parkland 4. Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved Improved/rescued 5. Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage	




[illegible]




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER					
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation 2. Scrub - dense Carr - alder willow 3. Parkland 4. Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved 4. Improved/rescued 5. Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Iracken 2. Upland spp. rich veg. 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage		BANK FEATURES % 1. sh. % solid earth cliff soft earth cliff rock cliff artificial flood bank flood bank set back levee Height Width Slope 1. Standing - canal ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off lake gravel pit reservoir marina running stream 2. % of adj. bank in creek stretch 1. ROCK cliff scree limestone pavement cave other artificial/waste 2. MISCELLANEOUS arable amenity grassland ephemeral/short herb hedge fence on bank fence set back wall building caravans fish farm sludge clamp sewage works garden sick pile flood debris road railway disused used other		RIVER HABITATS bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m intake/500m Depth Width Substrates BR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + silt/mud clay peat Habitats and Flow pool slack riffle rapids run waterfall protruding rocks Margins shingle ± bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent veg. < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area dryophytes emergents submerged floating algae % of stretch total 100%	
RIVER YARTY Km No. 1-1.5 km Date 9/4/92 Surveyor JALD		6 89 100 100 80 70 20 30 20 50 80 50 100 100 7 12 13 11 3 15 8 12 3 1		1 60 40 100 50 50 129 10 60 362 100 100%					




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation Scrub - dense scattered Carr - alder willow Parkland Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved improved/rescued Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken Upland spp. rich veget. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal	
D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet Lichen/bryophyte Montane Heath/grassland - dry wet		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed Bog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage	
RIVER Km No. 1.5 - 2 km Date 9/4/92 Surveyor JAVD.		BANK FEATURES % 1. cliff % solid earth cliff 1m ↑ soft earth cliff > 80 } rock cliff artificial flood bank with flood bank set back levee Height < 1m 1 - < 2m > 2m Width < 1m 1 - < 2.5m 2.5 - < 5m > 5m Slope < 30° 30 - < 60° 60 - < 90° > 90° mud sand bare shingle vegetated shingle earth natural cobbles natural boulders BANK VEGETATION Camellia Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standard willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % River/Sedge % Dense open % Sparse open % Rescued or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, 1 bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m inlets/500m Depth < 25m .25 - < .5 .5 - < 1.0 > 1.0m Width < 1 1 - < 5 5 - < 10 10 - < 20 > 20 Substrates IR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + silt/mud clay peat Habitats and Flow pool slack riffle rapids run waterfall protruding rocks Margins shingle 1 bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent veg < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veg area bryophytes emergent submerged floating algae % of stretch	




LG RB		RIVER YARTY		LB RB		RIVER HABITATS		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %		RIVER No. 2-2-5 KM		Date 10/14/92		Surveyor JALD		LB RB	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation	35	G. OPEN WATER		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Coniferous semi-nat. plantation		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
3. Mixed semi-natural plantation		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
4. Scrub - dense		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
5. Carr - alder		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
6. Parkland		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
7. Recently felled wood		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %	10	1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
1. Acidic unimproved		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Semi-improved		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
3. Neutral unimproved		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
4. Semi-improved		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
5. Calcareous unimproved		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
6. Improved/wooded		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
7. Marsh/marshy grassland		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %	65	1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
1. Blacken		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Upland spp. rich veget.		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
3. Other - tall ruderal		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
4. Non ruderal		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
D. HEATHLAND %		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Wet		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
3. Lichen/bryophyte		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
4. Montane		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
5. Heath/grassland - dry		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
6. Wet		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
1. Mires - bog		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Fen - reed		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
3. Sweet-grass		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
4. Mixed		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
5. Bog flushes		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION %		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
1. Swamp - single sp. dom.		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	
2. Tall mixed assemblage		1. Standing - canal + ditch		2. % of adj. load in creek stretch		3. % of adj. load in creek stretch		BANK FEATURES %	




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %		RIVER YARTY		RIVER HABITATS	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation	10	Rm No. 2.5 - 3 KM		bridges/500m	
Coniferous semi-nat. plantation		Date 10/4/92		weirs/500m	
Mixed semi-natural plantation		Surveyor JALD.		locks/500m	
2. Scrub - dense		G. OPEN WATER		inlet/500m	
3. Carr - alder		1. Standing - canal + % of adj. rock stretch		Depth	
4. Parkland		ditch		↑ ↓	
5. Recently felled wood		dyke		Width	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %		pond, pool, cut-off %		↑ ↓	
1. Acidic unimproved		lake %		Substrates	
2. Neutral unimproved		gravel pit %		HR bed rock	
3. Semi-improved		reservoir %		b boulders	
4. Calcareous unimproved		marsh %		c cobbles	
5. Improved/scrubbed		flood %		d pebbles	
6. Marsh/marshy grassland		stream < 1m wide		g gravel	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %		1-5m		s sand	
1. Bracken		5 10m		+ silt/mud	
2. Upland ssp. rich veget.		> 10		clay	
3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		ROCK		peat	
D. HEATHLAND %		1. cliff		Habitats and Flow	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet		scree		pool	
2. Lichen/bryophyte		limestone pavement		slack	
3. Montane		cave		riffle	
4. Heath/grassland - dry wet		other		rapids	
5. Mire, flush and spring %		artificial/waste		run	
1. Mires - bog		MISCELLANEOUS		waterfall	
2. Fen - reed		arable		protruding rocks	
3. Bog flushes		amenity grassland		Margins	
4. Swamp - single sp. dom.		ephemeral/short herb		shrub 1 bare	
5. Tall mixed assemblage		hedge +		shrub 1 vegetated	
		hedge =		mud	
		fence on bank		sand	
		fence set back		FLORA %	
		wall		emergent < 1m wide	
		caravans		emergent 1-2m wide	
		building		total veget. area	
		feet farm		bryophytes	
		silage clamp		emergent	
		sewage works		floating	
		garden		algae % of stretch	
		stock pile		Total	
		flood debris		100%	
		road			
		railway			
		damaged used			
		other			




LG, RB		LB, RB		RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %		RIVER YARTY		BANK FEATURES %		RIVER HABITATS	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation		Km No. 3-3.5 Km		shell %		bridges/300m	
Coniferous semi-nat. plantation		Date 10/4/92		solid earth cliff 1m ↑		weirs/500m	
Mixed semi-nat. plantation		Surveyor JALD		rock cliff		locks/500m	
2. Scrub - dense		G. OPEN WATER		artificial		info/500m	
3. Carr - alder		1. Standing - canal + % of adj. load in creek stretch		flood bank adj		Depth < 25m	
4. Recently felled wood		ditch		flood bank set back		↑ ↓	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %		dyke		levee		Width < 1	
1. Acidic unimproved		pond, pool, cut-off %		Height		1-5	
2. Neutral unimproved		lake %		↑		5-10	
3. Calcareous unimproved		gravel pit %		Width		10-20	
4. Improved/seeded		reservoir %		→		> 20	
5. Marsh/marshy grassland		marina %		Slope		Substrates	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %		1. Running stream < 1m wide		↑ ↓		bed rock	
1. Bracken		2. stream 1-5m		5-5		boulders	
2. Upland strp. rich veget.		5 10m		bare slung		cobles	
3. Other - tall ruderal		> 10		vegetated slung		pebbles	
D. HEATHLAND %		1. ROCK		earth		gravel	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry		cliff		natural cobles		sand	
2. Lichen/bryophyte		scree		natural boulders		silt/mud	
3. Montane		limestone pavement		BANK VEGETATION		clay	
4. Heath/grassland - dry		cave		Cauler		peat	
5. wet		artificial/waste		Oak, Ash, Sycamore		Habitats and Flow	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %		1. MISCELLANEOUS		Willow recent pollard		pool	
1. Mires - bog		arable		Willow old, not pollard		slack	
2. Fen - reed		amenity grassland		Standard willows		riffle	
3. Bog flushes		hedge +		Alder		rapids	
4. Sweet-grass mixed		hedge =		Other trees		run	
5. Fen - bog		fence on bank		Thick Scrub/shrubs %		wicket fall	
6. Fen - reed		fence set back		Sparse Scrub/shrubs %		protruding rocks	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION %		wall		Reed/Sedge %		Margins	
1. Swamp - single sp. dom.		building		Dense open %		shingle ± bare	
2. Tall mixed assemblage		curtains		Sparse open %		shingle, vegetated	
		silage clamp		Reverched or mown %		mud	
		sewage works		Exposed tree roots		sand	
		garden		ISLANDS		FLORA %	
		stick pile		Rocky, vegetated		emergent veg ~ 1m wide	
		flood debris		rocky, + bare		emergent 1-2m wide	
		road		shingle and rock		emergent > 2m wide	
		railway disused		shingle, rock + veg		total veget area	
		used		earth - maturing		bryophytes	
				earth - with trees		emergents	
				developed		submerged	
						floating	
						algae % of stretch	
						total	
						100%	




LG RB		RIVER YARTY		LB RB		RIVER	
15		RIVER YARTY Km No. 3.5 - 4 Km Date 11/4/92 Surveyor JALD		3 50		1 100	
100		G. OPEN WATER		20 50		60 40	
100		1. Standing - canal + % of adj. load in reach stretch 2		90 40		100	
		ditch		100 70			
		dyke		30			
		pond, pool, cut-off %		30			
		lake %		70			
		gravel pit %		100			
		reservoir %					
		marina %					
		furnace					
		stream < 1m wide					
		1.5m					
		5 10m					
		> 10					
85		2. ROCK		100 100		100	
		1. cliff					
		scree					
		limestone pavement					
		cave					
		other					
		artificial/waste					
		2. MISCELLANEOUS					
		arable					
		amenity grassland					
		ephemeral/short herb					
		hedge +					
		hedge =					
		fence on bank					
		fence set back					
		wall					
		building					
		farm					
		curtains					
		silage clamp					
		sewerage works					
		garden					
		stock pile					
		flood debris					
		road					
		railway changed					
		used					
		other					
100		1. BROAD-LEAVED SEMI-NAT. PLANTATION		100		100	
		2. CONIFEROUS SEMI-NAT. PLANTATION					
		3. MIXED SEMI-NATURAL PLANTATION					
		4. SCRUB - DENSE					
		5. CARR - ALDER					
		6. WILLOW					
		7. PARKLAND					
		8. RECENTLY FELLED WOOD					
85		1. ACIDIC UNIMPROVED SEMI-IMPROVED		100		100	
		2. NEUTRAL UNIMPROVED SEMI-IMPROVED					
		3. CALCAREOUS UNIMPROVED SEMI-IMPROVED					
		4. IMPROVED/ESCDED					
		5. MARSH/MARSHY GRASSLAND					
85		1. TALL HERB & FERN %		100		100	
		2. BRACKEN					
		3. UPLAND SHIP. RICH VEGET.					
		4. OTHER - TALL RUDERAL NON RUDERAL					
85		1. HEATHLAND %		100		100	
		2. DWARF SCRUB - DRY WET					
		3. LICHEN/BRYOPHYTE					
		4. MONTANE					
		5. HEATH/GRASSLAND - DRY WET					
		6. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %					
		1. Mires - bog					
		2. Fen - reed					
		3. sedge					
		4. sweet-grass					
		5. mixed					
		6. Bog flushes					
85		1. SWAMP/INUNDATION %		100		100	
		2. Swamp - single sp. dom.					
		3. Tall mixed assemblage					
		4. other					
		5. other					
		6. other					
		7. other					
		8. other					
		9. other					
		10. other					
		11. other					
		12. other					
		13. other					
		14. other					
		15. other					
		16. other					
		17. other					
		18. other					
		19. other					
		20. other					
		21. other					
		22. other					
		23. other					
		24. other					
		25. other					
		26. other					
		27. other					
		28. other					
		29. other					
		30. other					
		31. other					
		32. other					
		33. other					
		34. other					
		35. other					
		36. other					
		37. other					
		38. other					
		39. other					
		40. other					
		41. other					
		42. other					
		43. other					
		44. other					
		45. other					
		46. other					
		47. other					
		48. other					
		49. other					
		50. other					
		51. other					
		52. other					
		53. other					
		54. other					
		55. other					
		56. other					
		57. other					
		58. other					
		59. other					
		60. other					
		61. other					
		62. other					
		63. other					
		64. other					
		65. other					
		66. other					
		67. other					
		68. other					
		69. other					
		70. other					
		71. other					
		72. other					
		73. other					
		74. other					
		75. other					
		76. other					
		77. other					
		78. other					
		79. other					
		80. other					
		81. other					
		82. other					
		83. other					
		84. other					
		85. other					
		86. other					
		87. other					
		88. other					
		89. other					
		90. other					
		91. other					
		92. other					
		93. other					
		94. other					
		95. other					
		96. other					
		97. other					
		98. other					
		99. other					
		100. other					



LG RB		LB RB		RIVER			
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation 2. Coniferous semi-nat. plantation 3. Mixed semi-nat. plantation 4. Scrub - dense 5. Carr - alder 6. Parkland 7. Recently felled wood		RIVER YARTY Item No. 4-4-5 Date 11/4/92 Surveyor JALD		BANK FEATURES % 1. Height < 1m 2. Width < 1m 3. Slope < 30° 4. Bare shingle 5. Natural boulders 6. Artificial bank 7. Flood bank set back 8. Levee		RIVER HABITATS bridges > 500m walls > 500m locks > 500m inlets > 500m Depth < 25m Width < 1m Substrates 1. bed rock 2. boulders 3. cobbles 4. pebbles 5. gravel 6. sand 7. silt/mud 8. clay 9. peat	40 100 50 50 100 15 5 15 100 0.5 100%
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved 2. Neutral unimproved 3. Semi-improved 4. Calcareous unimproved 5. Semi-improved 6. Improved/resodded 7. Marsh/marshy grassland		G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + ditch 2. pond, pool, cut-off % 3. lake % 4. gravel pit % 5. reservoir % 6. marina % 7. stream < 1m wide 8. 1-5m 9. 5-10m 10. > 10		HABITATS AND FLOW 1. pool 2. slack 3. riffle 4. rapids 5. run 6. waterfall 7. protruding rocks 8. Margins 9. shingle & bare 10. shingle, vegetated 11. mud 12. sand 13. FLORA % 14. emergent veg < 1m wide 15. emergent 1-2m wide 16. emergent > 2m wide 17. total veg. area 18. bryophytes 19. emergents 20. submerged 21. floating 22. algae % of stretch		100 45 100 15 5 15 100 0.5 100%	
C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other - tall ruderal 4. non ruderal		D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry 2. wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry 6. wet		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog 2. Fen - reed 3. sedge 4. sweet-grass 5. mixed 6. Bog flushes		15 5 15 100 0.5 100%	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. 2. Tall mixed assemblage		ISLANDS 1. Rocky, vegetated 2. rocky, + bare 3. shingle and rock 4. shingle, rock + veg 5. earth - maturing 6. earth - with trees 7. developed		ISLANDS 1. Rocky, vegetated 2. rocky, + bare 3. shingle and rock 4. shingle, rock + veg 5. earth - maturing 6. earth - with trees 7. developed		100 0.5 100%	



LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation 2. Scrub - dense Carr - alder willow 3. Parkland 4. Recently felled wood		BANK FEATURES % 1. solid earth cliff 1m ↑ 2. solid earth cliff > 80. 3. rock cliff 4. artificial 5. flood bank adj. 6. flood bank set back 7. levee Height < 1m 1 < 2m > 2m Width < 1m 1 < 2.5m 2.5 < 5m > 5m Slope < 30° 30 < 40° 40 < 50° > 50° mud sand bare shingle vegetated shingle earth natural boulders BANK VEGETATION Conifer Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow, reed, pollard Willow old, not pollard Standard willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Reed/Sedge % Dense open % Sparse open % Reared or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, 1 bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m inlet/500m Depth < 25m 25 < 5 0.5 < 1.0 > 1.0m Width < 1 1 < 5 5 < 10 10 < 20 > 20 Substrates BR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + silt/mud @ clay peat Habitats and Flow pool slack riffle rapids run waterfall protruding rocks Margins shingle ± bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent wet < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area bryophytes emergent submerged floating algae % of stretch	
G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing canal + ditch pond, pool, cut-off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % running stream < 1m wide 1-5m 5-10m > 10 ROCK 1. cliff scree limestone pavement cave other artificial/waste MISCELLANEOUS arable amenity grassland ephemeral/short herb hedge + hedge = fence on bank fence set back wall building canals fish farm sludge clamp sewage works garden stick pile flood debris road railway disused used other		5 22 20 5 10 40 20 40 20 15 85 100 18 11 20 1 2		2 40 60 30 70 50 50 65 15 20 5 100 5	
D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage		100 100		100 100	




LB RB

A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation	
Coniferous semi-nat. plantation	
Mixed semi-natural plantation	
2. Scrub - dense	
scattered	
Carr - alder	
willow	
3. Parkland	
4. Recently felled wood	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %	
1. Acidic unimproved	
semi-improved	
Neutral unimproved	
semi-improved	
Calcareous unimproved	
semi-improved	
Improved/rescued	
4. Improved/rescued	
5. Marsh/marshy grassland	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %	
1. Bracken	
2. Upland spp. rich veget.	
3. Other - tall ruderal	
non ruderal	
D. HERBILAND %	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry	
wet	
3. Lichen/bryophyte	
4. Montane	
5. Heath/grassland - dry	
wet	
6. Wet	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %	
1. Mires - bog	
Fen - reed	
sedge	
sweet-grass	
mixed	
2. Bog flushes	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION %	
1. Swamp - single sp. dom.	
Tall mixed assemblage	


RIVER		LB RB	
Item No.	RIVER YARTY		
Date	0 - 0.5 km		
Surveyor	4/93		
Surveyor	JALD		
G. OPEN WATER		LB RB	
1. Standing - canal +	% of adj. load in each stretch		
canal =			
ditch			
dyke			
pond, pool, cut-off %			
lake %			
gravel pit %			
reservoir %			
marina %			
runoff			
stream < 1m wide			
1.5m			
5.10m			
> 10			
I. ROCK			
1. cliff			
scree			
limestone pavement			
cave			
other			
artificial/waste			
J. MISCELLANEOUS			
arable			
amenity grassland			
ephemeral/short herb			
hedge +			
hedge =			
fence on bank			
fence set back			
wall			
building			
caravans			
fish farm			
silage clamp			
sewage works			
garden			
stick pile			
flood debris			
road			
railway disused			
used			
other			

BANK FEATURES %		LB RB	
shill %			
solid earth cliff			
soft earth cliff			
rock cliff			
artificial			
flood bank adj.			
flood bank set back			
levee			
Height			
< 1m			
1 - 2m			
> 2m			
Width			
< 1m			
1 - 2.5m			
2.5 - 5m			
> 5m			
Slope			
< 30°			
30 - 60°			
60 - 90°			
> 90°			
material			
ss			
sand			
fine shingle			
coarse shingle			
vegetated shingle			
earth			
natural boulders			
natural boulders			
BANK VEGETATION			
Canter			
Oak, Ash, Sycamore			
Willow - recent pollard			
Willow old, not pollard			
Standard willows			
Alder			
Other trees			
Young trees			
Thick Scrub/shrubs %			
Sparse Scrub/shrubs %			
Reed/Sedge %			
Debris open %			
Sparse open %			
Rescued or mown %			
Exposed tree roots			
ISLANDS			
Rocky, vegetated			
rocky, + bare			
shingle and rock			
shingle, rock + veg			
earth - maturing			
earth - with trees			
developed			

RIVER HABITATS		LB RB		RIVER	
bedrock/500m					
weirs/500m					
locks/500m					
inlet/500m					
Depth					
< 25m					
25 - 5					
0.5 - 1.0					
> 1.0m					
Width					
< 1					
1 - 5					
5 - 10					
10 - 20					
> 20					
Substrates					
bed rock					
boulders					
cobbles					
pebbles					
gravel					
sand					
silt/mud					
clay					
peat					
Habitats and Flow					
pool					
slack					
riffle					
rapids					
run					
waterfall					
protruding rocks					
Margins					
single + bare					
single, vegetated					
mud					
sand					
FLORA %					
emergent veg < 1m wide					
emergent 1-2m wide					
emergent > 2m wide					
total veget area					
bryophytes					
emergents					
submerged					
floating					
algae % of stretch					
Total					
100%					



LG RB		LB RB		RB																	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation 2. Coniferous semi-nat. plantation 3. Mixed semi-nat. plantation 4. Scrub - dense Carr - alder willow Parkland Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved Improved/rescued Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland sp. rich veg. 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 2. Lichen/bryophyte 3. Montane 4. Heath/grassland - dry wet		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage		G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + canal = ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % marina % floating stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5.10m > 10		RIVER Km No. 0.5 - 1 KM Date 4/93 Surveyor JALD.		BANK FEATURES % L-shed % solid earth cliff 1m soft earth cliff > 80% rock cliff artificial flood bank adj. flood bank set back levee Height < 1m 1 < 2m > 2m Width < 1m 1 < 2.5m 2.5 < 5m > 5m Slope < 30° 30 < 60° 60 < 90° > 90° mud sand bare shingle vegetated shingle earth natural cobbles natural boulders BANK VEGETATION Canister Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standard willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Reed/Sedge % Dense open % Sparse open % Reseeded or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, 1 bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS bridges < 500m weirs < 500m locks < 500m inlets < 500m Depth < 25m 25 < 5 5 < 10 > 10m Width < 1 1 < 5 5 < 10 10 < 20 > 20 Substrates nr bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + silt/mud clay peat Habitats and Flow pool slack riffle rapids run waterfall protruding rocks Margins shingle 1 bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent veg < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veg. area bryophytes emergent submerged floating algae % of stretch		100 100 50 50 2 38 10 50	



LG, RB

LG, RB


RIVER


A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation	
Coniferous semi-nat. plantation	
Mixed semi-natural plantation	
Scrub - dense	
Scrub - scattered	
Carr - alder	
willow	
Parkland	
Recently felled wood	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %	
1. Acidic unimproved	
semi-improved	
Neutral unimproved	
semi-improved	
Calcareous unimproved	
semi-improved	
Improved/resseeded	
Marsh/marshy grassland	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %	
1. Blacken	
2. Upland spp. rich veget.	
3. Other - tall ruderal	
non ruderal	
D. HEATHLAND %	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry	
wet	
3. Lichen/bryophyte	
4. Montane	
5. Heath/grassland - dry	
6. wet	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %	
1. Mires - bog	
Fen - reed	
sedge	
sweet-grass	
mixed	
2. Bog flushes	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION %	
1. Swamp - single sp. dom.	
Tall mixed assemblage	

RIVER	LG, RB
River YARTY	
Run No. 1-1-5 km	
Date 4/93	
Surveyor JALD.	
G. OPEN WATER	
1. Standing - canal + % of adj. lake strength	
canal =	
ditch	
dyke	
pond, pool, cut off %	
lake %	
gravel pit %	
reservoir %	
marsh %	
flaming	
stream < 1m wide	
1-5m	
5-10m	
> 10	
2. ROCK	
1. cliff	
scree	
limestone pavement	
cave	
other	
2. artificial/waste	
1. MISCELLANEOUS	
arable	
ancient grassland	
ephemeral/short herb	
hedgerow	
hedgerow =	
fence on bank	
fence set back	
wall	
building	
concretes	
fish farm	
sludge clamp	
sewage works	
garden	
sick pile	
flood debris	
road	
railway disused	
used	
other	

BANK FEATURES %	LG, RB
1. solid %	
solid earth cliff 1m ↑	
solid earth cliff > 80%	
rock cliff	
artificial	
flood bank adj	
flood bank set back	
levee	
Height < 1m	
1-2m	
> 2m	
Width < 1m	
1-2.5m	
2.5-5m	
> 5m	
Slope < 30°	
30-60°	
60-90°	
> 90°	
1. mud	
2. sand	
3. bare shingle	
4. vegetated shingle	
5. earth	
6. natural cobbles	
7. natural boulders	
BANK VEGETATION	
1. Caudex	
2. Oak, Ash, Sycamore	
Willow recent pollard	
Willow old, not pollard	
Standard willows	
Alder	
Other trees	
Young trees	
Thick Scrub/shrubs %	
Sparse Scrub/shrubs %	
Reeds/Sedge %	
Dense open %	
Sparse open %	
Reverched or mown %	
Exposed tree roots	
ISLANDS	
1. Rocky, vegetated	
2. rocky, 1 bare	
3. shingle and rock	
4. shingle, rock + veg	
5. earth - maturing	
6. earth - with trees	
7. developed	

RIVER HABITATS																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			</
----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----





SIR ARTHUR'S PILL

CONTENTS

SIR ARTHUR'S PILL

1. BACKGROUND	1
1.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1.2 <u>STUDY REACH</u>	1
1.3 <u>BRAUNTON MARSH</u>	1
1.4 <u>RIVER CHARACTERISTICS</u>	4
1.5 <u>LAND DRAINAGE</u>	4
1.6 <u>GEOLOGY, SOILS AND LAND CAPABILITY</u>	6
1.7 <u>CAPITAL WORKS</u>	8
1.8 <u>RIVER MAINTENANCE</u>	8
1.8.1 <i>Farmers views on maintenance</i>	8
1.8.2 <i>Alternative maintenance strategies</i>	8
1.9 <u>CLIMATE</u>	9
1.10 <u>AQUATIC VEGETATION</u>	10
1.10.1 <i>Floating plants</i>	10
1.10.2 <i>Emergent plants</i>	11
1.10.3 <i>Submerged plants</i>	11
1.10.4 <i>Algae</i>	11
2. FARM SURVEY	12
2.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	12
2.2 <u>FARM TYPE, SIZE AND TENURE</u>	12
2.3 <u>LIVESTOCK ENTERPRISES</u>	12
2.4 <u>ARABLE ENTERPRISES</u>	13
2.5 <u>LAND USE IN THE BENEFIT AREA</u>	13
2.6 <u>TURNOUT AND YARDING DATES</u>	16
2.7 <u>GRASS CONSERVATION</u>	16
2.8 <u>NITROGEN APPLICATION</u>	17
2.9 <u>FLOODING</u>	17
2.10 <u>WATERLOGGING</u>	18
2.11 <u>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS</u>	18
3 HYDRAULIC AND HYDROLOGICAL INFORMATION	20
3.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	20
3.2 <u>CROSS-SECTION SURVEYS</u>	20
3.3 <u>FLOOD RETURN PERIOD</u>	27

4. LAND DRAINAGE	29
4.1 <u>FIELD DRAINAGE STATUS</u>	29
5 SCHEME APPRAISAL	32
5.1 <u>MAINTENANCE BENEFITS</u>	32
5.2 <u>MAINTENANCE COSTS</u>	37
5.3 <u>SCHEME APPRAISAL</u>	37
6 ENVIRONMENT	39
6.1 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	39
6.2 <u>SITE OF SPECIFIC SCIENTIFIC INTEREST</u>	39
6.3 <u>RIVER CORRIDOR SURVEY</u>	39
6.4 <u>PUBLIC CONSULTATION</u>	40
6.5 <u>FARMER ASSESSMENT</u>	40
6.6 <u>CHANNEL AND BANK QUALITY</u>	40
7 CONCLUSIONS.....	43
7.1 <u>SCHEME APPRAISAL</u>	43
7.2 <u>GUIDELINES FOR RIVER MAINTENANCE</u>	43
7.3 <u>IMPACT OF MAINTENANCE ON CHANNEL VEGETATION</u>	43
7.4 <u>MAINTENANCE BEST PRACTICE</u>	44
<i>Channel</i>	44
<i>Bank</i>	45
7.5 <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	45
7.6 <u>EPILOGUE</u>	45
8. REFERENCES	46

APPENDIX I	Example of input and output data for the watertable model
APPENDIX II	River corridor survey

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Site location and background information.....	3
Figure 2 Land drainage and location of cross-sections	5
Figure 3 Soil profiles.....	7
Figure 4 Land use in the benefit area	15
Figure 5 Channel information.....	22 - 26
Figure 6 Flood return period curve	28
Figure 7 Sites of Specific Scientific Interest.....	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Rainfall totals	9
Table 1.2 Probability of climatic condition.....	10
Table 2.1 Land use within the benefit area.....	13
Table 2.2 Turnout dates.....	16
Table 2.3 Yarding dates.....	16
Table 2.4 Grass conservation.....	17
Table 2.5 Nitrogen application rates	17
Table 2.6 Farmer assessment of wetness condition	18
Table 3.1 Bankfull capacity and return periods.....	20
Table 4.1 Drainage status for wet, average and dry seasons, with/without maintenance	30
Table 5.1 Financial net returns	33
Table 5.2 Economic net returns.....	33
Table 5.3 Change in financial net returns.....	35
Table 5.4 Change in economic net returns	36
Table 5.5 Farmer assessment of maintenance benefits	37
Table 5.6 Maintenance scheme appraisal: Sir Arthur's Pill.....	38

SOUTH WEST SIR ARTHUR'S PILL

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

Sir Arthur's Pill rises at Saunton, north west of Braunton village in North Devon. From source to mouth it is 6 km in length, draining a catchment of 11 square kilometres. The area is bounded to the north by the highland area of Saunton Down. The Taw-Torridge Estuary and the River Caen form the southern and eastern boundaries. The western boundary is formed by the sand dunes of Braunton Burrows which stretch for 5.75 km from the estuary to Saunton. The catchment area of Sir Arthur's Pill is small; approximately 15 km².

Sir Arthur's Pill flows through two distinctly different areas: an area of high grade arable land and an extensive area of permanent pasture (Braunton Marsh).

1.2 Study Reach


The section of river selected for study (Figure 1) runs for 5 km between Saunton (GR. 465 374) and the Great Sluice (GR. 474 341). Sir Arthur's Pill is a main river characteristic of those in the area on which weed clearance is regularly performed. The land area which derives a benefit from river maintenance in terms of reduced flooding and improved land drainage is 242 ha.

1.3 Braunton Marsh

Sir Arthur's Pill flows through two distinct areas in terms of land use. From the head of main river to 2.25 km downstream, it flows over an area of mainly arable land skirting the edge of the Great Field - a relic of the open-field strip farming cultivation, before flowing over Braunton Marsh.

Braunton Marsh is an extensive area of reclaimed salt marsh which was cut off from the sea by the creation of a large bank between 1811 and 1815 following an 1811 Act of Parliament which permitted the enclosure. The scheme was designed by James Green, a British Engineer

and the Great Sea Bank was constructed by local labour and workers from Cornwall, Ireland and Holland. Some arable crops were traditionally grown on the marsh but now the area is used entirely for grazing.



Legend

Scale 1 : 6250

- | | |
|--|--|
| Benefit Area | Agricultural Land Classification Class 4 |
| Agricultural Land Classification Class 3 | Location of Soil Cores |

Figure 1 Location of Sir Arthur's Pill and background information

R&D 317/21/ST

1.4 River Characteristics


Sir Arthur's Pill is a straight drain, only meandering slightly over a wide floodplain when it reaches Braunton Marsh. The channel is trapezoidal in shape with its depth varying between 1 m at the head of main river to 2.5 m to the landward side of the Great Sluice. Channel width varies between 0.75 m at the head of main river to 2.5 m at the sluice. Freeboard averages 0.75 m north of the marsh but over the marsh itself this is reduced to 0.2 m and at particular points in the autumn and winter there is no freeboard and the water floods out of the drain and onto the marsh. The bed substrate is dominated by silt and sand - characteristic of the old salt marsh over which it flows.

1.5 Land Drainage

When the marsh was reclaimed, the routes of the main tidal creeks over the marsh were replaced by a series of artificial delphs (ditches). These drain the marsh and remove water flowing down from the highland area between Saunton and Lobb. Water is discharged out to sea through the Great Sluice in the sea embankment.

A comprehensive system of ditches traverse the marsh, marking field boundaries and creating barriers to stock. These are maintained (weed cut) by the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) every three years. Water levels in the ditches are controlled via a series of sluices which keep levels high in summer and lower in winter. One such sluice is located at Velator Bridge (GR. 485 358). From this structure, in times of low flow in Sir Arthur's Pill, water from the River Caen is diverted into it via the Boundary Drain. The Boundary Drain in turn feeds minor ditches within the marsh area, keeping their water levels high. The sluices are controlled and operated by the IDB.

Figure 2 indicates the areas of land in the benefit area which have field drainage pipes installed. Of the land surveyed, 36 % is underdrained with pipes. The remainder is naturally draining. Areas of horticulture are associated with the most intensively drained land. Further information is provided in Section 2.5.



Legend

Scale 1 : 6250

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
|  Piped drainage |  Cross-section location |  Land use blocks |
|  Natural drainage |  Great sluice | |

Figure 2 Land drainage and location of cross-sections

R&D 317/21/ST

1.6 Geology, Soils and Land Capability

Sir Arthur's Pill flows over sand and silt deposits of marine and estuarine origin. The shaley silt stone with sandstone and limestone's to the north and shale and silt stones of Lower Carboniferous age in the south, form the boundaries to this alluvium which was laid down in recent and Pleistocene times.

The soil type is characterised by the Isleham Association containing both the Isleham and Crowdy series. The soils have developed over a permeable sandy drift which is typically waterlogged over long periods due to a high watertable. Humic sandy gleys are the typical soil type.

Soil profiles taken at three points within the benefit area are shown in Figure 3. Soil colour is a uniform dark brown. Sandy silt loams characterise the soil profile beneath the root zone. Some mottling and gleying is evident on the poorly drained soils.

The Crowdy series is perennially waterlogged and the risk of poaching (surface damage by livestock) is high. The soil profile is typically waterlogged within 0.4 m of the surface for over 50 % of the year and waterlogged within 0.7 m of the surface for over 90 % of the year. The Soil Survey of England and Wales (SSEW) classify such soils as having a Wetness Class of VI. Due to a high watertable the Wetness Class of the Isleham series is V. The soil is commonly waterlogged for 95 % of the year within 0.4 m of the surface (Findlay et al, 1984). According to precipitation records from the nearest meteorological station to Sir Arthur's Pill (Chivenor Met. Office), the average annual rainfall is high, averaging approximately 868 mm. This contributes to the high watertables in the area.


The Agricultural Land Classification of the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food (MAFF) characterises the area adjacent to Sir Arthur's Pill and Braunton Marsh as Grade 3 (Figure 1). The Great Field is classed as Grade 2 agricultural land. A small area on the northern boundary of the marsh area is classed as Grade 4.

Grid Reference 468 373

Soil Core Number 1

Soil Colour Dark brown

Comments Well drained,
uniform profile




Grid Reference 472 345

Soil Core Number 2

Soil Colour Dark brown

Comments Increased gleying
with depth



Grid Reference 475 341

Soil Core Number 3

Soil Colour Dark brown

Comments Well drained,
uniform profile




Figure 3 Soil profiles

1.7 Capital Works

In 1979 the channel was dredged to a design standard and re-graded. Local re-sectioning took place at the same time and the tidal flaps were replaced. Two water level control structures were refurbished in 1992/93. These consist of weirs which are used to control levels in Sir Arthur's Pill at various times in the year.

1.8 River Maintenance

Desilting and weed clearance along the entire length of Sir Arthur's Pill takes place approximately every 18 months for the benefit of land drainage. All the channel vegetation (100 %) is removed using a 360 degree excavator. The river banks are left untouched and are not flail mown. Debris from the channel is spread on the surrounding land. Repairs to structures such as the weirs and Great Sluice are carried out as required.

The main reason for carrying out regular weed clearance is that it is scheduled into a regular programme of maintenance due to site inspections highlighting the need for vegetation control. The availability of equipment/labour and customer demand also influence the scheduling of maintenance works. Custom and practice is the main reason for determining the standard of service maintained by weed clearance. Proven suitability and the cost of maintenance are the main factors in determining the maintenance method selected. Prior to maintenance, landowners/tenants are visited by a representative from the NRA. Pollution bodies are informed of imminent work via the telephone.

1.8.1 Farmers views on maintenance

During interviews with farmers in the benefit area, the majority of the farmers expressed satisfaction with both the timing and frequency of maintenance on Sir Arthur's Pill. However, one farmer expressed concern that a layer of clay was removed from the channel bed along with the weed. This deepened the channel which rendered the banks more unstable and prone to slippage and undercutting.

1.8.2 Alternative maintenance strategies

The only alternative method of maintenance suggested by the farmers was to flail mow the banks either annually or twice per year. This would aid access to the channel for grazing livestock.

1.9 Climate

The impact of river maintenance on watertable depth and river levels depends on the particular weather conditions, especially rainfall, which vary from season to season and year to year. The seasonal and yearly rainfall totals for the period of study in the area of Sir Arthur's Pill are shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Rainfall totals

Period		Actual Rainfall (mm)	Average Rainfall (mm) *	% of Average Rainfall
1992	Spring	146	170	86
	Summer	244	199	123
	Autumn	307	308	100
1993	Spring	130	170	76
	Summer	343	199	173
	Autumn	272	308	88
1994	Spring	214	170	126
	Summer	166	199	84
	Autumn	412	308	134
1995	Spring	186	170	110
Total	1992	863	889	97
	1993	1042	889	117
	1994	1172	889	132

(Source : Chivenor Met. Station GR. 494 347)

This confirms the farmers comments that the summers of 1992 and 1993 and autumn of 1994 were wetter than normal. The summer of 1993 is classed as very wet. The rainfall data were collected from the meteorological stations at Chivenor (station number 395 162, GR. 494 347) and Lower Slade W.T.W (station number 395 607, GR. 5095 4588).

Monthly rainfall records covering a period of 14 years were used to determine the probability of wet, average and dry seasons and years occurring (Table 1.2) in the immediate area round Sir Arthur's Pill. The classification of seasons and years is based on that of the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). Dry and wet seasons and years are classed as those with < 75 % of the mean and > 125 % of the mean respectively. Further details are contained in the R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.4.

Table 1.2 Probability of climatic conditions

Season	Dry *	Average *	Wet *
Spring	0.22	0.62	0.16
Summer	0.46	0.39	0.15
Autumn	0.21	0.65	0.14
Year	0.54	0.38	0.08

* (Based on records since 1980)

The Main Report (R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.4) describes the process by which financial benefits of maintenance are calculated according to the probability of each type of season occurring.

1.10 Aquatic Vegetation

Aquatic vegetation within the channel was identified prior to maintenance (Section 1.10.1 to 1.10.4). This vegetation has both hydraulic and environmental implications for the channel.

1.10.1 Floating plants

Lemna (Duckweed) and *Azolla* (Water fern) are common although the latter is predominately found in the Boundary Drain and not in Sir Arthur's Pill. Both are small and free-floating with rootlets on the underside of each leaf pad and often form dense mats.

Lemna and *Azolla* spread through vegetative reproduction by budding from pouches on the side of the leaves. Rapid growth often results in a dense cover over the water surface. Regrowth following removal through maintenance is thus rapid, especially as it is impossible for complete removal of the plant through mechanical methods alone. Chemical control may need to be considered if the growth reaches excessive rates. However, as *Lemna* and *Azolla* are purely floating plants, they poses little resistance to flow and do not restrict channel capacity. However, water quality may be affected as a dense mat may restrict the penetration of light into the water thus restricting activity of fish and invertebrates. As plant growth will also be restricted beneath the mat, its presence may actually reduce flow resistance through inhibiting plant growth.

1.10.2 Emergent plants

The emergent weeds include the narrow leafed *Phragmites australis* (Common reed), *Typha* (Reedmace or bull rush) and *Phalaris* (Reed Canary-Grass). Emergent plants pose a greater resistance to flow than floating species. If vegetation stands are dense, their stems and leaves provide a barrier to flow, causing the hydraulic resistance of the channel to increase and water levels to rise. If the stems are flexible, they will bend in the direction of flow and during high flows will exert minimal resistance to flow as their effect is drowned out.

1.10.3 Submerged plants

The submerged weed *Elodea* (Canadian pondweed) is abundant within Sir Arthur's Pill and the Boundary Drain. *Juncus* (Rush) is a submerged plant with fine hair-like leaves which can reach 300 cm in length. It is a streamlined plant and moves in the direction of flow. The greater the flow, the lower the resistance this plant poses to movement of water. At high flows, the hydraulic impact of *Juncus* is drowned out.

1.10.4 Algae

Filamentous algae is also found within Sir Arthur's Pill. It spreads rapidly through cell division (simple fission) and is difficult to completely remove. It grows up from the hydrosol and often invades areas in which other aquatic plants have been removed.

2. FARM SURVEY

2.1 Introduction

Site survey, informal discussions and structured interviews with farmers indicate a benefit area of 242 ha (Figure 1). Detailed discussions have been held with nine farmers within this area. The benefit area is described as that which will derive a benefit from river maintenance in terms of improved drainage and reduced incidence of flooding. The benefit area is divided into different blocks (Figure 2) according to land use type (LUT) land management and drainage condition.

2.2 Farm Type, Size and Tenure

Seven farms within the benefit area are classed as lowland and livestock enterprises according to the European Union (EU) system of classification. One is a general horticultural enterprise and the remaining holding is classified as a specialist cereal farm. Farm sizes range from 4 ha to 324 ha, averaging 86 ha. The number of Standard Man Days (SMD) required for each farm ranges from five to 1630. The latter is for the largest farm; a lowland and livestock enterprise. The SMD (Man - Work Units) is a standard, approximate method for assessing the labour requirements for regular staff. It is assumed that 300 SMD are provided annually per man.

The largest farm within the benefit area is a managed farm. Two others are run as a partnership and the remainder are under sole proprietorship. The majority of land within the benefit area is owner occupied. One farmer has rented land within this area, comprising one 4 ha field held under a full tenancy agreement.

2.3 Livestock Enterprises

The system of livestock farming on Braunton Marsh follows a similar pattern over the whole marsh. Friesian beef kept under the 24 month system are most commonly found on the marsh. Beasts are bought at 125 kg and sold between 550-700 kg live weight. Five farms have beef herds of various sizes. Four of these have spring calving suckler herds, the herd size ranging from 32 to 140 beasts.

Five of the farms within the benefit area have flocks of sheep under the fat lamb system. Flock sizes range from 150 to 2400 ewes and are of mule and mixed breeds. The lambing rate ranges from 1 to 1.8 lambs/ewe tupped (average 1.5).

A small number of dairy followers are also grazed on the marsh as are some race horses. The stocking rate over the whole marsh is in the region of 10 beasts/ha.

2.4 Arable Enterprises

Four farms within the benefit area have some arable enterprises. Two grow winter cereals, potatoes (both early and main crop) and field vegetables under varying rotations. The general horticultural farm follows a fixed rotation of early potatoes and field vegetable crops which includes brassicas and leeks.

A fixed cropping rotation is practised by the specialist cereal enterprise under which field vegetables are followed by winter or spring barley, winter or spring wheat and early potatoes. Ten hectares are double cropped with field vegetables.

2.5 Land Use In The Benefit Area


As Figure 4 illustrates, the majority of land surveyed within the benefit area (67 %) is under extensive grassland. Arable enterprises in the form of cereal/root crops account for 16 % of the benefit area. Holiday homes cover 4.5 ha of the benefit area (2 %). Table 2.1 provides detailed information regarding the percentage of land within the benefit area under the different land uses.

Table 2.1 Land use in the benefit area

Land Use	Area (ha)	% Benefit Area	% Land Drained
Extensive grass	162.0	67	10
Intensive grass	18.0	7	26
Cereal/roots	38.0	16	11
Horticulture	19.0	8	58
Other	4.5	2	0
Total	242.0	100	36

Extensive grassland is classified as that which receives low levels of nitrogen (typically < 50 kg/ha) and on which little or no grass conservation takes place. If conserved, one cut of hay is usually taken. The grass is grazed by beef and sheep, not dairy cattle. Grassland under the intensive system is high quality grazing land. It is usually well drained and receives moderate to high inputs of nitrogen. Multiple cuts of silage and/or hay are typically made.

Table 2.1 also shows the percentage of each land use which is drained by pipes. In total, 36 % of the benefit area is underdrained.



Legend

Scale 1 : 6250

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| Extensive grass | Cereal / root crop rotation | Other |
| Intensive grass | Horticulture | |

Figure 4 Land use in the benefit area

2.6 Turnout and Yarding Dates

Dates for the turnout and yarding of stock within the benefit area vary as Tables 2.2 and 2.3 illustrate. Stock is turned out to graze over the majority of the benefit area (42 %) in April. Over 5 % of the benefit area, livestock is turned out to graze after the grass has been cut for hay or silage. Twenty eight percent of the benefit area is grazed all year.

Table 2.2 Turnout dates

Turnout Date	Grassland Area (ha)	% Benefit Area
Early/mid April	12	5
Mid/late April	89	37
After hay cut	6	2.5
After silage cut	5	2
Grazed all year	68	28

Table 2.3 Yarding dates in Autumn

Yarding Date	Grassland Area (ha)	% Benefit Area
Mid / late October	61	25
Mid / late November	46	19
Mid/late December	5	2
Grazed all year	68	28

The majority of the stock which are yarded, are taken off the land in October. The land which is grazed all year is typically grazed by beef during the period April to October and by sheep over the winter months.

2.7 Grass Conservation

Table 2.4 shows the area of grassland which is cut for hay and silage. The majority of the grassland is grazed only (87 %). Silage is cut over 10 % of the grassland area and hay is cut over 3 %. The dates for the hay and silage cuts are early June and mid May respectively.

Table 2.4 Grass conservation

Conservation System	Grassland Area (ha)	% Grassland Area
Grazed only	156	87
1 cut silage	18	10
1 cut hay	6	3

2.8 Nitrogen Application

Nitrogen is applied to all the grassland surveyed within the benefit area; mostly in the form of compound fertilisers, especially 20 N:10 P:10 K. Application rates range from 20 to 50 kg/ha. Further details are presented in Table 2.5.

The higher rates of nitrogen application correspond to the areas which are grazed by dairy cattle and followers (intensive grassland).

Table 2.5 Nitrogen application rates

Rate (kg/ha)	Grassland Area (ha)	% Grassland Area
0	0	0
1 - 20	85	47
21 - 35	63	35
36 - 50	32	18

2.9 Flooding

Land within the benefit area does not flood on a regular basis. No flooding has been experienced on the land during the time of this study. Water levels in Sir Arthur's Pill, the Boundary Drain and minor ditches are controlled by boards in the weirs which are lowered as required to minimise the incidence of flooding. The land adjacent to the river is expected to flood at times during the winter months when water levels are high. Farmers accept this threat as to be expected when working marsh land adjacent to a river.

2.10 Waterlogging

Throughout the benefit area the wetness condition follows a similar pattern throughout the year. Table 2.6 shows the area experiencing different levels of waterlogging during the spring, summer and autumn.

During the spring, 60 % and 38 % of land surveyed is rarely and occasionally wet. Only 2 % of the land is often wet and none permanently wet. Throughout the summer the marsh area dries and only 11 % experiences occasional wet conditions. During the winter, 47 % of the benefit area is permanently wet.

Table 2.6 Wetness condition of agricultural land

Season	Condition	Area (ha)	% Benefit Area
Spring	Rarely wet	145	60
	Occasionally wet	93	38
	Often wet	4	2
	Permanently wet	0	0
Summer	Rarely wet	215	89
	Occasionally wet	27	11
	Often wet	0	0
	Permanently wet	0	0
Autumn	Rarely wet	29	12
	Occasionally wet	53	22
	Often wet	46	19
	Permanently wet	114	47

The main factors responsible for these wet conditions are the limited freeboard in Sir Arthur's Pill and the low lying nature of the land. The area is marshland and so by nature it is characteristically wet throughout the winter months.

2.11 Statistical Analysis

It is apparent that land use, farming practice and drainage are interrelated. Statistical methods were used to determine whether these relationships occurred more frequently than might be expected by pure chance. Full details of this analysis in which the 12 sites were grouped

according to NRA Region, are presented in the Interim Report R&D 317/13/ST, presented to the NRA in December 1994.

The following observations can be made from the statistical analysis of fields in the benefit area of the Sir Arthur's Pill maintenance programme:

- The dominant farming system influences land use within the benefit area. In this case, the dominant farm type is lowland and livestock which is characterised by beef and sheep enterprises. This farm type determines the land use, which is unlikely to change from grass to arable even if drainage were to improve as a result of maintenance.
- A strong relationship exists between land use and installation of field drainage. Areas with field drainage are predominantly given over to horticulture whilst land under an extensive grass system is not drained by pipes. (Statistically, there is an 83 % chance of correctly predicting the incidence of field drainage on the basis of land use).
- Grazing seasons are a function of spring and autumn field wetness conditions and not soil type. This wetness condition is in itself a function of the presence of field drainage. Those fields which are drained by pipes are subject to longer grazing seasons than those which are naturally draining. Livestock are overwintered on the land which is classed as rarely wet. (Statistically, there is a 66 % and 91 % chance of correctly predicting turnout and yarding dates for livestock on the basis of field wetness conditions in the spring and autumn respectively).

3 HYDRAULIC AND HYDROLOGICAL DATA

3.1 Introduction

Information on channel hydraulics and hydrological data has been used to determine the impact of maintenance on channel capacity and flood return periods.

3.2 Cross-section Surveys

Cross-sectional surveys of the channel were completed at five points within the selected section (Figure 2). Channel capacity has been determined from these cross-sections. Because the channel dimensions were not altered during the weed clearance process, a post-maintenance cross-sectional survey of the channel was not necessary.

Before maintenance was carried out, channel roughness was expressed in the form of the Manning's n coefficient, using the methodology developed by Cowan (1956). This coefficient consists of six parameters which include the predominant bed material, degree of meandering and the level of vegetation growth. Further details of the methodology used are presented in the R&D Note 456, Appendix IV. The same procedure was followed after maintenance in order to determine values of channel friction in a 'with' (post) and 'without' (pre) maintenance situation.



Stage/discharge curves have been created for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situation using these different values of Manning's n . The channel cross-section information including Manning's n values and stage/discharge curves are presented in Figure 5 and Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Bankfull capacity

Cross- Section	With Maintenance	Without Maintenance
	Bankfull Capacity (cumecs)	Bankfull Capacity (cumecs)
1	8.6	4.4
2	1.6	0.8
3	2.0	1.0
4	7.5	4.5
5	2.1	1.0


(Source: modelled estimates)

The bankfull capacity figures obtained from the cross-sections indicate an average increase in capacity attributable to maintenance of 52 % (from 2.3 to 4.4 m³/s).




River channel information		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
Manning's n value		0.089	0.045
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)		4.4	8.6
Return period (years)		11	120

Figure 5 Sir Arthur's Pill channel information




Stage / discharge curve




River channel information	
Manning's n value	Without Maintenance
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	0.08
Return period (years)	0.8
	1.6
	0.15
	0.7


Cross section 3 - drainage 921 m




Stage / discharge curve





River channel information	
Manning's n value	0.08
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	1.0
Return period (years)	0.2
Without	With
Maintenance	0.04
	1.0
	2.0
	1.0



Stage / discharge curve



River channel information		Without Maintenance	With Maintenance
Manning's n value		0.09	0.054
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)		4.5	7.5
Return period (years)		12	90



River channel information	
Manning's n value	Without Maintenance
Bankfull capacity (cumecs)	0.085
Return period (years)	1.0
	0.2
	2.1
	1.1

3.3 Flood Return Period

Throughout the period of the study (1993 - 1995), river water level information was collected on a fortnightly basis by reading off channel water levels from three gauge boards which were installed within the reach. General information regarding flood flows, frequency and duration were collected from farmers and NRA staff. This information was used to compile a flood return period curve for Sir Arthur's Pill using the methodology detailed within the Flood Studies Report (NERC, 1975).

Land within the benefit area is reported not to flood as levels in the channel and Boundary Drain are controlled by a series of sluice boards which are raised or lowered as required to regulate water levels in the channel. If the sluice boards were not operated and land were allowed to flood, the frequency of flooding could be ascertained from the flood return period curve in Figure 6.




Figure 6 Flood return period curve

4. LAND DRAINAGE

4.1 Field Drainage Status

Through an extensive literature and farmer survey, drainage status of the land has been classified into three standards according to watertable depth. Three watertable bands have been identified as > 0.5 m from the surface, between 0.3 to 0.5 m of the surface and < 0.3 m from the surface. According to the time the watertable lies within these bands, the drainage standard is classed as good (G, no restrictions on land use), bad (B, some restrictions on agriculture) or very bad (VB, severe limitations to agriculture). Further details are presented in the R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.2.

The drainage status of fields within the benefit area has been determined on a seasonal basis using a non-steady state watertable model which relates infield watertable levels (and hence drainage conditions) to observed water levels in the river and ditch system (see R&D Note 456, Section 3.5.2 for further details). The model has been run using river water levels for the 'with' and 'without' maintenance scenario using the same climatic data in order to isolate the impact of maintenance on drainage status. An example of the input and output data of the model is shown in Appendix I.

The results of the watertable model and the assessment of drainage status made by farmers are shown in Table 4.1. In some cases, there may be a change in the number of weeks that the watertable lies within the good, bad and very bad drainage bands following maintenance. However, these changes may not be of sufficient magnitude to change the drainage status classification. Where a sufficient change in drainage status has occurred due to maintenance, resulting in a change in drainage status, the changes appear in bold print in Table 4.1.

Generally, the output from the watertable model is consistent with the farmers' assessment of drainage status under wet, dry and average climatic conditions for the 'with' maintenance situation. The differences appear to be in the distinction between the bad and very bad drainage condition. The farmers tend to class all the land broadly as bad and are unable to determine if the land is under very bad drainage conditions. Under average conditions, there is 88 % agreement between farmer and modelled assessment of drainage conditions with

maintenance. In wet and dry seasons, there is 79 % and 83 % agreement between farmer and modelled assessment of drainage condition for the with maintenance situation respectively.

The assessments confirm that the drainage status in the benefit area 'with' maintenance is generally good under wet, average and dry climatic conditions. If no maintenance were performed, drainage conditions would deteriorate towards bad in wet and average seasons. In a dry season land would remain under a good classification.

Examples of the classification of the weeks of each season which are under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage status are shown in Appendix II.

Table 4.1 Drainage status for wet, average and dry seasons, without/with maintenance

Block No		Wet Season *		Average Season *		Dry Season *		Farmer Assessment			Without
		Without	With	Without	With	Without	With	Wet	Average	Dry	
101	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
102	Y	B	B	B	B	G	G	B	G	G	B
103	N	B	B	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
201	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
202	N	B	B	B	G	G	G	B	G	G	B
203	Y	VB	B	VB	B	G	G	B	B	G	B
301	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	B
302	N	VB	VB	B	B	G	G	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	B
303	N	VB	G	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
304	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
305	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
306	N	B	G	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
307	Y	B	G	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
401	Y	B	G	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
402	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
501	Y	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
502	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
503	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
504	N	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
505	N	VB	VB	VB	B	B	B	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>G</i>	B
601	N	B	G	B	G	G	G	<i>B</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i>	B
701	N	B	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	B
801	N	B	B	B	B	G	G	B	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i>	B
901	N	VB	B	VB	B	B	B	B	B	<i>G</i>	VB

NB : * Modelled results, Y or N refers to the presence or absence of field drainage, bold type highlights changes in drainage status due to maintenance, italics show differences between modelled and farmer assessment of drainage with maintenance.

River maintenance results in the prevention of a deterioration in drainage status on 8 blocks of land in a wet season and on 10 blocks in an average season. The percentage change in drainage status by area as a result of maintenance activities is estimated below :

- In a wet season maintenance prevents deterioration from :

B to VB over 29 ha (12 % of BA)

G to B over 28 ha (11 % of BA)

G to VB over 7 ha (3 % of BA).

- In an average season maintenance prevents deterioration from :

B to VB over 52 ha (21 % of BA)

G to B over 50 ha (21 % of BA).

The maintenance on Sir Arthur's Pill is preventing a deterioration of drainage standards on 42 % of the area in an average season and 26 % in wet seasons. Farmers assess that in the absence of maintenance, drainage status would deteriorate on 77 % of the area in an average season.

5 SCHEME APPRAISAL

5.1 Maintenance Benefits

For each block of land, agricultural production scenarios were created which reflect different levels of field management under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage (see R&D Note 456 Section 3.5.4). These scenarios are based on discussions with farmers in the benefit area over the period 1992-1994.

Changes in field drainage status as a result of maintenance under dry, average and wet climatic conditions have been identified. Changes in flood risk due to maintenance have also been determined. Estimates have been derived of the monetary value of changes in field management and productivity associated with changes in the standards of drainage service.

Two perspectives have been used to value agricultural performance. The first perspective is that of financial analysis which uses the prices paid and received by farmers to estimate the added-value associated with drainage. Financial analysis shows the benefits of maintenance to farmers in the benefit area.

The second perspective is that of economic analysis which modifies the financial analysis to make allowance for the direct and indirect subsidies paid to farmers by Government. In accordance with the MAFF Project Appraisal Guidance Notes on Flood Defence (PAGN, 1993), these modifications involve reductions in the financial value of output (including subsidies) by 10 % in the case of cereals, oil seeds and grain legumes, 35 % for beef and 25 % for sheep. Commodities subject to quota such as potatoes, sugar beet and milk are treated as winter wheat. The set aside areas are also treated as wheat. The reasons for these adjustments are discussed in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

Using the results of watertable modelling, Table 5.1 shows the financial net returns (1995/96 prices) for each block of land within the benefit area under conditions of good, bad and very bad drainage. Changes in net returns relating to a change in drainage status are also shown. Table 5.2 presents similar data using economic prices.

Table 5.1 Financial net returns

Block	Net Return (£/ha)			Change in net Return (£/ha)		
	Good	Bad	Very Bad	Good to Bad	Bad to Very Bad	Good to Very Bad
101	135	93	69	43	24	66
102	206	146	95	60	52	112
103	190	137	94	53	43	95
201	518	311	230	207	82	288
202	207	156	152	51	4	55
203	185	151	123	34	28	62
301	146	116	73	29	43	73
302	206	167	126	39	41	80
303	554	303	233	252	70	321
304	554	303	233	252	70	321
305	137	108	64	28	45	73
306	536	338	255	197	84	281
307	108	84	63	24	20	44
401	1247	543	151	705	392	1096
402	1247	543	151	705	392	1096
501	1037	514	174	523	339	863
502	1037	514	174	523	339	863
503	1038	515	175	524	339	863
504	1046	524	175	522	348	871
505	418	332	234	86	98	184
601	Holiday homes					
701	351	292	244	59	48	110
801	354	289	218	65	71	213
901	431	285	262	146	23	-262

Table 5.2 Economic net returns

Block	Net Return (£/ha)			Change in net Return (£/ha)		
	Good	Bad	Very Bad	Good to Bad	Bad to Very Bad	Good to Very Bad
101	1	-17	-20	18	3	21
102	28	5	-12	23	17	40
103	29	7	-12	22	19	41
201	365	301	165	63	137	200
202	66	44	35	22	8	30
203	61	46	33	16	13	28
301	-8	-14	-19	7	5	12
302	66	48	33	18	15	33
303	372	301	168	70	134	204
304	372	301	168	70	134	204
305	-9	-15	-24	7	8	15
306	382	320	189	62	131	193
307	-14	-20	-25	6	4	10
401	1126	603	177	523	426	949
402	1126	603	177	523	426	949
501	743	897	177	-154	721	566
502	743	897	177	-154	721	566
503	933	898	177	35	721	756
504	933	898	177	35	721	756
505	375	309	177	67	132	198
601	Holiday homes					
701	149	121	97	29	24	52
801	130	96	63	33	33	66
901	135	109	82	27	26	53

Table 5.3 combines data on changes in drainage status and financial performance to determine the financial benefits and change in financial net returns due to maintenance for wet, average and dry weather conditions for each block of land in the benefit area. These benefits are the avoidance of losses which would occur in the absence of maintenance. Benefits, weighted by field size for wet, average and dry seasons are multiplied by the relative probability of the occurrence of the season to give an average expected annual benefit. These are summed for the benefit area as a whole.

Table 5.3 estimates a total expected annual benefit of about £ 7700 in 1995 financial prices, equivalent to about £ 32/ha per year. The benefits relate to watertable control. Table 5.4 shows the benefits attributable to maintenance using economic prices based on the current MAFF Project Appraisal Guidance Notes. Total average expected annual benefits are approximately £ 5000 in economic prices for the benefit area, equivalent to £ 21/ha. On this basis, the benefit to the national economy is 65 % of the benefits which accrue to farmers. This difference reflects the adjustments required by MAFF to remove government subsidy from the assessment of benefits.

As an alternative estimate to that based on watertable modelling, Table 5.5 estimates the benefits due to maintenance which were perceived by farmers (earlier reported in Table 4.1) where they identified a change in drainage conditions between the 'with' and 'without' maintenance situations in an average, representative season. Farmer assessment gave an average annual financial benefit of £ 23571 (£ 97/ha) and an economic benefit of £ 2483 (£ 10/ha).

According to the criteria used, these financial and economic benefit estimates show the limits which farmers and the nation respectively could justifiably spend on maintenance. These estimates require cautious interpretation as explained in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

Table 5.4 Changes in net returns due to maintenance and climate, 1995/96 economic prices

Block	Area (ha)	Wet Season			Average Season			Dry Season			Total Change (£/yr)
		Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	
101	14.60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
102	5.80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
103	11.60	0	0	0	22	0	22	0	0	0	
201	4.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
202	6.80	0	0	0	22	0	22	0	0	0	
203	9.00	13	0	13	13	0	13	0	0	0	
301	13.70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
302	16.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
303	6.80	204	0	204	70	0	70	0	0	0	
304	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
305	4.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
306	11.2	62	0	62	62	0	62	0	0	0	
307	6.3	6	0	6	6	0	6	0	0	0	
401	2.8	523	0	523	523	0	523	0	0	0	
402	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
501	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
502	7.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
503	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
504	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
505	22.9	0	0	0	132	0	132	0	0	0	
601	4.4	Holiday Homes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
701	3.6	29	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	
801	46.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
901	20.4	26	0	26	26	0	26	0	0	0	
Total	242.40										
Probability of :-		Wet season			Average season			Dry season			Benefit (£/ha)
		0.265			0.572			0.163			
											21

Table 5.5 Farmer assessment of maintenance benefits

Block	Area (ha)	Average Season Financial Prices			Average Season Economic Prices		
		Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance	Benefit due to drainage (£/ha/yr)	Benefits of flood alleviation (£/ha)	Change in net return due to maintenance
101	14.60	43	0	628	18	0	263
102	5.80	60	0	348	23	0	133
103	11.60	0	0	0	0	0	0
201	4.70	207	0	973	63	0	296
202	6.80	51	0	347	22	0	150
203	9.00	0	0	0	0	0	0
301	13.70	0	0	0	0	0	0
302	16.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
303	6.80	252	0	1714	70	0	476
304	4.2	252	0	1058	70	0	294
305	4.7	28	0	132	7	0	33
306	11.2	197	0	2206	62	0	694
307	6.3	24	0	151	6	0	38
401	2.8	0	0	0	0	0	0
402	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
501	8	523	0	4184	-154	0	-1232
502	7.2	523	0	3766	-154	0	-1109
503	4.2	524	0	2201	35	0	147
504	4.2	522	0	2192	35	0	147
505	22.9	0	0	0	0	0	0
601	4.4	Holiday Homes					
701	3.6	59	0	212	29	0	104
801	46.00	65	0	2990	33	0	1518
901	20.4	23	0	469	26	0	530
Total	242	Total financial benefit (£)		23571	Total economic benefit (£)		2483
		Benefit (£/ha)		97	Benefit (£/ha)		10

5.2 Maintenance Costs

Maintenance activities on the Sir Arthur's Pill involve desilting and weed clearance carried out on an 18 month cycle. According to NRA sources, the 1992/93 cycle cost £ 7700, equivalent to an annual average cost of £ 5430 in 1995 prices, about £ 23/ha of benefit.

5.3 Scheme Appraisal

The estimated benefits attributable to maintenance can be compared with estimated costs to determine the justification for expenditure. Maintenance costs have been amortised to derive annual costs in order for the appraisal to involve a simple comparison of annual benefits and costs.

Table 5.6 shows that according to the modelled results, the existing maintenance scheme is viable in financial terms and almost breaks even in economic terms:

Table 5.6 Maintenance scheme appraisal: Sir Arthur's Pill

Average Annual Benefit (£)	Average Annual Benefits (£)	Average Annual Costs (£)	Benefit : Cost Ratio
<i>Modelled Estimates</i>			
Financial Prices	7700	5430	1.42
Economic Prices	5000	5430	0.92
<i>Farmer Estimates</i>			
Financial Prices	23571	5430	4.34
Economic Prices	2483	5430	0.46

Farmer assessment gave an average annual financial benefit of £ 23571 (£ 97/ha) and an economic benefit of £ 2483 (£ 10/ha) under average seasons. The scheme generates an annual benefit : cost ratio of 4.34 and 0.46 in financial and economic terms respectively.

These conclusions must be interpreted cautiously as discussed in the R&D Note 456 Section 2.7.2.

6 ENVIRONMENT

6.1 Introduction

The environmental quality of the Sir Arthur's Pill is outlined in this chapter. Reference is made to river corridor surveys, public consultation and farmer assessment.

6.2 Sites of Specific Scientific Interest

Three sites within the benefit area were bought by English Nature in April 1991. These sites are designated as the Braunton Swampool Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) part owned by the Devon Wildlife Trust, and the Greenaways and Freshmarsh SSSI sites (Figure 7). The Braunton Swampool site is one of only three remaining herb rich grazing meadows in Devon. The SSSI is flat and low lying with a high watertable. The soil is derived from marine alluvium with peaty horizons.

All three sites support a rich and diverse flora including local rarities such as the Marsh Arrowgrass (*Triglochin palustris*) and Tasteless Water-Pepper (*Polygonum mite*). The flora is thought to be typical of a traditional grazing marsh of which less than 24 000 ha remain in Great Britain.

In the past, management of the land resulted in the development of two different vegetation communities; MG11 and MG10 under the National Vegetation Classification (NVC). Land management deteriorated and fen vegetation developed (NVC M27/28). The aim of English Nature and the Devon Wildlife Trust is to resume traditional management of the land to encourage the development of the traditional vegetation community. At present, the land is not grazed but simulated hay cutting is practised in the summer.

6.3 River Corridor Survey

Prior to the river maintenance works in 1992, a river corridor survey was completed (Appendix II) for the selected reach following the survey methodology developed by the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC, now English Nature, EN). Sketch maps and record cards have been produced for each 500 m section. The survey concentrated on the river corridor

and adjacent land. Details concerning such features as channel dimensions, bed substrate, presence of structures, field drainage and bank and in channel vegetation were recorded.

As river maintenance did not alter the channel characteristics, especially as the banks were not flail mown, a complete post-maintenance corridor survey was not necessary. The post-maintenance survey took the form of a vegetational survey which concentrated on the location and percentage cover of channel vegetation (Appendix II).

6.4 Public Consultation

In the spring of each year a 'Conservation liaison Meeting' is held by the NRA to discuss the work programme for river maintenance in the following year. Representatives from various organisations such as EN, Countryside Commission (CC), English Heritage (EH), the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) are invited to attend. Objections to the proposed work can be raised and if necessary modifications to the work programme made.

6.5 Farmer Assessment


Farmers interviewed within the benefit area were asked to identify any environmental features along the reach which they thought were likely to be disturbed or destroyed by the maintenance work. Only one thought that river maintenance would have a detrimental impact on the environment. The young trees growing on the river banks were thought to be destroyed or damaged by machinery.

6.6 Channel and Bank Quality

The environmental quality of the Sir Arthur's Pill has been determined by following the procedure outlined in the 'Guidelines for the Justification of River Maintenance' (R&D Note 511) produced within the framework of the NRA R&D Note 456 (River Maintenance Evaluation).

The quality of both the channel and bank is classed as low. There is no transitional zone between the channel edge and the river at times of low flow, the sediment is uniform, no riffles and pools are present and the channel is of a uniform habitat.

The banks are of uniform structure, consisting of predominantly one vegetation type and no trees or scrub. Bank width is typically less than 2 m. The banks over the marsh area consist of uniform grass cover which is grazed by sheep and cattle. The bank structure is not varied and there are no dense stands of single species or flowering herbs. Channel banks of the upper section of the Sir Arthur's Pill which flows through the arable area are also uniform in structure and cleared of vegetation during the maintenance programme.



Scale 1 : 6250

Figure 7 Sites of Specific Scientific Interest

7 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Scheme Appraisal

The existing maintenance scheme of weed clearance and desilting is viable in financial terms. The average annual benefit of maintenance in terms of its prevention in a deterioration in drainage status is £ 7700. Average annual maintenance costs are approximately £ 5430. The benefit : cost ratio is therefore 1.42. In economic prices, the benefit : cost ratio is 0.92; the scheme almost breaks even.

7.2 Guidelines for River Maintenance

The 'Guidelines for the Justification of River Maintenance' (R&D Note 511), produced as a result of this River Maintenance Evaluation Study were used to provide an alternative method for justification of river maintenance on Sir Arthur's Pill.

According to this method, the economic benefit : cost ratio is 2.1. This value is more than that derived from the detailed analysis; the results of which are summarised in Section 7.1. The differences in result may be due to the fact that average channel dimensions were taken for the whole study reach. If the study reach is divided up into sub-reaches, the benefit : cost ratio produced using the Guidelines is more comparable to that produced under detailed analysis.

7.3 Impact of Maintenance on Channel Vegetation

The types of vegetation found within Sir Arthur's Pill are discussed in Section 1.10. The impact of the submerged and emergent vegetation on channel capacity is also discussed. Different vegetation types respond to maintenance in different ways.

The floating vegetation *Lemna* and *Azolla* reproduce vegetatively and unless every fragment of this vegetation is removed from the channel, vegetative reproduction will occur and the weed will rapidly regrow. Chemical control is the most effective method of control in this case. However, *Lemna* and *Azolla* do not affect channel capacity as they are free-floating plants and offer no resistance to flow. They can however, reduce water quality.

The Canadian pondweed (*Elodea*) reproduces through a system of rhizomes (underground stems). The current method of maintenance - regular cutting, actually stimulates regrowth of

this vegetation. Desilting of the channel every few years is necessary in order to remove the rhizomes in the channel sediments.

The current maintenance regime is appropriate in controlling much of the channel vegetation. The vegetation is cut and removed from the channel and the channel is desilted every 18 months. Desilting reduces the rhizome and seed bank in the channel sediments. Regular cutting of the reeds and Canary grass stimulates regrowth. Through cutting every 18 months, vegetation regrowth is likely to occur at a slower rate than if cutting was on an annual basis.

7.4 Maintenance Best Practice

The 'best practice' vegetation maintenance methods for Sir Arthur's Pill were determined using procedures outlined in the Guidelines for the Justification of River Maintenance' (R&D Note 511), produced as a result of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study.

Channel

Best practice maintenance operations for emergent weed are identified as :

- Annual autumn cutting;
- Biennial cutting; and,
- Cutting on a 3 to 5 year rotation.

Best practice maintenance operations for floating and submerged weed are identified as :

- Biennial cutting;
- Cutting on a 3 to 5 year rotation; and,
- Desilting / raking on a 2 to 7 year rotation.

All these maintenance operations should be selective, concentrating on those areas which are particularly choked by vegetation or areas in which the weed is liable to cause an obstruction, hazard or restriction to flow.

Since the beginning of this study, weed maintenance has been performed at an interval of approximately 18 months during the autumn or winter. All the channel vegetation is removed. Generally, in terms of timing, the maintenance regimes recommended as best practice in environmental terms for vegetation management are currently being applied to this reach of the

Sir Arthur's Pill. However, if some vegetation were left un-cut along the channel margins this would improve the environmental quality of the channel.

Bank

Best practice maintenance operations for bank vegetation are identified as :

- Light grazing.

The majority of the banks in the grassland areas are grazed by sheep, cattle or horses and are not flail mown. In arable areas, the banks are not flail mown. Grazing regimes are relatively intensive and if the bank is un-fenced, the bank vegetation remains short and uniform in structure.

If the bank maintenance regime recommended as best practice in environmental terms were implemented, the grazing intensity of the banks should be reduced. This may entail the fencing of banks adjacent to the watercourse.

7.5 Recommendations

It is recommended that further research examines :-

- the impact of a reduced maintenance frequency (cutting every 2 years) on land drainage within the benefit area; and,
- the impact of reduced channel maintenance on channel environmental quality.

7.6 Epilogue

This report has assessed the impacts of the current maintenance regime on the study reach. It has been used along with other study sites to formulate guidelines on the appraisal of maintenance works and best environmental practice. These draft guidelines are summarised in Chapter 5 of the R&D Note 456 and presented in full under separate covers.

8. REFERENCES

Findlay, D.C. Colborne, G.J.N. Cope, D.W. Harrod, T.R. Hogan, D.V and Staines, S.J (1984). Soils and their Use in South West England. SSEW, Harpenden.

MAFF (1993). Farm Incomes in the United Kingdom, 1991/92 Edition. MAFF, HMSO, London.

Met Office (1979). Monthly and Annual Totals of Rainfall 1969 for the United Kingdom. Met Office, Bracknell, Berkshire.

NERC (1975). Flood Studies Report. NERC, London.

Nix, J (1994). Farm Management Pocket Book, 25th ed. 1994/95., MAFF, HMSO, London.

Map: Agricultural Land Classification. Sheet 163 (1974). MAFF.

Map: Ordnance Survey Landranger 180. Barnstaple and Ilfracombe Area. 1:50 000. Ordnance Survey, Southampton.

APPENDIX I

Example of input and output data for the watertable model

Sir Arthur's Pill

Block Number 901

Cross-section 5

Input Data		Output Data
River height (m AOD)		Watertable height (m AOD)
Week		
1993		
1	1.44	1.49
2	1.44	1.69
3	1.37	1.66
4	1.44	1.61
5	1.44	1.51
6	1.37	1.44
7	1.37	1.39
8	1.37	1.38
9	1.43	1.37
10	1.43	1.35
11	1.40	1.32
12	1.40	1.37
13	1.40	1.34
14	1.40	1.46
15	1.40	1.40
16	1.40	1.35
17	1.37	1.22
18	1.37	1.18
19	1.28	1.24
20	1.28	1.37
21	1.40	1.30
22	1.40	1.69
23	1.40	1.69
24	1.40	1.40
25	1.60	1.28
26	1.60	1.35
27	1.60	1.69
28	1.60	1.62
29	1.51	1.67

Example of drainage status classification, Sir Arthur's Pill

With maintenance		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks	
Block 901		Watertable	1993	Spring 1993	Summer 1993	Autumn 1993	weeks
		depth (m)					
	>0.5	1.22	19	1.22	1.22	1.22	1
	0.3><0.5m	1.42	11	1.42	1.42	1.42	3
	<0.3m	1.72	22	1.72	1.72	1.72	9

Drainage status classification, according to time watertable is within the G, B, VB drainage bands

Very Bad

Bad

Good

Without maintenance		No. of weeks		No. of weeks		No. of weeks	
		Watertable	1993	Spring 1993	Summer 1993	Autumn 1993	weeks
		depth (m)					
	>0.5	1.22	2	1.22	1.22	1.22	0
	0.3><0.5m	1.42	18	1.42	1.42	1.42	1
	<0.3m	1.72	32	1.72	1.72	1.72	12

Drainage status classification, according to time watertable is within the G, B, VB drainage bands

Very Bad


Very Bad

Bad


APPENDIX II

Sir Arthur's P.M.
Pre Maintenance

Flow
0 - 0.5 Km.




LG RB		LB RB		RB		RIVER			
RIVER BRAWNTON WATERSHED Km No. 0 - 0.5 km Date 6/4/92 Surveyor JALD		BANK FEATURES %		BANK HABITATS		RIVER			
G. OPEN WATER		BANK VEGETATION		Substrates		Depth			
1. Standing - canal + canal = ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % 2. Running stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5.10m > 10		BANK VEGETATION Cornifer Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow - recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standard willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Reed/sedge % Sparse open % Rescued or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		BR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + sil/mud @ clay ~ peat Habitats and Flow P pool S slack T riffle R rapids T turn W waterfall P protruding rocks Margins single bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area bryophytes emergent submerged floating algae % of stretch		Depth < 25m 25-5 5-10 10-20 > 10m Width < 1 1-5 5-10 10-20 > 20		100 100	
100		100		100		100			





↑
Flow
0.5 - 1 km

LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB %		BANK FEATURES %		RIVER HABITATS	
1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation		sh-ll %		bridges/500m	
Coniferous semi-nat. plantation		AAA solid earth cliff 1m↑		weirs/500m	
Mixed semi-nat. plantation		UUU soft earth cliff > 80 }		locks/500m	
2. Scrub - dense		UUUU rock cliff		inlets/500m	
scattered		UUUU artificial		Depth < 25m	
Carr - alder		UUUU flood bank with		↓ 25 < 5	
Parkland		UUUU flood bank set back		0.5 < 1.0	
4. Recently felled wood		UUUU levee		> 1.0m	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH %		Height < 1m		Width < 1	
1. Acidic unimproved		↑ 1 < 2m		1 < 5	
semi-improved		> 2m		5 < 10	
Neutral unimproved		Width < 1m		10 < 20	
semi-improved		→ 1 < 2.5m		> 20	
Calcareous unimproved		2.5 < 5m		Substrates	
semi-improved		> 5m		RR bed rock	
4. Improved/rescued		Slope: < 30°		b boulders	
5. Marsh/marshy grassland		30 < 60°		c cobbles	
C. TALL HERB & FERN %		60 < 90°		p pebbles	
1. blacken		> 90°		g gravel	
2. Upland spp. rich veget.		↑ 1-1 mud		s sand	
3. Other - tall ruderal		SSS sand		+ silt/mud	
non ruderal		bare shingle		@ clay	
D. HENTLAND %		vegetated shingle		~ peat	
1. Dwarf scrub - dry		earth		Habitats and Flow	
wet		natural cobbles		P pool	
3. Lichen/bryophyte		natural boulders		S slack	
4. Montane		BANK VEGETATION		R riffle	
5. Heath/grassland - dry		Canker		T rapids	
6. wet		Oak, Ash, Sycamore		M run	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING %		Willow recent pollard		W waterfall	
1. Mires - bog		Willow old, not pollard		AA protruding rocks	
Fen - reed		Standard willows		Margins	
sedge		Alder		shingle & bare	
mixed		Other trees		shingle, vegetated	
2. Bog flushes		Young trees		mud	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION %		Thick Scrub/shrubs %		SSS sand	
1. Swamp - single sp. dom.		Sparse Scrub/shrubs %		FLORA %	
Tall mixed assemblage		Herb/Sedge %		emergent wet ~ 1m wide	
		Dense open %		emergent 1-2m wide	
		Sparse open %		emergent > 2m wide	
		Reseeded or mown %		total veget. area	
		Exposed tree roots		bryophytes	
		ISLANDS		emergent	
		Rocky, vegetated		submerged	
		rocky, bare		floating	
		shingle and rock		algae % of stretch	
		shingle, rock + veg			
		earth - maturing			
		earth - with trees			
		developed			




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER																	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation Scrub - dense Carr - alder Parkland Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved Improved/rescued Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland spp. rich veg. 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage		G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + canal = ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % marina % running stream < 1m wide 1-5m 5-10m > 10		RIVER Itm No. 1-1.5 km Date 6/4/92 Surveyor JALD.		BANK FEATURES % 1. Height < 1m 1-2m > 2m 2. Width < 1m 1-2.5m 2.5-5m > 5m 3. Slope < 30° 30-60° 60-90° > 90° 4. mud sand bare shingle vegetated shingle earth natural cobble natural boulders BANK VEGETATION 1. Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow - recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standstill willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Reed/Sedge % Desert open % Sparse open % Re-sown or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS 1. Rocky, vegetated rocky, + bare shingle and rock shingle, rock + veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m inlets/500m Depth < 25m 25-50 50-100 > 100m Width < 1 1-5 5-10 10-20 > 20 Substrates RR bed rock b boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + sil/mud @ clay ~ peat Habitats and Flow P pool S slack R riffle T rapids M run W waterfall A protruding rocks Margins Shingle + bare Shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent veg < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veg area bryophytes emergents submerged floating algae % of stretch		100 100 100 100 20 100 45 100%	







[illegible]




[illegible]



L6 R8	L6 RB	BANK FEATURES %	L6 RB	RIVER HABITATS	RIVER
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation 2. Scrub - dense scattered Carr - alder willow 3. Parkland Recently felled wood	Braunton Marsh Km No. 3-3.5 km Date 7/4/92 Surveyor JALD	G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing canal + ditch dyke pond, pool, cut-off lake gravel pit reservoir marshy stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5 10m > 10 2. ROCK 1. cliff scree limestone pavement cave other artificial/waste J. MISCELLANEOUS arable amenity grassland ephemeral/short herb hedge + hedge = fence on bank fence set back wall building caravans fish farm sludge clamp sewage works garden stick pile flood debris road railway disused used other	LB RB 10 100	BR bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m inlet/500m Depth < 25m .25-<.5 0.5-<1.0 >1.0m Width <1 1-<5 5-<10 10-<20 >20 Substrates BR bed rock boulders c cobbles p pebbles g gravel s sand + silty/mud clay peat Habitats and Flow P pool S slack T riffle M rapids run water fall protruding rocks Margins single bare shingle, vegetated mud sand FLORA % emergent wet < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veg area bryophytes emergents submerged floating algae % of stretch	100 100 8 95 5 60 } total 100%
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved Improved/rescotted 5. Marsh/marshy grassland			10 100		
C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other tall ruderal non ruderal					
D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet					
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge mixed 2. Bog flushes					
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage					




[illegible]



↑ Flow
4 - 4.5 km

LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
RIVER		BANK FEATURES %		RIVER HABITATS	
Braunton Marsh		sh-ll %		bridges/500m	
Km No. 4-4-5 km		solid earth cliff 1m ↑		weirs/500m	
Date 7/4/92		soft earth cliff > 80 }		locks/500m	
Surveyor JALD.		rock cliff		inlets/500m	
LB RB		artificial		Depth < 25m	
G. OPEN WATER		flood bank at/ly		↓	
1. Standing - canal +		flood bank set back		25- < 5	
canal =		levee		0.5- < 1.0	
ditch		Height < 1m		↑	
dyke		1- < 2m		Width < 1	
pond, pool, cut-off %		> 2m		1- < 5	
lake %		Width < 1m		5- < 10	
gravel pit %		1- < 2.5m		10- < 20	
reservoir %		2.5- < 5m		> 20	
marina %		> 5m		Substrates	
flumming		Slope: < 30°		BR bed rock	
stream < 1m wide		30- < 60°		b boulders	
1.5m		60- < 90°		c cobbles	
5 10m		> 90°		p pebbles	
> 10		4-1-1 mud		g gravel	
1. ROCK		5-5-5 sand		s sand	
1. cliff		bare shingle		sl/sil mud	
scree		veg. vegetated shingle		clay	
limestone pavement		earth		peat	
cave		natural cobbles		Habitats and Flow	
other		natural boulders		pool	
artificial/waste		BANK VEGETATION		slack	
1. MISCELLANEOUS		Caulifer		tittle	
arable		Oak, Ash, Sycamore		rapids	
amenity grassland		Willow recent pollard		run	
ephemeral/short herb		Willow old, not pollard		river, waterfall	
hedge +		Standard willows		protruding rocks	
hedge =		Alder		Margins	
fence on bank		Other trees		shingle ± bare	
fence set back		Young trees		shingle, vegetated	
wall		Thick Scrub/shrubs %		mud	
building		Sparse Scrub/shrubs %		5-5-5 sand	
coranans		Reeds/Sedge %		FLORA %	
fish farm		Dense open %		emergent veg < 1m wide	
silage clamp		Spartan open %		emergent 1-2m wide	
sewage works		Re-seeded or mown %		emergent > 2m wide	
garden		Exposed tree roots		total veg. area	
stick pile		ISLANDS		bryophytes	
flood debris		Rocky, vegetated		emergents	
road		rocky, ± bare		submerged	
railway disused		shingle and rock		floating	
used		shingle, rock + veg		algae % of stretch	
other		earth - maturing		100	
		earth - with trees		15	
		developed		100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	
				100	


↑ Flow
4.5-5km




[illegible]

Braunton Marsh
Post Maintenance.


Flow ↑
0 - 0.5 Km.




[illegible]




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER	
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation 2. Coniferous semi-nat. plantation 3. Mixed semi-nat. plantation 4. Scrub - dense scattered 5. Carr - alder willow 6. Parkland 7. Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved 2. Neutral unimproved 3. Semi-improved 4. Improved/reseeded 5. Marsh/marshy grassland		RIVER bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m intake/500m Depth Width Substrates Habitats and Flow	
C. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal 2. ditch 3. pond, pool, cut off % 4. lake % 5. gravel pit % 6. reservoir % 7. marina % 8. running stream < 1m wide 9. 1.5m 10. 5.10m 11. > 10		BANK FEATURES % 1. shill % 2. solid earth cliff 1m 3. soft earth cliff > 80 4. rock cliff 5. artificial 6. flood bank only 7. flood bank set back 8. levee 9. Height < 1m 10. 1-2m 11. > 2m 12. Width < 1m 13. 1-2.5m 14. 2.5-5m 15. > 5m 16. Slope < 30° 17. 30-45° 18. 45-60° 19. > 60° 20. mud 21. sand 22. bare slung 23. vegetated slung 24. earth 25. natural cobble 26. natural boulders 27. BANK VEGETATION 28. Canola 29. Oak, Ash, Sycamore 30. Willow recent pollard 31. Willow old, not pollard 32. Standard willows 33. Alder 34. Other trees 35. Young trees 36. Thick Scrub/shrubs % 37. Sparse Scrub/shrubs % 38. Riverbed % 39. Dense open % 40. Sparse open % 41. Revegetated or mown % 42. Exposed tree roots 43. ISLANDS 44. Rocky, vegetated 45. rocky, 1 bare 46. slung, rock 1 veg 47. slung, rock 1 veg 48. earth - mowing 49. earth - with trees developed		RIVER HABITATS Depth Width Substrates Habitats and Flow	
D. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Blacken 2. Upland spp. rich veg 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog 2. Fen - reed 3. sedge 4. sweet-grass 5. mixed 6. Dog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. 2. Tall mixed assemblage	
G. MISCELLANEOUS 1. arable 2. amenity grassland 3. ephemeral/short herb 4. hedge 5. hedge = 6. fence on bank 7. fence set back 8. wall 9. building 10. caravans 11. fish farm 12. sludge clamp 13. sewage works 14. garden 15. sack pile 16. flood debris 17. road 18. railway disused 19. used 20. other		RIVER bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m intake/500m Depth Width Substrates Habitats and Flow		RIVER bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m intake/500m Depth Width Substrates Habitats and Flow	
H. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog 2. Fen - reed 3. sedge 4. sweet-grass 5. mixed 6. Dog flushes		I. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. 2. Tall mixed assemblage		RIVER bridges/500m weirs/500m locks/500m intake/500m Depth Width Substrates Habitats and Flow	




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER					
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation 2. Coniferous semi-nat. plantation 3. Mixed semi-natural plantation 4. Scrub - dense 5. Carr - alder willow 6. Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved 2. Neutral unimproved 3. Semi-improved 4. Calcareous unimproved 5. Improved/resodded 6. Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Blacken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other - tall ruderal 4. Non ruderal 5. Heathland % 6. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 7. Lichen/bryophyte 8. Montane 9. Heath/grassland - dry wet 10. Mire, flush and spring % 11. Mires - bog 12. Fen - reed 13. Sedge 14. Sweet-grass mixed 15. Bog flushes 16. Swamp/inundation % 17. Swamp - single sp. dom. 18. Tall mixed assemblage		BANK FEATURES % 1. shell % 2. solid earth cliff 3. soft earth cliff 4. rock cliff 5. artificial 6. flood bank only 7. flood bank set back 8. levee 9. Height < 1m 10. 1-2m 11. > 2m 12. Width < 1m 13. 1-2.5m 14. 2.5-5m 15. > 5m 16. Slope < 30° 17. 30-45° 18. 45-60° 19. > 60° 20. mud 21. sand 22. bare shingle 23. vegetated shingle 24. earth 25. natural cobbles 26. natural boulders 27. BANK VEGETATION 28. Caudex 29. Oak, Ash, Sycamore 30. Willow - recent pollard 31. Willow old, not pollard 32. Standard willows 33. Alder 34. Other trees 35. Young trees 36. Thick scrub/shrubs % 37. Sparse scrub/shrubs % 38. Reeds/sedges % 39. Dense open % 40. Sparse open % 41. Reseeded on mown % 42. Exposed tree roots 43. ISLANDS 44. Rocky, vegetated 45. rocky, 1 bare 46. shingle and rock 47. shingle, rock 1 veg 48. earth - maturing 49. earth - with trees 50. developed		RIVER HABITATS 1. bridges/500m 2. weirs/500m 3. locks/500m 4. inlets/500m 5. Depth < 25m 6. 25-45 7. 45-100 8. > 10m 9. Width < 1 10. 1-5 11. 5-10 12. 10-20 13. > 20 14. Substrates 15. bed rock 16. boulders 17. cobbles 18. pebbles 19. gravel 20. sand 21. silt/mud 22. clay 23. peat 24. Habitats and Flow 25. pool 26. slack 27. riffle 28. rapids 29. run 30. waterfall 31. protruding rocks 32. Margins 33. shingle 1 bare 34. shingle, vegetated 35. mud 36. sand 37. FLORA % 38. emergent veg < 1m wide 39. emergent 1-2m wide 40. emergent > 2m wide 41. total veg area 42. bryophytes 43. emergents 44. submerged 45. floating 46. algae % of stretch	




[illegible]



[illegible]




[illegible]




LG RB		LB RB		RIVER					
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-nat. plantation Scrub - dense Carr - alder willow 2. Parkland Recently felled wood		RIVER BRAWNTON MARSH Item No. 3 - 3.5 km Date 30/3/93 Surveyor JALD		BANK FEATURES % 1. cliff % 2. solid earth cliff 1m 3. soft earth cliff > 80 4. rock cliff 5. artificial 6. flood bank 7. set back 8. levee		RIVER HABITATS 1. bridges < 500m 2. weirs < 500m 3. locks < 500m 4. intake < 500m 5. Depth < 25m 6. 25 < 5 7. 5 < 1.0 8. > 1.0m 9. Width < 1 10. 1 < 5 11. 5 < 10 12. 10 < 20 13. > 20		100 100	
B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved Improved/rescued 5. Marsh/marshy grassland		G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + canal = ditch dyke pond, pool, cut off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % natural % 2. Running stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5. 10m > 10		10 10		100 100		100 100	
C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Bracken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other - tall turf 4. non turf		L. ROCK 1. cliff 2. series 3. limestone pavement 4. cave 5. other 6. artificial/waste		10 10		100 100		100 100	
D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet		J. MISCELLANEOUS 1. arable 2. amenity grassland 3. ephemeral/short herb 4. hedge 5. hedge 6. fence on bank 7. fence set back 8. wall 9. building 10. caravan 11. fish farm 12. sludge dump 13. sewage works 14. garden 15. sick pile 16. flood debris 17. road 18. railway 19. damaged 20. used 21. other		10 10		100 100		100 100	
E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet grass mixed 2. Bog flushes		K. ISLANDS 1. Rocky, vegetated 2. rocky, 1 bare 3. shrubby, rock 1 veg 4. earth - matting 5. earth - with trees 6. developed		10 10		100 100		100 100	
F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage		M. HABITATS AND FLOW 1. pool 2. slack 3. riffle 4. rapids 5. run 6. waterfall 7. protruding rocks		10 10		100 100		100 100	
FLORA % emergent wet < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area bryophytes emergent submerged floating alpine % of stretch		10 10		100 100		100 100		100 100	

↑ Flow
3.5 - 4 km



[illegible]



↑ Flow
4 - 4.5 km

[illegible]

↑ Flow
4.5 - 5 km

Sluice Gate

Road

++

2 m ↑
1 m →
70° →

Pasture

> 1 m ↓
4 m ↔

9+

2 m ↑
20 m →
10° →


Pasture

2 m ↑
5 m →
30° →

Hedge

Wall

LG RB		LG RB		LG RB		LG RB		RIVER			
A. WOODLAND & SCRUB % 1. Broad-leaved semi-nat. plantation Coniferous semi-nat. plantation Mixed semi-natural plantation 2. Scrub - dense scattered Carr - alder willow 3. Parkland 4. Recently felled wood		B. GRASSLAND & MARSH % 1. Acidic unimproved semi-improved Neutral unimproved semi-improved Calcareous unimproved semi-improved 4. Improved/rosetted 5. Marsh/marshy grassland		C. TALL HERB & FERN % 1. Inacken 2. Upland spp. rich veget. 3. Other - tall ruderal non ruderal		D. HEATHLAND % 1. Dwarf scrub - dry wet 3. Lichen/bryophyte 4. Montane 5. Heath/grassland - dry wet 6.		E. MIRE, FLUSH AND SPRING % 1. Mires - bog Fen - reed sedge sweet-grass mixed 2. Bog flushes		F. SWAMP/INUNDATION % 1. Swamp - single sp. dom. Tall mixed assemblage	
river BRAUNTON MARSH Km No. 4.5 - 5 km Date 29/3/93 Surveyor JAD		G. OPEN WATER 1. Standing - canal + ditch canal = pond, pool, cut off % lake % gravel pit % reservoir % marina % 2. Running stream < 1m wide 1.5m 5.1m > 10		1. ROCK 1. cliff scree limestone pavement cave other 2. artificial/waste 2. MISCELLANEOUS arable amenity grassland ephemeral/short herb hedge hedge = fence on bank fence set back wall building curawall fish farm sludge clamp sewage works garden sick pile flood debris road railway disused other		1. BANK FEATURES % T - shell % AAA - soft earth cliff 1m ↑ AAA - soft earth cliff > 80° LVL - rock cliff LVL - artificial FV - flood bank only FV - flood bank set back levee Height 1 < 1m 1 < 2m > 2m Width 1 < 2.5m 2.5 < 5m > 5m Slope < 30° 30 < 60° 60 < 90° > 90° 1-1-1 mud 3-3-3 sand bare shingle vegetated shingle earth natural cobbles natural boulders BANK VEGETATION Comber Oak, Ash, Sycamore Willow - recent pollard Willow old, not pollard Standish willows Alder Other trees Young trees Thick Scrub/shrubs % Sparse Scrub/shrubs % Revet/dyke % Dune open % Sparse open % Revegetated or mown % Exposed tree roots ISLANDS Rocky, vegetated rocky, 1 bare shingle and rock shingle, rock 1 veg earth - maturing earth - with trees developed		1. RIVER HABITATS III - bridges/500m III - weirs/500m III - locks/500m III - inlets/500m Depth < 25m 25 < 5 0.5 < 1.0 > 1.0m Width < 1 1 < 5 5 < 10 10 < 20 > 20 Substrates BR - bed rock b - boulders c - cobbles p - pebbles g - gravel s - sand i - silty mud cl - clay peat Habitats and Flow P - pool S - slack T - till R - rapids M - run W - waterfall A - protruding rocks Margins S - shingle 1 bare S - shingle, vegetated M - mud S - sand FLORA % emergent veg < 1m wide emergent 1-2m wide emergent > 2m wide total veget. area bryophytes emergents submerged floating algae % of stretch		100 100 40 60 100 40 5 100%	





DSPACE

<https://dspace.org/>

South West Region: River Yarty, Sir Arthur's Pill

Dunderdale, J. A. L.; Morris, J.

1996

National Rivers Authority

<https://dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk/handle/1826/21262>

Dunderdale JAL, Morris J. (1996) South West Region: River Yarty, Sir Arthur's Pill, Annex of R&D note 456, R&D project record 317/21/ST, produced for the National Rivers Authority 1996