

## **E-Consultation Response: Consultee 6**

**Which organisation are you representing?**

-

**Q1: The Wonderful Windermere performance commitment identifies the following sources of phosphorus to reduce nutrient input: Private WwTWs, Domestic Septic Tanks, Catchment farmland, and 'Other' catchment land. • Are there any specific interventions you wish to be considered to support nutrient reduction from these sources? • Alternatively, are you aware of any additional sources of nutrient inputs that you think should be included?**

Having read the Wonderful Windermere Methodology, I understand that exclusions include land owned by United Utilities. I am unsure of exact ownership within the Windermere Catchment, but if UU own land within this boundary, then does it not make sense for the interventions to apply to these owned areas as well - especially given the whole catchment approach. - The definition of 'Agricultural Catchment' does not as far as I can see include Forestry and Woodland. There are areas within the catchment that include commercial forestry operation and indeed larger areas of important amenity woodland. These areas should be considered separately with their own intervention. The management of Forestry operations is entirely different to that of agricultural, but equally as important.

**Q2: United Utilities has put forward a comprehensive sampling regime (Table 1 in the document) as part of the methodology to ensure phosphorus loads are representative. Do you think the proposed sampling regime is suitable for each source of phosphorus?**

There needs to be a very sensitive approach to the regime of sampling on the 'Agricultural Catchment', especially with EA involvement. To engage with occupants of the land and landowners, an approach with EA representatives may be met with trepidation. Its important this is considered as a whole catchment approach and that the occupants and landowners are fully briefed on this, rather than met with a what could be received as a singling out approach to land management and farm practice. If these initial concerns are dealt with and managed well by the EA, then I am sure advice and interventions to improve a whole catchment approach will be welcomed by those who farm and own land within it. - Use the knowledge of those who farm the land for data as part of the interventions. No body knows the the land and water flow better than those who occupy and farm it. Use their knowledge and gain their trust.

**Q3: Verified modelled values will be used to claim phosphorus reduction outputs for catchment interventions and for interventions where sampling is prevented or not possible. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed modelled values?**

Modelled values should be applied with caution and caveated appropriately. They should be used as a last resort for data analysis.

**Q4: Throughout the performance commitment, the governance group will play a key part in having oversight and signing off all interventions as part of this performance commitment. Do you have any recommendations for how this group should be used throughout the performance commitment?**

The governance group needs to be representative of the whole catchment. - The governance group should be used to agree on the each intervention approach and to agree on use and relevance of data collection following those initial intervention. - It should be focused group, capable of making decisions quickly and efficiently as part of this project. - It should be established from the outset deliver and not fail and the process of making decisions clear and decisive in its set up.