

**BEDDINGTON CONSERVATION SCIENCE GROUP**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

**Date** : **Friday 4<sup>th</sup> December 2020; 10:00-15:00**

**Place** : **Microsoft Teams**

**Present:**

David Warburton [DW]	London Borough of Sutton (Chair)
Adrian Frost [AF]	Viridor Waste Management
Marcus Kohler [MK]	MKA Ecology
Derek Coleman [DC]	Sutton Group of London Wildlife Trust
Roy Dennis [RD]	Beddington Farmland Bird Group
Simon Chalcraft [SC]	London Borough of Sutton (Planning Enforcement)
Charlie Owens (CO)	London Borough of Sutton (Reserve Warden)
Ian Crump [IC]	Thames Water
Jonathan Downs [JD]	Viridor Waste Management
Martin Boyle [MB]	Mitcham Common Conservators
Rory Roche [RR]	MKA Ecology
Muriel Alix [MA]	Viridor Waste Management

**1) Apologies**

**2) Minutes of Last Meeting to be agreed and actions undertaken**

Actions from the September meeting were covered under the agenda items. Minor corrections and edits were made, particularly around the water management of Phase 3 wet grassland.

The minutes from September were agreed as accurate.

→ **DW to forward September minutes to Andrew Turner for entry onto Viridor website by 11/12/2020**

**Update: completed 08/12/2020**

NOTE: All actions are summarised with progress in the [Action Tracker](#)

### **3) CAMC update**

DC noted that the previous CAMC had had a brief discussion on fox control and that Dan Cooke stated that acid grassland creation was not viable.

[CAMC minutes](#)

### **4) Site Restoration Update**

#### **A) Meadowlands**

##### **i) landform remediation**

- (1) AF stated that no progress had been made on the puddled area since September, due to wet weather but almost all of the pipelines within the meadowlands have been buried.
- (2) Further disturbance will be required to pull cables through but will be remediated
- (3) The slump on the western face, opposite the southern lake, still requires further investigation to remediate.

##### **ii) Mowing and seeding**

- (1) All paddocks and paths subject to flail collection in September / October but banks were not able to be cut, due to contractor being unwilling to do so
- (2) MK requested dates for works for the mowing
- (3) DW stated that with CO now in place, CO can use LBS' templates for management recording and apply to BF to ensure there is a detailed record of activities

**Action → CO to create management monitoring spreadsheet by 31/01/2021**

#### **B) Grazing**

- i) JD investigated the plausibility and suitability of sheep grazing from an operations perspective. Including fencing repairs, installation of gates, and gas & leachate infrastructure security. The technicians who monitor the environmental infrastructure are happy for sheep grazing. AF added that "Issues we've had on other sites is damaged to this infrastructure through rubbing. Caniflex attached to the gas wells has pulled off causing oxygen increase which can a) blow an engine (very costly) & b) cause a subterranean fire."
- ii) MK commented that sheep are not a suitable livestock for meadow management in the long term
- iii) DW adds that they may deliver a benefit of control of hardier weed

species if used as an aftermath grazer in the short term and that cattle would be required thereafter, if there was a reduced haycut timescale (say every 3-5 years)

- iv) AF notes that there are issues with the existing fencing (requiring repairs, additional fencing and field gates if sheep were to be used as soon as possible and that the best way forwards would be to remove the existing fencing and replace with one suitable fence for cattle (to enclose the meadowlands as one grazing unit) by August/September 2021, with the intention of cattle grazing by the end of that year and to manage it mechanically during 2021.
- v) AF asks if removal of current fencing and installation of new fencing would require adjustments to the planning conditions
- vi) SC does not think that internal stock fencing works would require a planning alteration or require approval from the planning department.
- vii) AF - following an Access Task & Finish Group meeting on 3/12/20, presents a map produced by community stakeholders from the CAMC. This map shows possible access proposals. There is an understanding that this map has implications for grazing paddock location and sizes.
- viii) AF to propose that the publicly accessible pathway will follow the southern and then eastern perimeter of the meadowlands paddock.
- ix) CO adds that access to the meadowlands paddock is possible but would need to be a controlled, seasonal pathway to protect ground nesting birds.

**Action → AF to remove existing paddock fencing, re-use materials as far as possible and erect one single paddock around the meadowland, ahead of August 2021**

### C) Wet Grassland

#### i) Phase 1

- (1) AF Update - All seeding of islands and 50% banks was completed. Island uptake has been less successful, probably due to geese poaching, but the banks and upper levels have begun to sprout, RW has prepared an [additional seed mix](#) to overseed with. Spreading of this seed to be postponed until fence installation has been completed, as damage will be unavoidable.
- (2) DW noted that there are a number of weed species sprouting and that fencing would allow for appropriate management in the form of grazing to take place. Mechanical control in the spring would lead to a greater level of nest disturbance so should be avoided if possible
- (3) CO asked for a fencing timeline

- (4) AF no timeline at present. Contractors coming to site on 9/12/20 to discuss deliverable specs.
- (5) CO provided [specifications](#) to Viridor based on best practice up-to-date research published by the RSPB.
- (6) DW asked JD if he had contacted the local fencing contractors he had sent across. JD replied that he had not but had struggled to get people interested, based on the list CO had provided (which included suppliers of fencing).
- (7) CO stated that he was receiving interest from contractors  
**Action → CO & JD to work together to get contractors on site**
- (8) AF questioned whether those specifications were right for Beddington. AF more keen on a design and build solution from the contractors.
- (9) DW stated that although we could see what the contractors come back with, they usually build to the specification the reserve manager requires and in this case, the specification is based on the best available evidence from an organisation that deals with this issue on dozens of sites.
- (10) AF stated we need to consider the avian predation
- (11) DW responded that we do but there is a known issue with fox predation, so that needs to take precedence.
- (12) MK and DC commented about avian predation, with direct predation from corvids but less certainty as to impacts from larids, perhaps more through disturbance (i.e. adults mobbing larids to push them away) than through direct predation
- (13) CO suggests that, in combination with fence installation we need to use 2021 as a monitoring opportunity using temperature nest loggers, possibly camera traps and volunteers.
- (14) MK agrees that nest monitoring is a valuable use of time and resources to better prepare the site for nesting season 2022 and thereafter.
- (15) DC asks about license requirement
- (16) MK says that a license is not required for lapwing monitoring but may be the case for LRP.  
**Action → MK to speak to James Heywood**

ii) Phase 2 & 3

- (1) AF update - Due to challenging weather conditions and the impact of COVID, all works on phase 2 and 3 ceased in early November, Phase 3 has had significant volumes of material excavated out but is unsuitable for capping the landfill as

- planned as the clay is too wet for engineering purposes.
- (2) The plan is for the remaining bulk excavations and forming the main drainage channels and bunds to be undertaken in June/July 2021.
  - (3) Roger Wardle & Andrew Spence to come to site in August 2021 to undertake microtopographic formation of phases 2 & 3 ready for seed sowing in September, as well as any further island remediation.

D) Predator Fencing - AF/JD

- i) See the above discussion under Wet Grassland Phase 1, specifically points (5) to (11)

E) Autumn & Winter Works

- i) Island management update
  - CO update - Working with Viridor operational team and LBS staff, island work has been progressed.
  - North West island has been cleared of vegetation and tree stumps, save one, have been treated. This island has some surface gravels but could do with topping up.
  - North East island clearance has begun but is yet to be completed. Most of the annual weeds have been dug out but hardier purple loosestrife clumps remain to be cleared.  
**Action →CO to arrange task day(s) to finish NE Island clearance before Christmas shutdown**
  - East Central Island has had the majority of its vegetation cut and removed, although some remains. Gravels are present but have been churned into the soils with the use of the excavator. Additional gravels are required. Causeway was created for access and is yet to be removed.  
**Action →AF to finish East Central clearance and top with gravels, if possible, before Christmas shutdown**
  - West Central Island has been cleared of all vegetation. Gravels have been churned into the soils through the use of the excavator. Require additional gravels.  
**Action →AF to top West Central with gravels, if possible, before Christmas shutdown**
  - South West Island vegetation clearance is underway using the excavator. Unlikely to be fully finished before Christmas 2020
  - All island topography needs to be investigated against known weir heights and further reviewed with RW in August 2021.
  - AF confident that water levels can be brought up to remove any remaining vegetation and to desilt the gravels
  - CO to arrange a few more days of island clearance

- RD asks about bird disturbance/activity and CO & DW respond with numbers from watching brief
  - MK, DC & RD all commend the work and are pleased to see progress having been achieved, with MK stating that he would like the minutes to thank CO, DW and LBS for undertaking this necessary work.
- ii) Water control & levels
- Water controls and levels had been generally discussed during the meeting around the wet grassland creation and for the islands. AF investigating design and build options for later weirs and Viridor are negotiating for phase 1 installation. AF awaiting a detailed design for a precast weir solution, rather than casting in situ.
  - AF comments that sealing up the outfall weir on phase 1 can't be achieved in full as it is built on top of silts and alluvial gravels. Weirs for east and west of phase 1 to be installed but some leakage is to be expected due to the substrata.
  - AF update - Gauging boards. Proposes 9 to 10: 1 on outfall of northern lake, Phase 1 - 1 on outfall, 1 on east and west weirs of drainage channel; east of phase 2; 1 at south lake outfall, 1 on causeway wier between reedbed and SL and 1 on outfall of phase 3.
  - DW comments that water needs to be stored in the reedbed and south lake for slow feed into North lake, so that water levels for waders on the island are suitably managed, particular in dry spells in spring and early summer
  - DW requests that gauging boards be AOD and had provided contacts for companies who can create bespoke boards.
  - AF queried why boards should be exact, rather than relative measures of water depth. DW responded that as there needs to be topo levels for the islands, we need to tie the water levels into those island topographical details, to correctly manage drawdown to create the necessary muddy margins at the right time, as part of a wider water management system.
  - AF commented that there could be cost implications for this. DW agreed that this could be the case but it was worth asking the question of the suppliers and if it was quick and easy (and cheap) for them to make each board bespoke, then to go with that but if the cost significantly increased, other solutions, as proposed by AF to have two boards (one with relative height and one with a topo marker), could be accomodated
  - MK commented that gauging boards for the north lake need to be installed as quickly as possible for over-winter monitoring and ahead of the 2021 breeding season.

- It was noted that the weir within the feeder reedbed in the southern channel needed investigating to ensure it was working correctly and fixing, if necessary.
  - The same applied to the weir in the causeway. AF stated that clearance of the causeway could not be completed due to adverse weather conditions. DW stated that it may be that CO and LBS staff could undertake felling of willows and vegetation clearance of the causeway, causing less damage than stripping it.
  - AF commented about using cordwood as an additional woody dam.
  - DW stated that it was probably best to fell and stump treat the willows, leaving the root plates intact to bind the causeway together. Depending on species, AF's idea could work but not if the willows are crack willow (*Salix fragilis*), as the cordwood would re-sprout if in contact with damp substrate.  
**Action →CO to identify willow spp. on the causeway, fell and organise treatment of trees as appropriate, before February 2021.**
- iii) SDEN
- CO has created a draft [Management Plan](#) and [gantt chart](#) for the conservation management of the SDEN compartment and requests that all CSG members review and comment.  
**Action →CSG to provide comments / suggestions to CO by 13/01/2021**
  - DW and CO undertook a beat up survey of the SDEN planting and created a [report](#), proposals and spreadsheet and request that all CSG members review and comment  
**Action →CSG to provide comments / suggestions to CO by 22/12/2020**
- iv) Southern channel
- AF update - work has not progressed from last CSG due to weather conditions and COVID circumstances. Operations team may be able to progress tree clearance over winter so that phase 3 work can begin as soon as possible in 2021
  - MK states that there needs to be prioritisation of any works for clearance  
**Action →CO and MK to undertake a site visit by 18/12/2020.**  
**Update → CO was isolating due to C-19 restrictions on the day of the planned meet**  
**Action →CO to arrange work days with on site operations team, depending on outcome of site meeting with MK**
- v) Reedbed

- AF updates. Neil Gannon is preparing reeds for translocation to the reedbed islands. Reed-stock is coming from northern lake islands and maybe southern channel. AF & team currently working on a plan to create a pontoon for planting.
- DW stated that reeds need to be appropriately processed before digging in. Depending on the size of rhizome clumps, it may be possible to do this from the boat  
**Action → CO to establish a schedule of works and plan for planting Viridor staff by 18/12/2020.**

vi) 'Orchard'

- CO asked if there was any possibility in shifting to a more south facing location, based on some reading he had undertaken to understand this area more.
- DW stated that as it was not an orchard for human consumption, traditional orchard practices were not required and the species mix should tolerate the worse conditions on the north face of the landfill
- AF stated that no works had been undertaken. Second section of orchard area to be cleared in preparation for planting
- DW stated that species to be planted had been previously agreed and he had shared this with Viridor again.
- AF asked about whether to plant in a traditional and formal orchard layout or at random.
- DW stated that as for nature, random planting should be undertaken.  
**Action → AF to plant Phase 1 by 01/02/2021**

F) Displacement Habitats

i) Turning work

- (1) MK presented an update of [sludge bed management](#) that has taken place over the summer and autumn of 2020. [Sludge bed summary](#)
- (2) MK has been working with ex-site operative 'Tonka' (Stuart Kemp) to oversee restoration of sludge on a number of key beds in both 100 Acre and SE Corner. Further work has been undertaken to join two sludge beds, through removing a bund between them on 147 & 148. MK outlines other possible bed to join, including 149.1 & 149.2
- (3) MK states that 'Tonkas' time on site over the summer and autumn periods has enabled a greater level of bed, island and sludge manipulation to take place instead of remedial works that are required to control vegetation in the summer months. His time on site has been invaluable in preparing the site for breeding season 2021.

- (4) MK notes that Bed 73 dried rapidly even after turning and it is difficult to turn. Water has started to be pumped to this bed and if watering continues, it may be possible to bring this back as a viable bed.
- (5) MK says that all pipes are in place to manage the water levels in 100 Acre. Providing that water is pumped during spring and summer 2021 and lapwing return after the poor breeding season of 2020, the beds should provide good conditions.
- (6) DC asked about reconnecting some of the beds. Several of the beds used to be larger and had been divided over time (see numbering system).
- (7) MK responded that when you actually look, some are now particularly terraced (particularly in the 'additional nature conservation land'), possibly due to differential placement of sludge
- (8) MK recognises the impact of removing such large quantities of chenopodium on overwintering granivores but states that the focus must be on lapwing and wader breeding success. Other beds are being left unmanaged as an overwintering food source for granivores and to maintain the original habitat mosaic.
- (9) The bird scrape has been reprofiled but there is the possibility of removing peripheral dense reed to create a more open area.
- (10) MB asks if there is any long term management for the future of 100 Acre and SE corner from TW
- (11) IC responses that there are no long term definitive plans for TW to develop either 100 Acre or SE Corner. The original S106 says that TW will agree a management plan as part of the Viridor handover in 2023.
- (12) DC commends the efforts of Tonka and MK on the work thus far and is pleased to see some beds reformed into their original, larger form. DC happy to keep some beds small with the long term aim of larger beds where the landform allows
- (13) MK agrees that some beds were formally larger but the changes in the terrancing prevents certain beds being joined. Build up of scrub has the potential to put off some wader species from attempting to nest but that removal needs to balance a mosaic of habitats.  
**Action → CO to arrange a site visit with MK and DC.**
- (14) MK thanked Viridor for funding 'Tonka' to undertake the works in the displacement habitats, which have been fundamental to restoring these areas. This comment is seconded by MK, CO & RD, who also thank 'Tonka' for his expertise in helping restore these habitats

ii) Watering solutions

(1) AF briefly refers to the proposal produced for TW by Aquatic Engineering. This report did not take into consideration the overall watering solutions of the Beddington Farmlands area but rather just lagoons 5 & 6. There were elements of merit, including the consideration of water wheels as viable water control infrastructure for the MEC.

(2) IC recognised the disappointment with the first report and apologised for any miscommunication

**ACTION → IC to chase TW for an updated version of the report that covers the whole site.**

(3) DW suggested that two or more Dutch pumps may provide a water movement solution, one to the north of the site and one for the southern aspects of the site

(4) AF shared conceptual maps of the newly considered phase 4 of the wetland structure. This includes wet areas on the eastern edge of the landform, as, due to delay with EA permitting, it was unlikely that the necessary importation of inert materials could be achieved to create the agreed upon topography in the RMP. AF proposed that the runoff from the landform could potentially be used as a feed into this Phase 4 wet grassland.

**ACTION → AF to share designs with MK and RW for initial comment.**

**ACTION → AF to consider water requirements and whether drainage from the landform would be sufficient for these areas**

- (5) RD asked if there were ongoing plans to integrate the Prologis offset area known as either Pongo Park or Beddington Lane Ecology Reserve, with Beddington Farmlands.
- (6) DW has been in contact with Prologis. They have confirmed that they are unable to continue work due to weather conditions. Plans for integrating habitats are still under development as Prologis have been very accommodating in changing their designs to try to optimise the area for breeding waders. It is likely some trees and scrub need to be removed along the boundary between BLER and Beddington Farmlands to create the necessary vista.

G) Acid Grassland

- i) MA introduced herself and stated she had just joined the Biodiversity Team at Viridor.
- ii) MA then presented Viridor's proposed alternative habitat of [grassland](#).
- iii) MK stated that the prescribed mix within the RMP does not provide for a classic acid grassland and that the proposed habitat improves upon that agreed within the RMP.
- iv) DC agreed that the creation of acid grassland was probably unlikely, as he and others had been saying since the 1990's, when the appeal granting permission was heavily aided by the proposed creation of acid grassland. The biodiversity metric presented by MA evaluated poor quality acid grassland against neutral grassland. DC conceded that it was likely that the acid grassland would be of poor quality but planning consent would have assumed high quality acid grassland. DC was concerned that Viridor were suggesting that compensation would not be required. DC accepts DW's [previous work](#), which requires considerable compensation. MK stated that heathland cannot be created and would require compensation but the proposed acid grassland mix was not high quality.
- v) DW then asked whether anyone from Viridor had spoken to the Environment Agency about the proposed dilution factor within the [GeoChem report](#) (in the region of  $10^6$ ), as the Leachate Acceptability Criteria (LACs) suggested that any leachates from the landform would be way below the Acceptability Criteria for discharge into the MEC, as long as a buffering 'V' ditch, as suggested in the report, was utilised, such that, as DW quoted "*Under the assumption that an interceptor v-ditch would be installed around the entire perimeter of the acidic grassland area, capable of collecting and transporting groundwater and overland flows to the MEC, no risks to the offsite controlled surface water receptor is identified.*"
- vi) DW stated that there was a logical fallacy that the acid grassland

- could not be created, as outlined in MA's presentation, when the GeoChem report stated that it could be created, although there were a number of difficulties that needed to be addressed.
- vii) DW asked if any work had been undertaken into exploring the creation of the proposed mitigation. Viridor confirmed that it had not undertaken any work on this.
  - viii) DW then stated that without looking at the RMP, he was not sure why the proposed seed mix should not create acid grassland but then commented that the proposed mix (EM7), as shown on the [Emorsgate website](#), did not accord with the mix outlined in MA's presentation (taken from the RMP).
  - ix) RD agreed that the website and the presented species mix for EM7 were different.
  - x) CO stated that there may have been an error in the RMP or that Emorsgate may have changed their seed mix since the RMP was approved
  - xi) DW then took exception to the statement from MK that the proposed seed mix would not lead to a high quality acid grassland. This was, DW said, because acid grasslands could be floristically species poor but have high value for aculeate hymenoptera, other invertebrates and lichens. DW did not agree that the species mix, in and of itself, was reason for stating the acid grassland would be in poor condition, if it was created.
  - xii) DW then quoted the Final Structure (4.4) intended within the RMP: *"The aim is to create a sward with a diverse vertical structure and species composition in the longer term through modification of annual mowing rotations, periodic creation of bare ground and supplementary (slot) seeding to introduce rarer species, typical of the NVC U1<sup>1</sup> and U2<sup>2</sup> communities."*
  - xiii) DW stated that Viridor had had 25 years to think about the deliverability of this habitat and had not undertaken any work until recently to consider whether it was viable or not but there is an agreed habitat to be created and any changes need to be assessed against the agreed baseline, as he had previously stated at the CAMC in October.
  - xiv) A post-CSG email exchange between DW and MK (04.12.2020) and then a meeting (08.12.2020) discussed the presentation from MA and is outlined here for transparency:  
During the above, MK noted that the CAMC had asked for a suitable alternative habitat to be found. MA was charged by Viridor with investigating this possibility. MA's mandate was only to look at an appropriate alternative habitat for the acid grassland area and thus

---

<sup>1</sup> U1 - *Festuca ovina* - *Agrostis capillaris* - *Rumex acetosella* grassland

<sup>2</sup> U2 - *Deschampsia flexuosa* grassland

presented to the CSG an option to pursue, in regards seed mixes appropriate for the area.

DW stated that that was understood and would have been useful IF the CSG was trying to determine which of two paths to choose between, from a 'blank slate position' i.e. do we go with acid grassland, or neutral meadow?

However, the mandate MA had been charged with was not provided to the CSG ahead of the meeting and, therefore, a heated discussion took place over the question of compensation during the meeting.

#### 5) Predator and Goose control

- A) AF has had discussions with a local pest controller in regards to predator control, to understand recommendations and any necessary logistical approach. Observation over several evenings/early mornings has been suggested to better understand the population density.

**Action → CSG to determine course of action by next CSG meeting**

#### 6) Site Monitoring

- A) MK has produced a draft [Annual Monitoring Report](#) and [Common Standards Monitoring of Meadow Grassland](#) document.
- B) MK says that the annual monitoring report is defined by the loss of tree sparrows
- C) DC has no updates to provide as access to the site has been limited.
- D) AF asked the CSG whether the information provided by MK is the right information for the site and whether that information is being acted upon, as it cost a lot of money to pay MK to create these reports.

**Action → All CSG members to read and provide responses by the 10th January.**

**Action → All CSG members to consider whether this is the right information to inform management of the site.**

#### 7) Tree Sparrow Report

- A) DC presented a paper that he is planning to submit to the London Bird Report (LBR) 2019. Following DW's comments, DC considered withdrawing the paper for the LBR 2020 but knows that LBR 2019 is short of material. DC had made changes based on comments back from DW and requested further comments to a revised version by 11/12/2020

**Action → Any further comments back to DC by 11/12/2020**

#### 8) Thames Water

- A) Beddington Farmlands Mile Road entrance Pocket Park confirmed ownership

by TW and future plans to be managed with Grounds maintenance contractors or local community groups. Community would require the area to be brought back up to decent standard and could take on ongoing management from there.

**Action** → IC to get costs from contractors for restoration

- B) Aquatic Engineering require an expanded site walk & discussions with Thames Water, Viridor & EA to produce an holistic report for water management.
- C) Aquatic Engineering report on feasibility of watering solutions for northern 100 acre and southern SAM site “We can get water from the TW out fall circa 1km+ in most directions. We can also use several+ pumps if we agree they work as intended. If we trialled one in the first instance that might be the best way forward and then stakeholders can see the possibilities”. Action for May 2021? Reservoir areas (171 / 168 100 acre) / (74 & 75 South SAM site) as inflow points?

Barn Owl monitoring & access new procedure / future access to be arranged

## 9) AOB

- A) Warden update
  - i) Charlie provided an update on works during other agenda items
- B) Cycle path & Access
  - i) AF shared the local communities [access proposal map](#) as part of the meadowland discussion on fencing and grazing.
  - ii) MB raised concerns that Mitcham Common Conservators (MCC) have not been involved in the Access Task & Finish Group as the proposed cycleway leads directly to a dead end at Mitcham Common.
  - iii) DW reminds the CSG that Viridor’s responsibility for any proposed cycle route or permissive pathway development ends at the northern corner of phase 1 wet grassland. From this point the pathway moving northwards is TWs responsibility. Input will be required from them to develop the remaining section of the permissive pathway. As such, the ‘cycleway’ is a cycleway to nowhere, as there is no connectivity.
  - iv) MK seconds MB’s concerns that MCC have not been part of the permissive path development discussions and adds that this late addition to the group is necessary to prevent any further delays occurring later in the process. MK would like to see a timeline for development to avoid further delays
  - v) MB notes that advertising the permissive path as a cycle route may cause management issues for Mitcham Common as there are no designated cycle routes across the common. The perimeter path is utilised by cyclists but it is not designated as such.
  - vi) MK enquires if Mitcham Common has considered creating a

- cyclepath around, across or on the common.
- vii) MB confirms that no such discussion is currently underway.
  - viii) MK encourages the involvement of MCC in the Access Task & Finish Group as soon as possible.
  - ix) DW stated that it may be better to reframe the discussion away from 'cycleway' to DDA compliant accessibility for the western path (includes hides) and possibly to create a circular walk around the northern lake
- Action → CO to request that the MCC are invited to participate in and comment on the Access Task & Finish Group discussions**

C) BFBG Access

- i) RD commented on the ongoing restrictions to access the farmlands for monitoring, as well as it being impossible to access the BFBG hide via the east of the northern lake, as it was heavily churned up from the island clearance works. RD asked if there was the possibility of accessing via a different route and noted that BFBG members had been granted access to 100 Acre and whether they could have code access to go via 100 Acre to the permissive path
- Action → CO and Viridor to discuss access arrangements**

**10)Date of next meeting:** Friday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2021.

The meeting will be at 10.00 am, either in a large enough room within the ERF to socially distance or via Teams, to be set up by Viridor or Thames Water

**Action → DW to send out calendar invites**

**Update: Sent 08/12/2020**

**Action → JD or IC to set up Teams meeting for next CSG by 01/02/2021**

With no further business, the meeting closed at 15:00

**Site visit**

No site visit was undertaken, due to the remote nature of the meeting