

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Scrutiny Recommendation Report

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Environment and Transport
Date of Decision:	7 June 2011
Title:	Environment and Transportation Select Committee Recommendations regarding the 'Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment' report
Reference:	3000
Report From:	Environment and Transportation Select Committee

Contact name: Katie Benton, Scrutiny Officer

Tel: 01962 847336

Email: katie.benton@hants.gov.uk

1 Contextual information

- 1.1 At their 29 November 2010 meeting, Cabinet took the decision to commend the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA), when available, to the Environment and Transportation Select Committee for consideration.
- 1.2 Following the recommendation from Cabinet, the Environment and Transportation Select Committee met on 12 May 2011, where members considered the PFRA covering report, the Preliminary Assessment Report and the associated annexes.
- 1.3 The Director of Economy, Transport and Environment, with agreement from the Chairman of the Select Committee, invited district and borough councils in Hampshire to make comment on the PFRA or request to speak at the formal meeting if they so wished. As a result of this request, written responses were received by both Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Rushmoor Borough Council (see Annexe A and B). Members took these responses into account through both their lines of enquiry and final recommendations.

2 Recommendation(s)

- 2.1 The Committee made one recommendation in relation to the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment report:
 - A That the Environment and Transportation Select Committee commends the Hampshire County Council Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment to the Executive Member for Environment and Transport, subject to the following amendments being made, and comments taken into consideration:

- That the technical amendments submitted by both Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Rushmoor Borough Council to the Select Committee are taken into consideration in the final report.
- That the communications strategy set out in paragraph 3.9 includes a proposal to supply all borough and district councils in Hampshire with links to the PFRA document for display on their webpages.
- That a standard template for the recording of flooding incidents is published by Hampshire County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, and distributed to all district and borough councils. That a data sharing protocol is put in place that allows the County Council to receive any data collected by borough and district councils through the standard templates.

3.2 Following discussion, the Committee also made a separate recommendation in relation to their work programme:

- B** That the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy is brought before the Environment and Transportation Select Committee for pre-decision scrutiny, when it is available.

Other Significant Links

Links to previous Member decisions:		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Title</u>
<p>“The Flood and Water Management Act, 2010” : considered by Cabinet in November the same year.</p> <p>http://www3.hants.gov.uk/councilmeetings/advsearchmeetings/meetingsitemssummary.htm?pref=Y&tab=1&item_ID=2280&cancel=n</p>		<p>“The Flood and Water Management Act, 2010” : considered by Cabinet in November the same year.</p> <p>http://www3.hants.gov.uk/councilmeetings/advsearchmeetings/meetingsitemssummary.htm?pref=Y&tab=1&item_ID=2280&cancel=n</p>
Direct links to specific legislation or Government Directives		
<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	
<p>The EU Floods Directive 2007</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/flood_risk/index.htm</p> <p>The Flood Risk Regulations 2009</p> <p>http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/3042/contents/made</p> <p>The Flood and Water Management Act 2010</p> <p>http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/29/contents</p>	<p>2007</p> <p>2009</p> <p>2010</p>	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

<u>Document</u>	<u>Location</u>
Hampshire County Council Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment	Highways West, Economy, Transport and Environment Department

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.1. This is only a very early stage in the development of Hampshire's local flood risk management strategy. However, the document will provide an important evidence base for future decision making. The County Council has consulted widely in the preparation of this document, and worked closely with the district and borough councils. Future decision making will be done in partnership with key stakeholders via the Strategic Flood and Water Management Group and it is hoped that this will ensure an equitable approach.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. Significant flood events can to varying degrees result in the breakdown of law and order. Flood risk management can be critical in foreseeing and preventing such occurrences, and this document will help foster such preventative measures.

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption?

Potential impacts are as follows:

- the eventual work undertaken as a result of this document should reduce the energy used and carbon emitted in responding to flood events and cleaning/treating water;
- more coordinated activity following this document may result in carbon and energy efficiencies;
- but practical actions taken as a result of the development of plans and the strategy that will follow this document are likely to require energy and carbon emissions. These may be offset by savings outlined above, but this is unclear at present.

- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts?

The PFRA forms part of the Council's response to the Flood Risk Regulations and the Flood and Water Management Act, which seek to promote flood risk management. Such flood risk management constitutes both a response to past weather events that may reflect a changing climate, as well as preparation for a long term future of altered weather patterns and their effects upon water systems as a result of climate change. The flood risk management activity that will arise from this report will help Hampshire prepare for future threats and harness future opportunities that follow a changing climate, above all protecting the interests of our communities in this context.

Katie Benton
Scrutiny Officer
Department for Economy, Transport and the
Environment
Hampshire County Council

Our Ref:

4 May 2011

Dear Ms Benton

Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA)

I am writing in response to Stuart Jarvis' email of 27th April 2011 in respect of the draft Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment; the borough council has a number of comments to make in respect of the draft document which I hope you will take into account as part of the scrutiny process.

I would like to firstly take this opportunity to set out some background to the borough council's response for your information. As you are aware, the borough has a keen interest in the water environment and has published a two phase Water Cycle Study to assist in the preparation of our Core Strategy in order to understand and manage the implications of growth on water quality, surface water management and water supply. I understand that you have been made aware of these documents and that they have been taken into account as part of the PFRA process.

The borough has also produced a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies areas at flood risk at a more local level; I understand that this document has also been taken into account as part of the PFRA process. As the borough's evidence base has been utilised to inform the PFRA, I have no comments to make in respect of the overall findings, but have some detailed comments to make in respect of the report itself and the consultation process undertaken with a view to strengthening our partnership working.

In respect of paragraph 2.1.1, the borough's second phase Water Cycle Study identifies that whilst the northern part of the Thames Catchment is influenced by deposits of clay and sand (and is thus generally more impermeable), the River Loddon itself is a high quality chalk river, a fact which should be referenced within this paragraph in the interests of clarity.

With regards paragraph 2.1.2, this catchment is actually the South East Catchment and not the Southern Catchment, which should be corrected in the interests of clarity. Whilst this catchment mainly affects Test Valley, it also covers

part of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council's administrative area and this should be recognised within this paragraph.

In respect of paragraph 3.9 (communication), the borough council is pleased that a communications plan has been put in place by the County Council to make residents aware of the roles and responsibilities of the Local Lead Flood Authority. However, it is essential that appropriate links to this plan are provided on all District Authority websites and that all relevant departments are made aware of this plan to ensure a joined up approach to flood risk management is undertaken by the County and District Authorities. I note that the County Council intends to target relevant audiences (to includes Districts) to raise flood risk awareness, which is welcomed by officers. However, early communication and engagement is key to the successful implementation of such a plan and in future it would be useful if the county could make Districts aware of such proposals at an earlier stage. Notwithstanding my comments, I look forward to hearing from you regarding your communication plan.

Comments regarding data limitations in paragraphs 4.2 - 4.2.2 are acknowledged and the use of a standard template to record flooding incidents in the future would be useful. It would be preferable for all Districts to record such incidents in a standard way to ensure future data sharing (in the interests of flood risk management) can be carried out in a more streamlined way and to recognise that flooding can occur across authority boundaries.

In light of this, clarity is requested in respect of the standard template and whether this will be circulated to District authorities for use in all relevant departments and whether there will there be a requirement for data to be sent to the County for central collation to enable the PFRA to be updated. It is important to recognise that this is a two way process between the County and Districts, as any data that the County collects will also need to be shared with Districts to enable documents, such as the SFRA to be updated to ensure all risks are appropriately taken into account in local decision making.

Finally, the timescales for responding to this consultation have been challenging, despite officers of this council writing to the County for clarification regarding scrutiny procedures some time ago. I have attached a copy of this letter for your information; regrettably a response to this letter has not been received. It has not been possible, in the time available, to discuss this response with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport or other Borough Councillors which would have been preferable.

It is essential that the County engages with Districts in respect of important documents such as the PFRA at the earliest stage possible. Whilst the borough has a good working relationship with the County in respect of the Surface Water Management Plan, officers would be keen to work more closely with the County in respect of the PFRA and Local Flood Risk Management Strategy in the future and

I would be pleased to work with you more closely in the future in respect of this important issue.

I hope you find these comments useful, if you require further information please contact Rebecca Fenn-Tripp by phone on (01256) 845464 or by emailing r.fenn-tripp@basingstoke.gov.uk.

Yours sincerely

Giorgio Framallicco
Interim Head of Planning and Transport

Enc: Letter to Stuart Jarvis dated 23rd November 2010



Contact Matthew Melville
Telephone 01252 398739
Email matthew.melville@rushmoor.gov.uk
Date 6 May 2011

Dear Mr Jarvis

Draft Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment for Hampshire

Thank you for consulting Rushmoor Borough Council on the above document.

The document provides a high-level overview of the flood risk in the County.

It highlights the particular risk of flooding in Farnborough and Aldershot. This risk had already been identified by other work, and was the justification for the Rushmoor Surface Water Management Plan (which is currently underway).

However, there is a query relating to the Table on page 31, where the 23rd-ranked cluster is called 'Camberley (also covering Farnborough)'. Whilst I understand that this name is taken directly from the EA's nation-wide assessment (and so crosses County boundaries), it seems strange that the principal name for this cluster is Camberley, as the Council understands that most of the residents at risk actually live in Farnborough.

It may also be helpful to provide additional information at the end of paragraph 6.3 to describe how the boundaries to the clusters are formed when they extend beyond a 3km x 3km area. This would help to explain why Farnborough and Aldershot are not part of a single cluster, despite their close proximity.

It is also noted that appendix 1, relating to past flooding events, has not yet been finalised.

If you require any clarification on the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Melville
Senior Planning Officer (Policy)